

ICANN

**Moderator: Grace Abuhamad
December 21, 2014
8:00 am CT**

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Operator. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is Greg Shatan. This is the RFP 3 Subgroup call of the CWG of the IANA Transition Stewardship Working Group. It's December 19, 2014.

Let's begin with roll call.

Grace Abuhamad: Thanks, Greg. This is Grace Abuhamad for the record. We're going to do roll call based on the Adobe Connect room. If there's anyone on the audio line who's not in the Adobe Connect can you speak now? Okay, thank you. Back to you, Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Grace. Well I think following on our call on Monday and subsequent discussion one of the things that is a number of us were discussing was that the combination - that structure and function are interrelated and that thought it would help refresh our discussion on structure if we would move

over and clarify and discuss the functions of the multistakeholder review team first today and then go back to our so-called structural analysis.

So I circulated yesterday, and there's now upon the screen, a document entitled MRT Functional Analysis. Hopefully you've seen this. In any event a fair amount of this should be familiar since a lot of it is drawn from the draft proposal document.

So to a certain extent this is confirmatory of our draft proposal, there is more detail and in some cases there were overlaps in functions between the MRT and the CSG that were in that document that need to be resolved as to whether only one or the other group should have that function or whether they both should, and if so how they would relate.

So let's dive in here. First, what we have is basically a restatement of what's in the public consultation document. But of course that doesn't mean that's a starting point, not an ending point of course.

So the first thing we have here is to issue instructions to Contract Co. are there any comments, questions, thoughts on that? Seun, I see your hand is up.

Seun Ojedgeji: Hi, Greg. Thank you, Greg. This is Seun for the record. Before we continue like to just take care about what we are trying to achieve. Are we kind of trying to assume that we are trying to go into Contract Co route, is that really where we are for the - going into the details of this particular proposal? Because, I think it's important that we try to - each line (unintelligible) as much as possible.

I would suggest that if we actually review this role of the MRT (unintelligible) to (unintelligible) in respect to Contract Co (unintelligible).

Greg Shatan: Seun, I think we lost...

Coordinator: One moment.

Grace Abuhamad: I think we're going to have to...

Greg Shatan: We lost Seun's audio.

Grace Abuhamad: ...dial back out to Seun. Yeah, I think so. Maybe we can come back to him.

Greg Shatan: Okay. I think that if I can go with what Seun was saying that we are in a, you know, we are in a kind of a bit of an awkward period here in that we are still waiting for public comments, the proposal is still very much in flux. We need to be completely open minded to the public comments and, you know, work through them without any sense that there is any kind of predetermination because of calls that we are having during the public comment period.

And certainly anything that we do say about how the MRT and Contract Co relate will be irrelevant if there was this decision of the working group and the chartering organization instructing representatives and etcetera if we were to drop the Contract Co aspect of the structure.

So, yeah, I agree with that. I think the balance is that, to the extent that there is a need for more detail, continue to understand and discuss the current proposal we need to, you know, continue to flesh things out because one of the other concerns that people have expressed is the lack of detail or at least kind of next level detail in the draft proposal and that's also a fair concern.

So I think it's important to balance those two aspects out, trying to make sure that the proposal is clarified and at the same time understanding that the proposal is not, you know, in any means grave and in stone that is, you know, completely open as it should be to reacting to the public comment.

And in any case I see Avri's and in the chat.

Avri Doria: Hi. Thanks. This is Avri speaking. One thing that we might do in any case is start with the MRT functions and the customer standing committee function, you know, first because those seem to be common functions in a solution. And while they might have different names, every sort of version we had talking about these have had some entity like those so I think that's a good place to start.

And we can get to, like you say, you know, quite a contracting co function would need to fill. I mean, that's part of the breakdown is part of the analysis is look at the entities and what would they need to be. And then once you know it's function you also know, you know, whether it's possible.

So I see us able to sort of, as you said, respect the uncertainty but still talk about the - quite entities need to do and such. Thanks.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Avri. I think that's a good suggestion. And in any case when we get to the next page of the document and in further detail I think that having Issue Instructions to Contract Co is, if not misleading, a little bit reductive. And most of what actually takes place under the heading of Issue Instructions to Contract Co, we get to the detail is actually running the RFP process and the like which may occur under a plan even if there's no Contract Co on day one.

So it's really kind of running the business of the MRT in that - in that sense. But let's not get stuck on that point and let move on on this page on a high-level.

Martin Boyle, I see your hand.

Martin Boyle: Thanks Greg. It's Martin Boyle here. Yes, I think my question really is associated with the MRT's role which seems to replace or perhaps subsume the responsibility of the multistakeholder community.

So in other words once people have been selected for the MRT they then, if you look at the functions, a peer to have the responsibility to issue the instructions, to meet annually and review the performance, do the review of the budget and so on and so forth.

Now for me I think that's actually a bit of a problem. And it's one of the reasons why everybody wants to make sure that they have got representation and substantial representation on this as a committee. Where is it would seem to me that the MRT, for most of its activities, should be working with the multistakeholder community to identify the way forward, to assess whether the budget is in fact correct or otherwise.

So my question really is are we really assuming that, once selected, the MRT almost becomes autonomous subject to one of the organizations pulling its member of the committee for not following instructions or should it really have a very much greater responsibility for engaging and helping the wider community understand what is happening and to reach its decisions in discussion with the wider community. Thanks.

Greg Shatan: Martin, thank you. And I think that's a very good point. And as you say, a number of things flow from understanding that or how that question might be answered.

It's my feeling that the - it's really the latter, that the - as you said, that the individuals on the MRT are there as representatives of their stakeholder communities and that they are not in any sense autonomous, and that they have the responsibility of acting on behalf of their stakeholder communities and acting within the guidance of their stakeholder communities, keeping their stakeholder communities fully informed, getting instructions if you will, from the stakeholder communities.

And clearly there needs to be some level of latitude in that, you know, the operation has to be able to run. But like for instance, the GNSO, with which I'm most familiar, the representatives of the individual stakeholder groups and constituencies, you know, are not there to speak for themselves but to speak for their communities and important that they have an understanding of what their communities want them to do.

There is a greater responsibility that I think is - shouldn't be lost which is a responsibility to the mission of the MRT and ultimately to the security, stability and resiliency of the Internet and the other basic precepts. So I think acting as a representative of the community - or shouldn't mean and I think that most of the time it doesn't mean acting in a selfish, shortsighted or parochial manner.

So saying that they're there solely to represent the interests of their communities shouldn't mean that they are acting in a self interested manner, but I don't think that is the way the multistakeholder model works when it's working. So that's kind of my thought.

Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, thank you very much. I was just typing it but I'll say it, it's easier.

