

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White  
January 2, 2015  
8:00 am CT**

Gregory Shatan: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is a call of the RFP3 Subgroup of the CWG on IANA Stewardship Transition for the 2nd of January 2015.

First, a happy and healthy new year to everybody and second, let's turn to roll call.

Grace Abuhamad: Hi Greg. This is Grace Abuhamad for the record. So as usual we'll do roll call through the Adobe Connect room, but if anyone is on the phone line and not in the Adobe Connect room could you speak now?

Okay it sounds like we have everyone in the Adobe Connect room. I know we're processing a few more dial outs but I think we can get going.

Bart Boswinkel: One exception Grace. This is Bart. It's - Mary Uduma is on the call and not in the - and we ask that you go on mute. So I'll record Mary as being on the phone and not in the Adobe.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you Bart. Thank you.

Gregory Shatan: Thank you Bart. Thank you Grace. I think where we'd like to start the call is with the survey. I wouldn't call it a poll but survey questions or statements/propositions that were circulated yesterday or early this morning depending on where you are or today.

There are a couple of sets of comments that came into this document that are not in this draft, but we'll hopefully be able to make reference to them, add them to the mix here that came from Chuck Gomes and from Milton Mueller.

So apologies that those are not in this document but we'll make reference to those orally. And I will add them to the document assuming that that makes sense based on the conversation here and assuming that most or all of them will make sense.

The first page here is really just an introduction to set the stage for this survey, explain what it is and what it isn't, that it's not a consensus poll and it really - this is more a part of the process of reviewing the comments than it is anything else.

Given the volume of the public comments and the detail that many of them went into, while this is of course no substitute for actually reading the comments or reading highlights of the comments that have been circulated, this is another way to attack the comments and see how we can - whether they have attraction in this group, whether they highlight diverging opinions or perhaps are outlier.

And I would - noting the notes that are being put in the notes I would not use the word poll in any sense here. I think the word poll gets a little bit slated or

freighted with meaning relating to consensus and this is not intended to do that.

This is a working tool with regard to the comments. So scroll down here and I know if anybody who read this has any comments on the Introduction section before I move along.

If you do, please raise your hand. Being no comments on the Introduction section, turn to the Instructions section, which by and large is a kind of recap of the instructions, plus a note that we will be asking for names but that's just for the purposes of tracking and to make sure that we don't get duplicate submissions.

We're not going to report back out the names and say, you know, who believed what. But obviously the intent here is to get the views of the participants in the - and by participants I mean members.

Grace Abuhamad: Hi everyone. Just in case you haven't seen the chat we are waiting for Greg to dial back in, so please stand by until he calls back in and sorry for the delay and the silence.

Gregory Shatan: And I'm back in.

Grace Abuhamad: Excellent.

Gregory Shatan: Sorry about that. My cordless phone decided that it was not connected to my - the base of my cordless phone for no good reason. May - time to shop for a new cordless phone.

In any case just looking at the instructions, seeing if there are any comments on the instructions to the boring parts. But if there's anything here that's misleading or misguided, please let us know.

From the lack of comments I will take it that this is reasonably acceptable or at least not controversial, and we'll move on to the actual statements. The idea - just taking a look at the instructions here the idea is that each of these would be answered with one choice among the five that are listed - six actually.

Among the six that are listed in Instruction Number 1, strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, kind of a neutral statement, disagree and strongly disagree and finally no opinion, which is just essentially an abstaining from that question.

I think just in terms of methodology it's worth pointing out that that's a different answer than neither agreeing or disagree, which is that you have reviewed the concept and that you're neutral on it, that it - in that sense it would be acceptable if it were that way but that you don't agree with it and again you don't - you aren't opposed to it.

So I think that it's important to distinguish that from no opinion, because in some cases the question is maybe when we get to questions of what goes into the proposal is whether you or your Stakeholder Group or the - whoever you represent here can live with something even if you don't prefer it.

I think that at least answering neither agreeing or disagree can also be seen as, "I can live with it." No opinion is literally a, "I have not - I'm not going to think about this.

I'm not answering this question," for whatever reason. So the first question here - and the point here is not to debate on this call whether these are good ideas or bad ideas.

This is really to think about the methodology here because these statements come from all over the spectrum from different - are based on comments made in different proposals, which obviously are all over the spectrum.

That's not to say that they're equally weighted across the spectrum, but there's probably something in here that you disagree with no matter what your thoughts are on the draft proposal or any other proposal, and there are things here that you should agree with.

So the point at this point is whether these are phrased in a way that will get a reasonable answer based on the responses, and whether there should be any additional clarifying questions or statements made around it or whether it should be rephrased in order to get a more useful answer.

So the first statement is, one - and first off we are starting with statements regarding the Customer Standing Committee, the CSC. First statement is, "The CSC should perform the functions of the MRT," a rather significant suggestion.

But nonetheless question is not whether this is a good idea or a bad idea, but whether it's just clear from the question or statement rather what the idea is. So I'll pause briefly after each of these and see if there's any comment that says that this should be phrased differently, or if there should be another statement afterwards that would get some further information out to help us. Avri I see your hand up in the chat.

Avri Doria: Yes. Sorry. This is Avri speaking. Thank you. The question I have about that one - is that the same as saying therefore there would be no MRT? I noticed - so I looked at a question like that and I looked at it, and this is a problem I have with so many questions and I started to do a review and just questions kept coming to mind that I never finished one - is that one is saying that it should have the functions but there's an implication that therefore that means there would be no MRT.

Or is that not an assumption that - is that yes there could still be an MRT but it would - doing something else? So it - to me it looks like an ambiguous question.

I, you know, I don't have a fix for it other than to make it wordier but that's the kind of question I have when I read something like that. Thanks.

Gregory Shatan: Thank you Avri. I think that's a very good point and I think that I would see this question as - or statement as implying that the MRT would not exist since if it performed - if the CSC performed all the functions of the MRT there'd be nothing left for the MRT to do.

So I think it probably does make sense to phrase this differently and to have - maybe perhaps afterwards to say, "i.e., the MRT would not exist."

Lise Fuhr: Greg it's Lise Fuhr. Can I interrupt with a - just briefly and - because this is actually taken from all the comments. So maybe we should go back and see where this come from and see what their opinion on it or their way of saying or their proposal - was it implying that there should be no MRT because if we put our own interpretation into this we're taking some of the statements out of the comments.

And this is made of a test of where do the whole CWG see the different comments? Do they - what direction should we go in in our reply to the comments? Sorry for interrupting. Thank you.

Gregory Shatan: Lise no problem. It's the Chair's prerogative and a very useful point as well. I think it is true that if we can figure out what the - where this came from and what the original commenter was driving at, and that perhaps they weren't driving at abolition of the MRT.

Maybe they were driving at the MRT should be solely a second level of escalation for the CSC and that the primary work of the - assigned to the MRT should be that of the CSC.

But I think it's - regardless it's a - it is ambiguous the way it is and another possibility would be to have two questions or two statements; one that says what this says and says that, "The MRT would not exist," and the second, it has the same primary statement that says that, "The MRT would exist but only as a - an escalation mechanism for the CSC." Alan Greenberg you've been patient.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I think - I'm actually going back up to the top section but the - this particular question illustrates what I was going to say. We're - we still do not have closure in CW - in RFC - RFP3 on exactly what the meanings and the scope are of some of these groups.

And certainly in people's minds they vary perhaps heavily so I think you really need to define what you are - you - what you are implying by the term CSC and MRT.

Some of the various proposals and I suspect the one you drew this question from don't even have a - don't use that term at all and have created a brand new group, which sort of maps to the CSC in its composition but not necessarily in its function.

