

TRANSCRIPT

Internet Governance Review Group Telephone Conference 17 March 2014

Attendees:

Becky Burr, .us
Keith Davidson, .nz
Chris Disspain, .au
Byron Holland, .ca
Don Hollander, APTLD
Barrack Otieno, AFTLD
Katrina Sataki, .lv
Peter Van Roste, CENTR
Mathieu Weill, .fr

ICANN Staff:

Bart Boswinkel
Kristina Nordström

Apologies:

Abibu Ntahigiye, .tz
Carolina Aguerre, LACTLD
Debbie Monahan, .nz

Byron Holland: All right. Well, we are couple minutes after the hour. Kristina, who is on the call?

Kristina Nordstrom: Let me see. We have Keith Davidson, Chris Disspain, Byron Holland, Don Hollander, Barrack Otieno, Peter Van Roste, Katrina Sataki, Mathieu Weill, Bart Boswinkel and Kristina Nordstrom. And then we have apologies from Abibu Ntahigiye, Carolina Aguirre, and Debbie Monahan.

Byron Holland: Okay. Well, so we have everybody expected then. So this call is going to be a little bit different than originally anticipated. I'm sure, given the announcements of last week, what I thought we would do is try to briefly do what was intended, in terms of a quick overview of any of the activities that have taken place in the various Panels and Internet Governance streams that we have been tasked for. But then, I think, importantly, have a discussion about our path forward, as we come into the ccNSO sessions next week in light of the new information.

Does that make sense to folks? Anything that anybody would like to add? Hearing nothing, in case anybody is on mute and talking, but hearing nothing, let's proceed with that. And just to get things going, maybe I'll start with a brief summary of the Panel that I'm on.

The Panel had a two-day session, which is the second of our three scheduled meetings. We had a two-day session on the 27th and 28th of February. And it was, I would say, quite productive, particularly in comparison to the first one, which is more about us trying to figure out where we were going, and a limited amount of time on the substance. So that's what happened in the first one, and as a result the work that came out of the first one was a little thinner than I would have liked to have seen, although it gave us at least a point to start at the February 27th, 28th meeting.

Interestingly, there, also because Vint Serf's Panel had put out what I think was a very good -- a very good paper, and it's a Panel that Debbie has been reporting on. They did some very good work there, and certainly anybody who hasn't read it, I would strongly encourage you to read it. At the very least, the Executive Summary which is about 10 pages long, but I'd have to say reading the whole 65, 70 pages is worth it. But the reason I mention that is that part of that paper, Vint's Panel put over a strong recommendation about a new set of arrangements between actors and the ecosystem, and that it effectively would be, if I can describe it, a web of Affirmation of Commitments between all of the many varied parties within the ecosystem.

So, in a sense, they would have to think of the Affirmation of Commitments, there would be a lightweight version of something like that between many and all parties. And that would start to be the accountability mechanism for ICANN within the government ecosystem. And I know I'm doing a bit of a hack job on describing that, but I'm only just trying to give you a flavor of it, because when it came to the Panel that I'm on, of which Vint is the Vice Chair, it was clear that that framework had been very strongly -- had very strongly influenced the subsequent materials that our Panel received heading into that meeting. Even though there had been no such discussion in our first meeting.

And part of -- that was only one example of -- where a lot of shaping had taken place outside of the Panel's actual work. And as such, Vint, who was chairing the meeting, and Staff, or Fadi, I guess, actually received a reasonable amount of pushback that some of the content and substance was being -- seeming to appear not from the specific work of the Panel. And not that there was anything wrong or bad, per se, but it wasn't actually the output of the Panel, so there was some pushback on that. And there was some pretty robust discussion around one of the key goals of the Panel, which is to set out a number of overriding principles for the path forward. We spent most of our time working on those, including, you know, talking about some of the work that the -- that ICANN staffers, or the staffers of the Panel, had obviously injected into the process.

There was an additional new member, Henrietta (ph). And I'm drawing a blank on her last name, somebody help me out, from civil society.

Unidentified Participant: (Esther Inaudible)

Byron Holland: Yeah. Member of the Internet Hall of Fame, and she was quite an interesting addition to the Panel, and quite vocal in many of her thoughts, some of where were good. Through the process, we did manage to come to a draft to a set of 11 principles, which are going to be released shortly. I presume they haven't put a date forward yet, because there's -- yes, you know, what we put forward was a rough draft and they were -- Staff was going to buff and polish them a bit, and take all the feedback that the Panel provided, and put it in a new document, which hasn't been recirculated yet.

So that, in a sense is where we are at. And I think there's also a feeling that we spend a lot of time working through 11 high-level principles, but that there were considerable amount of work to do around trying to articulate some steps on the roadmap, to executing on this, and of course that's all prior to the NTIA announcement. And in the end, you know, there was certainly much discussion about the evolution but it hadn't been contemplated on February 27th, 28th, but an announcement like this would come so quickly.

