

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
March 26, 2015
8:00 am CT**

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks everyone. Thank you for returning promptly after lunch. I'm not sure there's much housekeeping. Just a remark, really, just to remind you that this is the way in which we've ended up structuring the day and some of the thoughts as to why we, as you know, we had that significant view post-Singapore that we - based on a lot of the feedback that we got an input from our own group as well, that we really need to move ahead with building out the operational and functional components of the proposal.

And that was the reason for, then, starting to draft a skeleton proposal into which the design teams plug their content. So we were very mindful that that was a key objective of the work post-Singapore and, therefore, of this face-to-face session.

Notwithstanding that, there are the big picture issues of structure and how we deal with that. And so, both on the basis of the CCWG had done their work and some of the structural or at least overarching issues that this group faces directly link into the work and are interdependent on the work of the CCWG so we wanted to make sure we got that down at the outset.

And then having worked our way through a significant number of the functional or operational issues, we wanted to make sure that we didn't leave aside the legal input we're going to start to work with and make sure we got going with that today rather than left that over for tomorrow.

One way that we could have worked would have been to split it into sort of operational, structural, but I think we - these - we can work - we can walk and chew gum as far as these two issues are concerned. And so we'll get that comprehensive discussion going as our last session of the day.

I mindful that we said to you we may need to work into this evening. I think we've talked about it and feel that it's - we can make good progress during the scheduled sessions and won't need to work into the evening session.

I'm sure many of you will enjoy the opportunity to just get a little bit of a break but also to take advantage of talking amongst one another and actually dealing with some of the obvious areas where there's opportunity to synchronize and think about what you've heard or how to synchronize the work of the design teams, how to integrate work with CCWG and so on.

So we may run slightly over in terms of time at the end of the day but I don't expect that we will run into a serious evening session. So I think that's it - covered. Lise, is there anything else you want to cover?

Okay, so that puts us into then the design team D to hear from design team D and consistent (unintelligible), that is the authorization design team and Cheryl has been the design team lead on that.

So I'll hand it over to Cheryl and just remind you again of that clear theme of the CSC, the escalation, the - and of course, the SLEs that we heard at the

beginning of the morning. And then, of course, this authorization was one of the interdependent components of those whether or not this authorization function (persists). Over to you, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And design team D is somewhat important to us to get done in priority one and to have the substantive work that we've already done in short order and I wanted, Jonathan, at least, to just thank the team. They hit the ground running and they have been so productive.

The discourse and discussion (on list) has been terrific and quite substantial. And that is why, in such a short amount of time, we could actually come back to you with some definitive responses to the questions that were posed to us. So thanks on the record to everyone on our team.

I'm not going to list them. You know who they are. If you don't, go to the Wiki page and it is listed there. But, what we have also managed to do and design team D, getting as far as we have, is make sure that the dependencies, and there are a number of dependencies, Look to Page 7 of the hard copy material that the staff kindly put out on your tables today.

You'll have a lovely, colorful little set of columns there. But in one of the columns, you'll see that there are number of critical dependencies of other design teams which, until we give you our recommendation, simply can't get onto that next piece of work.

So it has to be done in a timely fashion and they believe we have delivered at least that part of our work and we'll be asking you for discussion and deliberation and we hope, agreement, and what we are recommending.

Excuse me. It's no surprise, if you're reading the screen, to see for the discourse and the discussion on our list we are recommending to you that no authorization function for TLD changes is needed.

Let me read that once more. No authorization function for TLD changes is needed. For the sake of transparency, I do want to let you know that this was not a totally unanimous discussion and celebration. There is a single discussant that did question whether one form or another needed to continue but we're not that democratic.

The majority has, indeed, ruled but it is a consensus but not (four) consensus outcome. We've noted there a couple of outstanding work issues but in addition to that, I just wanted to make sure, and perhaps, staff, we should capture that in our outstanding work issues - we need to articulate what is said in our regional purpose and description.

And it, of course, is if the design team D which is authorization recommends not replacing the NTIA authorization function, then the DT is expected to detail what additional verification - David, I hope your writing this down immediately.

Thank you - if any - should be implemented by IANA as a result of removing the NTIA authorization function. That work we need to continue but they yay or nay we are presenting to you today and I don't think I need to say anymore. Open for questions.

Jonathan Robinson: Comments? Questions? Thoughts on this? Greg, your hand is up. Go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. Just the point of clarification - so in terms of the workflow, then, the changes will go directly from the IANA team, the route zone management team at - currently at ICANN straight to the route zone maintainer, currently VeriSign without a checking...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: External oversight, the stewardship role currently, yes.

Greg Shatan: No kiss the cheek as a walks by. Okay. Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: David please.

David Conrad: Yes, to just provide a little information, the way the existing system works now, the - a change request that's for the route, that actually does already go directly to VeriSign. It does not pass through NTIA. NTIA is notified in parallel of a change request.

VeriSign route zone maintainer does not process the change request to authorization is done by NTIA. This - the recommendation would remove that block on VeriSign being able to process the request when they receive it.

Jonathan Robinson: So, yes, no problem at all. Thanks. Did you want to respond to that at all, Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Not at all.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, great. Thanks David. Chris, go ahead.

Chris Disspain: Thank you. Chris Disspain. Cheryl, I just wanted to check with you on the second thing they said. I can't remember which design team it was but you're saying someone or somebody needs to make sure that the internal processes in

IANA have a check obviously because you don't just want one person to - so is that what you are saying?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, Chris, what I'm saying is exactly what is written in the description of design team D. It's not on that screen (on purpose).

Chris Disspain: Ah, right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And that states that if we were to say no, and we have said no, then we also can't just give up on that. We do have to come up with some expectations of what the source of authorization would be required. But what this means is critical work in, for example, design team F.

Chris Disspain: Can now proceed

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Can now proceed.

Chris Disspain: Thank you Cheryl.

Jonathan Robinson: I've got (Paul Cain)'s hand up. (Stephen), I don't - okay. I've got (Paul Cain), so go ahead, (Paul Cain).

Paul Kane: Thank you very much and thank you to this design team. I think, in principle, I'm happy with the concept of having no authorization party but also I want to make sure that the IANA themselves do not inhibit the ability of the registry to directly make the changes.

Before, when the authorization function was there, one of the things that NTIA very kindly were doing was checking that the processes have been

followed and no external third-party including ICANN, IANA hadn't changed the updates.

I don't believe there's ever been an instance of them doing so but that was the rationale when NTIA inserted themselves into the process back in the late '90s. So I'm in favor of the authorization function going provided it's not replaced by ICANN, IANA seeking to fulfill that role. It should rest exclusively with the registry operator.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Paul, that - part of that sounds -- Cheryl, for the record again -- sounds a little bit like work of another design team, not my design team D. But remember, we do need to come up with what additional verifications are going to need to be proposed and that could very well include that appropriate policy and practices are being followed.

I don't think they're mutually exclusive arguments. I think it can, in fact, be written in but it's probably another team's work to do that (set of) proposals, not ours.

Paul Kane: I'm sorry, I'm struggling keeping up with all the various design teams but I just want to put on record that it's important - the registry operator is the one that's accountable for registries. And if NTIA's role is removed, which I hope it's going to be, then the operator remains responsible for its entries - subject to complying with technical standards, et cetera.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: David.

David Conrad: A clarifying question, Paul. Are you suggesting that VeriSign - I'm sorry, the route zone maintainer not process a request sent by IANA unless there is a

second verification from the TLD manager? Replacing the NTIA with the TLD manager, is what I'm asking.

Paul Kane: No I'm not.

David Conrad: Okay, thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: So I just want to make another point that - I mean, Cheryl referred to another design team. There is no other design team working on any other aspect of this at this stage. I mean, so that was a - if it was a principle there could be some work being done on, I guess, process steps.

But I think I should remind us that the presumption is that steps, as they are currently undertaken, remain as such unless we seek to change them post-transition. So Marika, did you want to comment?