So I think you really need to say - and I'm not trying to put words in the mouth of the group but something like, "The CSC is a group who's largely but not completely composed of Registries whose main function at the onset of these questions is review of output from IANA and verifying service levels," or something like that.

You know, the MRT is a multi-stakeholder group with, you know, as much as we can condense what we think the range of functions is so that we're all playing with the same level as opposed to what each of us thinks the CSC might be or something like that.

That might help a little bit. It won't address this particular question and I'm not sure since I - I'm guessing - not having read all these questions but I'm guessing some of them are actually suggested by a number of the responses, and you may not find a single answer to the kind of question you're asking right now of does the CSC replace the MRT or is there still an MRT with some other function?

You may well find two different answers depending on, you know, which of the comments you're looking at. Thank you.

Gregory Shatan: Thank you Alan. That's helpful. I see, you know, a couple of different things in your - what you've said to unpack them a little bit. I see a suggestion in the chat from Brenden Kuerbis.



“Where available should we not use the definitions provided in the draft proposal?” I think that’s a good suggestion. Perhaps they could be condensed a little bit with reference to the draft proposal, but enough so that there is kind of a baseline of what the CSC and the MRT are essentially assumed to be for each statement.

And the statement - obviously a number of the statements would by their very nature change the definition, but in essence still kind of changed from the draft proposal’s definition.

So at least we are using the terms, you know, in somewhat of a defined manner.

Alan Greenberg: Yes that’s pretty much what I was trying to say - probably clearer than I did.

Gregory Shatan: Thanks. Or maybe I was just being redundant or thinking it through out loud. In any case I think it’s a good suggestion. And the second point I guess is that there could be, you know, different answers in a sense based on the proposal looked at.

I think that’s true but while that’s true the idea here is I think to get at what members and participants - I’ll just use the word participants to cover everybody, even though we use the word to mean both a thing and a part of that same thing but that’s just the poverty of our language in CWG for the moment, but what the opinion or belief or preference of each participant is with regard to that statement, so not necessarily what the commenter thought about that statement or how they - what the larger universe of suggestions/proposals they had in their particular comment.

So this is really just to kind of - these - basically we're floating a series of balloons past the - their participants in the CWG and see what the sense of the - of each and ultimately all hopefully who respond - certainly all who respond, how they respond to those balloons.

In any case any further comments on this first point? And I think we do need to - I see also a suggestion from Bernie. "Would it be better to say the MRT and CSC are merged into the CSC?"

That's certainly, you know, another way to view it. I think however that gets into - I actually like what we have here because if we define the CSC as being all or predominantly Registries, then we at least are able to use the definition of the CSC for the who will be doing the thing and then the what is also fairly clear.

It's clearer if we perhaps have two questions or two statements as stated before. One is assuming the MRT goes away completely and the second assuming the MRT exists as a kind of second level mechanism only if the CSC can't resolve.

Yes Alan Greenberg says, "The function of the MRT merged into the CSC." That's the point but the CSC itself is as proposed. Let's move on to the second statement.

"There should be a substantial multi-stakeholder component of the CSC."  
Staffan. Staffan we can't hear you.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. Sorry about that. I was on mute and I couldn't find the button here. Yes, regarding second question or issue, "There should be a substantial

multi-stakeholder component of the CSC,” this was discussed in length at the last meeting I guess.

And I argued about that we should keep a minimalistic approach to the MRT and the CSC. And I'd rather send in some written remarks for proposal but my take then was that we can't let these organizations be too big because they won't be operational - in a very brief way put it.

Gregory Shatan: Thank you Staffan. I think - thank you for the contribution. But on the other hand I think what we're trying to do here is just to review the statements to make sure that they're clear, and not to discuss the substance of any of these statements.

The idea will be that when we get the poll - or sorry, it's not a poll - survey out we'll get opinions back. So this is - we're really here to discuss I hate to say a form rather than substance so...

Staffan Jonson: Great. Sorry. I made that - you're right.

Gregory Shatan: No problem. I know it's tempting. I've already been tempted myself but we're here now as amateur survey designers. Perhaps some of us are professional survey designers or professionally review surveys prepared by professional survey designers, but we're in any case trying to make sure that we have a reasonable survey that will get us responses that are helpful to us.

Any comment on Number 2? I see Staffan. I'll assume that's an old hand and Martin Boyle has a new hand. Martin?

Martin Boyle: Martin Boyle here. Thanks Greg. I think this question is one that is almost certainly in most people's minds going to be related to the first question,

because if the CSC is going to perform the functions of the MRT I think there might then be questions on the multi-stakeholder nature of that or otherwise.

But I still think that the role of the CSC and the tightness of the definition around the CSC might well then influence how people judge the need from a - on this particular point.

I know there are others like me for example who would see the role of the CSC very firmly as being the people who are at the sharp end of the service delivery, in which case, you know, that would not particularly be a multi-stakeholder function.

But I think others see a rather wider role for it, and I think if we don't take that into account we're going to get a fairly ambiguous response on this.  
Thanks.

Gregory Shatan: Thank you Martin. Maybe what we should do is - in the instructions or in the introduction is to state that - and taking on the suggestion that we include at least abbreviated versions of the proposal - the draft proposal's definitions of the CSC and MRT, we should have in the instructions and introduction that for the purposes of each question to start with the assumption that the CSC that's being referred to is the CSC in the definition but for the - any change that's proposed in the statement so that we know we're not talking about some undefined CSC that's a moving target, but rather the CSC as defined except for a change in the particular variable that the statement proposes.

So the idea is that the functions of the CSC would be the - those that are stated in the definition but the composition would be multi-stakeholder in this case.

And I would note that Questions 2 and 3 are kind of opposites in a sense, 3 being that the CSC membership should be restricted to ccTLD and gTLD Registry operators.

And 4 really is a - kind of a middle ground, which is that the CSC membership should primarily consist of ccTLD and gTLD Registry operators with representatives from other impacted parties.

When we get to Question 4 I have a comment on that. But those three are kind of composition questions as opposed to function questions. Alan Greenberg your hand is up.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, you said a fair amount of what I was going to say. I - but it may mean we need to add a caution saying please answer the question as written, not what you think it might be.

Three, you know, for instance 3 says - 3 is clearer than 2, the CSC membership should be restricted and perhaps 2 should be the CSC members should be augmented with a significant multi-stakeholder component as opposed to the nominal, you know, one per or something as we have talked about.

Because Martin's question presumes that if we change the membership then the function changes also and I don't think that was the intent of these questions as I understand it at any case. And the order of the questions, subject to the comment you were going to make and maybe the same that I'm going to make on number 4. If 4 is the baseline then it should be the one coming before the other two. Thank you. But it might not be the baseline depending on our questions.

Gregory Shatan: Thank you Alan. And I think those are good additions as well to the protocol here. And, you know, one question or possibility that occurs to me is whether there - or should there be a bucket for comments after each statement or at least an open bucket for comments after each major section. I am a little bit weary of that because the idea is to make - is to get high response to this poll, sorry, survey and - I really do mean it's a survey and I should stop using the word poll.

In any case - and some people may just look at this thing and think oh my God I have to come up with a narrative response to 42 questions, or whatever we end up with, and they just, you know, put it off and the new don't get a response. But perhaps putting in a bucket and telling people that we by no means are asking that if everyone complete each point but if they want to make a comment they can put one in.

Yes, actually finding 140 characters - maybe we should just have people tweet their comments. So that's just a thought. Let's see I've got Cheryl Langdon-Orr to crack a smile and I see I've gotten Alan Greenburg to raise a hand.