So that's where we are at right now, if there are any questions.

Mathieu Weill: Byron, this is Mathieu speaking.

Byron Holland: Hi, Mathieu.

Mathieu Weill: Yeah. Thanks for the complete update. My question would be, when do you think there will be a publication of the draft report or the outcomes from this Group? I was under the assumption it could be before Singapore, the agenda?

Byron Holland: It was my assumption it was going to be out before Singapore as well, which it may still be, and I have not had -- I've not received any information about when it is going to come out, but I will follow up with the point person on that, Nora. And see if they've determined the date yet.

Mathieu Weill: Thanks.

Byron Holland: My sense, too, is that, you know, when it comes to the principles, they do set a frame around what I think those of us on the call would consider the kind ecosystem that we would all support and believe in, but they are, structurally high-level principles. They do include a principle around, essentially, human rights, which was much debated and discussed, because there were those who didn't feel that human rights, per se, should be included in the Internet Cooperation in Governance Mechanisms Panel. But there is a nod to that within the principles, but they do -- the principles are more around accountability, low barriers, stewardship was a very strong principle. There is a notion around subsidiarity. In other words, the governance should be done at the level closest to where the issue is.

So those are the types of things that are in there, and of course the number one was that it was a unified Internet, unfragmented and interoperable and interconnected. So there's still a lot of work to be done, and the Panel is very aware of that, and in fact I think we've -- we are still having a two-day meeting for the third meeting, it's going to be a three-day event, in recognition that we haven't gotten as far as we'd like to.

Any other questions? Comments? Now, Mathieu maybe we could get an update from you?

Mathieu Weill: Sure. So I think I haven't updated you on the one meeting -- the one single meeting of the High-Level Committee for the Sao Paulo Meeting. I get stuck in the abbreviations and names. There was one such meeting, and it should -- during the World Mobile Congress in Barcelona end of February, probably just before the meeting you mentioned, Byron, of your Panel--

Byron Holland: Right.

Mathieu Weill: It was very well attended. There was the Minister of Brazil Communication was chairing it. There were Ministers or Secretaries of State for several countries including Spain,

which was obviously the host. There was 12 (ph) other countries, I can't remember now. There was Neelie Kroes the European Commissioner, she was there in person. Ambassador Sepulveda was representing the U.S., and for the Technical Community there was Tarek (ph) from ICANN. There was (Inaudible) for ISOC was replacing Kathy Brown. Me, and Louis Pouzin was there for the Civil Society and there was a Business representative.

So the content of the meeting was very high-level, it's a high-level community. There was -- it was a lot about general intentions, later there is members of special countries about what they were expecting from the Sao Paulo Meeting. Overall the Committee was somehow clarified, it was not clear if the Committee would validate the outcome of the meeting. That's what they call setting the political tone, but it wasn't clear how it's going to validate that very consensus about the outcome of the meeting. Certain members were requesting from high expectation -- setting high expectations from the meeting, and expecting a clear agenda about changes in Internet Governance landscape and a roadmap -- No, they were saying they want principles and the roadmap.

And there was some discussion about whether this was too high an expectation or not. The United States being quite insisting on the fact that, maybe, only certain topics would be advanced enough into the consensus to be provided with a road map and a clear set of principles, while others might have to wait. A little bit of expectation management was in the way with the organizers, making sure that -- really want to ensure that not everyone should expect that there's going to be a revolution in Sao Paulo, so it's the beginning of a process. You know this, the kinds of things we've heard since last Friday.

And obviously this meeting took place before the announcement, and so on and so forth. So, that's basically it. There were general discussions like this, no very clear conclusions. And the next meeting we all -- there is a mailing list that has just been created a few hours ago, so it's -- there's not a lot of activities with this Group right now, and the next meeting is scheduled to take place in Sao Paulo during the meeting (inaudible). With this, for now, I think that's all. Any questions?

Don Hollander: It's Don Hollander here. I have a question about the Sao Paulo Meeting, and in what structure is it going to be. Is it going to be 900 people altogether for the two days? Or, will there be smaller groups as well?

Mathieu Weill: As a member the High-Level Panel I must state, I don't have this information directly. There are three layers of panels in the -- for organizing Sao Paulo. There's the Logistical Committee, there's a -- what do they call it -- Executive Committee which is currently gathering the contributions trying to make a summary out of the 180 -- or 380, I can't remember -- contributions they've received, and the High-Level Panels. It's probably the second one I mentioned, the Executive Committee which is currently on the exact agenda on how things are going to be broken up, or not. So, so I'm -- it's a good question though, but I don't have the answers myself. I don't know if anyone else on this call has it.