Greg Shatan: Please.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: For the record, not all GNSO councilors are there formally representing - are on the Council formally representing their constituencies or stakeholders; some are bound to follow instructions, some are acting as - act as free agents, presumably having been selected based on their philosophies that match the overall philosophy of the group that selected them so that varies. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Alan. And I think that's a good point in the sense that, well not - it's a good point period. I think - let me throw out a suggestion, do we think that we should reflect in the chart that the members are there to represent their communities? Or is there some value in the well selected free agent model and allow each community to decide how they are represented, if you will, or how their representative acts when they're on the community - on the MRT?

Avri, I see your hand is up.

Bart Boswinkel: Greg, just one minute. Sorry, Avri. Greg...

Greg Shatan: Oh sorry, Bart, your hand is up.

Bart Boswinkel: We made you presenter so you can scroll the document if needed.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Avri, apologies.

Avri Doria: Thanks. Thanks. That's quite all right. Thank you. Always (unintelligible) has to be allowed. In terms of the GNSO I just wanted to sort of say something relating to what Alan said. I believe that they are representative, each of them is representative. They may do that representation in a different way based upon their particular charters.

Now the other point though is - and so it's a bottom-up notion of representation and you do represent though. There is also three, of course, picked by the Nominating Committee that are meant to represent larger interests and or specifically representative of any population but are representative of the larger interests of the Internet, of ICANN, of whomever.

But, you know, that's the NomComm pick so that's the other piece. I just wanted to add that in. And to answer your question that, yes, I do believe that the people that are selected for an MRT need in some way to represent their communities.

However, if we go outside of, you know, the ICANN and in some of the membership proposals there is the inclusion of people from outside. And they may or may not be representative of civil society or representative of business so they, like NomComm people, would come in as representative of, you know, interests as they understand them but it's a different notion of representation. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Avri. That's very helpful. Martin Boyle.

Martin Boyle: Thanks Greg. Martin Boyle here. Yes, my point is twofold because I actually do see the MRT, if it's working effectively, not just to have a responsibility to their individual constituencies but also to have that responsibility for ensuring that they are engaging with the wider community and so that we don't end up with things essentially being siloed so certain decisions remain entirely within the GNSO, certainly within the ccNSO, certain within - of the other ACs or representative bodies.

I actually think that there should be that responsibility particularly when any decision of any degree of significance is made of going out to the community and properly discussing it with the community. (Unintelligible) sitting there and (unintelligible)...

Greg Shatan: Martin, you're breaking up a bit.

Martin Boyle: I'm sorry. I was just about finished anyway. Without the community properly aware and understanding why that decision is being made, why a particular recommendation is being made. Thanks.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Martin. I think that that's helpful. Certainly I think that - and there's some good stuff going on in the chat as well. I think the way I would summarize for this particular discussion goes, which I think does inform the rest of our discussion, is that the representatives, you know, need to be in a representative capacity. They need some latitude to act within that representation.

It may not make sense to define too rigidly what it means to represent. I don't think, at least that there should be the ability to be a complete free agent. And that should be expressed in how we define the role and maybe we can think

about writing this down, maybe start a - either an email or a document to get this down.

But I think this goes, to some extent, to kind of the - whether this is function or structure or it's kind of that nexus function or structure, it's something that needs to be expressed as part of the mission, right. I personally agree with what Martin has said that the - for important decisions they need to go out to the community, brief the community and get the buy-in of the community or each of their separate communities in order to move forward.

And that the idea should not be that, you know, once put in place they are autonomous and not answerable to their communities and that being answerable doesn't merely mean the ability to recall but that they need to be in touch with their communities.

So I think that that's important. And if there is any disagreement with that concept, either that there needs to be a much tighter hold in some fashion or a looser hold on their latitude, we should bring that up.

But I think that as long as it is clear that they are both kind of responsible for bringing the communities kind of needs and concerns, you know, in their capacity as a member of the MRT and also responsible for their community, to the extent that there is a distinction to be made there, I think it's important that clearly this organization is not an organization, a free agent, but is, you know, must be representing the community.

Seun, welcome back. Sorry about the audio. And I guess both directions. And I see your hand is up.

Seun Ojedeji: Okay thank you, Greg. I think going in the right direction. I just want to suggest something. Perhaps the membership of the MRT - are not try to be filled by representation from within the ICANN community. However, the decision-making process of MRT needs to be encompassing, all-inclusive.

So it's like - so the (unintelligible) issue be at the point that the members of MRT need to make a decision. At that point they are actually not going to be initiating a community - that is their community (unintelligible) process, they are going to be initiating an open process which given the community that's elected them or selected them can still contribute.

And then they're making a decision based on the global and (unintelligible) feedback that they have got (unintelligible) that the ICG is conducting the competition process. So I think it's kind of - it may be less competitive that way because if we want to try to make representation within MRT to be global in the sense that beyond the ICANN community it will become more complicated.

I think what is more important is decisions (unintelligible) allow a global feedback before they make a decision and that will need to ensure. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Seun. I think that's a good point. Do you think - let me ask you a follow up question. Do you think that things like conducting public comment periods and webinars or even, you know, actual meetings that are physical either at ICANN meetings or at other representatives type meetings would satisfy that? Or do you have some other ideas for making sure that it's an open process and not just a parochial process with consultations only within communities?

Seun Ojedgeji: Yeah. Yeah, so the way I see it the role of the MRT I think is defined by which they need to actually make a very meaningful or very big position good when something is about to go wrong. And when something is about to go wrong it's not going to be something that will be happening every time.

So when such thing happens then I will agree - I would agree with - I think this process is running public comment, running (unintelligible) the same way which we have run this ICG (unintelligible) consultation processes which actually allows everybody who wants to or (unintelligible).

So it's not going to be something that (unintelligible) and most of what I said that the MRT is doing it will not have to look into decisions that need to - that (unintelligible) major decisions every time but (unintelligible) in case there's a need for such (unintelligible). So, yeah, so that's it.

Alan Greenberg: We seem to have lost Seun again or you've lost me.

Coordinator: One moment.

Bart Boswinkel: Or it's not just you.

Grace Abuhamad: We did lose Seun. I think we're dialing back out to him. I'm sorry, one minute.

Coordinator: Seun joins the call.

Seun Ojedgeji: Hello, yeah, thank you. Hello?

Alan Greenberg: Did we lose Greg also?

Seun Ojedgeji: Hello?

Greg Shatan: No, hi this is Greg.

Seun Ojedeji: Am I here? This is Seun. Am I...

Greg Shatan: Yeah. Okay good.

((Crosstalk))

Seun Ojedgeji: Oh sure. I was on my mobile (unintelligible) so I hope I am not been talking - did you - did my point get through?

Greg Shatan: I would say yes. Yes. Your point did get through.

Seun Ojedgeji: Okay.

Greg Shatan: And I think that - I think that...