Alan Greenburg: Yes, sorry, I find it easier to talk than type early in the morning. Adding space for comments also make it a significantly more difficult job to analyze the results, but I think the opportunity is warranted. So, you know, maybe you want to say we're not supposed to be asking for comments, but if you feel compelled to make one here's the space.

Gregory Shatan: Thank you Alan and I guess we can (unintelligible) one bucket at the end of each section or a bucket after each question. Apologies I'm chewing on a Montreal bagel, which I brought back from Montreal. I went north rather than south for the winter holiday break. In any case, I came back with almost 6000 bagels, which is not nearly enough. In any case, back to the poll - survey. Any

further comments on question 2, which is not a question in the survey? And, Alan, I'll assume that's an old hand or just agreement that Montreal bagels are the greatest gifts to mankind.

Alan Greenburg: It meant I was going to be making my second cup of coffee and forgot to put it down.

Gregory Shatan: Very good. We'll look forward to increase vigor after the second cup of coffee and not that you haven't been vigorous, you've been quite vigorous. In any case, moving on to number 3. The CSC membership should be restricted to CCTLD and GTLD registry operators. And I note that, I think it was Alan, that said this is perhaps phrased more clearly than number 2 and number 3 and number 4 are phrased similarly and number 2 is phrased differently.

So perhaps what we should do is phrase number 2 so that is it more parallel to 3 and 4. That way we can kind of get at them a little bit. Number 3 then, any comments on number 3? The CSC membership should be restricted to CCTLD and GTLD registry operators. Again, not - the question is not that you agree with the statement, but is the statement clear enough that anybody can express a level of agreement or disagreement with it?

Seeing no comments we'll move on to number 4. The CSC membership should primarily consist of CCTLD and GTLD registry operators with representatives from other impacted parties. Any comments? I know I have one, but I'll call on Alan.

Alan Greenburg: My question is - was the intent of those who wrote it that impacted parties is different from the multi-stakeholder community?

Gregory Shatan: That's my question exactly. I have not - I suspect...

Alan Greenburg: Yes.

Gregory Shatan: I expect that's the case as well and expect - thought that perhaps members of the CSG and the ALAC, which you and I are, adherence respectively. Might be considered by some who write (unintelligible) impact parts to be non-impacted parties where as other would argue, and I think we've had this argument for - I shouldn't say argument, but we've had this discussion initially is that everyone is impacted to one extent or another and that the term impacted parties therefore really shouldn't be used because it just creates some ambiguity.

So I don't know if anybody who was - I did not draft that particular statement and I don't think we have certainly all of those who contributed to the drafting process on the call. So, you know, fairly likely whoever drafted the statement pulled it from the comments is not on the call. So I think we should, to some extent, put a pin in this, but I would certainly suggest that we either change the term impacted parties to stakeholder groups or that we go back and see what was meant by impacted parties by the person who made this, or group that made this, suggestion and add - add some clarifying language.

Or perhaps we, again, turn this into two statements, one, suggestion that it should be primarily registry operators along with representatives from other stakeholder groups and a second suggesting that it be only representatives of other impacted parties. And I know that there also have been suggestions that it should be the registry operators essentially groups such as RSSAC, IECS, perhaps others that are involved with IANA, but not on the naming side. That's kind of not entirely captured here unless that's what's mean by impacted parties. And, of course, all of our proposal relates only to naming functions. In any case - or not trying to come up with a proposal that's on its



own, but the needs of all three customer groups for the IANA function. Martin Boyle, your hand is up.

Martin Boyle: Thanks, Greg. Martin Boyle, yes, I wondered actually the risk of making the analysis of the survey a little bit more complicated. Wouldn't it just be better to ask people to suggest if they don't want full multi-stakeholder or they don't want full-registry, which of the parties - which particular parties should be included in the room. (Unintelligible) was putting the onus them to identify the sorts of groups that should be being involved in the case of that particular question. Thanks.

Gregory Shatan: Thanks Martin. I think that's good suggestion. I think we'd have to see whether it would make it too complicated. In essence, you know, do we have an open bucket which we can then analyze before we have a series of questions, which will probably get lengthy kind of asking for an up and down vote on each stakeholder group or potential operator, which I think there are just too many potential groups. So I see that Berry Cobb...

Mary Uduma: (Unintelligible) my line.

Gregory Shatan: Thank you Mary. I see that Berry Cob has, in the chat, found the origin on this impacted parties came from the (unintelligible) comment, which is in the chat and rather than using impacted parties. Initially what it says is - and I'll read it since it's easier - faster to read it than try and summarize it on the fly. Because the CSC's remittent should be technical and it should have no role in setting or reevaluating policy it's composition should be limited to direct customers of IANA and (unintelligible) function GTLD and CCTLD operators and related experts as that group sees fit.

As a result registry operators as well as liaisons from the SSAC the RSSAC the RARS, ISAC the IACS, among others, could be invited to participate to insure a seamless coordination among impacted parties of the IANA functions. So not entirely sure that that's the suggestion that impacted parties should actually be part of the group, but certainly is a suggestion for more of a - for a different composition includes other ideas too, which is that the CSC should - since it's the registry, plus whomever the registries themselves would like to invite, which is a different suggestion in and of itself in terms of how to convene or originate the group on that.

We'll put that idea to one side, but perhaps it should be rather than impacted parties it should be the related experts and that should be, you know, EG, SSAC, RS SAC, ISAC, ISOC, RIR, IATF. So, you know, maybe that is in essence kind of the third stream, which is the first, you know, number 3 - or number 1 is the multi-stakeholder, group number 2 - sorry, number 2 is the multi-stakeholder group, number 3 is registrars only and number 4 is registrars plus experts and then we give those the Alphabet Soup after that indicating who that would be, but essentially by definition that would exclude, I think, all other stakeholders as defined in the IANA - sorry, as defined in kind of - in the ICANN world.

In other words it would exclude the - all the GNSO stakeholder groups other than the registries. It would exclude all of the acts and the like. Again, question is not is this a good idea or bad idea, but just is the idea expressed clearly and I think that is the idea that it's here. Martin Boyle, I see your hand is up. Is that a new hand? I see Martin saying that's good and I see your hand is down. Alan Greenberg, your hand is up.

Alan Greenberg: My hand is up and hopefully will go down. Two questions - two points, number one, on thinking about this as you were talking I realized impacted

parties is really a bad expression. As the performance of IANA degrades the number of impacted parties approaches billions. It's fine to say only the registries are involved because the registries are their main customer, but if IANA doesn't make root changes when necessary, very quickly, you escalate to many many many more impacted customers - impacted parties.

So I would strongly advise against using that term. It dawns on me, however, that the purpose of this is trying to find a medium ground - a middle ground or something where we can get most parties - most participants in this process to agree the summary you gave at the very beginning of what does it mean to say strongly agree, strongly disagree or zero, in the middle, I think actually should be said. That is, you know, strongly disagree means, you know, if that's the answer you walk away from the table and say I'm not participating. If it's zero or minus 1 or whatever the range is you think reasonable it's something you don't like but can live with.

I would suggest you urge people to be flexible in their answers. Having just completed a survey of the ALAC, which took a lot of time and effort and ended up having zero results because we didn't make it really clear that we expected people to be very flexible we're going to end up having to do it again. So just those thoughts.

Gregory Shatan: Right, thank you Alan for a number of very good comments as well as the comment coming from recent survey experience. Very important. I think that it's a very good point in terms of how people should answer. We need to consider whether that's what we want at this point. Whether we want - but I think the point is if you're not going to die in a ditch for it, as (Bart) used to say that should be in the middle ground. Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Cheryl for the record. And I agree with your final points in terms of the explanation of what your choices of agree, disagree, etcetera, that that's valid. Why I raised my hand here however was because it seems to me that with a little bit of tweaking at the beginning and a little bit of cutting off at the end we could substantially use what Barry has quoted from the Google comment as the hypothesis that's going to be tested.