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. Just to notes and Cheryl already referred to that as well, that we do have design team F that will look at the relationship between IANA and the route zone maintainer and now that, you know, NTIA is out of the equation and, again, now that authorization function is recommended to no longer continue, how that may change.

So I think that's where the conversation may happen looking at, indeed, what does currently happen and is there a need for any changes to the processes as they exist as a result of those changes? At least that's my understanding.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, so that clarifies there's an existing three-way relationship which is design team F that has not commenced subject to the decision as to whether that is indeed a three-way or a two-way relationship.

And this recommendation of this design team, in effect, means it looks that now the relationship which, of course, may be no change, but it recommend the look at the interrelationship between the route zone manager and the route zone maintainer. Yes, okay - or between IANA and the route zone maintainer. Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Avri speaking. I have no strong feeling either way on this but since this is one of those changes where we're saying, okay, we need to change the steps. We need to change the process, I'm not quite sure - in fact, I'm quite sure that I do not understand why it is that it is no longer needed.

It was something that was needed and now it's something that is not needed. And I assume we have to explain that. And if summit he asks me to explain why we had decided that, I would go "Uh, I dunno." Cheryl said so. Oh, okay I've been told...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Donna) the words, "Cheryl said so," does not have universal carriage - I'm disappointed to say that it doesn't, but it doesn't.

Jonathan Robinson: I thought Cheryl was about to say that. We have a (unintelligible)?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We do but do you mind holding for Chris's comment, so perhaps Chris and then David? Yes, of course that's what I wanted to do.

Jonathan Robinson: Well, if David is responding directly, let's get it out of the way.

David Conrad: So the short answer is that originally the processing by which, you know, route zone change request was done was a very manual process that you relied on email templates that actually required significant analysis to be done.

And there was stuff you could actually look at that would - that you could verify, even not fully understanding the implications of, you know, this particular name server change for that sort of thing.

With the automated system that was deployed in 2011, the vast majority of the transaction is now fully automated to the point where, you know, there is essentially nothing for NTIA to check.

The - in their presentation, they actually document the steps that they do. And it basically boils down to, they make sure that the communication channel was secure, it's HTTPS, that they use the transfer the request.

And they look for a self-certification by ICANN that yes, indeed, ICANN followed its process. The value of that today is probably not that much. You know, in the past, NTIA staff could actually look at the email template and they were things that they can look at that, you know, probably had some value in doing a double check that is sort of superfluous now.

Avri Doria: Can I ask a quick follow-up? And the answer, you said in the automation process that covers most everything now. So what about the chunk of stuff that it doesn't cover? Is that - doesn't need it either?

David Conrad: I was - I said most because I couldn't - I was just being cautious in case there is something that I - you know, and again, I'm speaking sort of from a historical context because I'm not IANNA staff these days.

I don't know if there's anything that - and maybe actually Chuck might know from the VeriSign perspective, if there's anything that goes through NTIA that does not go through the automated system for the route zone management stuff.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. I don't think so, David. I think you're right. The kind of checks that both IANA and VeriSign does as the route zone maintainer, are technical and operational to make sure that there's no - in the whole process, nothing's changed in the rest of the zone file and DNS (sect) is covered appropriately, those kinds of things. But in terms of - but NTIA doesn't do any of that, no.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, and we can go to the very patient (Chris) now. Oh, is it...

(Chris): I've actually taken myself out.

Jonathan Robinson: I see you have. Yes, you got impatient. Thank you, (Chris). Greg is next then. Please put your hand up again if you'd like to come back in.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Greg Shatan. I'm being unhelpful and continuing to ask. Focusing - putting aside kind of route zone Whois changes where I don't have - it seems fairly - like all rubberstamp, you know, hardly needed at all - not needed really.

Delegations and specifics - in new delegations there is a self-certification that policy was followed at least technically, I think the NTIA, you know, looked at that and said, "Yes, we see you're saying the policy was followed," and, you know, one could argue that they had the chance to say, "No, we don't think policy was followed.

And maybe, you know, that performed a kind of bigger check on ICANN. Maybe that was the backstop. Maybe that has nothing to do with the authorization function.

But just that's kind of the one part here where I'm a little bit troubled that the - and maybe this check on policy was silly but it was there for - it was in the NTIA contract, the IANA contract, for reason. So are we all comfortable with that kind of certification by ICANN that the policy that led to the delegation was followed?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, thanks for the question, Greg. But -- Cheryl for the record -- and of course, that's why we're presenting you with a recommendation and asking this group to now decide are they comfortable with that?

We are recommending that it should not continue and that we are certainly comfortable with that. If you want more details, then, we can go back and run what happened again.

Jonathan Robinson: Chris, do you want to respond directly to that?

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: I think I might if you don't mind, Jonathan. Thank you. I appreciate that, and Olivier, my apologies for bumping you off in the queue. So I - look, I've said this so many times. I can't remember if I've said it to this group so I'm repeating myself I apologize.

What happens right now is that pursuant to the current contract, NTIA requires ICANN to certify - I think I'm using the right word. Yes, but to certify that the policy has been followed.

In the way that ICANN does that is that the board does that. So the staff reports to the board. The board looks at it and certifies effectively that the policy has been followed.

Now, the board does not want to do that. The board would prefer not to do that. So the question comes, well, what replaces that? And given that we're talking in the main about the delegations and given that we're talking in the main about ccTLDs because gTLDs are governed by a specific contract and so therefore that's different because that'll end up in court.

The question then becomes how do you replace the board? And the ccTLD community will work on that but it's not a part of this in the sense that we will eventually come up with something.

There is - in RFC 1591, there is a contemplation of there being a sort of review body and in the framework of interpretation report, currently before the board, there is a reference to that and the suggestion that the ccTLDs might like to look at that coming into being.

That may well happen but it's a long and complicated road. You need to get governments to buy into that sort of thing as well especially if there was a concept that it might actually say, you know, policy has not been followed, what follows from that if you say that it's not been followed and so on.

So it's a long and complicated road to work out but right now, it's done by the board. And I don't think I'm being - I'm not - I can't speak for every ccTLD, of course, but I can say I think there's a general feeling that that'll - that's okay for now because it'll take us quite a while to come up with something new.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, absent a new proposal which is unlikely to precede the transition, that the status quo will remain. Chris, you said something which is that the

board would be replaced. And given the context, I'll just say that it's the board's role as - that it would be replaced...

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: Yes, I apologize. I think that there are going to be plenty of other opportunities for the board itself to be replaced but that's not what I meant in this context. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you, Jonathan, Olivier-Crepin-LeBlond. I've got an open question here purely based on imaginary events. In the case that a country A has a court order to seize the TLD of a country B for whatever reason that it decides to have, with the authorization function has a part to play in that?

Jonathan Robinson: Now?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Now and currently, yes, currently. And if it doesn't then, of course, then authorization function might not have anything to do anything. But if it does, then do we need the checks and balances on something that would be able to cater for such a problem?

Jonathan Robinson: Anyone would like to res- Paul - okay, Paul.

Paul Kane: So let's just make sure we're talking about the same thing. The authorization function that the NTIA, Department of Commerce, currently holds is to check the process is being followed.

For number of years, both IANA have self-certified that they done their job properly and VeriSign self-certified that they are going to do their job properly.

So the issue you raise isn't really within the scope anyway. It's outside of this. Coming back the core issue, is this authorization function needed? Probably not. It never existed before ICANN. The authority rested with the registry then and post-NTIA's involvement, I hope the authority will rest with the registry again.

To address your specific issue, frequently a judge will require conditions to be appointed or two the lead upon the incumbent holder of quote, "The asset." That judgment will require that the incumbent registry operator, within a specified period of time, does stuff - transfers from A to B.

