
SINGAPORE - ICG Informal Session
Friday, March 6, 2015 – 16:30 to 17:00 SGT
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

JARI ARKKO:

Okay, folks, so our little informal session is about to start, so if you are an ICG member and want to stay for the informal discussion, please sit down and let's have one discussion.

Okay. So I don't actually know how much we have something to talk about and whether some of this will actually require us to go back and read some stuff and write on our own and then come back tomorrow or later, but I thought we'd start, at least.

So the potential things that we could be talking about today, or this evening, is the assessment document, but as Alissa pointed out, maybe that's not as high priority as the questions that we might be asking from the communities. And again, the assessments are like an internal tool and the questions are the ones that might actually have an effect into the community processes and the proposals.

So that, indeed, does seem like a higher priority thing and it's also on the agenda for tomorrow, so if we can do some preparation for tomorrow's session, that will be useful.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

And I propose that if we do any work on the assessment documents, then we can do that off line and not here and waste everybody's time.

And I have some ideas about how to go about the questions. Do people have other things on their mind that we should be talking about?

Someone mentioned time lines. I'm not personally prepared to talk about time lines, but maybe someone is.

I don't see anyone --

Yeah. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. Thank you, Jari.

Could you kindly confirm what I understood this morning? In the view of IETF, in the proposal that you have made to ICG, you have mentioned that practically there is no oversight of NTIA over your activities, one.

Two, there is no need to any sort of accountability, as you are doing the accountability within the IAB and so on and so forth, so that transition would have no impact at all on the activities of IETF?

Thank you.



JARI ARKKO:

I think the answer is yes. And indeed, we're -- we are doing -- we have accountability mechanisms and it's not that we don't need accountability. It's just that we already have them. We don't need a new one.

Yeah, and Russ points out that they have been working for 15 years.

Anyway, so I just -- before we go into the nitty-gritty details, we have both the numbers and the protocols proposals in front of us, and for both of them we could be sending questions to the communities, and I just wanted to spend one minute before the questions categorizing a little bit what we could be saying.

So in my mind, at least, there's a couple of different types of questions or clarifications that we might be needing, so one category is the type of questions where a clarification is needed but that is something that, say, the leadership of the community can explain. One example is, I gave you an explanation earlier about how the IAOC works. That, you know, information to you guys to the rest of the communities, but not something that we have to go to the IETF, at least, and ask for further information about.

Another type of question or comment or disagreement matter that we might have is a case where the community has made a decision X. You know, let's -- let's go away -- go forward with this approach.



And then there's disagreement here by someone that that's not a good choice.

And that's a little bit more difficult case and I'd basically argue, same as Alissa did earlier, that that we shouldn't do at all, unless we have some new information.

And the reason is that we are like -- you know, I don't feel like I have the right to override IETF consensus or, for that matter, the numbers community consensus either.

So we have to be careful with that type of comments, and recognize them.

And a third type of question is one where we actually would need to go to the communities and ask them about something and they would typically be something where we have new information. You know, "Hey, we didn't -- we, the ICG, did not think of this earlier" or "We noticed this thing" or, as an example, there's something between the different proposals that needs rethinking or correction or addition.

One example of that is there's something about IANA.org in the numbers proposal, and then there's something slightly different about that in the IETF proposal. And maybe that's something that we should ask someone about more, either now or later.

So with those three things in my mind, at least, you know, maybe we should go around the table and figure out if we have



something for you guys to provide or any comments on these categories, and then we can see if we can produce something tonight or if this is something that some of you have to work on your own and figure out the answers to.

Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Thank you, Jari.

I have a follow-up question. Sorry. You asked specifically but I just have to follow up what I said.

What you said, I suggested if possible you put it in some sort of writing as a complementary reply to the question raised. And the third question I'm raising that you may reply or not, should the two other communities -- in particular, naming community -- come to some sort of mechanism arrangements for oversight and accountability?

And since you mentioned that you are working with those two communities, you might be affected with -- would you be affected by those mechanisms or not? Thank you.