So rather than start with - because that's what we're trying to find out kind of in question 4 because the - try this again. (Unintelligible) these (unintelligible) should be technical rather than say that let's make that as an assumption and say assuming CCSC (unintelligible) being technical and then you - the predominant details out of the statement and start with something along the lines of among others could invited to participate or stop or dot dot dot and the people can agree, disagree, middle ground or not answer the question at all and we've sort of tested the hypothesis there, I think.

Gregory Shatan: Thank you Cheryl. I think that if we have a definition of CCSC, which emphasizes, I think that our definition is - the basis definition in the draft group and the draft proposal is operational technical, not policy and that probably feeds into this. (Unintelligible), you know, again why we probably need to have those baseline definitions in here. I think we (unintelligible) number 4. It's been long enough.

Number 5, if the CSC is only tasked with monitoring IANA performance the CSC may consist predominantly of registry. This is somewhat of an odd (unintelligible) a sentence that there are maybe other things that CSC would do. I'm not sure if this question is needed if we task the decision - the questions above plus the baseline definition of the CSC. Maybe the point of this question is the monitoring point but if monitoring - it's somewhat narrower than even - than the draft proposal, which would have the CSC not

only monitor, but respond to issues of performance by engaging the IANA functions operator with an attempt to resolve performance issues.

So if that is - assuming that's the point of this question, maybe it needs to be drafted slightly differently so that the CSC is a monitoring-only organization and all responses are intended to be made by the MRT than it can be predominantly (unintelligible). Any comments on this point before I move along? Somebody needs to mute. That's number 5; move on to number 6.

The CSC should include additional individuals outside the naming community who have relevant technical expertise. That's a variation on what question 4 will turn into. I'm not sure if it's redundant since number 4 states it should be primarily registry. Any comments or thoughts on this one? Martin Boyle.

Martin Boyle: Martin Boyle here. Thanks (Greg). I'm actually struggling to understand what this question might mean in comparison with the definition that (Perry) posted earlier. The idea is for technical expertise I would expect to come from one of the organizations, one of the structures, that already exists, but the alternative interpretation is that - well, actually, it could just be a random selection of technical experts who are chosen in which case then you need to start thinking about how you identify those people.

So I'm actually sort of really finding it difficult to understand, you know, how question 6 could be phrased in such a way that people understand what is actually on the table and if, as they say, it is the external technical expertise that just comes because these people are recognized as being wonderful people. Then I think something needs to be said about, you know, sort of how those people will therefore be chosen and to say it's worrying me that it's opening up the debate rather widely without giving people something to work on. Thanks.

Gregory Shatan: Thank you Martin. I think that the way I would see this is if number 4, now that we've kind of rewritten it a little bit or will rewrite it a bit to refer to the expert groups that are cited in the Google statement, that perhaps this one should be redrafted a bit so that it refers specifically to individuals. I mean it does say individuals, but that it makes it clear that we're talking now about individual technical experts not as representatives of any group, but just chosen as in, you know, individuals for their expertise whether that's a good or bad idea I think that at least is a slightly different idea than the idea of number 4 or the Google comment.

And then my point then is - I'm reading Martin's message, my point is then who chooses? And, like I said, that is another question. I guess it's assumed for the moment that some God-like perfect choice will be made or we'll get to maybe the second question or another set of question of who, you know, who convenes or who chooses these types of experts. Especially since they're not coming from communities that are - or groups that are nominating them, but are kind of just coming out and I think we've seen what the collection of the experts group and first the selection of experts to select next group's group how fraught the selection of so called experts can be, but then again, that's maybe one of the reasons why one might disagree with this is that selecting experts is it's own set of issues and that this bringing in representatives from groups that are likely to have expertise and would assumedly have, you know, put the right people in place would be - would make sense.

And I think, well, I think the question here is - I see a couple of comments from Stephanie Duchesneau in the chat. You know, we're trying to limit this to close-ended questions or at least to those that can be responded to with the range of options. So, Stephanie, I don't know if you have any suggestion on how to phrase this question - rephrase this question or to have an addition or

different question that can be answered with the - what I would expect would be the radial button approach that we are going here. (Unintelligible) I asked that question. I have Alan Greenberg's hand up in the chat and I'll call on Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, two comments. With regard to Stephanie's could and should - with the range of answers, minus five to plus five or whatever the numbers range is, I can probably live with both - with either, but you get different answers. So I think you need to think about it. If you ask should the community have relevant technical expertise I may say well, you know, that's probably zero. I'm not really sure. On the other hand could I could answer a plus five. Sure, you know, something we should consider. So understand that, you know, if they were only yes-no answers they're very different. They have very different meanings.

Gregory Shatan: I think that's a very good point Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Since they have a range just think about what you're trying to ask because they have different implications.

Gregory Shatan: This is actually a discussion that we had, you know, back channel among those of us - I shouldn't say back channel, but you know, among the sub-group that was putting together this piece of paper.

Alan Greenberg: No, I understand it. And my second comment is on technical expertise sometimes they're independent experts, sometimes they're not. You know, if technical expertise is to draw from the IATF who has written the RFCs, which are guiding some of IANA's operations, you know, you're going to the IATF and saying, you know, pick me a current person. SO that's not necessarily as vague as a completely independent expert.

Gregory Shatan: True.

Alan Greenberg: So, you know, it's going to vary from group to group.

Gregory Shatan: Right.

Alan Greenberg: Or the type of experts - the type of expertise.

Gregory Shatan: Yes. To respond to those two points briefly, one, in the very first draft of this there was kind of a mixture of coulds and should and it was my position, which since I was the last person that touched this document before this morning. My position is reflected in this document that all the questions here should be should questions. I think that's where we were coming at anyway since should - as I see should as a question of preference and could as a question of possibility and we don't - we're not really asking whether people think something is possible or not.

If it's impossible then we have, you know, bigger issues. Really can't adopt anything that's impossible, but really we're asking for preference for these and so that's why I think all of these need to be phrased as should questions. And, (Beth), I think, you know, going to your point in the chat not possible, but acceptable. I think that we need to point out that that middle question of neither agree nor disagree really is - I can live with it. So it's not so unacceptable that I'm going to die in a ditch or get seriously injured in a ditch for it. It needs to find that middle ground (unintelligible) possibility.

You know, that you can live with. And as to the other point of experts - independent experts versus, you know, nominated experts are those who may even come in with both expertise and an axe to grind or a point of view. One



of my problems with the concept of independent experts is wondering who in the ICANN world is associated with no organizations, whether it's a standard organization or an employer or the like and yet is an expert.

It seems to me it's almost a - they're almost mutually exclusive ideas, that there's somehow, you know, some guru on a mountaintop who is completely disengaged from all affiliations, and yet is an expert that will be, you know, of great value to the group. In any case, that's just a little bit of editorializing. If there's nothing further on this Question 6, we'll move on to Number 7.

The CSC members should be drawn from the MRT, so that there is coordination between CSC and MRT on matters that are escalated. Any thoughts or comments on Number 7? Seeing none, I'll move on.

Number 8. The CSC should have a continuous (unintelligible) fairly clear. Comments? Thoughts? Seeing none, I'll move on.

I see Steve Crocker's either doing a lot of typing or has left something in his typing box. I see he is typing a lot. In any case, I will ask the question Number 9 first, and then also read what Steve has written while we consider this.

