

---

DUBLIN – Joint Meeting of the ICANN Board and the NRO/ASO  
Tuesday, October 20, 2015 – 16:45 to 15:45 IST  
ICANN54 | Dublin, Ireland

STEVE CROCKER: Welcome, everybody. We've been meeting with constituents all during the day. We're still awake and eager here, so it's a good sign.

I've been making a habit of introducing our new board members. Can I see -- how many do we have still here? Any? Ah, Lousewies, Lito, Ron somewhere?

Oh, there's Ron.

>> (Off microphone.)

STEVE CROCKER: I'm not. Anyway, get to know them. They've already inserted themselves and been very active and real pleasure to have them. Any introductions you want to make?

AXEL PAWLIK: I'll introduce myself. My name is Axel Pawlik. I'm the managing director of RIPE NCC and this year the chair of the Number Resource Organization.

LOUIE LEE: Hi. I'm Louie Lee. I am the chair of the address council within the ASO.

---

*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.*

---

KUO-WEI WU: Kuo-Wei Wu. Actually appointed by ASO.

RAY PLZAK: Ray Plzak, future ex-board member.

STEVE CROCKER: I have a lunch scheduled every time with former directors, and I introduce the new board members as future former directors.

You have an agenda for us, yes?

AXEL PAWLIK: We have a very short agenda in terms of number of items. I think it's on the screen.

Nomination period for the board, travel support for CCWG member, of course IANA stewardship transition progress, and general ICANN accountability discussions.

Before we start into this, I would like to convey our thanks that our request for a slightly bigger meeting room has been granted.

[ Laughter ]

STEVE CROCKER: The larger room was not available, I'm afraid, so we had to make do with this.

[ Laughter ]

Let's take them in whatever order you want.

---

AXEL PAWLIK: Right. Who wants to speak towards the nomination period for the board?

Is that Louie?

LOUIE LEE: Yeah.

AXEL PAWLIK: Go.

LOUIE LEE: Thank you.

So we have opened the nomination phase of our board selection. It goes until mid-December. We plan to be able to announce around late May, mid- to late May, about what our -- who our selection is.

Now, is there a certain type of person you would like us to look for?

KUO-WEI WU: Ray.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you for asking.

Well, with some seriousness, the answer is along the following lines.

---

Being on the board is serious work. We need, ideally, people who have a substantial amount of experience with organizations, with governance, with -- where --

There's a business side of ICANN. We're more than \$100 million a year, 300-odd people scattered around the world, some political involvements around the world, so it's helpful to have people actually that have operated at that level, if possible.

It's complicated because inherent in having people come from the SOs and ALAC, people are coming from the community and so that's not the same pool of people that one typically looks for in a corporate board.

It goes without saying that you guys -- anybody you send will have a lot of technical expertise, which is extremely welcome.

Having the time to put in is one of the challenges. We consume a lot more time than anybody would ever guess. We have a pretty good group of people that work together. It's been cohesive. There's, you know, like a lot of differences among individuals, but it's a team effort.

We like -- we very much like geographic diversity, gender diversity or balance, linguistic diversity, and all of those nice things, but first and foremost is a good mind, a good heart, and skill sets that don't come so easily. I mean, you can't just walk in and say, "Well, I'm going to figure this out from scratch." So helpful to have been there.

I don't know. You guys, do you want to say anything about your experiences and what you would --

---

I mean, you have a free shot. You're leaving, so you can --

RAY PLZAK:

Well, I don't ever need a free shot, Steve. You know that.

I guess the big thing is to have someone appointed by the Address Supporting Organization that knows that "IP" does not mean intellectual property --

[ Laughter ]

-- and actually can take the time to help explain why the regional registries do the things they do, and to, in some extent, be capable of acting as an advocate for ICANN and the board to understand what really goes on inside the numbering world.

STEVE CROCKER:

One of the things we learned in the names side of things is that when you take a name out of service like "cs" for Czechoslovakia, and then you think that five years later it's okay to reassign it to something else, it turns out there's still a lot of traffic going.

Ray, I have to tell you that I suspect it will be at least five years before your exhortations that we should pay attention to the address community will stop ringing in our ears, so you've been a very strong advocate for the address community and reminding us always that there's two "Ns" in ICANN and one of them we should know belongs to the numbers community.

You want to add anything?

KUO-WEI WU:

Yeah. I think Ray's point a couple of points. I -- I think I'm going to say I have two points to add.

I think it's -- if you are looking for the next appoint board member, I would recommend, you know, the new board member should be try to dialogue or communicate with the ICANN CEO, because sometimes the ICANN CEO not necessary to understand the ARO, the number community and how it operate. And sometimes they even don't know actually the number community, we never generate policy here, you know. We generate policy in our communities and we come here to, you know, just (indiscernible) it. So I think that is one thing you have to think about, to choose a person has a good communication skill to tell, you know, the ICANN CEO, ICANN staff, and some of the ICANN board how this community operate.

Of course we have Ron already.

And I think the second point I'm thinking about is that it might also it's important not only talk to the ICANN staff, institution, at the same time to match the communication with the other community here, you know, because you might be -- I think you know that.

