TRANSCRIPT

IANA Stewardship Transition and Accountability Coordination Committee
Telephone Conference
2 October 2014

Attendees:

Byron Holland, chair of the ccNSO
Katrina Sataki, chair of the Meetings Program Working Group
Keith Davidson,.nz
Martin Boyle, .uk
Mary Uduma, .ng
Barrack Otieno, AfTLD
Carolina Aguerre, LACTLD

ICANN Staff:
Bart Boswinkel
Kristina Nordstrom

Apologies:

Giovanni Seppia, Intrim chair of the SOP Working Group
Peter Van Roste, CENTR

Byron Holland:	Okay. So I guess this is a loosely-assembled group, to provide updates and some form of coordination with the membership and the ICG -- and our ICG members (inaudible), so to me this is supposed to just be more an exchange of information. I didn't think there was going to be a formal Chair or anything, more just as an exchange of information, and provide feedback out of the ICG, and discussion with non-ICG members, to give the ICG member some general inputs.
Bart Boswinkel:	Hi. This is Bart. Sorry I'm late. I was on the Policy Webinar providing overview of the ccNSO to the broader community.
Keith Davidson:	I hope you told them we are having fun, Bart.
Bart Boswinkel:	Oh, absolutely. Yeah.
Byron Holland:	I don't know did -- would one of the ICG members be able to just provide us an update on the status of the ICG? Where you are at and any of the issues, and what's coming up?

Keith Davidson: Look. I'll be happy to start the ball rolling, but I probably don't have an exhaustive -- you know, I haven't sort of really thought about exactly what going on everywhere, but the latest issue that has been largely resolved is the production of an FAQ for publication on what the ICG is, and what it's doing, and what its processes are.

It went through, you know, an iteration on the mailing list, and we had a meeting a couple of days ago, to resolve most of the outstanding issues there now, I think it's just a question of polishing the document, but it should be published fairly soon. I think taking a step back from there, the RSP was published a bit more than a week ago now, calling for the proposals, and the critical, and for the ccNSO from that, was the call for either a single proposal from the main community, or one from the ccTLDs and from the gTLD.

And that the deadline for that set of proposals is 15th of January next year. So it's a pretty tight deadline, and if we still don't have a Cross Community Working Group formed and operating as every day goes by, that deadline looks less and less achievable. So that's probably the most pressing thing for the ICG at the moment. And just again, I think -- from my perspective I think once we do have the Cross Community Working Group operating, then the big issue will be how to (inaudible) set so that it can do as much work s possible in that short timeframe. But I see that's not in an area on the call, so who then has more to offer than just those views.

Martin Boyle: Hi. It's Martin here. Can you hear me?

Byron Holland: Yeah.

Martin Boyle: Yeah. So that's useful. I don't think there's very much more to add. I would note that the other area of work just at the moment, and this is why there's quite a lot of effort currently on the FAQ; is preparing the agendas for discussions in ICANN added already -- just next week, and the week after, to establish my (inaudible). And it's a pretty full program, and then we'll be doing the next face-to-face meeting of the ICG on the Friday, immediately after the ICANN Meeting, which I'm hoping will be used to take a certain degree of stock from the inputs that we perceive during the week.

I would certainly concur with Keith's comment about concerns on deadlines. And actually, at the moment at the CENTR meeting in Brussels, and we had a useful discussion yesterday with the EU Member State Governments in the room, got together a good part of discussion going. And raised by at least one person in the audience, was the gross impossibility of the timescale, and slower would be better. And I pointed out that well, yes, but we don't actually have the freedom to redefine the end points, and this morning we had a discussion on CENTR, looking at how it might contribute to the input.

The one place that the ITG discussion, I think, we are at, perhaps, differ a little bit from Keith's interpretation, and you know, I think that's probably just from where we are sitting in the room, rather than it being a disagreement between us, but certainly the messages appearing are, expectations that there would be, and a desire to encourage a more coherent proposal from ccTLDs and gTLDs. And in CENTR, one of the things that then came up, was the gap at the names of the protocol's, I think, we are dragging our feet, or are going to fail to meet the output. Might actually just cut and run with their own stand-alone proposals. And that's it from me, thank.