Don Hollander: I don't, so if my concern is to how to -- how to cover and engage with the various bits, and if there's only one room with 900 people in it, it will be a different experience than if there are nine rooms with 100 people at various times. Thank you.

Byron Holland: Thanks, Don.

Mathieu Weill: That's right.

Bart Boswinkel: Don, Byron, this is Bart. Don, maybe, you could send an email to the list we created. I assume Demi (ph) is on that list as well, and he should be able to answer your question because he's in the -- in one of the other committees Mathieu mentioned.

Don Hollander: I'm sure it will come out in due course over the next week. I just thought I might have missed something.

Byron Holland: And just on that note, in terms of NETMundial Conference, the Panel -- the Internet Corporation Governance Mechanisms Panel, did make a submission there, so I probably led you a little astray, I didn't know when ICANN was going to push it up, but we did make it one of the submissions that went into the NETMundial process. So you can search there, they do actually have a -- what seems like a reasonable search function, and if you just go to the governance, if you just search on Governance Mechanisms, it will pull up the panels contribution which will go through the principles that I articulated to you already.

It's relatively short, and I haven't seen ICANN push them out to the ICANN Community yet, but I haven't found every aspect of the ICANN website. But it is within the NETMundial contributions list.

Don Hollander: That's just along Global Internet Corporation and Governance Mechanisms.

Byron Holland: Yes. And I think if you just -- I'm pretty sure I did it before -- if you just search on governance mechanisms it will be one of the ones that comes up.

Don Hollander: That's what I did.

Byron Holland: Okay. Keith, you were on the call, did you want to bring us up to speed on anything, with the CCWG?

Keith Davidson: Now, the CCWG made a submission to Brazil, I'd have to say it was not well consulted on within the Group, so it's been a bit of a surprise to me, but (inaudible) forward in the form that it said that it's -- you know, probably worth to look at as well, but relatively not sure if I can post it to the list. The only other thing I said -- I hope to report on was from Debbie who had promised to get some information through to me on the Event Panel, and what it has been doing, but she's in the process of shifting house, and she must have overlooked it along the way.

Byron Holland: Okay. Well, I would definitely recommend reading that document. If anybody is thinking of going to Brazil, it should probably be on the required reading list. You're not allowed in unless you've read that piece.

I'm just trying to think who else is on here who has been tasked as one of our leads, and I think that's actually it in terms of the three of us. I think that's correct, right? Nobody else on the call who was a point person on one of the streams? I don't think so. Any further comments or questions?

Peter Van Roste: Hey, Byron. This is Peter. If this is the appropriate time and place I might give you a short update of what we did at the last week's (inaudible) RTA (ph) in regards to IANA.

Byron Holland: Sure. I think that will be appropriate. Please go ahead.

Peter Van Roste: So, I've summarized, important to know that this was just the first part of a discussion that we are going to have, it was -- we were very lucky with the timing of RTA, I mean, just before the announcement. There were -- there was the expectation that that announcement would come sooner or later, so we were in a good position to have an

initial discussion. Agree on the statements and use that as the basis for our communication and everything that's related to the transitional announcement. The discussion with (Inaudible) was quite interesting.

We had two sessions. The larger one about (inaudible), and to be frank that was complete chaos, because we had come up with a really clever ID to get interaction going, and that clever ID was, use vague questions and people will start discussing the question. In the meantime you hear their opinion on all the relevant elements in that discussion. That worked really well. It worked actually so well that they didn't want to stop. So I think that -- if any conclusion on that. But that, I mean that discussion was very useful, we did a couple of straw polls during the discussion just to make sure that we had an ID everyone understood.

I think the four points that we will definitely use as a starting point for the group that will draw for some position, or happy to work together with the regional organizations, or the ccNSO if anybody is interested. And those four points are that -- it's important to note that the current service level of IANA is appreciated by all members. I think we had a couple of hands raised to indicate the country, but that would be two out of a group of 30, just to give you an impression.

Another thing that everybody supported strongly, that was I think unanimous position; the policy on operational separation. Not -- and as third point that -- for most people that does not mean that moving IANA and ICANN in different organizations should be -- they are looking at functional separation. So, the Chinese walls between organizations, probably more than another scenario that has already been advocated through different proposals.

Then one of those pointers on the publisher's position, and if you look at various signs for today, some people think that it's extremely important. The publisher's function should be kept separately because is a matter of security that there is somebody else to watch what's going just a technical and (inaudible). And so that these are the key points from that, but again, underlying it, we did not get to conclusion of what -- in what direction SENDRA (ph) will move forward. The tasks -- the GA tasked the Board and myself, to work on a -- I'm not sure if it's just me but I keep on hearing beeps--

Byron Holland: No. I hear it too.