Several of the communities in the ICANN, maybe the GNSO or at-large, without a communication with them they don't really understand what is the number community in operation, so I think try to bring someone have good communication skill with the outside community and the institution.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you. And let me add that I've been thinking about sort of the next phase of operations within the board and we have now a strengthened board operations department.

Does Melissa happen to be here? There she is.

Melissa King, now vice president of board operations and head of the team that supports the board, is -- we're in a much improved state, and among the several things that are on my agenda is a cross-fertilization across the board and educating the nontechnical people on the board about the technical sides of the Internet, including specifically the numbers community and perhaps visiting one or more RIRs and engaging over time.

So I'd like to increase our presence and will be contacting you from time to time saying, you know, "Would you mind if somebody dropped by?"

So an incoming board member will have those duties, too.

GEORGE SADOWSKY:

Thank you. George Sadowsky.

I want to take off on something Steve said about Ray exhorting us to become more familiar with the numbers community and that there are two "Ns" in ICANN.

One of the -- it's so easy to concentrate on names because we are, in effect, dealing with names most of the time, and one of the things that I think you could help us to do, either through your new board member or directly, really, more generally is to tell us how we can most effectively interact with you and learn from what you're doing.

---

Your suggestions will be very welcome. We'd -- I'd really like them myself personally and I suspect that the other board members would agree. Thank you.

AXEL PAWLIK:

So let me quickly come back to the interaction part. I think we've said many times that -- and of course we continue to invite all parts of the ICANN community to the RIRs' meetings that happen regularly around the globe. We'd be happy to introduce you to the rest of the numbers community, certainly, and would love to see you there.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you. Rinalia Abdul Rahim.

I have a question. ICANN is moving towards a new meeting strategy. There is a particular meeting called Meeting B, which is shorter and policy focused. It wasn't clear to me whether or not there would be a component in Meeting B where the ICANN community gets a sense of numbers policy, whether you would be willing to do a briefing. Because I know your policy development happens elsewhere.

Is this something that you might consider?

LOUIE LEE:

So I'm actually pushing for a slot where it's uncontested, plenary style, to where I can do such a briefing of number policy.

We've been doing that within the workshops, and it's met with limited success only because it is in -- during conflicted times

when people choose between names-type topics or transition-type topics versus numbers.

And so I do have a set of slides that actually show the policies that are being discussed, the policies that are recently enacted, and break it down with the types of policies that these are, how many within -- across the world.

As much as these are regional policies, everybody lives within a region, so these policies do affect each and every one of you in some way, whether directly or even if you need an IP for your name server, for instance.

STEVE CROCKER:

Just one second.

So this is a semi-serious question.

You said it would be nice to have a plenary slot. Plenary slots are, of course, very dear and time is extremely --

And so I'm thinking, how do we get that to be a high-value compressed tight thing?

TED talks come to mind. It takes a long time to prepare a good TED talk, and practice. Are you willing to go through the onerous preparation and practice for a TED talk style?

And, you know, I say that slightly tongue-in-cheek, but actually I could imagine that if we could get things prepped that way, so that it worked, it would be enormously effective, and I'm just making that up on the spot here. I'm sure there will be some

---

other opinions, but you'd have my vote if we wanted to move in that direction.

RAY PLZAK:

Steve?

Yeah. What Louie is getting at is the fact that whenever the address council is scheduled to do the kind of things he's talking about, it's always put up against some big other session that's going on, and it's not that they don't also try to go to as many of these other constituency sessions and things and so forth that they can't interact, but one of the things that happened towards the end of the Friday sessions before they were cancelled was that Louie was able to produce a discussion of the -- of the policies that were discussed -- being discussed at a regional level and was able to show or discuss and point out how or -- they would affect the people in the room that normally you wouldn't consider to be a customer of a regional Internet registry.

And on top of that, there's been a number of discussions going on in the names world about directory services and WHOIS and privacy and so forth. A lot of these problems were discussed 10 years ago in the regional registries, and addressed.

And so what's really needed is a way to get the greater group of attendees at a meeting to be able to hear that. And it doesn't have to be a long period of time but it should be a period of time when the people aren't being scheduled to really be someplace else and that this is just a convenient place to do it because there's a room that's open because everybody else is in a different room.

---

STEVE CROCKER: Okay. Our team is taking notes, and so some of this is noted. We've got a queue.

Do you want to --

DMITRY KOHMANYUK: Well, Dmitry Kohmanyuk, address council.

As somebody who is MSWG delegate from ASO, I must add that it was never the intention to prioritize down the presentation work or what they call cross-contingency work. So even if the new schedule is still in kind of process of being made, I don't think there would be any problem for ASO, as if any other ASO, to present it current issues to others.

And as Steve commented, I do think videos are great, and yes, indeed, maybe we should have these practiced. And that, again, is not just for this ASO but for others.

And (indiscernible), just to add on your comment, well, yes, you made a good point and I think, yeah, that's basically a good idea.

Yeah, I don't think there's any issue of us being kind of phased out of the meeting, plus don't forget the meeting, too, is the ASO own meeting in ICANN structure, so --

STEVE CROCKER: Something to think about.