And the registry - the incumbent registry operator, if he does not record with the court orders requirements, will be in breach. So we need to ensure that there is no impediment with the incumbent registry operator fulfilling the law of the land, the judicial determination. And so having an authorization function would not be helpful because it could potentially be a gatekeeper role.

((Crosstalk))

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Yes, just a small follow-up. When I spoke about country A and B, in other words, not reallocation within the same country but one country, there was a case recently - one country deciding that there should be a seizing of assets of country B and, therefore, wanting to proceed forward.

I know that the process didn't go through in the end but in the case that it does, what other safeguards are there or something as (illogical) as this to (take place)?

Chuck Gomes: Can answer that, Jonathan, or try? The answer to your question, Olivier, is the law. We can't make a thing that - a multi-stakeholder-based organization that can - that stops people from bringing actions in whatever court they choose to bring them in. The answer is you rely on the common sense of the law - of the relevant law. You know, so I think that's really the answer.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jonathan, Chuck Gomes. Just want to make sure everybody's clear that when we're talking about this (unintelligible) in the policy has been followed before a TLD is delegated or re-delegated, that's really a ccTLD issue and not a gTLD issue.

And I just want to make sure - I think people, including (Chris), have said that but I want to make sure that the differentiation is there. I think - and this one, I'm not as clear in my head right now without looking at contracts, but I think even with the re-delegations, that's pretty much contractually defined how that would happen in the registry agreements for GTLDs. So I think it even applies there. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: ...come in with a quick comment before we move on.

Woman: Yes, because I think this discussion is a very good example of we have to be very careful of the way through this proposal to make the distinction between gTLDs and ccTLDs and have to check, every time, do we need to have two separate solutions or can you have one that that's both? Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, I've got Greg's hand up again.

Greg Shatan: Just a brief follow-up, I think Chris' earlier comment pointed out, it's really the certification that's interesting and not the authorization. It's just the fact that the IANA contract required the certification under kind of the authorization rubric.

But I'm a little confused - maybe I need to look back but I thought that there was also a certification that the policy was followed in the gTLD delegation. I believe that's the case.

Man: I don't think it is. And - because the - at first - and also the board doesn't have any action in the case of gTLDs. It's already been - the board had - will have - for example, let's just take new gTLDs. They approve the guidebook which approves the conditions upon which somebody's approved for delegation.

They don't - when the latest TLDs had been added to the route, the board didn't take any action on those at all. And there is an implicit understanding that policy was followed in the delegation that happened. But there's no actual certification that occurs when the policy is followed.

Now one of the reasons we need to have an appeal mechanism for a gTLD registry operator is if they think that policy wasn't followed they would do that. Otherwise I think it's just implicit that policy was followed unless somebody challenges it.

Greg Shatan: I'll check that.

Jonathan Robinson: That was Greg for the record who is going to check that and I mean but the way it's been described the way I understand that is effectively a typical situation of power delegated by the board to the management for the purposes of fulfilling one or more actions and in this case it's the delegation of a series of TLD's.

Okay, Donna I see your hand is up so go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks Jonathan, Donna Austin. So I think to Chuck's point I think there is actually a process where not IANA but ICANN staff or GDD staff actually sign off that a certain process has been followed and the policy has been followed.

I'm actually trying to bring up the report itself on the IANA Web site at the moment but the link isn't working on any of the reports. So I can't confirm that at the moment.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Donna Cheryl here, it's just going to be pre-authorization remember. We're talking about...

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: Yes but I'm just clarifying that...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...yes.

Donna Austin: ...Chuck is saying that there is, you know, policy isn't certified but in my mind it is.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Good point, yes I just want apples with the apples and not with the bananas.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great thank you Cheryl, thank you very much. So I mean this is a good example of where some work is being done and in a sense as you see as we've been through the secrets of design teams it's not entirely linked to when they started but that some of them started before others and are more complete in their work for a variety of reasons.

Mostly because of start time, some of it because of size of the task at hand. What you're seeing is there's quite a lot of substance being generated that in principle or in practice can go into the draft proposal to the extent that there remain loose ends we'll try and capture those in these short form summary formats.

And bring those back to the group as soon as possible and they will then be a guide for the design teams to do further work or for the design teams to be in effect complete with their work and some of that will of course involve the synchronization of the work between the design teams that we talked about.

So that's the process. We have a session set aside tomorrow where we will start to look at bringing some of this back. So I think that covers what I'd like to say now before handing over to Cheryl, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, no.

Jonathan Robinson: I think I did, I did...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well if I may, Cheryl for the record. I will take the thanks to the team on behalf of the team that this is a group of really good, fast moving well thought

out discussions and debates. So it's the DT that gets the thanks and I'll thank them.

Jonathan Robinson: I've got a question or comment from Paul, go ahead Paul.

Paul Kane: So I found that last session very useful and I would like to endorse Chris's point because I also share the view. But I didn't know that this was the case and I don't wish it to be the case and I'm pleased the board don't want it to be a case.

But currently the board certifies the IANA (processes) on behalf of the IANA the board will not continue in that role. I also would welcome the board not being in that role I wasn't aware that was the case.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Paul but just clear for the record I didn't hear Chris proposing that that was changed pre-transition. He made it clear that that would be a potentially complicated part to get for the board to remove itself from that.

So it's not a pre-transition change but it is I guess an indication of intent or, yes Chris do you want to respond?

Chris Disspain: Yes just for clarity. What I'm saying is it's entirely possible that the ccTLD community might in the future which I suspect is what you would like Paul say actually no one needs to confirm any of that stuff.

It's equally possible that the ccTLD community when it looks at the issue will come back and say our preference is that someone does and that that someone is or somebody does and that our preference is that somebody is asked.

But the key is right now the situation is as I've described it and that's the status quo, which I believe this general feeling should be maintained for now because to change it is going to take quite a lot of effort and complicated work.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you and now we're going to have a session regarding the defined team L and that about the actual technical stuff regarding the transition and I'd like to underline that this is only regarding the functional aspects of the transitioning to a new IANA functions operator.

It's not that it's a precaution, it's not that it doesn't assume that it will happen it's just that we would like to describe the technical outset of the transition plans.

So James Gannon and I don't I have - you're doing it because I also have (Matt) on mine, (Matthew). Okay.

James Gannon: (Matthew) is free if he wants to come up.

Woman: Okay.

James Gannon: So (Matt) has been, yes (Matt's) been working very close with me on this and so has a number of other people on the team. And so over the last two days or so I've come up with an unofficial title for this, it's the technical world.

So we're looking at currently under the IANA function contract there is a deliverable, which ICANN has produced and under C.7.3, which is a transition plan for moving to a successor IANA contractor.

So this is something that has already existed. So (Garu) filed a (DAPP) request and we received it from ICANN and we were then able to look at that

current transition planning that is already there as a result of the clause in the current contract.

So we felt that while there was some good work in that document that it was possibly a little too high level to fulfill the requirement of having a look at what will be required in order to if we did go to an external model or a shared services model what will be required on a very technical level to fulfill that transition.

So currently just for some context the C.7.3 deliverable from ICANN looks at six areas. It looks at documents published on IANA (org), the IANA functions registry data, the route zone automation system design, request data, request history data, the secure notification system and the transition of the route (KFK).

So what we wanted to do with this was to take that document as a basis and put some industry best practices around it. So the way I've approached this is if I were a project manager asked to come in and look at this transition from a very technical point of view if I was a technical project monitor.

What industry standards and what guidelines would I need in order to fulfill a stable transition of these functions? So we've done this by looking at it very technically, we're very model neutral.

We feel that even if an internal solution is realized by the community this is still valuable work because it may inform ICANN's own internal planning going forward.

And in order to speed up the work a little bit what we've done is we've split our work in two so we have a small piece of text which will be going into the draft proposal, which will refer to an appendix.

So we've completed and submitted to being on the list this small (unintelligible) and draft text and we'll be continuing work on the appendix, which holds the bulk of the details.