JARI ARKKO: It's kind of hard to answer before I see what they're proposing, so I mean maybe. It's difficult to say. I think it's, to somewhat extent



-- to some extent it's unlikely, assuming we or the numbers go ahead with our type of arrangement, but you never know.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

This is Russ. I'd like to add a few thoughts about that.

It seems to me that the accountability mechanisms are going to have to be quite different for accountability when the two functions are within the same organization, and when the functions fall into two different organizations, you have some kind of an agreement that has the ability to be severed.

So that's not an option in the other case, and so you have to have a somewhat different mechanism.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF:

Just a question that when you're -- obviously until such time as we have all the proposals, we can't understand if there's a need to reconcile some of the mechanisms against each other.

This is a little bit off topic, but when you looked -- when you were thinking of the time line, were you thinking of the need for the community to consult on whether any reconciliation is necessary? Is that appropriately built into the time line or do you think you need more time to do the consideration of when the proposals are coming together in terms of a formative step?



And I just want to make sure you had thought about that and it was properly reflected in the time line.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Well, the original time line that I did had -- you know, that was one of the considerations was do these together form a quilt or do we have, you know, a bunch of different pieces of cloth that don't come together to form anything.

The -- so that was part of the ICG discussion time that didn't overlap with any community comment time, because I think that would lead to what we described at that point as gaps. Right.

ALISSA COOPER:

So this is Alissa. Can I jump in? Can you hear me?

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Yes, we hear you.

ALISSA COOPER:

I was just going to say that that time is also, you know, still reflected in the -- in the updated time line that I circulated earlier and that we discussed earlier. That's part of why I think, you know, it's important to think about how much time is needed after the names proposal comes in to us, because there is, you know, potentially more work to do to reconcile the two that we



already have with the third one that we get. There's potentially not any work to do; it's just that we don't know yet. So to be conservative, we need to allow for that reconciliation time, in case we need it.

JARI ARKKO:

And I was just asked to remind everybody that if you speak, please say your name, so -- for the scribing and for remote participants.

And this is Jari Arkko.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

So this is Russ.

I have a question about the RIR proposal and how it differs from the protocol parameters in regard to the IANA trademark and IANA.org.

In the protocol parameters community, we had a long discussion about those two things and felt that we could live with the current situation, even though we preferred that the IETF trust be the owner of those. At least many of the community people did.

However, we didn't feel it was necessary for transition. That was basically the consensus.



The numbers community have seemed to have decided that those are necessary for transition. They need to go somewhere other than where they are.

Do you have a mechanism for making that transfer in mind, or do you have -- it's not a detail -- your plan doesn't say how that will happen.

PAUL WILSON:

To be honest, I don't know, but it's a good question. I guess that's what we're here to compile -- right? -- is some questions that want -- that we think need to go back to the communities to clarify things like that.

So no, I don't know. I think it was a deliberately general statement that, you know, handing those things to the community is what's -- what's required, but whether or not it's seen to be something that is -- that must happen in the time frame, I kind of doubt it, but it's a good question.

NARELLE CLARK:

Hello. Narelle here.

That sounds like a question.

Do we have anybody here acting as an actual notetaker, as an official scribe of this informal session to take down any questions?



MILTON MUELLER: I wrote down Russ' question because it was very similar to one that I wanted to ask, so I think it's -- it's worthwhile to send that to both of these communities.

My original question was more along the lines of, you know, Section 3.A.2 of the RIR proposal says, blah, blah, blah, about a domain and a trademark. How can the IETF approach to -- the proposal be made compatible with this, but the idea of what mechanism would be used to do it I think is a better one, and I see no reason not to encourage them to think of a mechanism at this time. I just think it would be a more airtight proposal, going forward, to do that.

JARI ARKKO: And this is Jari Arkko. Please remember to say your name when you speak.