DMITRY KOHMANYUK: -- secondary column that we have.

---

LOUIE LEE: Thanks.

CHERINE CHALABY: This is Cherine Chalaby, member of the board.

I just wanted to follow on of what George said earlier and support his -- his request for a meaningful engagement, I think, between the board and the -- and the NRO/ASO, but also management. So I think we need to find ideas and ways where we continue an ongoing dialogue and an ongoing engagement.

I personally will not be just -- find it not sufficient just to attend meetings and just come here. We have to have something that keeps us linked and have a conversation, an open conversation between us.

So I welcome any ideas that could help that. It would be great. Thank you.

HANS PETTER HOLEN: Hans Petter Holen, chair of RIPE, the open policy forum that sets policies for the RIPE NCC.

I want to pick up a bit on how to interact, and I think maybe we should this around. As Axel said, you're all more than welcome to the RIR meetings. The RIRs don't only do the policy meetings, they also do what you are starting to call "B" meetings, the regional meetings, where they go out to. Last week, it was in Ukraine. We've been to Kazan in Russia. We've been to the Middle East. I think in addition to the two RIPE meetings, we're doing six, seven, eight meetings a year where we get a hundred, two hundred participants, so -- and ICANN staff is coming to

---

some -- many of these and that's very good, but maybe some of the board members should actually come to these meetings as well.

There you can actually meet the community who will never come to an ICANN meeting because they're not even able to come to a RIPE meeting because it's too far for them.

So that would give you an opportunity to meet the local communities and understand what their problems are.

And some of the content are really good and really local. It's not only us bringing content to them but people who present their interests to each other.

DAVID OLIVE:

David Olive, vice president of policy development support.

I just want to emphasize what Rinalia said about the meetings team B program, less conflicting schedules, more time to have a discussion, so I'm happy to either help you or co-chair a session that might be policymaking on the numbers side, policymaking on the names side, best practices, how we best work together. There will also be ICANN fellows there, new people from the region, so that could be a good way of doing it. I would propose that.

KUO-WEI WU:

Kuo-Wei.

David, thank you very much. I like to remind one thing. Actually, on regional day, APNIC Jakarta meeting, just August. Regional

---

APNIC expect we have name community, people come to this APNIC meeting. The ccTLD already there but -- the key registry and registrar, but eventually we heard they want to run this regional name community in Los Angeles first, which can be happen to all the regions as soon as possible because originally we happened in Jakarta but not really did.

AXEL PAWLIK: Thank you, Kuo-Wei.

Fadi.

FADI CHEHADE: Based on the comments we just heard and based on the great experience I had visiting with Oscar and his community and the excellent work that Kuek has been doing with APNIC, including common meetings, et cetera, why don't we just at least start towards -- also based on what Louie said -- an exchange of plenary slots whereby the SOs should have a plenary spot with us, we should have plenary spots in their six meetings per year since we're there anyway, and it becomes a chance to make sure that all the communities are cross-informed about what's going on and we're not going to go necessarily and, you know, bring people up-to-date on naming policies. I mean they don't care much about that. But in general about ICANN, what we're doing and the role we play as the coordinator. And vice versa, our community should be exposed to that.

Would that idea have some -- I see lots of heads nodding but maybe some input would be good. And then we can move

---

towards implementing and trying -- maybe we try it for a year, come back and revisit it if it's not necessary.

RAY PLZAK:

Fadi, that used to be part of the things that happened at our regional registry meetings. However, once the ASO MoU was signed in 2004, it then started to drop off. So now the only consistent people that come are some of David's people and the IANA people, but people from the global leaders coming up, these guys will not hesitate to give you a slot or put you on a panel.

And so it's welcomed to do that.

FADI CHEHADE:

Yeah, exactly. I'm just saying if we institutionalize it, then it becomes part of the process. And our teams will always be ready. Our meetings team just know that the SO has a slot and they will update the community, right? And I think that would be a very welcomed change for us.

We are named out at the moment.

[ Laughter ]

We have so much naming community work going on that we will -- we are very much welcoming the second N in our name to take more space. So...

AXEL PAWLIK:

Thank you, Fadi. Hans Petter.

---

HANS PETTER HOLEN: I just want to add ICANN has, indeed, had a slot on every RIPE meeting since its formation. There is a RIPE meeting in Bucharest coming up soon. All the program was published a couple of days ago. There is still lightning talks, ten-minute talks left. And there is a slot reserved for ICANN IANA together with the RIR presentation. So you are more than welcome to come there and fill it with whatever you think is important to communicate to the RIR community.

AXEL PAWLIK: Thank you, Hans Petter. I think in the interest of time, may we move on?

HANS PETTER HOLEN: They are saying me, that's the way in all the RIRs.

AXEL PAWLIK: Right. Thank you. Let's move on in the agenda.  
Next point we have down is travel support for CCWG member.  
I think that is an interesting topic on the background of ICANN as an international organization serving all of the world.  
And I have Oscar's request to speak.