Seun Ojedgeji: Okay. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: ...there are certainly times when the MRT is going to be making momentous decisions and we need to have an open process for those key times. But that's actually not the - while it may be the most critical juncture for the MRT, not a juncture where they are going to be spending time - most of the time and that as has been said repeatedly that most of the time the job of the MRT should be rather boring.

And so I'll go to Donna and then to Alan and then I'd like to move on to the, you know, delving back further into the function here and to the other bullet points on this first page and moving on from there. Donna Austin.

Donna Austin: Thanks Greg. Donna Austin. So I think, you know, we need to be flexible and sensible about this. I understand that on the big decisions series certainly reasons for going out to the broader community and seeking input on the day-to-day stuff I think, you know, representatives have been appointed by their respective communities.

So they should have the -- what's the word -- they should have the authority to make decisions on behalf of that community. So I think we just need to build in some flexibility and be sensible about what it is we're trying to achieve.

I think the other thing in terms of transparency any decision that the MRT takes should be explained and there should be a rationale that goes with it. So I think, you know, I accept what everybody said but let's be, you know, a little bit sensible about it.

When we need to go out for broader community input and when we give the MRT the authority to make decisions on a more regular basis.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Donna. That's helpful. And maybe as we go through the functions, we can note from time to time whether this is something where a broader community engagement process must take place or whether it's more business as usual and there shouldn't be the need for stopping constantly for long consultative processes for which there really will be no time in many cases.

But I think that that's kind of the flexibility that any kind of working organization - representative organization needs to have. Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I'm not disagreeing with either you or Donna. I think the point that Seun raised however is really crucial. And it's not just at the

time momentous decisions. You know, if we look at one of the specific things that there's been some debate about whether there's a regular RFP every N years or a decision is taken to issue an RFP.

That decision to take - to issue an RFP is in its own right a momentous decision and perhaps should be backed up by, you know, is there a feeling in the community that it's necessary.

So I think the issue of public consultation or (not) say public but at least the public it's serving really should be one of these bullet points. That needs to be a core principle of what the MRT - of how the MRT operates. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Alan. And I would - that's very helpful. And I would certainly agree that the decision unless you have a structure where the RFP is mandatory that the decision of whether or not to issue an RFP is definitely a momentous decision Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. If I may elaborate. Any time where, you know, where you're trying to make a decision, there should be a consultation, you know, process built in. And just on a regular basis feeling the pulse of the community to decide whether there's need for a momentous decision or even consider it. So I do believe it has to be a core principle on which the MRT operates.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Alan. I think that is important. On the other hand, we have to make sure that the organization has the ability to be nimble on things other than, you know, something as momentous as seen in the IANA functions operator.

So why don't we move onto the next bullet points here and then on after this to the next page. As overall, the next bullet is to meet annually to review

overall IANA functions operator performance and also annual IANA budget review.

Any thoughts or comments on those roles at this end - at this point rather? I think that seems fairly straightforward. Next. And we'll delve into these a little more deeply. Christopher Wilkinson, I see your hand's up. You may be on mute. I'm not hearing you. Is everyone hearing me?

Grace Abuhamad: Hi Greg. This is (Grace).

Man: We hear you.

Grace Abuhamad: Yes. Everyone can hear you. I think we're having a hard time with Chris. Maybe - I offered a dial up...

Greg Shatan: Okay. I see him typing at the moment. So we'll keep an eye on that. And then just move through the rest of this, come back to Chris either when he's typed or has audio again.

Next major task is to address any escalation issues raised by the Customer Standing Committee. And lastly, to perform certain elements of administration that are currently set forth in the IANA functions contract and currently being carried out by the NTIA. Avri, I see your hand is up.

Avri Doria: Great. Thank you. This is Avri speaking. I think in looking at these topics and looking at, you know, our previous conversation of differentiating between momentous and sort of the more mundane, you know, in process tasks of this, I think that the first one of dealing with escalations and how to proceed with them is the kind of thing that counts as not momentous.

And while certainly still agreeing with the open public comment, you know, nature - fundamental nature, I'm not sure about calling it a core principle unless it is actually in our core principles. But certainly part of the fundamental nature of the MRT is to do public consulting and full community consulting.

Those decisions that are dealing with escalations, problems with something that needs an action now are the non-momentous that don't call for a specific community check on every decision. At least that's how I think, you know, we can look at that differentiation on those. Thanks.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Avri. That's helpful and definitely, you know, on point. (Grace), I see your hand is up.

Grace Abuhamad: Hi Greg. I just wanted to read Christopher Wilkinson's question for you out loud. Is that okay?

Greg Shatan: Yes, absolutely.

Grace Abuhamad: Okay. So Christopher Wilkinson's question is what is the IANA budget, how will it be allocated between major - between the major functions and how will it be financed?

Greg Shatan: Thank you Chris for that question. The IANA budget - well, first let's say that the IANA functions operator is currently ICANN and under this plan and just about any other plan that I've seen proposed. ICANN will remain the IANA functions operator for the immediate future after the transition.

Therefore the budget for IANA is set by ICANN and the - at least the decisions on how that is done are done by the operator whether that's ICANN or something else - somebody else.

There'll be a review and consultation - a review and approval process for the budget that will take place between the MRT and the IANA functions operator. But the budget itself and how those things are divided up would initially be considered by the IANA functions operator.

And I think that doesn't change too much between pre-transition mode and post-transition mode although the MRT may take a more active attitude in reviewing the budget perhaps than NTIA did.

I don't have a sense of how active they were in reviewing the budget. But as Avri says, it's the function operator whoever that is and it's currently ICANN and will be post-transition. In the first instance that will, you know, deal with the budget. Seun, I see you're back and your hand is up.

Seun Ojedgeji: Yes. Thank you. Thank you Greg. So two things I want - I'd like to make comment on the project (but) and then the - it's also a question. Does - does ICANN at the moment (send) any budget - add a budget proposal to NTIA for approval or something because that would really determine how our (initial) response (next). Because I think we need to reduce the amount of activity or the amount of rules and power and reduce to MRT.

And then we mentioned - just mentioned that it is when this really - what they are doing is keeping check and when - because if we for instance we say review budget - IANA budget. So that means that the Board will be bound to propose a budget to MRT.

And because we have said that a budget position for instance is submitted (unintelligible). So it means that MRT mission develop a community process to make a position on that project.

And so I think we perhaps should remove the review on projects and - can you scroll up? Can you scroll back up? Can you scroll back up Greg? Yes. And those - the second one is the performing - (unintelligible) status elements of administration.

This again is - it's something I think we perhaps want to remove from the role of MRT. It's - unless we (unintelligible) those elements of administration is about. Otherwise, I think the operator should postpone those functions - those (administrations). The operator should perform this.