Members should have staggered terms, e.g. - I'll point out just for validity's purpose, e.g. is for example. So this is, you know, not the only way that staggered terms should be executed, but just an example for clarity purpose. Members should have staggered terms, e.g., only one-third of the members should be replaced each year, to provide continuity. Any comments or questions? Seeing none, I will move on.

Number 10. Users of the IANA naming functions should be able to address issues directly with the IANA functions operator, rather than being required to

go through the MRT. Comments on this one? Or questions or clarifications?  
Alan Greenberg?

Alan Greenberg: You know, this one goes directly to Steve's comment, although he was referring to a different number. It presumes the existence of the two functions. And this is one of those where it's hard to answer I disagree completely or agree completely or I'm in the middle, if you do not agree that both the organizations should be existing to begin with.

So I'm not quite sure how you handle that. Maybe this is one of those opportunities where the 140 characters or maybe 140 words are the way you answer.

Gregory Shatan: Thank you, Alan. To go back to what Steve said, which is - try to pick out a little bit of summary. Obviously you can read the full thing in the chat, everyone who's in AdobeConnect, which is almost everybody.

He said, apologies for joining belatedly. In reading through the questions, I find some are hard to answer because they include assumptions that I disagree with.

That was something we discussed at the beginning of the call, and I think the idea is to assume the baseline for protocol, for purposes answering, which doesn't mean you agree with the baseline proposal except for the tweak or change that is proposed by the statement, but just that, you know, in that universe -- a universe in which there is a CSC and an MRT -- do you think it should be this way?

And rather than saying I disagree with this, for instance, you could look at this Question 10 and say, well I'm going to disagree with this because I don't believe there should be an MRT and a CSC.

But I think that would actually - that would be kind of a false positive or a false negative answer, because I would assume that someone who believes there should be only a single organization and not a CSC and MRT would probably also believe that users -- and actually that means customers -- should be able to talk directly to the IANA functions operator.

And that the CSC should not be performing some sort of gatekeeping function for customers, but rather is adding - that its value added is the group that, you know, reviews monthly performance issues, and deals with performance issues that may come up, without needing to have any particular member or customer go directly to the IANA functions.

So there it is. And I see Avri notes that the survey design is a complicated matter. Yes, actually I'm aware of that. I majored in sociology and psychology in college, and took two or three different courses that, you know, related to survey design and (unintelligible) plus dealt with them professionally as well.

So I recognize that whatever we come up with here would probably make a quote/unquote survey expert either laugh or cry. But we'll just try to do our best, and hopefully it will be useful.

So I think the point is here to, again, get people to answer the question itself, and assume that whether they like it or not, the rest of the universe is as proposed in the draft proposal. Alan, is that a new hand?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, sadly it is a new hand. I guess I'm echoing something of what Avri said. We spent a bit over an hour looking at, I think, about a third of the questions in the survey. And each of us have, in some cases, very different views of what this meant and what these questions mean.

I'm just questioning how effective or how useful the answers are going to be if we have to presume that all of the respondents are going to have such varied understandings of what each of the questions are. I'm not sure I have a better way forward, but I've got to raise the question.

Gregory Shatan: I think that's a fair point. Steve Crocker in the chat comments, let me suggest including questions at the beginning that test the assumption -- that is, allow explicit response to whether the respondent agrees or disagrees with the basic assumption.

You know, it's a good suggestion. I think part of the issue is when we get to doing kind of quantitative analysis - well I guess we can slice and dice quantitative responses depending upon how they answer those baseline questions. So for demographic purposes, we kind of can divide people up into those who, you know, answer differently to different baseline questions.

So that may be a good way to kind of be able to slice and dice things, if we had an idea of where the respondent is coming from. I think that's still - we need to make it clear that we need each person to answer the question just for the proposition being proposed, and not to disagree with the question because it presumes things that they disagree with. Hopefully that's clear enough. We'll try and make it clear as it's redrafted.

So Number 11 is a - any further comments on Number 10? Seeing none, we'll move on to Number 11, which is kind of a related question to Number 10.

Users of the IANA naming function should be able to address their issues directly with the IANA functions operator, rather than being required to go through the CSC.

The only difference between this and Number 10 is the reference to the MRT rather than the CSC. Stephanie Duchesneau, your hand is up. Stephanie, I'm not hearing you.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Hi. Can folks hear me?

Gregory Shatan: Yes, we hear you now.

Stephanie Duchesneau: I'm sorry. I was connecting my audio. So without seeming too glib, I am actually not clear on what addressing issues means in this context.

Gregory Shatan: I don't think that's glib at all. I mean the language here has to be as clear as possible, under the circumstances. I don't know where this came from initially, or who expressed this as well, which is an issues would be anything that the customer wanted to bring up with the IANA functions operator. But I'm assuming it's a - it really should be maybe performance issues, I'll suggest. But any comments on that thought?

Stephanie Duchesneau: If the question is should people have access to - if the question is should people have access to some sort of customer service function for individual issues, then I would say certainly.

If it's, you know, should having access to an appeals mechanism if something isn't being correctly (unintelligible) say certainly that should take place at the individual level rather than having to go through one of the two panels.

But if it's something bigger, you know, being able to seek some sort of remediation with the functions operator at large, then my answer would be different.

Gregory Shatan: The way I read these two questions is, in essence, there's kind of a third statement which would be that - and maybe this should come before two of these, that users of the IANA naming function must be required to go through the CSC or MRT to address issues relating to the IANA functions operator.

Given that these two include the rather than being required to, my understanding is currently - well currently, obviously, the MRT and CSC don't exist. And clearly users, customers, are not required to go to the NTIA to raise an issue, a performance issue or any kind of issue, with ICANN as the IANA functions operator.

So really the assumption of these questions, you know, assumes a third question. If my knowledge of the atom was better, I'd say there was some analogy to be made there, but it isn't. Again, I took sociology and psychology. I thought those were science.

In any case, that's really the question. Are these performing some sort of gatekeeper function? Or should there be direct - continue to be direct access? So that's probably where I would go with these questions. I don't think this is about having appeal process at all. This is really only about whether and how customers should be able to approach issues relating to IANA functions operator performance.

This is not to assume that, as Avri says, they may not be currently required to go to NTIA, but they certainly can and they do. And I think that certainly the way this is phrased is, you know, not great. But I think under any phrasing

there would be - certainly customers would be free to go to the CSC with an issue, as I would see it; or free to go to the IANA functions operator.

The MRT might be a slightly different question, since the MRT really exists only to deal with escalation from the CSC, and perhaps annual report functions, and also with end-of-contract issues. So I would see the CSC as being the place for customers to go.

In any case, Stephanie, is that a new hand or an old hand? Assuming it's an old hand, I'll go to Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. Not the reason I raised my hand, but a note to Bart that Statement 7 has - also I made a comment that it presumes both the CSC and MRT.

Part of my problem with this question is I don't know what the status quo is. Stephanie may well know. Does Verisign have the right to go to the IANA right now? Avri presumes that they can and do go, or could go to the NTIA. I don't know that. So knowing what the status quo would be would make it a lot easier to answer this question. And for those of us who aren't registries, we're at a disadvantage.

Gregory Shatan: I believe the status quo is that any registry - and perhaps Verisign, you know, given that they're also the original manager may not be the best example. But that any registry can deal directly with the IANA functions operator.

Or if they want to go and complain to the US government about something they don't like, they are free to do that as well. If that's incorrect, please let me know. Again, Steve Crocker, you know, Verisign's a very special case.

Yeah. Verisign's a bad example of that (unintelligible) some other...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: (Greg), thank you for that answer. That helps the people on this call. But the point I was making is those answering this survey may not be aware of the details.