Keith Davidson: So that's an interesting conjecture, totally, Martin. I think -- yeah, I have no kind of vested belief in either having one or two proposals from the main community, I'm happy conform. I just see it being exceptionally difficult, that the issues that will become important to the ccTLD community won't be of any interest at all to the gTLD community and vice versa, when it comes to the things that are not covered under Service Level Agreement. But I feel quite confident that between the GNSO and the ccNSO we feel -- or between the

gTLDs and the ccTLDs, that having a service-level agreement that's jointly agreed, and can come forward as a single proposal, shouldn't be too much of a problem since we are essentially dealing with the same service-level requirements currently, and it's not likely that we would see any new requirements introduced along the line.

But yes, it is a bit of a worry that the other communities might move ahead of the other, but I think that that would still, essentially, mean that there would be no chance of the transition occurring, because the U.S. Government is only going to allow to have another -- a wholly-agreed proposal from the broader and multistakeholder communities. So I think it would be the other -- that the other -- you know, the protocols and then the IP Address people will be putting pressure back on us to, you know, get our proposals in by deadline.

Just as a couple of other little minor items, it could be worthwhile noting on the ccNSO page, or putting it out an email from the Secretariat, just telling ccTLD members and non-members that there is a meeting on the Friday in Los Angeles, and there are some limited seating for non-ICG members in the room. So just in case anyone wants to attend, it's probably worthwhile getting that message out. So, Bart or Kristina, could you attend to that?

And I think the final thing on my list was, I think Martin and I would probably agree that we've got to get this right rather than getting it done on time, and that's going to be challenge, it's balancing how right we can make the things in the very short timeframe available to us. So anyway, I've been talking much too much, so I'll shut up.

Martin Boyle: (Inaudible/audio static) without any problem. If I can chip in, about (inaudible), certainly that came out quite clearly in the CENTR Meeting, of the concern that we have to get it right, and people who would challenge the September 2015 date, we certainly know, you know, we could take two years, and we could take a year. I don't really think that that is an option. You know, if we haven't got a solution, and this is certainly coming in quite clearly in the ICG timeline, because we haven't really got a fairly, reasonable proposal for the U.S. Government to start working on by, say, June 2015, we are probably heading for some sort of really difficult stages, because I'm not sure if there's an (inaudible) way for carrying -- carrying on beyond -- much beyond September 2015.

Byron Holland: Keith, this is Byron. I just want to make two comments; one goes back to just some basic timeline stuff that Keith raised initially. I believe that the CCWG will have its first call on Monday, so the early constituting of that group should be taking place Monday, to give you a sense of the timeline. We in the CC -- we don't -- we haven't approved our five members, yet, in the CC, but I would imagine what's going to happen today or tomorrow. And then the other communities, from what I hear are all already, or will be ready to go for Monday, a sense of timing there.

And Martin, maybe -- can I just ask you to expand upon the comments you made that CENTR is working through to transfigure out how they are going to input into the process?

Martin Boyle: Yes. We were looking at how we can help pull some of the threads together in any particular -- for any members of the Cross Community Working Group who might come from the European area, to help them make calls that are likely to lead to a constructive way forward. And so it's associated really with giving some support for whomever, if ever; there are certain members who are actively involved in the process. And there is a sort of recognition that this is likely to be a pretty intense job, and therefore we will need to make sure that we are communicating around the community very quickly and effectively so that everybody feels that the solution belongs to them.

Byron Holland:	Okay, great. Thanks.
Martin Boyle:	And by the way, I have put my name forward to be an observer on the CCWG, and I believe Matthew Lai (ph) has also done, and I would actually hope that all the CC, members of the IWG -- of the ICG will also -- will also join as observers.
Keith Davidson:	Right. It's Keith here. I was assuming that it was a given that the four of us on the ICG would automatically be observers to the Cross Community Working Group, so I haven't put my name forward as a result, but I'm happy to. So I'm not sure how -- well, actually I didn't, and on the IANA, ccNSO lists (inaudible/audio static) as far as the observer status.
Byron Holland:	Keith, are you still there?
Keith Davidson:	Yes.
Byron Holland:	Okay, sure. I had a lot of static, I thought I lost you.
Keith Davidson:	Yes. Me, too; I don't know where that was coming from.
Byron Holland:	You know, I think there's a general assumption, that the four of you would be observers, although I think that there's now going to be friendly amendment, and you are all being to be called participants, not just observers. But anyway --
Keith Davidson:	The same?
Byron Holland:	The same general rule.
Keith Davidson:	We'll still be in trouble whichever way we look at it.
Byron Holland:	That's right. Okay. Thanks. Mary, are you still -- are you still on with us?
Mary Uduma:	Yes.
Byron Holland:	Did you have anything you wanted to add?
Mary Uduma:	Yes. I am here. Can you hear me?
Byron Holland:	Yes, we can.
Mary Uduma:	Can you hear me?
Byron Holland:	Yes.
Mary Uduma:	Okay. All right. I missed some of the conversations from (inaudible) so I'm not -- I didn't follow all through. So please pardon me, I had challenge with my -- figuring out my equipment. I'm sorry.
Byron Holland:	Okay.
Mary Uduma:	Hello? All right. So that I'm -- I think I'll go with what Keith and Martin has said, and so I would go with the (inaudible/audio skip).
Byron Holland:	Okay. Thank you, Mary. So is there -- at this stage is there anything else that we want to surface in exchange in terms of views or issues or dates.