However, since like running on (unintelligible) these doesn't get feedback form the community and so on, which NTIA in (Americas) can still be done by this MRT because these have to do with for instance I know the NTIA at the moment needs to look at any and enough - any instruction - any (assumed) management instructions.

And I think NTIA needs to look at it before it gets to VeriSign. Things like that should not be assigned to MRT because at that point in time it's to change - it should make the role of MRT become less boring and more interesting. And should make it also become more intensive initial.

(One of the points then) however is that when there's a - when there's an indication of a - of the (strict) policy is a process in which - that which MRT can charge the operator to give responses to our community. That is what I think is more valuable very, very much important.

So two things. I'm not (unintelligible) review on that project. And the (unintelligible). I'm not for this review and you (unintelligible) element. And for that about this review the ICANN Board should be mandated to present projects to the community as what is done in the (a number of institutions).

And some organizations present budget to the community. So I think it - think that will (comment) it better. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Seun. Any other comments on that point? I'll just briefly comment on that. Then I do want to move on. I think it's probably out of scope for us to suggested in this group that the entire budget should be put up for an annual comment process.

Whether the IANA - how the budget review process takes place for the IANA budget I think is a level of detail down that we will get to and let's get to the second page here.

Getting into more detail here. We meet - we've gotten some of these points already of course. First, the annual reviews. And these are largely, you know, called for in the current IANA contract.

And I think it's been generally suggested in the draft proposal that they continue; that the MRT would meet annually to - and that with the operator to review the overall IANA functions operator performance - annually among themselves and then as well with the IANA functions operator in a performance review process. Any comments on that point? So we'll move onto the second.

Budget review. The MRT would meet annually with ICANN staff during the course of development of ICANN's annual budget to A, review and discuss

ICANN's proposed budget for the IANA naming functions and B, discuss funding for improvement to the IANA naming function and the introduction of new services as deemed necessary by the MRT.

I'll not there I think the Board review and discuss our meaningful as we kind of just discussed. You can have a review and discuss function, a kind of review and consult meaningfully function or review an approval function. Those are all, you know, different things or meant to express a different level of control by the reviewing party.

Is there anybody who thinks that - yes. Where you see ICANN here, it's a - the drafting point - the IANA functions operator, you know, should be kind of read in there for future (net post). If the function is every moved away from ICANN, it's clear they would no longer meet with ICANN staff about the budget presumably.

But in any case, any thoughts on whether this should be a - something stronger than a review and discussion function? Martin Boyle, I see your hand is up.

Martin Boyle: Thanks Greg. Martin Boyle here. Yes. I think actually for both these reviews my earlier comment - in fact the importance of the MRT being a vector between that which is being reviewed and the wider community again needs to be taken into account.

The fact that they do a review well, what do they base their review on. For certain things it's going to be quite clear because they will have good and clear representation. But nevertheless I think there needs to be and the missing bit in both of those is the publication of the review and the conclusions of the

review. And throughout the piece it seems to me that the obligation on the MRT to publish those seem to be quite noticeable by its absence. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Martin. We'll make a note of that suggestion to publish results of the review whether it's absent as on purpose or it's just as a matter of level of detail. I'm not certain but certainly I'll carry through the suggestion to publish the review. Any comments on whether publishing the results of the review may not be a good idea either because of the workload issues or because it may not be the same from public?

Generally it's in the, you know, for transparency and accountability purposes that publication is a good idea. So any other thoughts on that? Like to see if there are any. Not seeing any and I see Avri with a check mark on that.

Moving on to the next bullet - more detailed bullet, which is called issue instructions to contracts - as I said earlier, that may be a somewhat misleading topic heading because this really has to do with essentially running the contract and RFP process. I think, you know, largely this is titled issue instructions to contracts because of a technical matter.

When an action needs to be taken by the party to the contract, that would be a contract (co) as a technical matter. But since the (brain trust) of contract though is really the MRT, this is, you know, should be even more the delegated function. And the instruction part of it is a - is more at the level of technicality. So let's move on to the individual bullet.

I then find terms for the agreement so the IANA functions operator for the execution of (demanding) related functions. Managing a re-bidding RFP process in the case of performance efficiency and as part of a regular re-

bidding process. I'll pause there and see if there are any comments on this particular bullet. Martin, is that a new hand or an old?

Martin Boyle: That's a new one Greg.

Greg Shatan: Yes. Go ahead.

Martin Boyle: Martin Boyle here. Yes. I think this one and the fact I think all of these are areas where there really does need to be the MRT perhaps managing an open process. And I'm mindful that when NTIA designed the current contract. They went through two stages of notice of inquiry.

And I must admit I see that process of going through that sort of consultation as being a major factor in why the current contract has helped us achieve much better levels of performance and satisfaction in IANA's performance than there ever was before. Thanks.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Martin. Very helpful. And I think that by and large everything under this bullet point, you know, requires a fairly high degree of connection with the community.

And the details for that some extent to be determined but I think that following, you know, prior practice is a good first step although of course the contracting process of the U.S. Government is not necessarily something any private institution should model itself on entirely. But the point of public consultation is entirely a valid one. Seun, I see your hand is up.

Seun Ojedgeji: Yes. Thank you. I just want to ensure that I made myself clear the last time when I see (much) you also asking a question. It is (unintelligible) the rules of the MRT (to discuss this). We need to - we need to be clear on what you view

but just review means that it's a very, very important practice is that we don't - that's definitely require a community (process).

Just we are saying that we want the Board to pose - to present a budget to MRT before it gets published or something of it approved. If MRT is the wrong (unintelligible) approve, just go ahead for budgeting.

So it needs to be clarified what review means. Is it reviewing just to agree and forward the concluded and published budget just to see what are the (abilities) okay and to avoid any shortfalls in future or reviewing with the - with a mindset of actually making a change in the initial...

Greg Shatan: If I...

Seun Ojedgeji: Okay.

Greg Shatan: ...could cut in here for a second. And you look at the page it says they'll meet with staff during the course of the development of the budget for review and discuss the proposed budget and to discuss funding for improvement. So clearly it's a review during the process...

Seun Ojedgeji: Yes. Okay. So...

Greg Shatan: ...the budget.

Seun Ojedgeji: ...this may then lead to some consultation. It needs - it definitely will need consultation with the community. We cannot just leave that to the MRT to decide at that point in time.

The other thing I'd like to say is - the last thing I'd like to say is in relation to the role of MRT in administering. There was one point where it said administering - (unintelligible) of the role of NTIA subject to in the administration of IANA function.

I think we need to clarify what those are before we then - and see how to this can be as boring as possible and not imply that we're given so much power to MRT with us ensuring that the - in other words, make a decision to consult with the community. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Seun. Yes clearly there needs to be a discussion of balance at some point here between the role of the MRT and the community.