Peter Van Roste: Okay. No problem. So we would first form a working group which will operate quite quickly, I hope, and swiftly produce at least a draft that can be shared with the GN, maybe even Singapore, we'll see how fast we can go.

Then during the second session we basically agreed to short statements, which we have sent out, and anybody who is interested can let me know, and I'll send you a copy. It's very short, it's about an open transparent IANA based on the Multistakeholder Model, where ccTLDs are actively involved, and where IANA remains accountable to its stakeholders. I'm paraphrasing, but that's basically it. So that was it from me. Thank you.

Byron Holland: Thank you, Peter. Any questions for Peter. No? Okay. Hearing no further questions or comments on what would have been the regular business, I guess in a bit of an ad hoc way I wanted to have a discussion about going forward to the Singapore Meeting given the significant change in landscape since we last spoke. Chris, are you on the call still? If you are, you're on mute.

Chris Disspain: Yeah. No, I am. I'm here.

Byron Holland: Did you want to offer any perspective or comments in terms of the issues you see or the process you see happening, unfolding at the Singapore Meeting?

Chris Disspain: Sure.

Byron Holland: Given, I think, there was one session devoted to Internet Governance on the actual agenda.

Chris Disspain: Yeah.

Byron Holland: Presumably it's going to be quite different. Can you give us any insight on how ICANN is going to be approaching this?

Chris Disspain: Yeah. Just a little bit. I mean, I think that if you go to the agenda, it's being updated a little bit, I think. I think there's now the session straight after the -- well, there were a number of sessions that were put in place. We were supposed to have all run these advisory groups, the Board Advisory Groups that have been set up, but that's now is sort of transferred into effectively sessions to discuss the announcement on what ICANN is too. So it was one of those straight after the opening bit. And I think there's another one in the afternoon.

And there's the -- I think it's still happening, Byron, it's the SO/AC Session--

Byron Holland: Mm-hmm.

Chris Disspain: --which is on Internet Governance and, again, that's going to be about obviously about this. I don't know how the session is going to run yet, we are still working on figuring out the best way to deal with what was the Advisory Group Session. Because that's split into a number of different legs. What to do -- you know, the Affirmation of Commitment is one leg, with the globalization of ICANN is another leg, policy, effectively ATRT2 is another leg. So to work out how to get all that in.

Can you still hear me?

Byron Holland: Yes.

Chris Disspain: And then of course, you know, the CCs will have to decide what they want to do with the time that they've got on the Tuesday and Wednesday. But I think most of the -- I think the intention, as far as I can see, for the whole ICANN Community is to try and run a couple of sessions that talk about process. So not talking about what will it look like, what will IANA look like, how will this happen -- sorry -- what will this look like at the end, but much more: okay, what's the process going to be by which the, quote, "Internet Community" comes back to NTIA with the transition time. Well, I don't know how that's going to look, and how the session is going to run at this stage.

Byron Holland: Okay. Thanks for the update, Chris. Which probably leads us to, I think, the next discussion I wanted to have which was around what the ccNSO was going to do, and there's two -- I think two pieces to that. One is, we obviously have some logistical challenges that I know are being worked on, and certainly Katrina, and Keith in particular, who have been, you know, focusing on the sessions that we are going to do in the ccNSO, and are working busily to try to modify them to make them appropriate given the changing landscape.

Katrina or Keith, did you want to give any color to the direction of travel that we are headed for the panels that we are going to have? So I'll just park that and let you think about that for a moment.

And the other thing is coming out of the ccNSO Meeting, so Wednesday afternoon, given this landscape, what do we want to achieve as CC Members? In my sense coming out of that, and also coming out of the Council Meeting on Wednesday afternoon, as well as the workshop on the weekend leading into the ICANN Meeting. There's a real opportunity to, I think, define our position and set the frame on the issues that are relevant for us, and take ownership of the issues in the space that are particularly relevant to CCs.

And I think, obviously, that's going to be fundamentally around the IANA function in general, and no doubt delegation, redelegation updates, particularly redelegations where we have a level of expertise, and interest that is arguably unparalleled in the community. So making sure that we, in a sense, take ownership, or at least kind of set the frame around which those discussions will revolve, I think will be important. And then just to pick up on the point that Chris made a moment ago, it's necessarily to be in solutioning mode out of the gate, even though I'm sure many of us have our own views on what solutions there might be, but rather coming out of Wednesday afternoon with a proposed path forward in terms of process, that gives us time to, you know, claim ownership of the space, but also ensure that have enough time for some working group to actually do the good work that needs to be done on this.