Keith Davidson:	Actually, or just, I suppose looking ahead, too, well first thing, January might be a supremely optimistic deadline. It's possible that the right scheduling, and then the final opportunity of (inaudible) in early February with the ICANN meeting being that early, you know, there's a chance that by mid-February, or no later than a month, say, over two or three months, we would just get a proposal in, but I think, yeah, that's something that we'll need in a careful consideration as a first point with the Cross Community Working Group anyway.
	And then just as a peripheral topic to ICANN report back on a rather unhappy call that I've had, as the Chair of the FOI Working Group, the only remaining GAC member of the FOI Working Group who then -- yeah, our hope was that we would have the framework in a position to be approved by the GAC in L.A., but she's suggesting that we have a useful champion within the GAC, or it's going to be a lost cause, and we probably need to do some more work between now and (inaudible) in February, and then, you know, bring it to the GAC then.
	So you know -- and my fear in all of that, and its relevance to this group, is that eventually the issues that are covered by the Framework of Interpretation are likely to come up as requirements, or policy interpretations for the IANA transition anyway. So my hope is that we can get the GAC in to be a little bit more constructive than they currently are, and I'll be doing a lot of work in L.A. on that, but just a slight word of warning for this group that all of those peripheral issues that the U.S. Government has kind of included in its stewardship role, needs to be thought about, and the relationships to this transition as well. Thanks.
Byron Holland:	Well, that's certainly very disappointing. So when you say that a useful champion was in the GAC, I take it Susan is not that, or unwilling to be that, or can't be that?
Keith Davidson:	I think she -- I think it's a question of, if she can't be there because of the conflicts with the IANA transition, and she's always -- while she has contributed reasonably positively on occasions within the working group, she has always made it clear that, you know, that's her words, not the U.S. Government's; with for instance -- for her the biggest change in that (inaudible) her, and certainly the U.S. Government of this (inaudible) -- (inaudible) was the other representatives from the GAC on the FOI Working Group and was the lead, that he is retired as of the meeting before ICANN London.
	Sp, I think Susan's advice is that we work collectively on finding someone who could champion within the GAC, and the suggestion is that we might approach Norway, (Inaudible 00:33:03), and see if they could talk to the GAC groups who might be quite useful, since I've been fairly animated and engaged all the way through. They might usefully be the champions within the GAC, so that's a possible way forward, that of course it's going to take time, and it will take time to get the (inaudible 00:22:56) with the intimate details of the framework as well.
Martin Boyle:	It's Martin here, if I can just intervene. Norway, certainly I would see as probably quite a good candidate. I gather that Norway, as if the GAC eventually agrees to join the Cross Community Working Group and the decision is going to be made tomorrow. Norway would be one of two representatives from the GAC into that working group, so that I think would give a nice link through on understanding the links between these different issues. And that certainly did come out quite clearly in our discussions with the (inaudible) governments yesterday.
Keith Davidson:	That's very helpful. Thanks, Martin. And I think -- yeah, that strengthens the case that we should be working hard to get Norway aligned. I guess the question is whether Norway has the capacity to take on extra activities in both regards.