On the other hand I think we've discussed that earlier on that the organization needs to be representative whether there should be a public consultation every year on the IANA budget I think is - the detail isn't, you know, certainly consider but I think that may or may not be, you know, a great idea.

And I think overall we are discussing, you know, consultation process here. So I wouldn't drive a, too big a distinction there between the different words.

Chuck I see your hand is up.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Greg and apologize for intervening here since I'm not a regular member of this group. But I have been very active in the budget process of ICANN since it's beginning.

And I know some of the things that are going on right now including a possible session in Singapore about process for development of the budget and input into the budget.

And so I just want to generally say that I think this is really appropriate and is something that the ICANN finance team is working towards, not specifically necessarily with the IANA but I just think it would be good if the MRT in whatever form it ends up in would participate especially with regard to the IANA functions budget.

So I just want to say that I think it's consistent with what I'm hearing (Zavia) say they want to do in the future. So let me leave it at that.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Chuck. That's very helpful just to have the broader perspective especially regarding how budget is being handled and the changes that might occur in that.

Let's get getting back to the contracts and the RFP points noting the words our regular rebidding process I think that that - the word regular can mean a number of different things as in normal or as in periodic.

I will note that we need to discuss and that one of the major open issues is whether an RFP is going to be mandatory or a decision of the MRT at the point in time where an RFP might be this.

But I'd like to put a pin in that and actively put that to the side so that we can move forward. And we'll definitely return to that point.

So next bullet point is selection of the IANA functions operator for naming related function pursuant to any rebidding process.

Clearly that's a critical if maybe not the most critical decision that could be made by the MRT I would say, you know, would require high degree of public consultation and input on such a thing.

As is in a sense the next which is renewal or termination of the IANA functions contract for naming related functions as well.

So really these are bullet points all break down kind of different stages of the same process.

And lastly selection of professional advisors to draft and modify contract language. Somebody has to figure out who the lawyers are for this if there is going to be an RFP is there is going to be a contract or if the contract needs to be modified or revised in some fashion kind of the last role of the group in the - under that bullet point.

Any other comments under this - any of these particular bullets or this bullet generally before we move on?

Seeing none, move on. (Donna)?

Donna Austin: Thanks Greg. Sorry that this is kind of related to budget but not. So the IANA functions operator will have a separate budget that's currently provided by ICANN.

I guess I have some concern here about the MRT and if it gets somewhat bloated. Where does the money come from to support the MRT understanding that representatives are appointed by the communities?

There still needs to be some kind of - and I understand that it's supposed to be cost neutral. But that's not actually going to be the case, you know, in the event that you have to get professions in to draft a contract or something like that.

So I'm just wondering with the budget whether we - whether there's - it's something else you could stick a pin in is that at some point we have to think about what costs are going to be associated with the MRT and who pays them.

Greg Shatan: Yes I think (Donna) that's both very good points. I think I for the good of the order would like to stick a pin in those and in the related issue of funding as well as you say who pays it, how it's paid and what those costs are.

Definitely an important discussion, not a function discussion per se but, you know, a critical discussion nonetheless.

At this point I see a suggestion in the chat from Avri that it would be funded by the IANA function operator just as this effort, our current effort is being funded by the operator.

So Alan Greenberg I see your hand is up.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. And respect to that when you're sticking pins in things you can also add to the note the pin is holding that there needs to be, I don't know if it's discussion negotiation on the magnitude of that budget.

You can't - the MRT can't be a military contract where the IANA operator simply pays anything that they're billed for with no ability to control it either in the community or in the one who's providing the budget.

We're putting all sorts of controls on the IANA budget. This budget's also going to need to be controlled at some level. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. So perhaps and I sense - well I'll put in a pin and I'll note that perhaps in a thought what's good for the goose is good for the gander sense both the community and the ICANN - the IANA functions operator should have at least a review and discuss role in dealing with the MRT budget.

Alan Greenberg: Yes indeed. Load comes in many ways.

Greg Shatan: Yes. And yes I agree that the - I think that they - a desire on all sides to keep MRT as small and boring and low-cost as possible.

And the question how to control all that and somewhat natural tendency for creep is important.

Moving on the next point address any escalation issues raised by the CSC, clearly an important part of the role two bullet points here to communicate (unintelligible) to communicate more to CSC and then communicate with the IANA functions operator and/or the directory effected party to address such issue.

And I think address and resolve is really what should be said there. And then engage in other enforcement and escalation behavior up to and including initiating a termination for breach procedures or a rebidding procedure.

Oh, and what's implied here is the - a further escalation clearly termination is a last resort in my mind, not a first but something that needs to be available to as the nuclear option (subsidy).

Alan is that a new hand?

Alan Greenberg: It is indeed.

Greg Shatan: Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I was really going to comment on the presence on the first line that is the title of - this section is on taking orders from the CFC.

I have many times asked the question who monitors policy that policy is being followed?

We're told it's not the CFC. It can't be the MRT because the MRT's only going to meet if there's already something on its agenda.

We have been suggested that perhaps it's parts of the GNSO or of ICANN presuming that GNSO or ccNSO presuming that they are funded and staffed to doing that but they don't have standing to complain to the MRT. There's no comparable bullet point to say follow-up on complaints or problems raised by the TLD SOs.

There's a significant component missing here. Someone's got to be doing it. And the MRT has to be able to act on it. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Alan let me ask you a follow-up question. When you talk about monitoring for policy compliance can you give an example of how that monitoring might take place and what it's - what sort of policy compliance or noncompliance you would be looking for in the IANA function operator?

Alan Greenberg: Well first of all we are talking about a generic service here. So I don't know what policy is going to be instituted four years from now.

Certainly the re-delegation process which has in escape catch at the end with the IAP is something that should be monitored.

There are day to day processes where one can easily imagine that, you know, IANA is taking shortcuts and not doing something or other.

It's not just the performance issue. It's are we doing it according to the process that has been laid out?

You know, we have some rigid rules here and rigid we don't want IANA to deflect to be innovative in what it's doing. And therefore it's got to be somebody's plate to be reviewing it not, just annually.

Greg Shatan: Alan do you have a sense of how that's currently being handled?

Alan Greenberg: Well yes. It's right now if the GNSO for instance were to notice something or the ccNSO they're part of ICANN. They can complain through internal channels.

People can write to NTIA. You know, there's all sorts of paths that could be followed and someone would pay - someone hopefully would pay attention.

Right now we are building a structure where we don't have any of those paths in it.

Greg Shatan: So then would do you suggest perhaps that the CSC or the MRT should be the recipient of those kind of notices if they were to be generated by...

Alan Greenberg: Yes the...

Greg Shatan: ...the SI?

Alan Greenberg: ...CSC is problematic but it's not a real multi-stakeholder organization. You know, unless it's, you know, if you're saying it must be simply a mail stop that passes it on yes sure. I don't like intermediate steps.