OSCAR ROBLES: Thank you, Axel.  
Four months ago I had this conversation with staff -- sorry. I had this conversation with some of the staff and board members

---

about this issue. We were unable to send our representatives to one of the CCWG meetings. The solution has not come up. I know you are working on that. It is to do with some of the rules that ICANN has to comply with because of some limitations of the embargoes and these kinds of things.

But rather than what, I'm interested in knowing when are we going to have this solution implemented to have a proper participation of all the representatives from the numbers community in these committees.

STEVE CROCKER: Amy, do you want to comment?

AMY STATHOS: Sure. So as you said, we are working on it. We did submit a request for a license in order to allow the member to participate.

The license requests cannot be just generic in sense of just to travel anywhere in the world for a year. So as soon as we understand what the specific locations are, we submit.

We have one pending right now. The latest meeting that we were aware of was here. So we are prepared to amend as soon as we know where the next place would be. We have been in communication with the folks. They're aware that we've submitted an expedited request and -- as soon as we know where the next few locations are. Because previously we submitted for Ireland, for the United States, for France, et cetera. And we did submit for expedited treatment.

---

Unfortunately, at the -- it's been a very short lead-up time for this particular instance.

But we will continue to work as hard as we can and we will continue to try to understand as soon as we can when we might be able to get something. But we can't -- there's no guarantee as to exactly when; but we are working very, very hard and on a regular basis to ensure that we get expedited response.

OSCAR ROBLES:

All I'm asking is to ask your staff to be more creative in these solutions and willing to have this solution implemented because it is not a single-person problem. It is not a single-country problem. It is the whole numbers community that hasn't been able to participate properly in these committees.

So just willing to have a creative solution. We are willing to help you to have these properly solved. We already solved to have this participation during this meeting because there was no solution. But we're not going to be waiting forever. I mean, it has been four months. And I don't know if you are trying to follow the format procedures but, please, be more creative. We are being disadvantaged.

FADI CHEHADE:

Unfortunately, Oscar, "creative" and the "U.S. Department of Treasury" don't go in the same sentence. This is not something in our hands. We're expediting proposals through the U.S. government. There are laws that we cannot change. And there are procedures, unfortunately ugly procedures, but they are procedures nonetheless.

---

So we will -- as Amy said, we'll do everything we can -- and this, by the way, affecting only one country and probably one person, nonetheless a very important member of our community.

So we will push harder. And I will check with the team if there are ways through Washington to push harder. But it is a procedure. You already -- okay.

It's awful, but okay, it is what it is. And I hope that the new situation will remove that whole issue soon.

OSCAR ROBLES: I understand, but we have to be very careful. Our politicians, ours, yours, are so creative in inventing new enemies.

FADI CHEHADE: Yeah, yeah.

OSCAR ROBLES: Today it is this country. Tomorrow is going to be another country.

FADI CHEHADE: Understood.

OSCAR ROBLES: So we have to think again creative and have a formal solution for anything that may happen in this regard.

---

FADI CHEHADE: Correct.

OSCAR ROBLES: And we have to be very careful what is the solution we implement to this issue because we are giving arguments to those countries that think that this is not the right place to have these organizations.

FADI CHEHADE: Be fair, Oscar. ICANN will not change the global policies of the United States. So put yourself in our shoes. There are laws that we are trying to deal with, rules that are very tough. And, I mean, what I don't want you to leave with is any feeling or sense that ICANN is not doing everything we can.

Creative with rules around very tough laws in the U.S. government about paying for travel of individuals from certain countries is just -- is not something I can be creative about because I can't break the law. I am subject to that law.

So -- but I assure you we are doing everything we can. And I will double down. I will look into it after this meeting, talk again to my team. I know they're doing everything they can. And it breaks -- I'm sorry that this is happening. Don't get the sense that we're taking this lightly. But there's just so much we can do around laws and rules that are very tight right now. My apologies.

AXEL PAWLIK: Thank you, Fadi. And I hear what you are saying there.

---

Marty.

MARTIN HANNIGAN: Hi, I'm Martin Hannigan from Akamai Technologies. The last time Fadi said he would solve the problem, it was very impressive, the Argentina meeting, with one of the visitors who was cleared. I believe she was from Iran or something.

I wanted to point out that perhaps there is some confusion because I know inbound to Cuba, the new general license is much different than the old OFAC required license and is much simpler. In fact, I plan to be in Cuba myself in a few months. And I did not need to apply for any license whatsoever. There is some rigid guidelines that you have to comply with, and they're not voluntary but they are self-audited and whatnot. I'm not a lawyer, but I think putting some extra effort into this would be very useful. Thank you.

AXEL PAWLIK: Thank you, Marty.

Fiona.

FIONA ASONGA: Fiona Asonga for the record. I think what ICANN needs to do to help -- because I come from a part of the world where we visibly went against some U.S. treaty or something we'd be sanctioned. And I see myself easily being in that position.

But because meeting venues get approved way in advance, we shouldn't be waiting until it is close to travel time to begin

---

applying. Let's be real. The applications as soon as the meetings are approved by the meeting team immediately, the next staff who needs to be following up on the license should begin to do so.