Martin Boyle:	Of course, and the inevitable, but then there are two of them.
Keith Davidson:	Mm-hmm, but have very few other alternatives from the framework of interpretation, to the endpoint anyway.
Martin Boyle:	Okay. Thanks. Well thanks to both of you. I'm, unfortunately, going to have to drop off the call now, Byron. So I'm going to have to bid you adieu.
Keith Davidson:	Yeah. I don't think I've got anything else to report anyway. So that's probably the end of the call; unless I'm missing -- unless anyone else has anything to add.
Mary Uduma:	Hello? Can you hear me?
Keith Davidson:	Yes, Mary.
Mary Uduma:	Can you hear me?
Keith Davidson:	Yes, Mary.
Mary Uduma:	Yeah. Okay. I just wanted to -- sorry, I missed most of the program. I wanted to know there are other dates we need move forward, or other meeting schedule for not only for this group, apart from Los Angeles, and having the target day of submission at -- by 15th of February -- 15th of January. So what I did, I think she can do in between so they would get our office together, and they would come up with what we think should be -- we've been having challenges in my region getting our assistants (ph) to talk, getting our assistants to -- We then did a webinar, and not much -- not many, we had only five assistants that were responding to it. Is there another thing we could do? Or during the L.A., we're going to ask people to really, have to come up with inputs into what (inaudible).
	I don't know about other regions, what they've been doing, but my region is doing a very -- a very difficult thing getting my people together, and getting the assistants ((ph) creating input; even asking them to get to the ICANN website to read about IANA transition and ICG trying to get it across. So I don't know, at L.A. what -- if we have specific periods to -- or we will look at a time to really devote on how to put the proposal together. I'm sorry if you have discussed it, I missed that point. I'm sorry.
Keith Davidson:	No. You've raised a very valid point, Mary. I think Martin has just reported that the CENTR, the European City TLD Group, have been meeting on this topic today, in fact, and I know APTLD organization was doing some outreach just a week or two ago, at its meeting in Brisbane, Australia. Carolina, I don't know, I see you are on Adobe Connect, I don't know if you have any comments to add about what's happening in the Latin and Caribbean area. But I think in any case, we do need to have an outreach program to ensure that ccTLDs everywhere, are as involved and informed as possible, because if we don't, the fear is that when we get to a final proposal, that some group of ccTLDs will say, well we -- that we don't agree.
	And that could essentially be the stumbling block that would prevent the transition from occurring. But we do need to do that, and that's where, I think, we'll need resources beyond -- above and beyond our current capabilities to make sure that we have connections to as many ccTLDs as possible. But Carolina, I'd appreciate if you could let us know if things are happening in your region, too.
Carolina:	(Inaudible/audio static)
Keith Davidson:	An awful lot of static.

Carolina:	A lot of noise effects.
Keith Davidson:	Oh, I see. Carry on--
Mary Uduma:	So she can type?
Keith Davidson:	Yes. She typed that in Adobe Connect thing, so she's very aware of the issue via outreach.
Mary Uduma:	Okay. .
Keith Davidson:	Because she's just in the middle of the report.
Mary Uduma:	Yeah. That's what she said.
Keith Davidson:	Okay.
Mary Uduma :	Yes, that's it.
Keith Davidson:	So there -- so, yes, I think it's -- you know, it's an issue and it may be that you just have to be the main advocate for getting the information out, in Africa, too, Mary.
Mary Uduma:	Okay. We have done the social outreach by doing the webinar, and we are going to do another one before the L.A., hopefully, but I'm thinking at L.A., that enough time should be devoted to this process, so that even if there are some regions that are not forthcoming, we'll see what we can do during earlier -- I don't know whether the Council would -- Okay, I'll look at the agenda, whether there's an agenda item devoted, if it is half of the day would be devoted on that. Since after L.A., we'll not meet again face-to-face before the submission of the proposal.
Keith Davidson:	Yeah. Your idea that some webinars along the way would be pretty useful, particularly if they are recorded, and can be provided as links for later viewing by anyone who wants more information coming in later, it might (inaudible). And Carolina has just reported in the Adobe Chat, that she's organizing a webinar next Wednesday, the 8th of October; and a meeting in Aruba, on the 6th or 7th of November to discuss these issues. Now that sounds great, and I'm opening the process to those, like TLD members and non-members, it's a bit then -- sounds very promising, I think, Carolina. Okay. Yeah. It sounds like Byron has dropped the call, so does anyone else have anything to raise at the moment?
Bart Boswinkel:	This is Bart. Can you hear me?
Keith Davidson:	Yes, Bart.
Bart Boswinkel:	Ah. Finally, I'm muted. You had too much background noise from the webinar. So going back to what Mary said, and others, say, as you know you are all subscribed to the ISTEC, and we've got this Web page up, and you all subscribed to the ccTLD world list as well, and the others, so if you have something, like Mary was saying, and want to reach out to the broader community, please let us know so we can use that avenue. And through that the regional organizations as well, because they are all subscribed to that email list, and to the email list, and to this -- through this list as well.
Keith Davidson:	Sure; point taken. Okay. Any other --
Mary Uduma:	Point taken; well taken. Thank you --