So we won't be examining any of those circumstances of the transition. The main thing that we wanted to do was ask the group around - to confirm our assumptions that we're working under.

So our assumption is that we're working at this at a relatively high level. We don't want this to be a detailed standard operating procedure where we say have literally step by step walk into room A, press button B.

We want this to be something that for example if we're transitioning a group of documents that we have an international (NC) standard that we look at to do a sample from them to make sure that we've looked at, that they have all been transferred correctly.

For example setting up checks and verifications for database, which are being transferred. So just industry standard best practices around transitioning of data, placing data into escrow between the two operators when they're moving and then looking at the requirements of the legacy operator then data retention.

Do they need to retain data for a certain amount of period for security concerns? Does that go to an independent third party to be retained? So issues around that.

So on the right hand side you will see the issues that we're currently working on. So the issues related to the transfer of the documentation that's on IANA (org) while we can do some work we're going to put that off to the end because we're hoping that design team G, which we will note is a priority two design team.

They are looking at the intellectual property associated with everything that IANA does essentially. So there may actually be an output from that design team, which will inform a lot of our work.

So at the moment we're going to put that to the end of our work queue. So next one, two, three, four, five items are the technical systems that exist within IANA at the moment.

So today, as of today (Matt) had a meeting with (David Conrad) so we're going to start looking at a very high level overview of what the technical systems are.

We don't need to know version numbers and specific operating systems but we need to know that the secure notification system runs on this style of platform, is it a (unintelligible) server, is it a data base.

So that we can inform our work to then look at okay, we'll look, we'll find out what the industry standard best practice for transitioning a database system between two independent companies is. We'll then form that into the framework document that we're building.

As of yesterday what is on this as item 11 we were initially going to look at staff knowledge transition elements. We are now erring to not look at that as we want to retain our very technical focus.

So absent any significant objection to us not looking at that we will not be continuing with that one. That is something that can be handled by the project manager at the time if required. We feel that it's important for us to maintain a very technical focus with this.

And finally we'll be setting out an overview of the project management best standards to manage this entire transition with. The one point of note with this is the route (KSK). There is a lot of public data on the route (KSK) transition process within the DNS practice statement.

So we will essentially be referring to a lot of existing documentation when speaking of that, anything to do with the (KSK) transition as that's a very well developed technical body of work that is already there. We are not interested in reinventing the wheel.

If we go down to the second page and we have as I've mentioned before we're going to hopefully have input on the transfer copyright so the documents that are all sort of by IANA that will obviously inform us as to how we can approach transitioning those documents over to a new operator.

So at the moment we are going to leave that to the end of our work. If design team G comes out with some work that informs us brilliant, if not we will just put in a very broad overview of what could happen and we'll possibly give a number of different scenarios based on different interpretations of how that copyright works out.

The question that I would like to ask the room now and I'd like feedback on this if we could is, within this technical and we're calling it the technical

transition framework, should we address the possibility that the IANA functions will be separated out into numbers, names and protocols?

If that is something that the room wishes us to do we can look at that or at the same time if the room does not wish us to do we can go on the basis that the IANA will remain as a whole that addresses all of them.

Jonathan Robinson: You mean as part of the transition?

James Gannon: As part of the transition yes. No input?

Chris Disspain: Well I can tell you that, I can tell it's Chris Disspain. That I can tell you that I think it would be a fair assumption that it all goes whether something might happen in the future is a different issue but I think it's a fair assumption that it all goes together.

And part of the ICG's role is to kind of sew these three set proposals together into one. So I think you would probably be wasting a fair amount of energy and time to look at that at this stage.

James Gannon: Just for clarity, the reason why we're asking the question is we wanted to ensure that we weren't going to be in a position where we come back with a document and members of the CWG come back and say why haven't you looked at this.

So we just wanted to get this out of the way at the start of that we're very tight on what our scoping is.

Woman: That's a very fair point James but I agree it might be out of scope since this is a naming community only.

James Gannon: Yes.

Lise Fuhr: But I have Eduardo next.

Eduardo Diaz: Thanks Lise this is Eduardo. I would say to answer your question I would keep the whole thing together. It will review complete complexity so that's what we're looking for, thank you.

James Gannon: Perfect.

Jonathan Robinson: So we'll move onto the next question and...

Woman: I have another one, Jordan Carter first.

Jordan Carter: Thanks yes Jordan Carter for the record. I think that we have to be really careful here. We have to be making sure that we don't answer questions for the other operational communities.

And so while it might be worth just checking and what they put in their proposals about this as you sort of finalize your text. We have to be very clear that we do not impose our view about separability on them whatever direction we wish to go in doing that given both their proposals provide for it.

It would be totally illegitimate for us to say that the three functions have to stay together that's something the IGC is going to have to deal with.

James Gannon: I fully agree. And so the next question is something that was a question last night but after some discussion that we've had yesterday and today I think

we've largely resolved that we are not going to look at any of the associated transition planning.

We are going to purely maintain a pure play technical look at things. So again absent any objection from the room we are not going to look at things like HR issues, legal issues, procurement, any transfer of assets, any cultural transfers or staff transitions or transfers.

So the next steps that we have is so again last night we had received offerings from the ICANN DIDP process. As of last night I had to rejections come back so we will be continuing without those documents for the moment.

Chris Disspain: James could you tell me what those documents were please?

James Gannon: So the two documents we requested were both referenced in C.7.3 as deliverable. They were the CCOP, the continuity of operations plan.

Chris Disspain: Right.

James Gannon: And the route (KSK) termination plan, which is referenced as having a section on transition the route (KSK) to a new operator.

Chris Disspain: Yes I can see why - sorry it's Jonathan is it all right if I - are you okay? Sorry Lise I apologize is it okay if you...

Lise Fuhr: Okay.

Chris Disspain: ...so I can see why you might look at the route (KSK) one that kind of makes sense to me but I can't see why you wouldn't get the other one. If you could send me a note it seems like...

James Gannon: Yes as a quite note it was actually the opposite way around.

Chris Disspain: ...really.

James Gannon: The continuity of operations there was a blank refusal and on the route (KSK) there was a paragraph on possibly in the public interest a portion of the transition plan maybe...

Chris Disspain: Okay so you've got that one?

James Gannon: ...no it was in the future we may release it we will get back to you.

Chris Disspain: Okay can you send me that gives me those details and I'll see what I can find out, thanks.

James Gannon: So for two and we've had a number of meetings with various people who have an input into this and we'll be taking that input and again working on the document.

The other thing is if there is anybody in the room or I know a number of people here are representing organizations. If there is anybody with experience in technical transition planning, business continuity, disaster recovery anything like that we are fully open to new members on the team.

We would like to again keep it very, very technical we're not looking at bringing in any of the other side of things. So if there is anybody else who wishes to join the group we would be very welcome to any new members. I'm open for any questions at this point.

Woman: Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Lise Chuck Gomes, backing up James to your statement that this design team is going to be working on the technical aspects I'm fine with that. But where are the non-technical aspects of a possible transition going to be dealt with?

James Gannon: That will be something that would have to be rolled back to the CWG as a whole. It's not something that we'll be looking at. I'm sure there are people in the room who would love to work on the design team for that side of it.

But from my point of view as looking at (DTL) it's not something that we're going to look at. It's something that probably would need to be brought to the CWG as a whole.

Lise Fuhr: I have a question regarding that because of course we have the technical aspects but when you and also you Chuck are discussing the other parts. Is it legal parts, is it the political parts, is the - you are talking about HR but...

James Gannon: Yes so primarily what in our course of looking and scoping out of what we should be looking at the main things that we identified were tribal knowledge within the IANA department.

So stuff that is not necessarily written down in a very solid standard operating procedure. So in any major corporation you have a large volume of information that is not necessarily documented.

So one thing we'd be looking at how to transition that. The other thing that was identified was any staff movements would need to be looked at between

the current IANA and an independent IANA if it happened was if any of the staff are looking to move. So that would bring in the HR issue.