And maybe it's an evolution of the FOI, given the expertise that's been hard won on that work group over the past number of years. That's to be determined, but something like that, but really I think it's about coming out of Wednesday with a statement from the Council, an agreement of the ccNSO around what a process, over the coming year, is going to look like. And then hopefully, also, acknowledging that the FOI, or some version of the FOI, would be an appropriate choice for that work to get done over the coming year.

So I'm certain -- you know, I want feedback on that, but I see that as a likely path forward. So maybe I'll go back to the first piece which is around Katrina and Keith if, you know, I know hopefully we are going to have some more conversation in the hours and days to come. But is there anything that you wanted to raise with this Group, or seek input from this Group around the panels on Tuesday and Wednesday?

Keith Davidson:

Katrina is obviously being very reluctant to speak, so I'll see if I can put a few words in. I think, you know, with -- the announcement has sort of floored us all. I think the issues for Singapore and into the Panel discussions for the ccNSO Council Workshop, are now up in the air quite a bit, it's looking like Bart, Katrina and myself, will at least be able to meet after this call, and have a discussion about what reformations we need to make. But, you know, to me, things like the reporting and decision that we were going to have on the Tuesday from the panelists on the various ICANN Panels, is largely redundant.

You know, the reports are there to be read, except (ph) for your Panel at this stage, Byron. So, maybe substituting that to have more time to chew and digest on the way forward for the ccNSO and this new world, might be more appropriate, and certainly a bit more focused for the Council Workshop as well, about its future strategy will be necessary too. So I think with -- anyway that's just me, sort of, spouting forth, and we need to have a much better plan than that. And I think within another hour or so we'll have that plan so we can probably update this bit as well.

Byron Holland:

Okay. Katrina, did you have any further comment? I mean, I know that there are calls scheduled to happen, or meetings scheduled to happen, but I'll suggest put it out there and you have a range of people here on the call, if you wanted to solicit any input or feedback as well, I would open that to you.

Katrina Sasaki:

Yes. Thank you. Thank you, Byron. I just want to use this opportunity and urge everyone to come and participate in the sessions, and not only by listening but also by speaking

up and asking questions or keeping up on the dialogue, so it would be really good if we gather in the room altogether -- everyone together and first forward here, what our panelists have to say, and then we keep the discussion going. Like, yes, we were going to discuss everything in more detail after this call.

Byron Holland: Okay. Thank you both. So if anybody has any further suggestions or insights, you know, I'm sure Katrina or Keith would appreciate your thoughts. The second part of my questions or thing about the path forward was around what we as the CC folks want to have the week end with. How do we want to see the coming Singapore Meeting end from our perspective, and I highlighted what I think would be appropriate. Are there any thoughts or comments, additions to that. Do you think I'm in the ballpark?

Keith Davidson: I think we have to respond there quickly, Byron. You know, it's a real challenge for us, given the diversity of our community.

Byron Holland: Yes.

Keith Davidson: I think that it is something solid at the end of the week, otherwise we are going to look a bit odd compared to the rest of the community and, of course, I think this is us paying the price, in some ways, for not having been included in the iStar Community, and not necessarily knowing the moves and motivations of others along the way. So at the least, I'd like to see us having some agreed high-level principles, even if it's not a complete fit, but if we could have a sort of six sentences capturing what is critical to us as a community, and have our announcement around that, I think that would quite a useful bit of a go forward for us.

Bart Boswinkel: Byron, this is Bart -- sorry -- go ahead.

Byron Holland: Go ahead. Thanks, Keith. Go ahead, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: It's, before answering your question, maybe one of the, I'm going to say, underlying questions is: how much time do we have? Say, if were at the stage and, say, as Chris already alluded to, say the main sessions, and for the CCs probably as well, will be around defining the process, how to move forward. So it's, we could hint at, say, some of the principles that CCs want to achieve, but I think we have to be careful not to really rush into it, at the same time we need to align what we are doing with, say, the broader timelines. And I have no idea, sense, of these timelines. Maybe somebody else has.

Chris Disspain: Byron, it's Chris. I'm trying--

Byron Holland: Go ahead, Chris.

Chris Disspain: --to answer that. So the broad-brush timeline, I think, is the end date if there is one, is September next year, because that's when the current iteration of the contract between NTIA and ICANN for the IANA function expires. That has a three-year rollover, so it can be rolled over if we want for a shorter period of time, but that's kind of, I think in the Board's mind, that that's the goal. In order to do that, you can then look at some milestones along the way, and look at what we would like to have in place by those milestones. And I think if I remember correctly there is published a very broad-brush timeline about, you know, what you'd expected by London, and so on.

Byron Holland: Yeah.