We have - this whole structure has people passing messages over the wall from one group to another continually. We want to - we could add another one of those.

But we need to acknowledge the fact that policies are set, policies need to be followed and someone has to have - give the responsibility of monitoring it or at least the ability to complain if they're not being followed.

I'm not trying to be prescriptive. It's, you know, I'm not the author of this plan. And I don't agree as you know with a lot of the parts of it. But it's got to be - it's got to hold water. It can't be leaky.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Alan. I see Chuck you have your hand up.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Greg. I'm going to speak wearing two different hats. One of them is the coordinator of the Sections 1 and 2 of the proposal that's on the table.

But also the hat I wear is a co-chair of the Policy and Implementation Working Group in the GNSO.

Let me talk to the latter one first and I - Alan knows all this because he's a part of that working group as are others on this call.

But we're - the appropriate body for reviewing whether policy is implemented appropriately is the policy development body as I think Alan basically said in part of what he just commented on.

The GNSO in the case of gTLD policies and the ccNSO with regard to ccTLD policies although theirs gets a little more complicated and I won't go into that because of government, local government laws and so forth.

So I think the answer to Alan's question is the policy development organizations are the right bodies to do that.

I don't think that's the MRT or the CSC in my own opinion. But it should be the policy development bodies.

Now if you go back to Section 2A of the proposal we lay out for the GNSO the steps of the - that are related to IANA functions.

Some of those aren't directly IANA functions but policy development and policy implementation are there.

And one of the things that the CWG still needs to deal with is standing to appeal different things.

And so I think that the GNSO and the ccNSO have to have a standing to appeal to file appeals to the IAP I presume with regard in cases where they think that policy has not been implemented appropriately.

Now a good point was made that if the MRT's only meeting once a year it doesn't really work for them to do that.

But an individual registry operator that's impacted by policy implementation could alert the SO, the applicable SO with regard to policy that may not be implemented appropriately and so that they can flag that and escalate it with regard to the supporting organization.

So again hope that's helpful but I think that helps a deal. And I think the Policy and Implementation Working Group will be coming out with some recommendations, although it's not a consensus policy PDP, that will help in this regard.

And it may impact some of what we're doing in this working group although it's not clear that the policy and implementation PDP recommendations will be finalized before our work is finalized. Thanks.

Greg Shatan: Thanks Chuck, all very helpful and insightful and especially, you know, given your role -- very pertinent. Avri?

Avri Doria: Thank you. This is Avri speaking. I want to - first of all I support much of what Chuck said but I think I have a slightly different view of the function of the CSC to include is basically I have to them as including one or two policy implementation experts.

And I see these people these role as very much analogous to the Implementation Review Team concept on specific PDPs but somehow different in that this is looking at start of a broad range of the policy that has been developed and in relation to IANA specifically and its implementation.

So it's not any one specific PDP so it's not quite specifically an IRT and Implementation Review team so but I see it very much as an analogous role on that.

And I very much agree that, you know, the notification and the CSC notification is probably good that it isn't just to the MRT, it can notify the MRT.

And at the same time whether it's through the MRT representatives or whatever it's also notifying the supporting organizations that there is an issue.

I agree that, you know, that the SOs coming through the having standing for the appeals seems - you know, seems very reasonable.

But there's also than what happens at the end of an appeal? Now at the end of an appeal might -- and we haven't gotten to that but then an end of the appeal might end up in some instruction to the IANA functions operator to fix something.

But it also might, you know, result in a not that basically gets passed on to the MRT saying hey this one needs to be dealt with in some multi-stakeholder process way. There's a real issue here. It's a real definable issue.

There's no clear plan that we as an appellate group see and so therefore we're passing it to the MRT to deal with in using your processes.

So that and the last thing I wanted to say is, you know, there's this notion of throwing the things over the wall.

I think sometimes things are called throwing them over the wall and sometimes they're called communication pathways and channels.

And I think in this case it's not a throwing over the wall. It's a communication pathway.

You know, as Alan correctly said, you know, when we include the notion of separability we include the possible disruption of the communication channels as we know them.

So making sure that we do establish new communication channels is something I very much agree with.

And I believe that if you start looking at the arrows that they're showing on some of these designs the nodes are commuting one with the other. There is a channel between them.

What we need to do is of course, you know, stress it to analyzing that all the routes are indeed proper and work. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Avri. Alan Greenberg?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I guess I erred when I used the term policy. A lot of what we're talking about here IANA has been around for a long time before the GNSO.

I don't think the GNSO has ever set capital P policy that directly relates to IANA. I may be missing some, this specific instance and it doesn't really matter.

A lot of what I was calling policy and perhaps should not have is process, is rules that are within the contract for instance that of what steps must be followed to do things.

All of that in theory if there is a rule, if there's a process if there's an established procedure that have long been adhered to then it's there for a particular reason.

And if it's not changed deliberately someone's got to have the responsibility of making sure it's being done properly. I don't see any of that.

If it doesn't result in a service degradation that's going to show up in a report and if it doesn't result in something that a registry takes offense at and remember if the GNSO ever were to set policy regarding this it's not clear that the other gTLD registry likes that.

They may have voted against it. It's still policy once it's been established.

So there's a whole set of monitoring to make sure that IANA is doing what it's supposed to be doing that might result in things other than service, direct service degradation.

And that whole component is missing and that's what I've been trying to talk about...

Greg Shatan: Again I'll go back (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...(unintelligible) policy implementation issue. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: I'll ask how you think that is currently being handled as one of our roles here is to as Chuck said to identify current processes, carry them through where we can and then or replace them with something else or discard them if we think they're no longer necessary. So where is that currently taking place Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Well it's taking place in a very distributed environment. But we don't have issues about who has formal standing to raise the issue.

So as someone notices it and they have a loud voice they can make that known.

Greg Shatan: Are you suggesting we should change current...

Alan Greenberg: We're setting up very rigid rules of standing and who can communicate with whom. I apologize for the tossing over the wall.

Greg Shatan: Yes. And I'm not sure that we're setting up rigid rules of who can communicate with whom. But I haven't seen other than with a discussion of the IAT really any discussion of standing or being out of...

Alan Greenberg: When I see a title saying address any escalation issue raised by the CSC but I don't see a corresponding one for some other entity then that I see as a problem.

I - it's - I think this is moderately easy to fix but there seems to be no interest in fixing it.

Greg Shatan: Well I wouldn't say that. There's - we wouldn't be discussing it if there was no interest in fixing it.

Certainly there could - we're interested in fixing anything that's broken or could be broken.

So perhaps there should be a bullet point to address issues brought to the MRT by the community or brought to the MRT by an MRT representative. Think about that.

Alan Greenberg: Many solutions, I haven't seen any yet though. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Well we're in the process. This is a process not a result. And when we get to a result then I think not having seen something is more of an issue. In the process...