And also there is the I think they're down here as IT and procurement issues. So any of the existing systems, which are currently owned by ICANN. If the new IANA operator is one was to become about wished to wholly transition those systems i.e. rent out the data center and do a full turnover of the administrative power rather than the actual servers how would that be managed?

Those are some things that people tend to - I'd ask would that be what we were looking at.

Lise Fuhr: I have a queue building up, (Chris) go ahead.

Chris Disspain: Yes just a couple of things. First of all I may be slightly confused. I understood this was looking, this design team was looking at the (transition) of the stewardship.

Is this design team looking at what, how transition would happen in the event that we by whatever mechanism we moved the IANA functions out of ICANN?

James Gannon: Yes.

Chris Disspain: I'm confused.

James Gannon: Yes so basically the concept of the work is there are multiple models on the table at the moment and this is an informative piece of work to give those...

Chris Disspain: Well that explains why I'm confused then because I misunderstood. So therefore I am no longer confused and it also explains why you've been saying what you've been saying. So thanks.

James Gannon: I'm not sure it's (unintelligible).

Chris Disspain: No, no thank you that's great.

Woman: Well Chris as we started it's a precaution, it's to have the technical okay.

((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: The only point I would make is that I'm and I'm fine with that but to come back to the reason I put my hand up originally was to say unless you, unless - is it really for us to be looking at the human resources aspects of the - I mean it probably isn't.

If there is a requirement at the end of the day for there to be the ability to separate and if that is ever triggered, you know, there will be mechanisms built in to do that.

I think this working, this CWG's job would be to look specifically at this but I don't believe there's a reason to be looking at (unintelligible).

Woman: And that's why I think James took it out of this.

Chris Disspain: Yes absolutely.

Lise Fuhr So it's been scoped into a very narrow technical scope and I think that's important that we keep it that way, thank you. We have Elise next, sorry.

Elise Lindeberg: I keep falling out of the Adobe Connect by the way. I don't know what it is but it's in and out so my hand goes up and down. So just to note that. I'm also confused because the design team L was about IANA function separation mechanism.

And certainly I see that the name has changed to IANA function transition plan actions. And you have explained why but I don't think we have been discussing that because one of the things that has been on the, you know, high on the agenda is the separation.

If we need any plans for the separation of IANA as such from ICANN. And now that that has diminished into some technical descriptions I don't know. I think we should have had a discussion on that before it was changed and also then - so I see we're missing something here because this was not only about technical issues.

It was more on the overarching issue of separation or not. Maybe we conclude that that is not what we want but we should have a discussion on that before it changed, thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Let me try and answer that. We have an overarching issue as to where and how separation may or may not be possible. That is a what we would characterize as a structural issue.

That is in some ways the elephant in the room here let's not mess around. It's not being dealt with in this particular conversation and that was why the design team name was changed because the design team name was confusing.

It implied as it was originally name that it would be dealing with that issue. Whereas in fact if you look at the way IANA operates at the moment there is a semblance of a plan, there is a formal plan that says that the U.S. Government the NTIA asked for and it's what I would call, I would characterize as a kind of disaster recovery business continuity type plan. It's similar to that sort of thing.

So in the event that for whatever reason there is a requirement to transition this function away from ICANN has anyone thought about what would need to be done?

So in our case we are aware that that might be, that's being contemplated within the group and we may come to that kind of route by whatever means in our structural discussions.

When we come to that when and if we come to that in whatever form, we need to have a technical plan in place that could be, that could support such a transition whether that happens or in 100 years' time.

And so that's the essence of my understanding of what this design team is all about. It's in response to something that is existing currently, a current plan that exists and it may be needed in the future.

Lise Fuhr: Yes, go ahead Elise.

Elise Lindeberg: Thank you, now I see rationale at the same time then I think again we must have a reasoning for changing - if this is not handled by this team no. Then where does it go?

And so it is an issue that's going to be brought up later, it is an issue that we cannot solve before the IANA transition as such that's my biggest reason. But it needs to be commented on at least because what we sent out, you know, in December for public comment it was also a major issue but (unintelligible) do we need it.

Do we need to have the possibility in for separation (unintelligible) and if anything happens whatever. If we don't want to look at that now we want to narrow it to the technical thing it's okay but then we need to rationale that position.

Otherwise this is also something (unintelligible) or the multi-stakeholder component that is just lost in the process and we need to explain why.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes so those are first of all the problem was not that we took something out of the design team, the design team was misnamed in this particular case. It didn't have the right - it had the wrong, the name was misleading.

The name led you and me and potentially others to think that the content was about separation mechanism when actually it was about business continuity, how to manage the technical issues in separation.

That was the content of the design team. But the issue you're talking about and I think you're absolutely right, you know, where and how. We've got to come back to the MRT where does that fit in, is it or is it not necessary.

As you said it was in the previous job proposal so where is it now? And I think as we will have time and opportunity as we take the legal advice or the legal input and we have other discussions on structural issues we will have the opportunity to talk about what potential mechanisms and which potential

structure and how separation may or may not be possible under different structures.

And indeed then what the future or the perspective variants of something like an MRT could be in those different structures. So please don't think that these things have been sort of squirreled away and put aside and they won't come back.

The intention here is to focus on as I said functional and operational considerations in the design teams and then to look separately at the big picture structural issues.

But if you remember as we came into Singapore and as we were in that Singapore meeting the criticism was that the group had become solely focused on structural issues and was not dealing with the functional and operational issues.

So we have attempted to address that by focusing in on the work of the design teams. But to some extent in reaction I mean that's actually not entirely inaccurate. It was repurposed, refocused, get the design team but it's not, it hasn't gone away.

And in part if you remember we said we would wait pending input on some of the legal issues, which clearly significantly impact our discussions on structure.

Let me hand over to others who might wish to comment on - specifically on the work related to the design team, but if (unintelligible) related points as well.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Jonathan. And regarding the legal input, we're going to have that tonight. So we're all going to get into the structural part too. So I agree with Jonathan. It's not to not talk about severability, but this is the operational part of it. And I have Greg Shatan next in queue.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. Although we haven't constituted for a formally designed team, gee I think as an informal working construct it would be fair to say that the copyrights and IMF generated documentation should be assigned to the successor operator.

And I - that's - I don't think you necessarily need to put a design team together or wait for one in order to write that in to your deliverable.

Man: Well, that's great input and it's something that's what we'll run with for moment unless anything changes.

Greg Shatan: I mean there could be technically other alternatives such as releasing it to the public domain, but I think for straight forward purposes, and to follow kind of a commercial model it would (unintelligible)...

Man: Yes. Anything that allows us to keep moving with our work is most certainly welcome.

Greg Shatan: Right. And just a second point is that currently the transition plan is a contractual requirement of ICANN and the IANA contract. The IANA contract goes away, there will be no contractual requirement for ICANN. So there may be a bi-law change, there may be a - somewhere they need to be required to keep this up. There needs to be an authorizing document or documentation to authorize this to be an obligation of ICANN on an ongoing basis to maintain a transition plan.

Lise Fuhr: I have a comment. Greg, if you follow that line you would also say that all the software should be defined to a new organization.

Greg Shatan: Well, I think that's not necessarily the - it's a different question. Software, you know, can be treated as stuff that is protected by copyright, just like the documentation. The question whether a new successor/operator should start from scratch and build its own software or whether the software should be transitioned across so that they could continue to work from the same database is an operational, technical question.

It would seem to me from a purely technical point of view they should assign the software as well as the - all of the kind of paper documentation -- soft documentation -- that we're talking about.

Man: So coming out of here we're hoping to have a greater grasp from ICANN technical staff on the overarching architectures of the systems that the IANA uses so we will then be able to look at is this commercial, off the shelf software which can be transferred very easily. Or we would then have to give some form of input into how custom developed software will be transferred technically.