Gregory Shatan: True. Yeah, so that needs to be clarified, and that's why these two questions are not a great question alone. So there needs to be definitely some clarity around 9 - or, rather, 10 and 11, and maybe an additional question.

Moving on, since we're already at 10:22, or 22 after the second hour, well the role of the CSC should be focused on service levels (unintelligible) performance indicators and quality assurance. That seems like, you know, I'm going to say baseball, apple pie and motherhood. But that's kind of a very American-centric way of viewing something that's highly acceptable, but at least it's a clear enough statement.

Moving on to Number 13, if there are no comments, the CSC may go directly to the independent appeals panel rather than the MRT, if there is an issue that cannot be resolved. Any comments on this?

Obviously this assumes the existence of CSC, MRT and IAP. But the question is if we are in a world like that, whether you like that world or not, should the CSC be able to essentially bypass the MRT and make an independent appeal? So it's a question of standing to the appeals standard to initiate an appeal of an action. Alan, is that a new hand.



Alan Greenberg: Sure, it's a new hand. The question generates a whole bunch of other interesting questions of how do you enforce a ruling of the IAP on the CSC, when the CSC may be an unincorporated committee of some vague structure?

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: A court order against them, I don't think.

Gregory Shatan: Well I think the way I see the independent appeals panel working -- I mean again we're kind of going off into assumptions -- is whether - is appealing an action or inaction of the IANA functions operator. So there's really nothing to be enforced against the CSC, but rather either the IANA functions operator's action is upheld by the panel, or it is overturned by the panel as being inconsistent with policy.

And again, there's going to be a second survey that deals with the other two pieces of the framework, the contract (unintelligible) and IAP. So this is not the place to get into even proposing questions about the IAP. But assuming the IAP is what it is, is a way to appeal an action or inaction of the IANA functions operator, that's the only effective - sort of the only entity that enforcement would be an issue with. Any further comments on this point?

Next, Number 14. Assuming the MRT is not a standing committee, the CSC should decide whether an instance of the MRT needs to be created to address a specific topic or issue the CSC has been unable to resolve. At least this kind of states an assumption or two. Again, not whether you agree or disagree with this, but just whether this is clear enough to express an opinion on. Any comments or questions on Number 14?

Seeing none, I'll move on to Number 15. The CSC may develop IANA service levels without going through the MRT. This assumes a number of things as well about who develops service levels, but at least it has a proposition clear enough to me. Any questions or comments on Number 15?

Staffan says, assuming IANA service levels equals SLAs. Well SLA being service level agreement, either there'll be a service level section to an IANA functions contract, or there'll be an SLA.

But yes, I'm assuming that the service levels would be documented in a document which could reasonably be referred to as an SLA. I think that's - I don't know if we need to change the question to reflect that, but I think that's a reasonable way to look at it.

16 -- the CSC should be a subgroup of the MRT. This is somewhat like Question 7 -- the CSC members should be drawn from the MRT. I'm not sure if it adds anything different, but one element of survey design is to ask questions that are similar but not identically phrased, to see whether you get the same answers or not.

That's a terrible reduction of what the point is of related questions or rephrased questions in surveys. But this may be redundant to 7 or not. Any thoughts on whether to leave this one in? Take it out? I'm agnostic. And if they answer the same question twice, it's not the worst thing in the world, since we're just talking about pushing a radio button.

17 -- the CSC should be tasked with the job of resolving issues related to policy implementation, or escalating those issues to the MRT if not resolved. Now we have the words policy implementation, which I believe were initially

phrased perhaps as policy deviation in an earlier phrasing of this statement.  
Any comments or questions?

Seeing none, move on to Number 18. The CSC -- and this assumes a CSC composed only of registry representatives -- should be solely responsible for annual IANA tasks, i.e. performance review, budget review and customer survey input.

These are essentially the three annual tasks that are in the current IANA functions contract. The customer survey is a collaboration between IANA and the NTIA, or at least it is on paper.

I see a question in the chat from (Donna). So on Number 17, there's an assumption the question that the CSC should deal with policy and would escalate to the MRT if not able to resolve.

I think the assumption is policy implementation. I don't think anybody wants the CSC or the MRT to deal with policy in the sense of whether policies are good or bad, but only whether policies are being followed. I don't know if that helps, or if, (Donna), you think this should be phrased any differently. Let us know orally or in the chat.

I see multiple attendees are typing. Meanwhile, 18 is up for comment. (Donna) clarifies policy implementation was what she meant. And I think that is the assumption, that the CSC should be dealing with these issues. Any comments on Number 18 before we move to Number 19, which is a related question?

19 -- the CSC, proposed of direct customers and other stakeholders, should be solely responsible for annual IANA tasks -- performance review and budget

review and customer service input. I would note that under the draft proposal, these annual IANA tasks are all functions dealt with by the MRT.

So this essentially - both of these questions assume that this would be moved from the MRT to the CSC, thus leaving the MRT only with end-of-contract conflict/contractual compliance issues, such as breach; and also with escalation from the CSC. So this takes - inherent in these two questions is that the - a function that the draft proposal puts on the MRT is moved to the CSC. Perhaps that needs to be more explicit.

I see a question from Steve Crocker in the chat. Where are policies developed, reviewed and chosen relating to infrastructure, e.g., adding IPv6 addresses for the root servers, or assigning the root zone?

I think those are developed, reviewed and chosen where they are now today. I don't think that changes at all. It's clear those are not currently done by the NTIA. So I don't think anything changes. And also, IPv6 would fall into numbers rather than names, so we're conscious that that's kind of outside of our remit.

Although if I were sitting on the ICG - I see Steve answers that this is a question that has an answer. They do not currently have a home now. This has been one of the weaknesses of the current arrangement.

I guess should there be a question here whether the CSC or MRT should deal with these things? I don't know if that was proposed in any of the proposals. Steve. You misunderstood the IPv6 question. It is absolutely a names issue. You know, if there is a statement or question that should be put to the group in this survey, then perhaps that should be suggested in the chat. So that would be helpful.

Any other comments on Number 19 or on the CSC questions generally? Or any additional questions that are either based on proposals you've read, should be asked regarding the role of the CSC? Well in the interest of time, it would probably be best -- especially since I don't see hands coming up and we are talking kind of about things that should be in writing -- to put those in writing, either here in the chat or in emails.

Let's go to the MRT. And given that it is now 35 after the hour, I think (unintelligible) regardless that any of the - kind of all of the comments and issues that we've discussed so far with regard to the CSC questions will be also used as input to revise questions in the MRT space as well. So no need to revisit comments that may have been made the first time around. So statements regarding the MRT and again, you know, all of these come from I think or most of if not all come from comments. So whether you agree or disagree not the point just whether it is a clear statement of some sort that can be understood when writ - read. The MRT should be convened by ICANN in conjunction with the ISTAR organization. Any comments on this statement?

I have a brief comment which is that this question seems to assume that the MRT needs to be convened by some organization or organizations and can't be brought into existence without quote unquote conveners. It's my view that conveners are not needed. I refer that's become a method used in ICANN as well as outside is to have essentially chartering organizations or the like. But I don't think there's any need for it. Actually a question from - a comment from Olivier. Questions are ambiguous. If you can suggest different wording that would be great in the chat or in the email. Alan Greenberg I see a hand.

Alan Greenburg: Yes I was going to comment on 18 and 19 also. Eighteen and 19 seem to be repeating questions from way at the top as to what the composition of the CSC

should be and then tossing in a functionality question. And I'm not sure if there are orthogonal questions that already cover both of those issues or they're really introducing something new. But they're certainly doing it in a format that's very different from those that we used before.