And as we continue to open up ICANN to the global community, we are soon going to have guys from Kenya-Somalia, Somali-Somali, Puntland-Somali who will be appointed to these positions and need to participate in ICANN. So that means that someone's roles somehow needs to be tweaked a bit to pay more attention so that there is just more efficiency to achieve because, yes, the rules are rigid. Again, if we plan well and we are efficient and we synchronize our cross-departmental communication, it is easy to be able to get it done on time because I know if anything happened Kenya, USA, I will be in that category. And I love to participate and to engage.

So I don't know how that will -- we need to be ready. It's about planning and being ready. Thanks.

FADI CHEHADE:

And, certainly, Fiona, we are applying ahead of time all the time for our meetings.

The problem here is CCWG having snap decisions on where they will meet. But in terms of our meetings, we apply ahead of time. We're always, frankly, preparing for that. So I want you to know this.

And, again, on the gentlemen's comment, the problem is not the inbound. It's the travel support. It's the fact we're paying

---

money to an individual from that country. There are special rules around paying for that trip. That's the issue to be frank.

AXEL PAWLIK:

We understand that. And my personal thought is maybe there's some more leeway around -- not around but in sort of focusing on the official ways licenses and the like. Talk to the community a bit more when you see there is a problem forming like that. Just -- we are a big community. We can solve problems all together. I think that's the main point.

George, sorry.

GEORGE SADOWSKY:

Quick comment. Whenever you deal with a lot of countries, there are visa problems. And I could conceive of a matrix which is country and visa and what's possible and what's not. I think the meetings team is taking this into account for some extent, and I suspect what we should do is up the importance of the ability of people from many countries to get into other countries in our choice of meeting locations whenever possible. Thank you.

AXEL PAWLIK:

Thank you very much, George.

Okay. Time is moving on. Let's move on to the next tiny point on the agenda. It's only about IANA stewardship transition and progress there.

---

If you remember this meeting that we had in Buenos Aires, I was at that point saying that the numbers community was moving forward on an SLA, a contract for IANA services; that we would be with interest looking at the big picture of IANA stewardship transition but that we would be very much willing to find a quick solution to the situation, the IANA services; that we would have a contract soon; and we would be looking forward to ICANN being able to sign that hopefully already ahead of the transition process itself. Basically, our provision would be to have a contract that lies dormant until the NTIA would let us all go.

So we have made some progress since. We have published a couple of SLA drafts for public comment. We have taken those comments in. We've replied to them. We've amended the text. And over the last couple of months, we sat together also with ICANN operational folk and looked at sort of the issues that were born in maybe slight misunderstandings of each other's intents.

But I'm happy to say that after today, we have basically achieved operational agreement. Of course, there were a couple of comments tossed around the room that, oh, the lawyers would have to look at this and that.

So this would be the next step in this. We would hope very much that we would get some time from the ICANN legal team during this week ideally to make progress on this and ideally finish this and have something that we would all feel at least happy to sign even if we are not signing it already. But that would be preferable, of course.

So that's my quick update. I don't know whether anybody else would like to talk to this or any responses maybe.

---

Ray.

RAY PLZAK:

Thanks, Axel. This situation with the SLA reminds me, if you recall Shanghai in 2002, when we were negotiating between the then three, possibly four regional registries with ICANN in regards to ASO MOU and contract and so forth. And the operational guys came to a very good understanding and conclusion and so forth and happily drafted something together, gave it to ICANN legal. And it came back with all kinds of red ink and we were told it was non-operative. I certainly hope that doesn't happen this time. Thank you.

AXEL PAWLIK:

Yes, me, too.

[ Laughter ]

BILL WOODCOCK:

Bill Woodcock, member of the CRISP team. I would just like to say our work was finished on the 15th of January. We have been very happy to see a spirit of cooperation here. But I would really like to see that spirit of cooperation turn into actual signatures by the end of this week. I think the fact that we've come to agreement on the substance means that the last little bit of lawyering, I think, if we could get that taken care of here this week while everyone is still here and we can apply signatures in realtime and get out of this would make all of us who put in many very long nights over November, December, and January happy. Thank you.

---

AXEL PAWLIK: Yes. Izumi.

IZUMI OKUTANI: I basically want to thank the RIRs and also ICANN for working on the SLA and to start working on the implementation. And while I have see the statement from the ICANN board that you observe no issues about the proposal. And as we have expressed, we trust both the RIRs and ICANN to continue work on the implementation to be consistent with the number community proposal. And it seems that the progress is smooth. So as Bill has expressed, we will be able to progress on implementation smoothly and far beyond the expected time lines to complete the implementation. So thank you, once again, for these efforts.

AXEL PAWLIK: Thank you, Izumi. I just want to add that while all the other discussions at this set of ICANN meetings are fascinating, we have made clear this is our priority, the RIRs' priority at this set of meetings is to make progress on this contract and preferably get it to signature ready at the end.

Do we have any supportive comments maybe from the ICANN folks?

RAY PLZAK: The contract should have been signed a long time ago.

AXEL PAWLIK: Couldn't agree more. Anybody else? Fadi?