The --

MILTON MUELLER: That was Milton Mueller.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah. Thank you. So just to go back to the IANA.org question, I think this is actually kind of like a double question because we had this discussion in our community and, indeed, we felt that, like, I mean, the domain name really -- I mean, it would be convenient



but not absolutely required in a transition situation. And -- and the reason why it's like that is that like the -- at least our community or the implementers and so forth that will be using numbers registered at IANA would probably go more for the sort of reputation that they know where to look for, rather than just blindly going by a particular domain name.

And so asking maybe a little bit more clarification from the RIR community why do they believe -- or if they believe this is required and required at the same time frame or not.

And from the IETF, perhaps, the counter side of that is that, you know, if this was required by the other communities or we wanted to make this happen, could you make -- you know, could you be part of this arrangement or not.

Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Excuse me. Just a question raised by Russ with respect to the trademark. Did you refer to the IANA trademark and the IANA organization domain or a different trademark? This has been mentioned in the document of the numbering, how they react on that. And they prefer to have another organization to do that; that, in fact, they have proposed a candidate to do that. Are you referring to that IANA trademark or a different trademark? Thank you.



RUSS HOUSLEY: That's the IANA trademark and iana.org and they proposed that the IETF Trust be the one that owns those. The IETF Trust already owns ietf.org, iab.org, irtf.org, and rfceditor.org. And those things are operated by various vendors who are performing those various services.

ALISSA COOPER: Russ, I was wondering if you could repeat the question that you posed since people seem to like the question. I was going to try to keep track of the questions on this whiteboarding tool in the Adobe Connect.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I thought Milton had captured the question. But basically it was noting that the IETF proposal did not feel that those things needed to be dealt with before transition but that the RIR proposal felt that it had to be dealt with before transition and what mechanism for dealing with them were they proposing.

MILTON MUELLER: And also, Jari -- this is Milton, again. I think Jari also put it well, that if this was required by the other communities, could you make a proposal compatible with that. And I think that's a good question to ask. I think we have time to ask it. I don't think it makes them redo their process or anything. It just -- it is a



compatibility and consistency issue that I think is good to ask at this point.

I had another question which I think you answered, but maybe it would be -- I think we discussed this over there. So the assurances that you're seeking from ICANN as part of the transition were not specified. They were simply told the IAOC could get them. And I think one of my questions, which I thought was a very practical question was just: Would we get these assurances before or after we submit our final proposal to the NTIA?

RUSS HOUSLEY:

So the current approach is we're going to put them into the 2015 SLA. We have proposed language before Christmas actually, and the ICANN legal review is ongoing of that which has led to a negotiation of some of the words.

We just -- negotiation is difficult enough without bringing 1200 of your favorite friends along in the journey. So we're -- we will have a document that's signed and public long before the proposal to submit to NTIA.

JARI ARKKO:

And I just wanted to add one thing. Just remember that the IETF proposal has two items in it, and it might actually have more if you consider the IAOC might have additional things to consider or



they have gotten feedback from you and others in the community for some additional things.

And the answer to your question may not be the same for all of these things. So one of these things is clearly -- one of the two is clearly something that would go into the SLA. The other one would be something that is probably more -- has to be done with multiple parties. Not just ICANN and IETF. And it is not clear, for instance, what, if anything, the U.S. government would be able to say and at what time.

MILTON MUELLER: Is one of those parties the U.S. government, or is it independent of the U.S. government?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think the part that Jari's referring to, we would like to have some expression from NTIA that the contents of the IANA registries remain available to all implementers. So the proposal was that there would be some language as part of them executing the transition where they would --

MILTON MUELLER: You were very soft. The contents of the what? The SLA?



RUSS HOUSLEY: No. That as part of NTIA's work in doing the transition, they would make a statement that made that clear to everyone that the contents of the IANA registries remain available to everyone.

JARI ARKKO: Just to clarify. We believe that's actually the case already today per typical U.S. government practices with regards to the data that they hold. But whether they will be --

(off microphone).

JARI ARKKO: That the registries hold, yes. But whether they will be able to state this or additional things and when the contract that they have, when those can actually expire or disappear, those kinds of things are -- is a little less clear when those can happen. And one theory is everything can happen at the same time from their perspective, and they are not doing anything before then.