Greg Shatan: This is Greg Shatan. To follow-up, as a technology transaction the turning them off and dealing with spinouts of companies from larger companies, and typically, you know, you have to deal with licenses and things like that, but typically you would want to take the whole kit and caboodle with you and not reinvent the wheel.

Man: That side of it will be outside of what we would look at. We're looking at purely how to technically transition it. The transition of the ownership is outside of our scope.

Greg Shatan: I think it's a technical recommendation. You'd probably want to recommend technically that the software be transferred, or at least the opportunity - the new operator have an opportunity to pick up the tool.

Lise Fuhr: Okay, Greg. Greg, now we end this. And I think (Dave) has a quick comment for this and then I'll move on to the queue. Thank you.

(Dave): Right. I'm fairly certain that the software - all the software that's used related to the IANA function is open source with a BSD license. So the question of ownership here doesn't seem to actually matter that much.

Greg Shatan: Excellent.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Thank you, (Dave). We have Olivier next.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thanks, Lise. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking and it's another one of my open questions. Jonathan spoke about the business continuity plan which we have here. The question is whether we're looking at business continuity in perpetuity or just specifically for this transition. So would making the text more generic in itself be in scope or out of scope for this group?

Man: So I'm merely using business continuity as an analogy. It is the same area of expertise I suppose is the right way to say it. ICANN maintains a separate continuity of operations plan.

So we're looking at it as a business continuity exercise. Purely as an analogy, we are not looking to get involved in any of ICANN's existing business continuity concerns.

Jonathan Robinson: I'll just say just because you reference me in the question (unintelligible). It's an analogy. This is not a business continuity plan. This is a transition to a successor/operator. But it is analogous to a disaster recovery or business continuity plan.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: So just as a follow-up - it's Olivier - you kind of missed the end of the question there. So the question was whether this was specific to the IANA transition from ICANN or was this something that we were looking at in perpetuity? In other words, the text that you would be proposing would be more generic and not mention ICANN specifically, but say "current operator, next operator".

Man: We will remain as generic as possible. This is purely looking at the technical aspects. We're not interested in - we will never refer to it as ICANN will give this.

Jonathan Robinson: I'd say there's a more specific answer to that even to add to that in that this is in a sense specifically not for this transition, but it is in preparation for should there be a future transition to an alternative operator. So to the extent that this stewardship transition doesn't result in any transition of operator -- which every indication is that that is the intention -- this will not be invoked.

This is purely -- which is kind of why it's like a disaster recovery or business continuity -- it's purely in the event that such a transition to a different - an alternative operator should take place in the future -- which may be in visage by the (unintelligible) this plan -- we've got the backup work to solve it.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: So Olivier speaking here, and just to make my point here, from alternative operator to alternative operator, we're looking 20 years down the line. The alternative operator might have to transfer...

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: So make it generic. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you. I don't have any other in line or the queue is empty. Alan, you had your hand up before. Do you...

Alan Greenberg: I had my hand up, but although Olivier's question was not my question, your answer addressed my question so there's no need to ask the question.

Lise Fuhr: Okay, perfect. So any other comments or questions? I think that's been quite a lot of clarification during this session. It's been very good. And any others? If not I will thank James, and I think we can applaud the whole team.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, and in particular I know James had very, very short notice -- less than 24 hours I think to travel here. So very impressive addition to the work on the design team.

Lise Fuhr: Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Have we finished (unintelligible) early?

Lise Fuhr: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: No, but I think we finished ahead of schedule on that one, yes.

Lise Fuhr: Very effective.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, so thanks. We've crept slightly ahead of schedule. That's good news. Design Team E is - the word that goes with that I think is SAC 69 -- which is the idea of the design team. But nevertheless, it's a discreet piece of work, and in many ways probably more analogous to a form of stress testing.

But it was set up to - in recognition of the fact that the security and advisory, Security Advisory committee of ICANN -- SAC for short -- had put out a report called SAC 69 that was entirely related to and pertinent to the transition, and I think SAC recommended and we recognized that it was entirely logical that we should review our work, and/or be in a position to review our work against the recommendations of SAC 69 -- which is why I described it as a form of stress test or cross check.

So that table which has parsed out the issues within SAC 69 -- or I should have said SSAC, I left off the S -- Security and Stability Advisory Committee. Yes, known as SSAC 69, yes. Okay. I gather there's a subtlety I hadn't quite picked up on. It is the - the committee is the SSAC. Their reports are SAC. Amazing. We can all...

Man: I have a request. Can we have a design team on acronyms please, Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: And Berry Cobb from staff has assisted us here in parsing out that report and looking at where in the draft proposal -- which sections and areas -- that is either addressed or to be addressed, or maybe addressed elsewhere.

So Berry, if you can here me I'll hand over to you and you can take us through - there's a precursor to what this design team might do -- the preparatory work that's being done by staff. Thanks.

Berry Cobb: I think Jonathan - this is Berry Cobb for the transcript. So I think the presentation component for this will probably be fairly quickly - Jonathan basically stole my thunder in terms of explaining the high level component for what staff had been asked to kick off the design team (unintelligible) for.

Essentially for those that are familiar -- which I believe most are familiar with the SAC 69 report -- it was essentially divided into two sections. The first section was a list of issues and possible recommendations as well as some rationale behind the recommendations -- which I committed in terms of importing into column one here -- which is just strictly the issue and the recommendations. But I believe there were about a total of 10 or so recommendations divided amongst seven sections.

And then there was a secondary component to the SAC 69 report which is on page two of the document. And they had highlighted specific causes within the NTIA contract for the IANA function that I think were relevant to the transition.

So staff was essentially tasked with creating an inventory of sorts comparing our current work method and the design team's structures that we had, and highlighting or comparing those with each of the issues recommendations and/or the contract clauses, and then also trying to draw that connection to the draft proposal that we had together -- which currently shows the different sections of section or RFP 3 part of the draft proposal.

So I don't know that we want to go through specifically each and every recommendation here, but ultimately I think probably the next step for this particular document after the group decides how to handle this -- whether this is a feeder into the red team or if it does stand alone as a separate design team -- but I think the big takeaway here is the leaders from each of the design teams should review this document, and where your design team is highlighted in column two, to take a fair understanding of the recommendation and ensure that your draft proposal does consider the recommendations.

If in fact you find that there's confusion -- for example the first recommendation on page one we have listed as design team L that would possibility have some input regarding this recommendation. If you don't think that that is the case, because you'll know your own design team better than I do, then certainly get back in touch and we can adjust the recommendation - or the inventory appropriately and see if it's either not needed for another design team, or it should just be removed altogether.

So I think we're all - that's about all I have for now unless, Jonathan, you want to actually go through each recommendation and have a discussion about the design team assessments.

Jonathan Robinson: We need to go through it in detail. I think what would be useful is to get any questions and comments on this. Also to - I mean you suggested, and I think I agree with you that this is - I wouldn't mind any comment or point on this that - well, there's two points.

So first of all there's the design team assignments. Anyone got any questions or comments or issues around the design team assignments. Second, there's this red team catch all which is effectively a form or stress testing of the

proposal -- which includes checking against SAC 69 and any other checks we choose to put into it.

So I'd like to make sure that everyone is comfortable with that from both a content and a process point of view. So that would be good to get that feedback and support for that, the work that you've done, the way in which we propose to process it.

It seems to me that we're not proposing that a specific design team is commissioned in and around this work. James (unintelligible). James, go ahead.

James Gannon: (Unintelligible). So I'm just going to note that, for example on the second page, some of these documents are not public documents. So the continuity and copyright continuity of operations plan is not a public document, so therefore there is no possibility for a design team now to actually assess that document within our work. And I wouldn't possibility think that there may be another example of that.

Lise Fuhr: I think this also feeds into the RFP 4 work that's going to be the implication of the actual - the proposal that we're having. So the model we're going to choose is going to have an effect on this and also on how we evaluate this according to the FAC 69 - or SAC 69, sorry.