Gregory Shatan: Yes I think this should be redrafted. I think the idea of the parenthetical is to create an assumption. So perhaps it should begin with something like assuming that CSC is composed only of registry representatives the CSC should be solely responsible for annual IANNA tasks. And assuming the CSC is essentially multi-stakeholder it should be solely responsible whether people agree with those two statements. And again there's a - the unspoken question here which I think needs to be explicit which is that the CSC and not the MRT should be responsible for these tasks.

But the idea of having two questions was to see whether the answer changed depending upon whether the CSC was a registry only group or whether it was a multi-stakeholder group. Assumption being that if the group is registry only some people might want to see this as a MRT function because they want to see this as a multi-stakeholder function but that if the CSC is more multi-stakeholder then they would be more positively inclined to leave - to having the CSC handle these particular topics. That was the intent of the question, the effect made of the confusion or ambiguity but that was the intent. Olivier?

(Olivier): Yes thanks very much Greg. It's Olivier speaking and thanks for your explanation. It certainly removes the ambiguity of the question. The concern I have is because you have two variables per question here whatever answer you're going to get you're not going to know why you're getting this. And certainly you asking, you know, whether the - well saying that you've got some people who might change their mind and say well if it's the CSC that is not the stakeholder it's fine for it to do this but if it's not multi-stakeholder it's

not fine for it to do this. It just sounds as though it might just complicate things and I'm not quite sure what we're going to end up with at the end. We'll have very fragmented answers and we might even have people saying no to both or strongly disagreeing with both because of something we've not even thought about that doesn't even come into the sentence but they've gotten a bit confused with it.

So I don't know what way to get out of this and as Alan said maybe we should have - this one should just be the CSC should be solely responsible for annual IANNA tasks, performance review, blah, blah, blah and not actually say it if it's composed of this. Or if we were to say as you explained if the CSC is only registry representatives should it be solely responsible for blah, blah, blah. If the CSC is only direct customers and other stakeholders should it be directly responsible for blah, blah, blah. The concern though is the complexity of the answers we're going to get. It's like a mix and match menu now where the set menu isn't what everyone goes for. You end up being a la carte.

Gregory Shatan: Right. Well I think maybe the way to approach this is to have a - the first question should be that the, you know, the CSC and not the MRT should be solely responsible for annual IANNA tasks. And then to have a couple of follow on questions that, you know, if you assume only registry representatives on the CSC what is your answer. If you assume direct customers and other stakeholders on the CSC what is your answer? Because really the first question is whether these should be MRT tasks or CSC tasks. So in the interest of time so we get to some of the rest of the questions though I'm going to force us back to the MRT questions.

The first number one as I know that this at least assumes that there should be - that there needs to be conveners but at least for the purpose of being a statement it seems to be relatively clear unless we want to ask people whether

there needs to be any conveners or not. Any thoughts on that point? Seeing none I will move onto number two.

The concept of the MRT could be replaced by a dual pronged vehicle similar to that used by the addressing community, e.g. an IANNA support organization and an IANNA research - resource organization, this being a reference to the ASO and NRO. This is a question I particularly don't like because it assumes a lot of - that one should have a knowledge of how the ASO and NRO relate to each other and, you know, who they consist of and the MOU between the ASO and the NRO and all sorts of other things. But any place - in any case a - maybe we'll just get a lot of no opinions on this because they won't understand what the question is.

Any thoughts on this one whether we should delete it entirely, change it or leave it as is? And assume that if you have a level of knowledge about the ASO and the NRO and the MRU between the ASO and the NRO and what each one does and how they function we can leave it in. I see Stephane suggests deleting it. This is a comment from one of the - or it's rather the proposal from one of the comments. So I am - as much as I don't like the question I'm loathe to delete it entirely. Alan Greenberg?

Alan Greenburg: Well ALAC is at least one source of this if not the source. So I would suggest leaving it. I don't think I can do anything else. I think the reason it's there is it's - is there's a correspondence to existing structures in one of the other applications that IANNA supports and therefore it may well have some validity. The ALAC was not necessarily proposing this as the answer but offering it as something to be considered.

Gregory Shatan: I wonder if there's any way to make the question more understandable on a freestanding basis.



Alan Greenburg: Well.

Gregory Shatan: I view the ASO, NRO thing as being somewhat of a, you know, solution to a historical accident or, you know, need to create internal to ICANN organizations but whatever. Any thoughts on it?

Alan Greenburg: I would not call it a historical accident. That is a pejorative term given that it was suggested. What I would suggest however is pointing out something that many respondents may not understand that the supporting the ASO is within - is a structure within ICANN. The NRO is a whole - is a structure comparable to it at some level but wholly outside of ICANN. And it's that jewel prongedness that the illusion was being made to but it's not intuitively clear from the names. And in fact most people do not understand the relationship.

Gregory Shatan: Yes no that's the problem I have is most people don't understand. I wasn't being pejorative about the suggestion. I was saying that the existence of the ASO and the NRO itself is somewhat of a historical accident or it was a - it's a solution to a problem that existed in the - initially with the existence of one organization and then the need to create an internal ICANN organization.

Alan Greenburg: But it may have merits in given that part of it is outside of ICANN and therefore can have a relationship with ICANN which we have identified that internal organizations cannot.

Gregory Shatan: Well maybe we need to - I think maybe there needs to be some refinement...

Alan Greenburg: (Unintelligible). Yes.

Gregory Shatan: You point out there's an internal external like structure there that may not be obvious to people. That is the very least that needs to be made clear...

Alan Greenburg: Right.

Gregory Shatan: Yes I think maybe that's what we need to do is essentially two organizations that essentially have overlapping or contiguous identical membership but that one functions as a organization within the ICANN structure and the other is an outside organization, an external structure. I think we can maybe torture that one a little bit offline. Try to make it - get something useful out of it. And Don often comments this is not dissimilar to the regional CCTLD organization.

Number three, you know, we're at quarter to the hour. So I want to kind of speed through these to see if we have any real issues with them especially given a shorter period of time. The idea is to have this survey out to the community by the end of the U.S. day. So it'll be a task to get that done. If an MRT is convened under the auspices of ICANN it should have a legal status, e.g. incorporation of its own. And number four, a paired question. If an MRT is not convened under the auspices of ICANN it should have a legal status, e.g. a corporation of its own. Any comments on either of these? Alan is that a new hand?

Alan Greenburg: No it's an old hand. Sorry.

Gregory Shatan: No problem. Number five, the MRT should not recreate another ICANN. We've phrased that way. I'm hard pressed to see who would disagree with that but in any case it is a comment from the proposal. Number six, adequate care should be taken to restrict the growth dynamics of the MRT. In other words I think mission creates scope, creates and the like. The phrasing is probably, you know, comes from its comment of origin similar to number five.

Moving on, seven. There should be multi-stakeholder representation on the MRT. I see Brendan is going and making comments relating - reiterating in terms of that internal ability concerns and cautions against drawing conclusions from the survey. Well I think we will, you know, look at the survey for what it's worth. And Steve Crocker also commented earlier on the difficulties of dealing with - of, you know, taking too much from quantitative analysis of a survey like this. I think whatever we do we'll take it with a grain of salt but at least we'll get some views of the group as a whole or a large part of the group out of the survey. Number seven, there should be multi-stakeholder representation on the MRT and it seems to be a clear statement whether you agree or disagree.