FADI CHEHADE:

Well, Just to keep expectations fair, we have wanted -- when you and I met in Buenos Aires, we wanted to sign it, like, right there and then and have a nice sangria after. But we'll try again with Guinness. But my sense is it will take a raki. There's some limitations on us, that's all, on when we can physically sign this.

I think if it were just us, we would just sign it right now because as the gentleman who spoke is right.

Great work has been done. Super progress on this. There's no question from our side, this is ready to go. So right now all we're dealing with is the three implementation phases that I presented on Monday. What can we do between now and when the proposal is sent? What can we do from the moment the proposal is submitted till it is okayed by Larry, which depending on the DOTCOM Act may be certification or just an okay. And then what can we do after that and all the way till September 30. So these are the three phases of implementation. We had a meeting with NTIA in Washington to discuss both the contractual and political limitations on us to do certain things. And we can continue those discussions, Axel, while we're here. From my perspective, the faster the better. But we are living within a context not entirely in our hands right now.

AXEL PAWLIK:

Yeah, I understand the sensitivities around appearances and stuff like that as well. So while I would like to present to my community in Bucharest in a couple of weeks' time that we have signed it, I think it might be difficult to do that. However, as a second best result I would really like to ensure that ICANN, including the legal team and ourselves, have a contract that we

---

agreed on could be signable anytime the greater forces let us.  
Ray, and --

FADI CHEHADE: Sorry, just to add to this. We also discussed with them the idea of signing things with you that could have a conditional, so that's also been floated. Legal counsel on their side is reviewing that. So we're trying everything we can to move this forward. But -- anyway, I think you understand the envelope, Axel. We've been discussing.

AXEL PAWLIK: Thank you. Ray.

RAY PLZAK: I have a different thing inside this topic area so if this is the same, go ahead.

AXEL PAWLIK: All right. Then Craig.

CRAIG NG: Craig Ng, general counsel for APNIC. I just wanted to reinforce that point, that in version two of the SLA we inserted a specific clause which is a condition precedent that makes the SLA of no force and effect at all until ICANN is released from the current obligation with NTIA. So I just want to make that point.

---

FADI CHEHADE: And Craig, this addresses the first of the two trips. This addresses the legal trip line, right, that we put a conditional. It may or may not address the political concern --

CRAIG NG: I understand.

FADI CHEHADE: -- that the appearance of us moving forward as a fait accompli when there are people who are -- that we're still navigating with to get this done. So we need to calculate that, our keenness to get this done. I think what you do know is that ICANN is ready. We think what you gave us is a fantastic proposal. We now need to just get it done in a way that is safe for all of us.

CRAIG NG: Thank you, appreciate it.

AXEL PAWLIK: Great. And we do appreciate the effort that ICANN is putting in as well. Ray.

RAY PLZAK: Thanks, Axel. I was wondering if the NRO or any individual regional registry would like to share its thoughts about the PTI.

AXEL PAWLIK: The PTI. Yes. Well, I've said earlier I believe that we are looking forward to sign this agreement right now with ICANN as the IANA

---

operator and we would look forward to that being transferred in some way or assigned to the PTI if and when it happens. But at this point of course we don't know exactly how that will -- will look like. Any other comments towards PTI? Bill.

**BILL WOODCOCK:** I would of course defer to Izumi relative to the CRISP team and to John relative to ARIN. But to summarize my understanding of the conversation, we couldn't care less about the PTI. It seems a little heavyweight. Our interest is in contracting with ICANN. If ICANN is forced into doing a PTI thing and then chooses to use the PTI to execute, as long as we don't have to know very much about it, it would be okay.

**AXEL PAWLIK:** Thank you, Bill. Athina.

**ATHINA FRAGKOULI:** Yes. So as you know, when we -- when CRISP team completed its proposal that was before the whole idea of PTI came up. So the idea was that we're happy with ICANN, so we will continue having contractual relationship with ICANN. When this PTI idea came up, we try really in the -- for the record, I'm Athina Fragkouli. I'm the legal counsel of RIPE NCC. And I was working on the draft SLA with my colleagues from the other RIRs.

So when we started drafting the SLA we thought about this. We said okay, what we have now is ICANN. This is the reality we know. This is in line with the CRISP proposal. However, we know the discussions about PTI. We now know that this might

---

be the successor IANA operator. So we added in our SLA the possibility for ICANN to subcontract someone else for the service and reassign rights and obligations from the SLA. So this is sorted out this way. Thank you.

AXEL PAWLIK: Thank you, Athina. Kuo-Wei.

KUO-WEI WU: Yeah, I think I might be thinking about Ray actually asking two different question. One question is, if the PTI going to happen, you know, how the RIR have the flexibility to do what you say. Actually not a question. What is coming from the RIR regarding for the PTI? Is that general area risk for RIR, you know, the relationship with ICANN? You know, there's different views.

ATHINA FRAGKOULI: Legally speaking, we have a contract with ICANN. So for us, ICANN will be liable if they subcontract someone else. This -- ICANN will be our contractual party.