MILTON MUELLER: So in that case, would it help you in these interactions to have a statement from the ICG that says, Gee, we sure hope this happens? Something like that?



JARI ARKKO: I think it would be useful if the ICG supported the mechanisms proposed in the IETF plan and in the RIR plan and stated that it's important or even pointing out the particular parts of that. This is really important that it happens.

RUSS HOUSLEY: One way I have thought about that, Milton, is that the ICG would put a letter on the front of the proposal, if we want to, and we could highlight any actions that we want NTIA to take as part of the transition in that letter.

MILTON MUELLER: That would be the letter accompanying the final proposal? You don't think we need to do anything at this stage specifically addressing the protocols proposal?

RUSS HOUSLEY: So the action that we want taken is by NTIA, and I'm sure they're not going to do it early.

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah, but, again, it just gets back to my original question, which is NTIA being what it is, the U.S. government, in some sense they are saying, We really want community input and support for what you're doing and, therefore, it might help for us to say at this stage please do this. On the other hand, it is the U.S. government.



They have their own criteria, their own internal organs for making a decision. It might be completely meaningless for us to say that or maybe even conceivably harmful. So...

This is Milton, by the way.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

And I'm not sure that I know the answer to that question, whether it would be helpful or harmful. But Jari and I did have a meeting with Larry and we've made sure that he was aware that this is something the community wanted. And he seemed to appreciate that it was highlighted and didn't comment further about when he might do it.

JARI ARKKO:

I want to add that I think we need to -- or we at the IETF at least look at this thing as a continuous improvement rather than a big-bang approach.

And we've been doing the continuous improvement over the years. So support from the ICG for continuous improvement in the contracts as well as otherwise in the IANA system would be really appreciated, at least by me.

MILTON MUELLER:

Okay. I'm afraid that -- this is Milton. I'm still confused about jurisdiction, what you're actually saying about that. And I wonder



if there is a clarification need for that. So we know that in your current proposal you say, "There is no jurisdiction" and we, you know -- we understand the argument that if there is a serious dispute that's unresolvable, that the IETF can just fork and say, We're the real IANA. They're not.

So do we need to specify that in the proposal, or do we need to be more clear about how any dispute would be resolved and whether jurisdiction would be a factor at all?

RUSS HOUSLEY:

I think there's two things to keep in mind. The first is that any dispute that is not so serious that we're thinking about breaking the relationship will be settled by the IAB. And so that is what the MOU says, and we couldn't come up with a way to say that the IAB is the jurisdiction. So the second thing is, if the disagreement is so significant that we're going to pick a different service provider, break the MOU, and enter into an agreement with some other party, then that happens with six months' notice and that's - - again, what jurisdiction is there is important in that situation.

And while I'm speaking, I realize there is maybe a third thing to point out. And that is the Internet Society's headquarters is in the United States. It is in Virginia. And ICANN's headquarters is in the United States, which is actually in California. So if there's going to be a dispute that has a jurisdictional relationship, it's going to be dealt with, I would think, in one of those two locations.



MILTON MUELLER: If it were cross-jurisdictional, it would be federal.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Or you'd pick one of those two.

MILTON MUELLER: I would recommend that you modify that to just say that the disputes are settled by the IAB. That's kind of a private agreement that ICANN has signed onto, right?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, it is in the MOU.

MILTON MUELLER: And then if ICANN ignores the IAB's ruling, then you have a break. Just say that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I thought that's what we said.

MILTON MUELLER: You said there is no jurisdiction. It is global.

Because the IAB is global.



JARI ARKKO: Well, we do say that by reference but we take your point.

MILTON MUELLER: Come on. You could say a lot of things by reference. For people who are reading your proposal, it is much clearer to say there is a private agreement. The IAB settles it. And if that doesn't -- part of the agreement isn't adhered to by one of the parties, specifically ICANN, then we have to terminate the agreement and set up our own registry.