Keith Davidson:	Yes, Mary.
Mary Uduma:	-- for this information.
Keith Davidson:	Okay. Any other questions or comments? If not, I think that we'll pretty much conclude our call. I think the only tangible action point was for Garth or Kristina to put a -- you know, a note on the ccNSO page, that there is the Friday meeting of the ICG in L.A., and that some members may wish to attend.
Bart Boswinkel:	Just one more question. Say, do you want to make this a regular call?
Keith Davidson:	I think we will need to, but it's probably more over to the -- we probably need to (inaudible) a mechanism from the Cross Community Working Group as well, but I think it's -- do we have a scheduled meeting of this group in L.A., or should--?
Bart Boswinkel:	No. But we can organize one, and will need to be informal, or maybe on Thursday morning we may have some time. Although then it's the accountability stuff. Let me say -- because I think by the end of this week, we know who the members of the CWG are as well; and try to set up at least one face-to-face meeting in L.A.
Keith Davidson:	Yeah. I think if we could agree just a broad sort of statement and process--
Mary Uduma:	Okay. I think we are also subscribed to the (inaudible)--
Keith Davidson:	You are all subscribed to the email list, this one.
Mary Uduma:	Okay then.
Keith Davidson:	And Mary, I think if we could make that a--
Mary Uduma:	Which one?
Bart Boswinkel:	Of this working group, Mary.
Mary Uduma:	Okay. All right. I wanted to ask whether we are all subscribed to the Cross Constituency Working Group on the proposal, that Drafting Committee--
Bart Boswinkel:	Not yet. But if you want to -- if you want to be observer, I'll make sure, say, by definition that you will be added as members, we can do that as the ccNSO Secretariat. So, I'll add you.
Mary Uduma:	Oh, sure.
Bart Boswinkel:	You don't need to send me an email, maybe if you all don't -- doesn't want to, but that's unfortunate.
Keith Davidson:	Yeah. I think, you know--
Mary Uduma:	All right, good. I think it will be helpful that we are subscribed to it.
Bart Boswinkel:	Yeah.
Mary Uduma:	So that we can also follow and make some interventions where necessary.

Keith Davidson:	So, yeah. I think, Bart, if we can meet, at least briefly, just to discuss scope and timetables of meetings--
Bart Boswinkel:	Yeah.
Keith Davidson:	--for us in L.A., and that will be most useful, to see what you can do.
Bart Boswinkel:	Yeah. Okay. And then start scheduling as of that date for regular update calls as well?
Keith Davidson:	Yeah.
Bart Boswinkel:	That this was, yeah, an attempt to get together. Okay, yeah.
Keith Davidson:	Thanks, Bart. Thanks, all. Is there anything else?
Mary Uduma:	Agreed.
Keith Davidson:	Nothing else from anyone?
Bart Boswinkel:	Keith?
Keith Davidson:	Yes, Mary?
Mary Uduma:	No. I'm fine. I think I'm fine (inaudible)--
Bart Boswinkel:	Could you have a look at, say, the email on the FOI I sent you; if that is possible?
Keith Davidson:	Yeah. I'm working my way through.
Bart Boswinkel:	Yeah. No -- but it -- because I've got it reduced now.
Keith Davidson:	Yes. I'll get back to you in the morning, and apparently it's coming at 1:00 a.m., so it takes a--
Bart Boswinkel:	Yeah.
Keith Davidson:	--my first job in the morning.
Bart Boswinkel:	Okay. Thanks.
Keith Davidson:	Okay. Thanks, all, we'll see you in L.A. in the next couple of weeks.
Bart Boswinkel:	Yeah. Bye-bye.
Mary Uduma:	(Inaudible)
Bart Boswinkel:	Cheers.
Mary Uduma:	Thank you, Bart.