Alan Greenberg: Greg...

Greg Shatan: ...the point is to identify those.

Alan Greenberg: Greg the frustration in my voice is because I've - it's been raised many times already and still has never made it into a bullet anywhere. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Seun I see your hand is up.

Seun Ojedgeji: Yes. So thank you, just a quick comment. This is Seun for the record. And I think that we need to look at existing process.

They want to see really why existing process perhaps has not been effective is because of the choice of - is because of the choice of whether to approve it or to throw it away at the top level.

And then I think MLTs should have a rule, should have a means by which after the normal internal - I mean the (internet IND) no more SO - if for instance our SO spot something that it doesn't like after that has to follow the normal process.

And it doesn't - does not achieve the growth (unintelligible) have a way of (unintelligible) a process which (unintelligible) never will and present in such because the old idea is that going forward we want to make sure that issues that receive community supports is issues that receive community attention gets process. That would be good.

And I think the MRT should be very, very involved in such. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Seun. Anything else on this point on the escalation issue or on other pathways to the MRT other than escalation for - from the CSC?

If not I'll move on to the next point because it's 10:28 and we do need to get to these kind of the contractual periodic obligations that are currently carried on by the NTIA.

So that's the third bullet point which is to perform certain elements of administration currently set forth in the IANA functions contracting and currently being carried out by the NCAA.

And the - in the current contract Section C to 12A includes a valuation of the program manager. Any comments on that whether the MRT should be caring that out?

I think the questions of exactly how I think we might need to put a pin in but any general comments on this as a role of the MRT?

Seeing none I'll move on. C3 to secure systems notification. In this case the role of the NCIA is to receive notification of outages in the secure systems.

Any thoughts that this should be the CSC rather than the MRT that receives this notice or that both should receive this notice?

Greg Shatan: I'm not sure how often this notice has actually been sent out. One might hope none, but then again, maybe there has just been a security issue that would require such a notice to be sent out. I am being a little flip, but don't know exactly where the widely reported ICANN hack is in relationship to the secure systems of the IANA. (Martin Boyle) your hand is up.

Martin Boyle: Thanks Greg. Martin Boyle here. Yes, when I look down this list, certainly I see quite a number of them where there is a very specific operator interest and certainly outage of the secure system if that were to happen would be one of those, and therefore, (unintelligible) to the CSC.

Generally speaking, any of reports that are under NTIA contract for production I think should remain as being produced in the new regime and therefore...

Greg Shatan: Martin.

Martin Boyle: This was a significant...

Greg Shatan: (unintelligible) therefore.

Martin Boyle: Okay, I can't remember where therefore was in my sentence, but essentially what I was saying was that the reports should be published. It would be

possible to CSC then to identify which of those are considered so significant that it would report them up to the MRT and of course the MRT could in certain cases come up and say it needed to look in more detail at what was coming out because it fell for example in the annual performance review. That it fell into its role for (unintelligible) action. Thanks.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Martin. I don't have it available, but it might be helpful to look at the role of the CSC in performing elements of administration. Both the CSC and the MRT have these roles with the intention - I think when this was originally set up it was that the CSC would deal with more day-to-day and month-to-month types of reviews and that the MRT would deal with more longer term review types of issues. So at some point very soon, may want to put up a chart that compares the CSC and the MRT and make sure that we've got the division right between the two in that regard. And but I think that is a point well taken to compare the two.

Next we have C41 meetings, which again is that the MRT would perform annual program reviews and site visits, putting aside the site visits for a moment, I think the annual program review is kind of the heart of the - or one of the hearts of the MRT's role and this is really the periodic review. That was the genesis of this group and site visits. I am not sure currently whether there are site visits taking place by the NTIA on an annual basis. Does anybody know if that is the case? That may be a question for IANA.

Grace Abuhamad: Greg this is Grace Abuhamad. NTIA does perform site visits to the IANA center, to the IANA department at ICANN if that's (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: Okay great. Thanks. So (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Grace Abuhamad: I think they are biannual.

Greg Shatan: Biannual, okay. By which you mean every two years or twice a year. I've never quite (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Grace Abuhamad: No, twice a year. I am sorry. And I have to check on that. It might be annual or twice a year.

Greg Shatan: Yeah, I think you said it correctly. Biannual is twice a year and (biannual) is every two years. I digress. But if you could check on that, that would be great and we will decide how that might take place since you know we don't want this to turn into a junket for the entire MRT to walk through the IANA functions you know with hard hats on to see that it is all functioning properly. I joke. I know there are not hard hats involved.

In any case, any other comments on this point. Seun I see your hand is up.

Seun Ojedgeji: Yeah, thanks. I just (unintelligible) fast one and a quick one and that's (unintelligible). That's (unintelligible) 4.1. I think once we clarify how much visits that NTIA does or what it does during the visits, I think we should only just tie that responsibility to CSC when they have meetings. I mean whenever they (unintelligible) CSC (unintelligible). I think we should try to avoid - the CSC is the one that is essentially tasked with the role of looking at what is going on and not (unintelligible) visits. And the CSC (unintelligible) visits. Besides, I would suggest that we try to limit this level of visiting as much as

possible because it is just not going to add any value to the process except just introduce more costs. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, I am sure there are some who would disagree that the site visit is useless. If it is truly useless, it can always be taken out of the contract, but I would assume that there are good reasons for it to be there. It doesn't necessarily need to be everybody on the MRT doing it and you can put a pin in the question of whether that should be the MRT or the CSC that does the annual site visit or the semi-annual site visit. But I think again the idea of the periodic review team and the multi-stakeholder review team was to take on those kinds of roles. But again, as I said to Alan, this is a process, not a result, so nothing is final by any stretch of the imagination, but that would be my thinking on that.

Next C44 - receive and review monthly performance standard reports. Is there other monthly reports that are going to the CSC. This particular one was originally tagged as going to the MRT. Any comment on this point. Seeing none, I will move on. C45 - participate in the development of - and then which in a collaborative process with IANA. The annual customer service survey and then to receive and review the results of the survey.

Now I note that the results of the latest customer service survey was published this week and I won't go into the details, but it seemed fairly positive. And C46 - this is kind of a one time or very rare type of thing. To receive and review the final report which the IANA functions operator is required to issue. I think it is within 30 days after the expiration or end of the contract.

Next C47 and C54 were both noted as the responsibilities, which is to inspect and accept deliverables. Really not a separate function but just part of how they should receive deliverables, inspecting and acceptance certainly requires

a level of some activity. The MRT isn't supposed to just be a mail drop. It is supposed to be an active monitoring function-taking place upon receipt of things.