Jonathan Robinson: Any other comments or questions or points on this? All right. Very brief. We expected that some of these sessions may go faster and some would take longer. I think we've let a couple run over this morning. So I wonder if that's the time to take an update from another design team or whether we take a break at this stage.

Man: Coffee.

Jonathan Robinson: Do we have another - do we have another...

So I think as much as I heard that raspy request for coffee, it's not clear that coffee is available for you yet. Yes. So our planned coffee break is around 3:30 so I suggest - I have a feeling that we might want to dig pretty deep into the issues raised in the discussion with (unintelligible) which is currently scheduled for 5.

So I think we should be confident enough to just keep things moving for the moment -- hear our updates from the other design teams, make any overarching comments and try and deal with that in the next session. And we will take a break around 3:30 in any event.

So I - certainly I think we've got a small update from you, Alan, on DTB. All right, and you'll do it from the desk. So let's go straight into the update from DTB and then hear if there are any questions -- Design Team B -- make sure we know exactly what the design team is doing.

Man: Fontgate has been lodged.

Alan Greenberg: I like the other one. I've been called many things, but never openly Helvetica. So we are a very small lean team comprised of three CCTLD representatives as well as one observer from the GAC, Elisa. This is a very narrowly focused DT, and it flows from the question of whether there should be an appeal mechanism for CCTLD delegations, and whether that should be developed in the context of the IANA transition proposal.

Many of you are aware that there was a generally applicable appeal mechanism proposed in the Frankfurt proposal. When we had the discussion in - when we had the survey in January, what that showed was that many in the GTLD community were comfortable -- at least at that time -- to let the CCWG deal with the issue of an appeal mechanism. But the CCWG had signaled that they're not going to touch CCTLG delegation and redelegation decisions.

So in so far as there was a - this was put on the table -- when I say this, the notion of an appeal mechanism was put on the table at the request of the CCTLD's. There was a meeting of the then RFP 3 to discuss the issue and they more or less said over to UCCTLD's, you have to decide what you want to do. So - and it's out of that kind of flow that this DT was created.

And what came out of the CWG survey in January was that while at a very macro level, there was I guess a form of agreement in the CCs that were part of that survey that there should be an appeal mechanism. That was not defined, and when one probed into certain parameters of that -- what would apply to, who would have standing, whatever -- it became apparent that there was no consensus to move forward.

So what we've really decided to do is to survey the whole of the CCTLD community to see if that view formed out of that very limited survey. The CWG was generally held in the wider CCTLD group which as many of you know are over 240 registries. So that survey just went into the field on last week's call and we have given the community until April 3 -- the end of next week -- to respond.

So we've had less than a dozen responses to this date, so we're not at a point to talk about any kind of results. But I guess my final word would be this is

almost a reverse ONES test. It'll be up to the CCTLD community to demonstrate strongly that they want it as part of this process. Because certainly it's been observed on list in a number of comments that perhaps this is something that the CC community should develop itself in its own right on a parallel track. And I think this point has been made by Chris and others already.

But I'm trying to keep an open mind as to what the survey is actually going to tell me - us, excuse me. So that's really where we stand, but I'm happy to take questions. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Alan. Questions, comments or points in relations to the work of this group? I think it potentially started off as a more broad group and has been narrowed down to a very specific issue. So it should be self-evident, but any comments? I see your hand up. Go ahead.

Elise Lindeberg: Thank you. As it says (unintelligible) I'm just an observer to this group. Again, I think it's important that this group keeps (unintelligible) to the CCBG mechanisms that are being worked on, on an appeal mechanism, just to make sure that we underline that the appeal mechanism system as such is being covered by the two groups together. That is why we have this narrow scope on this one. So again, it doesn't seem like the big questions of appeal have disappeared somewhere, but that we have the connection, and thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: I got the principle, I'm just not sure in practice - how do you think we should capture that and make sure - are you capturing that now by just stating it or do you think - are you suggesting we do something else?

Elise Lindeberg: No, I saw some questions in the chat earlier on if the appeal mechanism that would be looked at from CCBG covering our needs, let's say like out in the

CBG. I think somebody posted that question. Maybe we'll just have a quick look - I don't know how long they have arrived on this in CCBG.

They are looking at an overall appeal mechanism that will handle accountability issues for ICANN as such, and also covering the IANA (unintelligible) that is needed. We can progress into that group. So just - so we do some check and balances if the work doesn't - in the CCBG is covering our needs, and if it is we can just write that into our cross report that this is being covered by the (unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: So a quick comment before we go back to Chris, and then Alan, make sure - hands up in the chat if you want to respond as well. Yes, I was (unintelligible) that there was a comment much earlier in the day about building up that list -- that checklist -- of making sure that the links are fully covered and that there was - I don't remember the action specifically, but it was building a form of cross checking between making sure that there were no sort of cracks between our expectations and what will be fulfilled, and the work of the CCWG. But there's a bunch of people coming up in the queue. So let me defer to them.

Chris Disspain: Jonathan, thanks. Chris Disspain. Yes, look, just for clarity I think what Elisa is saying is right. So this particular design team is looking very, very specifically at CCTLD delegation, redelegation appeals mechanisms, but just forget about that for a minute. Ignore that. That's looking at - that's what this design team is looking at.

There will be (unintelligible) and some sort of independent appeals mechanism -- or whatever you want to call it -- in the IANA escalation mechanisms to deal with the stuff we talked about this morning around service level expectation failures and so on.

That is something that is either part of the CCWG which is intending to set up an appeals process, and we can hook on to that one or if we really wanted to we could create a very specific IANA one, but I can't see the point of doing that. The key is to make sure that the experts you use in an appeals mechanism are the right experts. The mechanism itself can be cross everything, but you just use the right experts at the time if that makes sense. That's what I think we've got to do.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Chris, and I see an action here for Cheryl to make sure that this is actually stress - to review the CCWG's stress test according to this issue. So I think we should put this in and also consider how this relates to the RFP 4 work, okay? Thank you, and I see Alan, you're next.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I'd just like to follow on in response to Elisa's comment. One other thing that informed my thinking in seeking to create the team was the communication from the CCWG in January -- albeit it was some time ago -- that while they were going to establish their appeals and redress track, that it was not their intention to look at specifically CCTLD delegation and redelegation because it was sensitive.

So I just want to make the point that - so there's no overlap between the CCWG and what I'm doing - and what we're doing actually in Design Team B -- that whatever that will be now, if they change their mind, obviously we'll see how that affects what we're doing, etc. -- but I'm just saying that that's information under which I'm working. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Alan. And I agree this is specific addressed by the (CCWG) that we should decide on this. But I think Lise is concerned with broader on IANA and this - and their (IRP). I think it's not (IAP). Yes. Well thank you. And I see Greg you're next.

Greg Shatan: I'll cede my time.

Woman: Well. Thank you. Paul.

Paul: I have to say until the survey is completed and --well done Alan and his team for putting the survey together. But it's very difficult for us to ccTLD representatives to actually form a view. And so I think that whilst it's valuable. The Design Team is doing its work. I would like to suggest we really postpone pushing this one forward until such time as we know what the (CC)'s want.

Woman: Well this was really meant as an update. So it's not to have an expert view. So any - oh. Alan Greenberg you're next.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I guess I'm a little confused. Because I think I'm hearing different messages from different people. I think what (Chris) said is if indeed we need an appeals mechanism associated with re-delegation of (ccTLD)'s that we at least make an attempt to see if we can use the same process with different experts perhaps. And not invent a completely different process from scratch. I think that's what I understood. But I didn't really that from other people.

(Chris): No. That's not what I said. That's not specifically absolutely the reverse of what I said. What I said was that with respect to IANA issues outside of delegation or re-delegation. So it's to settle disputes et cetera. It is contemplated there will be a different (rules) mechanism. You could use the - we could use the independent appeals mechanism being put forward by the CCWG. It seems pointless to create a new one but to use that one. But a mandate that the panelists that sit are experts in the areas they need to be in.