JARI ARKKO: Earlier on, we talked about the different categories of questions to the community. I feel this particular one may be in this clarification class or category where we could provide information. Again, this is by reference and we can explain the situation and the rationale in that that is not something that is like a substantial change to the proposal but it's an explanation of how things are, and it is already pointed to by the proposal. So I think that's in that category and can certainly be done.

MILTON MUELLER: That's how I introduced it, as a clarification. Always has been seen that way by me.



You saw the government people getting confused about what the hell you're talking about, global jurisdiction, who's the party, blah, blah, blah. Just trying to help.

JARI ARKKO:

We get your point. Thank you.

Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. The question that I raised also, I suggest it would be a question that you clarify as you mention that. There is no oversight. There is no accountability additionally than those currently exist to the (indiscernible) required. And if the two other communities establishes various mechanisms, the issue depends on the way that they have done and that will be dealt with later on. We would like to have that as a question and clear the answer. Thank you.

JARI ARKKO:

I think that's, again, in the same class because Russ and I actually believe we say that in the document. But if that's not clear, then we should say it again in different words.

Any other comments? Other things to raise for either the IETF or the numbers community or opinions about this process?



MILTON MUELLER: Those -- this is Milton. Those are the only questions that I was thinking about proposing with respect to the protocols proposal.

JARI ARKKO: Do you have any for the other?

Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL: Sorry for coming in late, but can we have the screen adjusted so that we can see the questions that are already compiled? Is this --

No?

NARELLE CLARK: Narelle here. Manal, that hasn't quite been how it's been working. There's been a discussion that's gone around and Milton was going to write down some questions, but I believe Jari has also taken some on board.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah. You will get it later, but we currently don't have it on screen, unfortunately. Sorry.

MANAL ISMAIL: I thought this was what's been put in writing, so I'm sorry, I'm -- I got confused. Obviously this is something --



JARI ARKKO: Well, this -- the text that you see on the screen right now will actually show up in the minutes and it will include our questions, hopefully, but a more concise version will come out of Milton, and maybe I also have a backup here.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you.

JARI ARKKO: Anyway, so I am soliciting further comments that we could try and compile before tomorrow. We don't have to do everything here and we don't have to sit here the whole time if we don't have anything to say. We can also go back to our rooms or bars and restaurants and discuss further or think on our own and then come back with more tomorrow, but this is your opportunity to say something today.

Joe?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I kind of raised the issue bilaterally with Paul, but from I think a general business perspective, I think one of the questions which was kind of alluded to in the question-and-answer that we had during the day, which would be relevant to the numbers proposal, came with the -- what happens if a couple of the entities decide to use a different operating entity and that -- I guess depending on



which ones and how it can or cannot have ramifications on some of the operational functionality.

So -- and I think these are probably things that might be answered in the contract, and so the question was: Might it be useful to highlight some questions which might be useful to address in the contract as they are currently working on the contract definition.

You know, so for instance, exactly how the mediation and arbitration would work, things of -- things of that nature, which would be the kinds of things that are specified. The concept of survivability beyond the contract. Because obviously those would be things where, if you're looking for -- if you'd make a decision to change your operating entity and then you need to go and figure out how to do that, then you need their help in the continuation language that you guys are already working on.

So it was just a question of those might be some questions that might be useful to pose, which we would understand aren't clarified yet but might be clarified as they work towards the contract.

So just if that was helpful, that might be something.

And sorry. It was Joseph Alhadeff, for the record.



JARI ARKKO: Let me just clarify one thing that I understand what you were asking. So you're basically asking about the scenario where some of the RIRs want to select a particular operator and the others -- another one -- and the details of that and so forth. I think that's a reasonable question. Maybe it's, you know, part of the next steps, not necessarily a problem in the proposal per se.

PAUL WILSON: Yeah. Paul here.