Chris Disspain: The ccTLD -- from the ccTLD's point of view I think -- actually building on what Keith -- both Keith and Bart have said and, yes, you know, some overarching principles or statements of -- you know, for us this is what needs to happen is -- would be fantastic if

that could be agreed, even if the words are very vague, as long as the essence is still with it, but I get that that's going to be challenging from a timing point of view. My concern would be more slanted towards the process point, which is to make sure that by the time we walk away from -- ccTLDs walk away from ICANN Singapore, everyone knows that they -- that we are in charge of our own process.

So, yes, that's a global process, yes everybody has to feed into that. Yes, there needs to be, you know, everything needs to go out to public discussion and comment, but in respect to the ccTLD interface with IANA, if that's a process that will be managed by the ccTLD community. And the advantage of that happening is then -- if just to take an example, so those of us who end up going to Brazil to the NETMundial Meeting, we are able to say to anybody, government, to others who start to talk about, you know, the interface with IANA from ccTLD's perspective, there is a venue already established for dealing with that, and that is the ccTLD Community. Everyone is welcome to come and talk about it. So that's my very brief kind of perspective on it.

Byron Holland: Okay. So, again, in a sense, let's make sure we can come out of Singapore articulating the process, period. Staking our ground, but not getting into the -- let's call it the substance of it yet. That there is more than enough time to get some group of us to try to bring our very heterogeneous community together, at least in terms of the basic principles.

Chris Disspain: Yeah. Let me just give you a really simple, really, really -- it encapsulates that in a nutshell. That on Friday of this week there's an NCUC all-day session. I can imagine the circumstance where some groups of civil society people on the Internet Governance Caucus list, on the Best Fit (ph) list, should get together in the corner of the room and say, "We've got a really great idea for discussing how -- we've got a really great idea for the way that the ccTLD interface with IANA should be dealt with." What we need to do is to divert those people to a process that we control, rather than having a discussion type in a process that they control.

Don Hollander: It's Don here. I can't agree any more strongly with what Keith and Chris have both said. I think -- and you Byron. It is very important that the CCs own the process, and I think the CCs should also find a way to make sure that the unique nature of the ccTLDs is well communicated to the rest of the community. I guess well people might say that they understand, I'm not convinced that everyone does understand or believes the special nature of the CCs.

Byron Holland: Yeah. And I think it's certainly our -- and in particular folks on this call and a few others -- to be the chief advocates and ambassadors of that concept, absolutely. And whatever we produce coming out of Wednesday, needs to very, very strongly articulate that.

Keith Davidson: And I think there's an important little sub-aspect to this too, that on the one hand, where we can collaborate strongly with the other folks like the RIRs and the IGFs and so on, and it seems that the IANA database is for the straightforward, everyday updates that we all make in terms of the IP addresses for our root servers -- our own root servers, or technical context, phone numbers or stuff like that. And, you know, flitting in with a tin-plated, quick update and mechanism within IANA that's across all stakeholders, that's quite appropriate in that regard. So as a principle, a point of reference, that we want to entertain around, is the issue of delegations and redelegations, and the sensitive issues about sovereignty, this is the kind of areas the RFC 1591 local Internet Community obligations.

So I think that might just add a bit more flavor, you know, to the debate. If an RIR is saying to you, well, you know, what's the difference between you updating a telephone number or us updating a telephone number, the answer is, nothing at all, but the issue

that we have that you don't have is delegations and redelegations, and that is a much more sensitive and political issue.

Byron Holland: Great. And I guess the other thing, I've a little bit volunteered the FOI or some construct of it, to be the obvious expert group in this space. Keith, do you have any thought on that? Does that make sense?

Keith Davidson: Well, again, you know, you could sort of, maybe divide the work and I think we have an IANA Working Group, or we used to have IANA Working Group as well. So, for the issues around those more straightforward updates, maybe that work could be done by another group, but certainly to the construct of what should be governing the process of delegations and redelegations, I think the FOI Working Group is a logical base of expertise in this, so you know, it will be interesting to have comments from others as to whether that's appropriate or not.

Chris Disspain: Keith, it's Chris. Byron, if I may? I just want to say what I think is a really important point, which is that there will be a tendency on the part of some people to try to use this pathway to the end of the NTIA Contract to reopen the whole way that redelegation or delegation is done. That is not what this is about. That's not what this is about, and any discussion about that has to be in respects, what you've already dealt with. I mean, the ccTLD communities, I think there needs to be -- the FOI Working Group has almost finished its work, pretty much a done deal; what this new stuff is about, is how that process happens, not what happens.

Keith Davidson: Yeah. I agree. But it would also means that we need to expedite some work on things like a PDP on retirement of ccTLDs, because we need a policy in place for that before we have a construct of something to replace the U.S. Government decision-making in that regard, and so--

Chris Disspain: (Inaudible) at that point.