Number eight, the antithesis. Membership in the MRT should be restricted to the direct customers of IANNA the registry. Any comments on this? Number nine, control of decisions in the MRT should be restricted to the registries even if they are representatives of other stakeholder groups in the MRT. This question has a number of kind of built in assumptions to it and is just a - or adds to other questions. You know, are we talking about a veto power or a weighted voting or a number of groups, you know, a number of members such that a vote would always require registries to vote for it or all of the registries to vote for it? But I think as a statement at least it's clear enough as is to at least get some responses to it. Stephane I see your question in the chat. If you could email or chat a proposed statement that would be great.

Number ten, and I think that's in relation to what Stephane asks in terms of weight of representation between CCs and Gs. There's also a question of size that may need to be add - asked about both the CSC and the MRT. Number 10 and 11 are kind of pairs of so 17 and 18 although slightly different. The MRT should be solely responsible for annual IANNA tasks. And number 11 the

MRT with input from the CSC should be responsible for annual IANNA tasks. Any comments on these two?

Seeing none move on to number 12. The MRT should have a continuous existence regardless of how often it meets. And number 13 is a pair or antithesis. The MRT should be recreated each time it is needed. Alan I see a hand.

Alan Greenburg: You do see a hand. Let me try to find the right question now. Question ten, the MRT should be solely responsible for IANNA annual tasks. I read that as solely responsible at the - to the exclusion of the contracting party. How can you do that?

Gregory Shatan: What do you mean the contracting party?

Alan Greenburg: Well if the contract is awarded to ICANN and IANNA's a group within ICANN that says the MRT talks to IANNA and not to ICANN. So issues related to budget and things like that are simply imposed by the MRT and there's no opportunity to discuss.

Gregory Shatan: I think that's what we're asking...

Alan Greenburg: Because that's the intent.

Gregory Shatan: ...issue. I don't know...

Alan Greenburg: That's the way I read what that's saying.

Gregory Shatan: Yes. No well it's important to see how these things read. That's not the intent. I think the intent is that it basically the MRT takes on the in instance the

MTIA role in those tasks versus the CSC taking on those roles. You know, those roles can be, you know, explained and this need - it needs to be - number ten needs to be. Maybe all four of these questions need to be revised so that it's clear that it's the receiving the performance review, engaging in budget review and discussions and with IANNA over really ICANN as the IANNA functions operator and collaborating with the IANNA functions operator to design the customer server. But I think this is a - that is the intent of those basically to hold up one end of the dialogue if you will not to substitute itself for both ends of the dialogue. I hope that's - I realize the statement may not be clear in the survey but I hope that that clarifies what the intent is of I think each of these statements.

Alan Greenburg: Again for those who are going to be answering the survey who are not on this call there needs to be some more clarity. Thank you.

Gregory Shatan: Yes. Absolutely. That's why I say that, you know, the - we need to redraft I think all four of the questions that refer or however many questions refer to the annual function so that it's clear, you know, what we're talking about and what role we're talking about. I really all of these questions go to whether these are MRT functions, CSC functions, some sort of a shared function in terms of taking on the non-IANNA functions operator side of the dialogue.

Number 13 - 12 and 13 we discussed. Number 14 and last members should have staggered terms, e.g. only 1/3 of the members should be replaced each year to provide continuity. This one may assume - so I guess this would assume in perhaps three year terms but again this is only an e.g. for staggered terms. We don't know what the length of terms will be but only whether there should be staggered terms rather than a complete reboot of the membership each time assuming obviously that there could be re-elections. This also assumes, you know, does not assume anything regarding term limit but really

only goes to the question of whether they should be stacked or term rather than a completely new panel or new membership, you know, so it's composed of the same people.

Any questions or thoughts on this? I'll - seeing none I'll approach who proposed statement by Stephanie Duchesneau in the chat which she notes is - drafts quickly. The composition on the MRT should be weighted toward greater representation by direct customers of the IANNA function, e.g. registry operators. As - I think again as a statement that's fairly clear. You know, it might be a little tweaking of words but I think as a statement is one that's clear and that should be put forth whether you agree or disagree. Alan Greenberg?

Alan Greenburg: Thank you. I think there was a question earlier on should the MRT be standing or reconvened every time it's needed. However my recollection of the responses to the public comment is they range from those who believed that one could meet once a year and perhaps reconvene from scratch to other comments that suggested that the workload was going to be so heavy that only those with a large financial interest would actually be able to volunteer that kind of effort into. And that in turn implies some level of potential capture but nevertheless the implication was that there were very wide beliefs on what the workload is going to be in the MRT. And, you know, ranging from meeting once a year for an hour to a full time job. I think you need a question to try to capture how pervasive either of those answers is or something in between.

Gregory Shatan: As I'm not sure what the statement would be that would capture that. I'm also not sure I mean given the workload that's been discussed which is escalation, end of contract and annual tasks how it would turn into a full time job unless there was massive (unintelligible)...

Alan Greenburg: Greg you're addressing the quality - the substance of the question not the question.

Gregory Shatan: What do you think the question then should be though or statement should be?...

Alan Greenburg: Well the question is do you believe the workload of the MRT is going to be, you know, at minus five. You know, meeting once a year is probably going to be fine to it's a full time job. I'm not sure how you word that to fit into your questionnaire but I'm sure someone can come up with that. It's a very large difference between some of the various comments.

Gregory Shatan: I see Martin Boyle asks in the chat how would the respondent know?

Alan Greenburg: How would - how do we know any of this? All of this is asking opinions.

Gregory Shatan: We have reached the top of the hour. I guess we - Steve Crocker suggests you could ask respondents to estimate the level of effort and give five ranges. That's a possibility. I guess that - in each case, you know, assuming the tasks that are set forth in the draft proposal. So I guess that kind of goes without saying that's going to be. Martin Boyle notes it depends on the job as it is. You know, clearly if they say the annual functions are moved to the CSC and the MRT is only dealing with escalation and end of contracts issues or potential end of contract issues it's tasks are lighter.

In any case as I said it's reached - we've reached the top of the hour and the end of the questions. We're hopeful of getting this survey out today. Well I wouldn't say hopeful. We will get this survey out at some point today. Whose day that is let's assume a - no later than 11:59 Pacific Standard Time in the United States which would be 8:00 UTC tomorrow we'll get this out. But I

would ask that I think if we could take comments up until about say it's 11:00 New York time. I would say for the next say five hours from now wherever you may be. That would give people enough time. And I would do the - just send the comments I think to the RFP3 list and just begin them with a statement - a survey suggestion. And then we can kind of kick those out of that. I'll monitor those and look for those along with others who are working on this. So if we can get those by 4:00 pm New York time I guess that's 21:00 UTC. That will be helpful or not helpful.

If they come out after that they will I think not make it into any version of this. The sooner the better obviously since any considerations but more time for considerations that a consideration can be. Any last questions, comments on this point? If not I will look forward to seeing suggestions in emails to the RFP3 list saying survey statement suggestions or the like. We'll try to - and Stephanie said ask - can we get a version out that incorporates the changes from this call pretty quickly. We'll try. I'll have an interim draft to kind of have your definition of pretty quickly. But we'll figure out. We'll get an interim draft that is - so that there isn't just complete radio silence between now and the final survey being released into the world. Well not the world. To the CWG. And if that's my definition of the world I'm pathetic.

In any case there being nothing further I will note that we have a call scheduled at this time, the time of the beginning of this call, for Monday. Due to my schedule unless we start earlier we'll need to limit that to about an hour since I have a call - a conflict - client conflict with the second hour. Perhaps we might start this a half an hour earlier. I don't want to start it a full hour earlier just because of time of day issues. But something - we'll consider that. Maybe we'll just all talk twice as fast and we get it done twice as quickly. In any case thank you all for your participation. Again Happy New Year. I will



say that this brings this call to a close and ask that the operator stop the recording.

Woman: Thanks Greg.

END