At some -- I don't have the final answer because that's something that actually needs to be defined, but the default -- the de facto operation that's been -- has been operating, the decision-making principle that's been operating for many years, has been one of unanimous consent for any -- any decision that needs to be made under the NRO's MoU, which is our -- you know, our memorandum of understanding for working together under which the NRO is actually formed, so I would expect that would be reflected explicitly or implicitly in the, but, yeah, it's a good question. Thanks.

JARI ARKKO: Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Kavouss speaking.



Just for RIRs or numbers, in section Roman III(a), the element of this proposal, it is mentioned the establishment of the review committee with representatives from each RIR.

How this review committee structured, how this review committee, it works with representative of each RIRs, and advice from NRO, and then you have spoken -- or mentioned that there should be independent arrangement with each functioning or operating and there should be a type of coordination among these three.

Who will establish that coordination?

You mentioned that this proposal assumes that specific NRO customers should have independent arrangement. You proposed even for naming to have independent arrangement whereas you just need to talk about the numbers but not about the others.

And then you mentioned that -- which all these times required that -- to have a communication and coordination within all these three. Who and how this coordination be established and how it works. Thank you.

JARI ARKKO: Paul will reply, if possible.

PAUL WILSON: Paul here.



I'm not -- to be honest, sorry, Kavouss, I'm not -- I'm not quite sure what you're quoting there. I'll need to bring up -- I'll need to bring up the document myself.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: This is Joe. Could someone just give a section number?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: The section Roman III(a), elements of this proposal. Thank you.

JARI ARKKO: Kavouss, can I try to rephrase your question? So you're basically just asking about the review team, what it -- what is its structure and how it operates. Is that right?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I refer to Bullet Point 4 of Section Roman III(a), "Establishment of Review Committee."

I would like to know how this review committee established, who established that, and how it works, and what is the relation of this review committee with other review committees. Because in the latter part of the proposal, you mentioned that all three communities, they should work together in a coordinated manner. They might have review committee. At least naming have a review committee. So how these review committee, they



work together, and who establish this importance of communication and coordination between all these three communities.

Just the big paragraph after Indent 4 or Bullet Point 4. Thank you.

MILTON MUELLER: This is Milton. I'm just taking my leave now. I'm -- I think I will write up a question. Do you want me to send it to the list or just to the group members here?

JARI ARKKO: The list.

MILTON MUELLER: Okay. See you tomorrow.

JARI ARKKO: Thank you, Milton.

PAUL WILSON: Milton, were you offering -- it's Paul here. Milton, were you offering to write up that particular question of Kavouss'?

MILTON MUELLER: No, no. The one about the protocol parameters proposal.



PAUL WILSON: Okay. Okay.

MILTON MUELLER: You're on your own.

PAUL WILSON: If I could just say I think, again, that these -- that those are relevant questions.

What the CRISP team will need to do is to answer them according to what -- what they actually have in mind, if they believe it's clear enough or might have to go back to communities. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: This is Alissa. I would just say -- I mean, not to give a specific answer, but in terms of the coordination between the communities, there's already a lot of linkages and coordination that goes on. You know, the IAB and the IETF chair work very closely with folks on the NRO and the RIRs and at ICANN, for the naming part, so I would expect that we could, you know, leverage all of the existing liaisons that we have, and coordination that already goes on between the three groups for this purpose in the future.

I don't see any reason why we would stop coordinating because we already do.



JARI ARKKO:

And this is Jari. I also wanted to say that there is also -- we have to keep in mind that there are these details in further steps, and I think out of necessity, all of these proposals will have some forward pointers to future actions, and some of them are not fully specified out, like exactly what the charter and details and agreements regarding the review team are, as an example.

So I think that's a natural state of affairs and it's not -- not necessarily to be considered a fault in the proposal.

Okay. Anything else or shall we close the meeting?

Yeah, I think that sounds like we have no other items to bring up, so thank you. I think this was very productive. We made some concrete progress, and earlier on during the day, it was not so clear to me, at least, what the questions might be, but this is far more concrete and constructive than we have seen before, so thank you for that and we'll see you tomorrow. And the scribes and everyone else is free to go.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]