Keith Davidson: Yeah, there's a huge amount of work to be done, and--

Byron Holland: But you can't--

Keith Davidson: You know, I think though that Group is well -- or my Group is well situated to understand the ramifications of what it might be to do, and to add new players to that group would probably be a distraction because it would mean covering old ground several times over to get people up to speed.

Bart Boswinkel: Byron, Keith? This is Bart.

Byron Holland: Go ahead.

Bart Boswinkel: If you go back -- and maybe I'm -- if you go back in time, let's say, when we started, say, with the -- we knew of the contract. We had a ccNSO statement on the further notice of inquiry, and at the time, what we tried to do was separate the work of the FOI with this further notice of inquiry, because fundamentally they were two different things. In a way I see, say, reviewing this, say the whole relationship around, say the generalities in the oversight roles, is something different as well. You cannot mix up the work of the FOI, because in principle, nothing should change there on the policy side. If this goes back to what Keith just said, and what Chris just said, is that some people will use it to open up the whole debate around RFC 1591, et cetera, again. And I think the call needs to be that RFC 1591, and the rest remains no matter what.

Byron Holland: That's a very valuable point too on this, Bart. And I think it's very pleasing to see the U.S. Government sort of being right up front saying that the replacement mechanism for IANA, or the U.S. Government's role in IANA is not a multilateral or governmental organization. So that clears the way where the GAC might assume some control over the delegation or redelegation process, and that they be seen as an equal stakeholders in a multistakeholder process. So, given that clarity before we even tack the issues is very, very useful.

Chris Disspain: And maybe take it a step further, this is probably one of the principles to discuss with the community already in Singapore, that this is one of the basic assumptions of the CC Community.

Byron Holland: Yes. Yes. That's where I think, if we came up with a set of principles, I mean I think there are some principles that we have agreement on, like no one-size-fits-all, no ccTLD will instruct other ccTLDs, or all those sorts of things, which are pretty much founding methodologies of what you might construct because it's giving you licenses to do something and prohibiting you from doing other things. I think we -- you know, if we can refocus our panel discussions, a little in Singapore which was that we could come up with something that's moderately sensible to steer us forward from.

Bart Boswinkel: And these principles, if you put them at the level of, say, shaping the process to move forward, and as requirements for the process, then I think, say, then the CCs will own the process.

Keith Davidson: Yes. We absolutely have to do that. That's the bottom line, is that we need to stamp our authority that we are the policy decision-makers for issues that affect the ccTLDs, and other participants in any discussions are by invitation only, but at the end of the day, the vote is ours to come up with a workable model for consensus by the ccTLD operators.

Byron Holland: Okay. So the -- Mathieu, go ahead.

Mathieu Weill: I think that there's a lot at stake for the ccTLDs in this process, and I fully agree that a lot of questions may be reopened. I am -- I slightly defer with the consensus that's emerging around -- to own the process we need to reaffirm with our principles, upfront. I think there is going to be very strong pressure by all the stakeholders. Civil society will be one, and governance being another, I expect registrars will come as well, around the very discussions that took place before the ccNSO was created about our CC threshold, and so on.

If we want to avoid this, I think we need to avoid other (inaudible), like we own this, or we stick our grounds. We need to be the first ones to provide content, and engage with the other stakeholders in a way that raise an edge with their own expectations. I see governance are very aware of the issue of delegation and redelegations, and to link with the other side, and we need to figure out something that really fits in their own models and how they want this to be dealt with. And I'm afraid, what I'm hearing right now is somehow quite defensive about the things what we have right now, and how we protect it.

And I wonder if it's the right strategy, when all the discussion are going to open up, and are certainly going to go much farther than just IANA, I'm pretty sure it's going to have implications about ICANN's supporting organizational structures or anything at some point, and I'm a little bit in affinity (ph) with this sort of an approach by the ccNSO that would be only, "This is what we have. It's right, don't change it." But it's just my personal feeling.

Peter Van Roste: Byron, this is Peter.

Byron Holland: Go ahead, Peter.

Peter Van Roste: I have a comment and a question. The comment follows a bit the lines of Mathieu's comment, but it's triggered by something else. That is from within the iStar Group, I know there's already the planned rollout of some pretty detailed proposals, probably even before Singapore. So this will almost by default change the level of discussion through to the details. And while I couldn't agree more that setting out of principles, is a pretty sound way of starting that discussion.

I think we should also be prepared, and this might be something that Keith and Katrina on their call after this one can take into account. To actually discuss a response, or have some views, or have the room to get some views on some other proposals that are out there. And apart from the iStar, there's going to be the IGP proposal, which is probably the most debated that I've seen, although I haven't been following the One Net discussions that close. So, we need -- we will need to react in some way or another to other proposals, maybe not individually but at least on a general level.

Byron Holland: Correct.