AXEL PAWLIK: I believe there's also a clause in there that the number side would have to agree to the assignment to the PTI, right? To a different party.

ATHINA FRAGKOULI: Yes, of course. Yeah. Every assignment should be in the agreement with us, yes.

---

AXEL PAWLIK: Ray.

RAY PLZAK: What if the PTI does something to affect IANA operations that are in contravention with the SLA?

ATHINA FRAGKOULI: Yeah. As I said, according to the contract we have with ICANN, ICANN is responsible for us. So we are not going to ask for damages suit for someone else. We have -- do not have a contractual relationship. However, ICANN might do so. It's not our issue.

AXEL PAWLIK: So the contract draft basically has a couple of requirements for IANA operations, and whoever is going to be on the other end of that contract with us, it's ICANN/IANA as this is the current configuration or in some other configuration maybe even including a PTI there, I think those clauses are held up and are relevant, and if the conditions, requirements, are not met, then we will have to go and to look for a different provider in the end. We hope not to have to do that, of course.

Okay. I -- Nurani, are you approaching the microphone? Because I would like to --

NURANI NIMPUNO: Very discretely. No just -- Nurani Nimpuno, vice chair of the CRISP team. It might be obviously to everyone on this side of the room and maybe at the front of the room, but it needs to -- I

---

think everyone outside of this room needs to know that these draft SLAs are public. They're available and are on our Web site and they've gone through public comment periods. So if people want to know there's no -- there's nothing here being redrafted behind closed doors. So if people are interested in looking at it, it's all available. Thanks.

AXEL PAWLIK:

Thank you, Nurani. And of course we'll update it as we can. All right. John, go ahead.

JOHN CURRAN:

So -- John Curran, president and CEO of ARIN. I want to be equally clear because Nurani raised a very important point. So we've had meetings with the IANA team to work on the operational aspects that are called for. The SLA has principles that the CRISP team laid out and we're honoring those principles but at the same time we have to make sure that what's called for in terms of reporting and how requests go back and forth actually works for the RIRs. Likewise, we know the IANA legal team still has a chance to -- I'm sorry, the ICANN legal team still needs a chance to look over all of this and provide comments. So there is actually a working draft that as we've been meeting today in fact that is slightly different than what's publicly out there. We need to converge, give the ICANN legal team a chance to review. There may be comments. Obviously the public drafts don't include what ICANN's legal team hasn't yet written. So -- but as soon as we converge on something, we will get it back out to the community. But I do want to be very clear, the working draft we started this week up with is not

---

necessarily what's currently underway but we'll get out to the community as soon as possible, once we have all the ink dry on it. Thank you.

AXEL PAWLIK: Thank you, John. Right, we have about five minutes left for ICANN accountability in general. I think that's a fairly easy topic. I have the impression that Filiz wants to jump at the mic.

FILIZ YILMAZ: Thank you. Filiz Yilmaz. Formerly from Akamai but here with my address support organization address counsel vice chair. I just -- I'm a bit -- I'm the one to blame for that one maybe to be up, but I think it links to what has been said here in regards to the previous agenda point. This issue the conversations around the CCWG and accountability issue has a direct link with the IANA transition timelines. There are communities regional communities are very sensitive to. They put a lot of work to that and they would like to see the results.

Now, it's been -- I've been following through our representatives and also myself here since I've been at the meeting the general discussions around this topic, and what strikes me is the usage of the word "consensus." And it seems to me that in that context there seems to be an understanding that everybody needs to be agreeing on every little detail and that agreement needs to be absolute. That -- that's -- that brought me thinking. It took me to some thinking, and consensus in our understanding is a concept -- it's a long-standing concept in the regional Internet communities and we have been using it a lot in

---

application level in our policy building mechanisms. And we don't think that it is directly (indiscernible). We don't think that it is full agreement from all stakeholders. It comes down to the question, where can we meet at the bare minimum. And if your preferred option is not the one that will be the outcome, to move the whole concept to our consensus, what will be your bare minimum as a compromise? What can you live with? So that everybody can win.

In that concept -- context, I know that our ICANN board members are very familiar with that concept, too. And there was a question how we could help towards the ICANN board. So I'm again encouraging our board members and to yet the future board members who are very much embroiled in these processes as well, to bring that necessary understanding, maybe to make it more a concept to focus on. And the other thing, so -- and I want to ask again, I heard there has been a call for the -- for the entire community to focus on the compromise aspect of the current issue, that what we can live with, where we can meet. So I think that's the help we can ask from the ICANN board as well, to repeat that message so we can all move towards -- towards an agreement. Thank you.

RAY PLZAK: Thank you, Filiz. Very important. Izumi.

IZUMI OKUTANI: I wasn't sure if ICANN board wanted to respond to Filiz's question or can I just make my comment first. Okay. So Izumi Okutani, this time with the hat of ASO representative from the

---

CCWG. And I completely understand and, you know, agree with the point that Filiz has commented, coming from the same community obviously. At the same time, I'm pretty optimistic about how things are going within the CCWG now that I'm seeing that the chairs are encouraging to the members to clarify what is the absolute minimum and what is your preference and so this might be something more close to the idea of, you know, wrapping rough consensus, not seeking for the perfect solution, as I know Nurani has expressed at the meeting the other day. And this might be something that we as the ASO representatives in the CCWG may be able to reiterate and again share with the rest of the CCWG members. So just a sharing of some information from my side.