Next is C51. Receive and review the annual report of audit data and I will note the asterisk here, which is that in the proposed - in the draft proposal, C51 is also listed as a responsibility of the CSC and the question is whether this should be responsibility only of the CSC and not the MRT. Whether they should both receive it simultaneously or whether there should just be an escalation matter that the MRT would see it only if the CSC noted a performance issue in this audit.

Being an annual report, my prejudice would be - or my gut would be that this should be received by the MRT. Seun is that a new hand? Hearing no response I will move on.

Seun Ojedgeji: Yes hello.

Greg Shatan: Yes Seun.

Seun Ojedgeji: I was typing what I wanted to say, but let me just (unintelligible). Actually looking at this action currently being performed by NTIA with the aim of also considering which one does (unintelligible) to any of the CSC or MRT. Are we also considering that in the discussion? Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Yes, I think we are considering it, although then if there is no oversight, there is no receiving of a report by MRT and CSC, then there is no external oversight being exercised. I think we would have to - given - the RFP itself says if we are not going to carry any current function forward, we have to explain why it is no longer necessary. So you know certainly we can consider

whether some reports should no longer be received by the MRT or CSC as an oversight body replacing NTIA.

Seun Ojedgeji: Okay Greg so I am not saying - so yeah. So I think in the oversight function, the oversight enabler that the (unintelligible) concerns will determine whether (unintelligible) 4.6 would be appropriate to continue. That's what I am saying. So I think we should take a look at that as definitely some of these reports may not be necessary in the long run.

Greg Shatan: Well perhaps we can take that point you know to the list. If there are any of these that people think shouldn't be - continue to exist or should not be seen by essentially the party holding the contract, or its delagee, which would be the MRT, we would certainly consider that. I am somewhat skeptical personally that we would want to stop any of these oversight functions, but that's just my opinion, so we can take that to the list.

Grace I see your hand is up.

Grace Abuhamad: Yes, this is Grace for the record. Greg I just wanted to confirm that I quickly asked IANA and they said that NTIA does schedule annual site visits and they visit the Los Angeles office because that's where we have the IANA department located. And the next visit is for January 2015.

Greg Shatan: Great, thank you very much Grace. An excellent point of information. C52 - receive and review monthly root zone management audit data and this is the asterisk so this is on both the plate of the CSC and the MRT. My prejudice might be that this should go to the CSC initially, but perhaps we need to take a closer look at what this audit is and why it might be more appropriate for the MRT than the CSC. But I think again, the more that we can - the monthly items going to the CSC makes more sense to me.

C53 - external security compliance auditor. There is supposed to be you know such an auditor-taking place. Again, we receive - the NTIA currently receives and reviews the results of the annual audit of security compliance. And I would think this would be a very important one to continue, and for the MRT to receive this one. I am not sure that it would make any sense for the CSC to receive this as well and I see agreement from Matthew Shears in the chat.

Next moving on, the last couple of items here, C6. Receive and review an annual validation that the contractor is meeting state requirements regarding conflict of interest. And last, receive and review an annual validation that the contractor is meeting stated requirements regarding the continuity of operations. Again, these are you know requirements in the current contract.

So let's see at least a - the tendency would be to continue them and again, if annual validation would go to the MRT. Any comment on that list as a whole or on any particular point in terms of replacing these functions of the NTIA. Hearing none, we will move on noting that it is a quarter to the hour. Anyone just want to take a brief look at these questions. I don't think we have the time on this call to consider them.

Some of them have been discussed already, but we can turn to them on the list or on our next call so that we'd ask the people give consideration to this list. Some of these are fairly detailed in terms of the level of process that they get down to, but we do want to try to look to more detail where we can, especially where it is important in understanding the proposal as a whole and trying to reach consensus or advice the process to reach consensus on the proposal.

So I will just note the main topic headings here. Under issuing instructions of the contract though is a question of who does this, how, the termination for

breach criteria, the important question overall. And (unintelligible) will be taken out, meaning the annual IANA functions operator performance review will go into more of the details of this. In a sense, it might also be helpful to know - and I don't know Grace if IANA can provide any enlightenment on how the annual performance review currently takes place and who does what between them and the NTIA. Similarly with the budget review. But I think these are more process concerns, but some thoughts on these would be helpful.

So I think that it is now ten to the hour we can wrap up and looking towards Monday and to - which would be our next at the same time, would ask that the group do the following. Which is first to look at this page in front of us and give some thoughts to this. Second, we will be returning to the so-called structural analysis and we will pick up where we left off in that document, work through those issues, and I think that the - a key question that we do need to focus on is an endless question that sometimes may seem is the composition of the MRT.

And I think related to that, I think it may have been (Donna) that mentioned this on the last call. How the decision-making processes of the MRT take place. Consensus vote, super majority vote, vetoes, anything like that, but also influence the composition issues or maybe alleviate some concerns regarding composition necessarily.

I will note here that it is noted on the list that there is matrix if you will of different alternatives for the composition and I would as that anybody who has been discussing this issue on the list or considering it but not discussing it. If you have an idea of how you would want the MRT to look, to go and post it on that matrix for all to consider. And if you have an incomplete idea of maybe how you would like certain stakeholder groups to be represented that

you try to flush it out so that it is reflected. It reflects how all of the stakeholder groups should be represented. It's a little hard to consider any one idea representing one stakeholder group without affecting the composition of the organization as a whole.

So that I think is kind of the assignments if you will for Monday. Obviously there are - you know we have a good roster of participants here with 20 and only a couple being staff support, but there are other participants who are not on the call, so I will post this to the list as well. Before we wrap up a few minutes early, I will open the floor to any comments on things that were discussed today that perhaps did not get brought up orally in time. Actually there is also a lot of activity in that so that will be preserved for - and reviewed and should be reviewed by all of us.

I see once again the chat seems to have been cut off at some point. I think we need to look into whether that earlier part is being preserved. I hope it certainly is. If not, that's an Adobe issue. Grace I see your hand is up.

Grace Abuhamad: Hi Greg just to note that indeed it is being preserved. I don't know why it is cut off at the beginning, but when we send the chat copy to post, it is all preserved from the beginning.

Greg Shatan: Okay and perhaps the chat window in Adobe Connect has a maximum number of characters, but the underlying memory is not - does not have a limit, which is good. It is good to know that at least it is available for later perusal. Anything else or shall we all move on to our Fridays or our Friday evenings or Friday nights depending on where we are?

All right hearing nothing further, I will - the last call, final outcry. I see none. I thank you all for participating today and certainly we will continue to look at

all of these questions and next week not only will we have our call Monday, but Monday is also an important day, because that is the last day for public comments to come in. So we will have much to consider beyond what we are currently considering as the public comments are tallied and reviewed.

So I think you all. I will say goodbye, wish you all a good weekend, happy holidays to those celebrating holidays between now and the next time we talk, and I will ask that the operator turn off the recording, and that we all go and relax a little bit and then get back to work. Thank you and goodbye.

END