Peter Van Roste: Then the question I have is, since we were trying to bring some life to the GAC discussions, I think we have found a great topic. But the question is, how do we -- how does it move from here? Is there something new we are going to discuss with Heather? Or, do I raise it with Thomas (ph), who will then raise it with Heather? I mean, it's up to you.

Mathieu Weill: From my experience with discussing the improvement plans with the people from the GAC, they don't move without Heather giving her approval.

Byron Holland: Okay. Well, just on that final note, I think it makes sense that both of us should be pushing on our contacts, and perhaps you and I can take offline from this discussion, what you think would be most helpful in terms of leveraging the relationship with Heather.

Peter Van Roste: Okay.

Byron Holland: Which I'm happy to leverage, right. I mean she works 200 meters down the street from me, so I can -- and I have a good relationship with her, so I'm happy to do what's required there.

Peter Van Roste: I'll send you a couple of lines with that (inaudible).

Byron Holland: Okay. Great. Thank you. I just want to go back to Mathieu's point, because I think, you know, somewhere, perhaps, between the language here articulated, and the points that he made, like the course of action, and it will be a delicate balance. I think here, on this call, among the friends on this call, we perhaps use language that isn't necessarily what we would use out in the public sphere. I think the kind of language I used about staking our ground, or maybe Keith even took it a step further, you know, that isn't necessarily the language I would want to go out with as the ccNSO, but I think the notion that, that we create a framework and set the anchor points to the best of our ability around which the discussion revolves, and revolves from a position of expertise and background and experience, that will allow us to do the very things that may be strong language is suggesting, but we can do it from a position of expertise as opposed to strident statements.

So, I'm sensitive to your comments, Mathieu, but I do think it behooves us to make sure that we come out as the experts on the space, and then do what we can to make sure

that the conversation revolves around the points that we are making as experts. And the other thing is, you know, we can even see here on this call how quickly it turns -- how quickly the discussion tries to go to solutioning or details. When I think that it's going to be important for us as a community to say, "We have some time, although time is precious, it's not that much. Let's make sure we use the time available to us to get to the best possible conclusion which is going to take a bit of time and an Expert Working Group to help us work through.

But we've set the agenda, we've set the anchor points around which the -- hopefully, the brunt of the conversation will revolve. And of course, remind the broader community that we have deep expertise in this space, and we can do that without being inflammatory and having us, say, end up on some other unhelpful path.

Keith Davidson: Oh, yeah. And, look, just -- I think, just to clarify my view. Yes, we are talking amongst friends here, so I'm trying to use a shorthand on the call, as we know and relate to, but of course if we had GAC members on the call, we would have the somewhat more sensitive to their needs, et cetera. And just on that topic, just reminding Mathieu and all that the FOI Working Group has GAC and At-Large participation, all the way along the road, so we have carefully listened to their concerns along the way, and tried to address them as best as we can as well.

So it's not a question of shutting the door and putting up walls and saying this is ours, and you mustn't have any input at all, it's a question of us taking the high ground, but making sure that we are bringing our friends and colleagues outside of our community with us. So rather -- so I think the upshot is, we don't want to be dictated to, but we are not going to be dictatorial to others either. We'll look for the consensus and certainly on issues of the greatest sensitivities around delegations and redelegations, we have to take into account government views and sovereignties. No doubt about that.

Byron Holland: Great. So we do have -- I'm sensitive to the fact that we are past the hour now. We do have a Council Workshop which is several hours, and we are going to be working, you know, we certainly had a component of that dedicated to Internet Governance, we will no doubt be expanding that, and revisiting some of these very issues, as well as others. And then we should be also using the panels themselves to air the kinds of views and input and feedback that we are trying to solicit here on the call.

So, we do have a reasonable -- well not -- actually I take that back. We don't have a reasonable amount of time, we have a very short amount of time, but we do have several venues for us to get the kind of information and start to position the framework and the process as best as we can for our community. And I actually like -- I like Keith's phraseology there, you know. We shouldn't be dictated to, but neither will we be dictatorial, and I think that actually, to some degree, sums up how we should be approaching this.

Are there any -- I know there's more conversation and there's not specific outputs from the last 30 minutes of dialogues, but are there any final comments, or suggestions?

Bart Boswinkel: Byron, this is Bart. What will happen, and probably there's something to discuss online as well for this Group. Say, we, as Staff will put out the first content to the Web page of this Group. Say, referring to all the announcements, et cetera, but in the near future this Group will be asked to provide some links to documents they consider to be relevant for the community as well. I think it's not the role -- Staff to determine what is relevant for the CC Community.

Byron Holland: Okay. Any other final comments?

Bart Boswinkel: See you in Singapore.

Byron Holland: Okay, everybody. Travel safe. See you shortly. Thank you.

Unidentified Participant: Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Bye-bye.