AXEL PAWLIK:

Thank you, Izumi.

GEORGE SADOWSKY:

Thanks. George Sadowsky. I've been following the CCWG now and interacting with it for about three months and 3,000 messages. And one of the things that frustrates me a little bit is that the process is chartered and fairly well controlled in terms of the way in which the outlines, the initial outlines of the proposals have been developing and there wasn't been, for example, any significant community wide development -- I'm sorry, community wide discussion of -- such as a public forum which would allow other people, people other than the central group that have been guiding the process to express their opinions. And so I'd like to ask if any of the NRO folks would like to talk about the proposal from their point of view. What are the

---

attitudes toward it? What -- how do you see closure coming, et cetera?

AXEL PAWLIK:

Right, I could do that. You might have seen the statement that the NRO has issued a couple of weeks ago basically saying look, people, we see this with our interest. We will rely on the contractual arrangements for enforceability and accountability. Much of what is being talked about within the CCWG we have fairly well under control within the RIR's roles. However, we look at various mechanisms that are being discussed and we had a meeting yesterday also with the CWG chairs and so talked about this a bit. We see ICANN being a designator-run organization. We would like, in all of our doings, as little change as possible so we would -- we would actually encourage any thoughts along those lines in keeping the current structure as much as possible multi-designators. However, having said that, we are fairly flexible. Our main priority is to get this thing done. As long as it works, it will work for us. We are a little bit concerned about new arrangements around sole membership or sole designators because we feel that the organization around the sole new entity will require implementation details that have not been talked about too much or maybe I haven't heard them yet. So that's a bit of a concern on our side. Otherwise, I think that's mainly what we would have to say to that. Kuo-Wei.

KUO-WEI WU:

Yeah. Actually we participated in the CCWG in Los Angeles or here also. And as you say, I think the CCWG, from my personal observation, it's a certain issue, it's a remit. I think in the CCWG I

---

didn't see very clear mechanism what called as consensus. You know, because -- maybe because I was -- came from APNIC. We know what consensus mean. You know, every time we go to the policy in the member meeting, we ask the people show of hand and to see what is the consensus or abstain or against, but in the CCWG I didn't see this mechanism. There is sometime the consensus just based on -- I don't know who decide consensus is. I think these are one problems.

The second problem I saw, right now this deals in the stage of the conceptuals that didn't go to the implementation stage.

Let me tell you one example. When they talking about remove a single board member, I'm not against that. But I think Izumi know I talk to the CCWG people and say in Taiwan, we are revoking system. 50-year, never work. Never work. Because I think (indiscernible) know that. The board have three-year term only. You remove a single board member. Once you're appointed, at least you need to allow him six or one month -- or one year to perform before you say we should revoke him, right?

And then you need to do the defenses. You know, if I was to be removed, can I defense? You need to give them six months, some time, to defense.

And then you need to go to the final decisions. It might be whenever his term is almost end. So what is purpose to go through?

You know, when you thinking about a conceptual like removing a single board member, you have to thinking about the whole process. At this moment, they didn't go through the whole

---

process. They just stay in the conceptual. To be honest, this really worry me, because if you finish this one and go to the implementation, you will be take a very long time to do it.

AXEL PAWLIK:

Thank you, Kuo-Wei, and I think that's -- the implementation issue was something I was talking about. We don't know how things will look like.

Folks, I have to apologize. We are overrunning a little bit, so maybe if you can keep it relatively tiny, Bill, and then we would have wrap up.

BILL WOODCOCK:

Yeah. Absolutely. So I think the ICANN accountability measures of interest to the numbers community are clearly and completely defined within the SLA.

I think that the accountability measures of interest to the names community are being discussed within the CCWG. I think it's an extraordinarily bad idea for our community to meddle in the CCWG too much for two reasons.

Number one, because it would perhaps encourage people from the names community to meddle in our business and they are much larger than us and I'd rather we not poke that bear with a stick.

Number two, it -- I'm very worried that it will promote the misconception that there is an interdependency between numbers and names and that numbers is somehow affected by

---

what happens in CCWG, and we definitely don't want people to come away with that impression.

We have three non-interdependent functions and we want to make sure that people continue to perceive them that way.

AXEL PAWLIK: Thank you, Bill. Ray, closing words?

RAY PLZAK: Yes. In addition to what Bill just said, don't forget that there are accountability measures built into the ASO MoU and into the exchange of letters that exist between ICANN and the NRO.

So there are plenty of accountability things in place already, so I just wanted to add those documents to your discussion.

AXEL PAWLIK: Thank you, Ray.

My apologies about time control. Back to the chairman, Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you all. It's been very pleasurable. Appreciate meeting with you guys, and as I said at the beginning, we expect to increase the level of engagement and visibility, so thank you and keep it up.

[ Applause ]

[ END OF TRANSCRIPT ]