That's not nothing to do with the (Delredo) stuff. That's entirely separate. My apologies.

Woman: Well. Thank you (Chris) for the clarification. Do you have? Your hand was up and it's down now. And Alan Greenberg. Anymore on Design Team B? I think we should move on to the next update on Design Team N. And Avri that's on the review. What do we call it? It's called Periodic Review of the IANA Functions. Yes. So thank you.

(Abdrienne) (DT-N) reviews is quite a good name for it. We basically have gotten to the point I believe where we have a template that all of us that are working on it and now there's a bunch of us have accepted. And so then we actually in the last 12 hours actually started working on it. Even though the template has not in any sense been approved.

Now what this one looks like to me and I think that the others agree. Although we've only talked in a little group here --a little group there. And haven't managed to have an "all together" type meeting on it. Is that what? What we're really doing is collating a lot of the reviews that have been discussed in other places.

One of the things for example that I picked up earlier is that we need to go back and look at (E) and make sure. Because what we did was went to the contract and looked at it. And had what reviews are in there now need to go back to (E) which was the (Fact 69). I'm sorry. I'm not supposed to say (E). I'm supposed to say (E Fact 69). So go back to that and make sure that we have collected everything.

Looking at all the evidence because a lot of the other (DT) whatever have been talking about reviews and talking about reports. And even some of them

have said it's yearly, it's monthly, it's weekly. So started building a table of this collection of things with the periodicity, with the reference. With the - and then with the "who does it?" And in some of them groups have said "this is (CSE). (CSE) is doing it." And some of the others, it's open. And that's just starting to fill in the boxes. Took a lesson from Jordan in the CCWG. I've put up a table with a lot of empty boxes. And start filling them in.

So basically took that approach. And you know we've been working on it. Now that we think we've finished the template you all have to check the template to make sure we finished the template. Have started doing the work. And it remains at the moment the work as a drive document that's you know open for anybody to look at, comment and suggest edits. And you know I've put out the names to the full list several times. So it's still there.

But that's what it feels like. It's basically what are all the reviews? And how do they fit all together in terms of what other people are looking?

Woman: Thank you (Abdrienne). I think it's very nice to hear that you're very conscious of what other DT's are doing. And if you're overlapping. And it think it's also important to - and you are a part of this accountability team too. So they're also looking at the reviews. So I think it's very important that we keep the big picture when we're having the reviews.

And of course we need to be very specific on the IANA part. But just to make sure that we have linkage. Right? Any questions? Yes. Jonathan you're next.

Jonathan Robinson: I think this is relevant to this group. So when I heard that CSC reports this morning. It you know - my analogy continues to be of a customer and supplier. And that customer gets the services from the supplier. Has continuous regulatory interaction with the supplier. Let's the supplier know if it's not

meeting their expectations. And periodically as the CSC proposes as meetings with that supplier.

Now they may be once a year. They may be once every six months. But you sit down and you say "look I know we've sent this to you in an email a while ago. But still haven't done anything about it." And so on. And then you continue that same analogy. And you said that actually that customer needs some form of - and the supplier may be that whole relationship needs some form of audit, review and some sort of external look into what's going on.

And I - so I - it seems like I rarely - notwithstanding the discussions we had early at the genesis of this group about whether or not scope was payment of work or more than that. It feels logical to me that periodically a knowledgeable group or some sort of knowledgeable expertise auditors or otherwise comes in and has an open straight forward relationship with both the customer and the supplier. But some degree of independence. And say "right, how's it going? What's" - you know, and checks through things.

So it feels like a very natural function. I'm not sure quite how far that analogy goes. And I suppose this goes to some of the question in and around things like (unintelligible). I think that certainly seems to cover - there certainly seems to be a requirement. Quite who performs that requirement and how it's performed probably needs some more discussion. Because you know I don't want to assume it's a multi-cycled, (a body) professional services company or whatever. It could be one of a number.

It probably depends on the scope of that function. And what's really intended to be achieved by that piece of work. It certainly feels like something natural that needs doing periodically. And I'll leave it at that.

Lisa Fuhr: Next in line.

Jonathan Robinson: Avri, you might mention that (Nike) did not apologize. But there are a number of review mechanisms suggested in the guidance document. That's one that the registry's put together and sent it which you might find helpful. It talks about some folks like (Halfen) whom et cetera including a regular ATRT type multi-stakeholder review agree sort of four years or so. So you might want to have a look at that. And see if that helps you with what you're doing. Thanks.

Woman: Avri you're next.

Avri Doria: Yes. Thanks. And I have to apologize. Every time I hear the DTs I do think of delirium (unintelligible). But anyway yes I think one of the things also we're looking at in addition to that is - in terms of your comments Jonathan. Is there are many of the audits and stuff that IANA is contractually bound to do at the moment.

And so also then there's the notion of "who looks at those audits?" And so that's another piece of this puzzle. And if nobody's looking at them then perhaps you know they may or may not be needed. But you know so this bunch of things if you go through the contracts. And have yet to go as yet

And to (Chris). Thank you. Hadn't checked the guidance document to be guided by it yet on reviews. So I'll have to get at it.

Woman: Thank you Avri. What?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. I'm responding to the message board. Which is I mean - I think briefly those of us that do remember will remember we started off with

Periodic Review Team. And we said that "that's going to have a multi-stakeholder component." Therefore we'll close the Multi-Stakeholder Review Team.

And that's where I kind of checked myself. Because I was about to go that far and say "that could be the question that officers Lise and maybe Greg's point of where the multi-stakeholder comes in.

But I really want to hold back from presuming - in our world. In our very little world here a legacy structure. Because - where my chairs have now. I'm sympathetic to and have heard the very strong message about multi-stakeholder. I also was advocating as a kind of a member of the group the requirement for a periodic audit.

I do think these needs may be written in different ways in different structures which is why I would urge people to be patient. Not sweep their requirements for multi-stakeholder audits or any other key key requirement under the carpet. But just to see as we get into the structural consideration as we receive the legal input. As we process the evolving work of the CCWG. And all the ramifications that that has for ICANN.

But just - I'm trying to and I'm encouraging all of you to keep an open mind as to which structures might perform which functions. And to keep a healthy focus on your requirement rather than the structure. And so providing your requirement is that there's a periodic audit. Or that there's an appropriate multi-stakeholder component.

It doesn't necessarily have to exist in that particular structure we initially envisioned it taking place in. So that's where my thinking's at. And I'll share

that with you. And do that in part in response to (Matthew Shears) comment on the original intent of the (MRT) in the chat. Thanks.

Woman: Any other on Avri's Design Team and...

Avri Doria: Review.

Woman: No.

Avri Doria: Craving coffee.

Lise Fuhr: No. We have actually we have Design Team S which is the Relationship and (TIA) IANA and (roots on retainer). And as far as I am informed Alan Greenberg is going to be the lead of that one. But I don't know if you will give a short update. Because you've just been appointed. But Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I will be candid. I was informed yesterday I was probably volunteering to lead this. And I haven't declined. I'm told there are some other volunteers who have volunteered for the group. Although I don't know who they are. And I just heard (Cheryl) say she was volunteering. So I'm delighted.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: And I suspect this falls under the category of "fools wonder in where angels fear to tread." But nevertheless I did say yes.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. So these are all the priority one Design Teams that we've gone through. We have the team that got no priority yet. And that's also a kind of a wrap-up design team in my view. So I think - Jonathan will you conclude on this session? Because I think we have gone through all the Design Teams that are

open in priority one. The rest has to be looked upon. And then we will have a wrap-up by Jonathan and then off the (IO).

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. I think we're waiting for fresh coffee. But fresh coffee with high quality (max) as well. So you keep motivated. It'll come. It'll be there shortly.

So I'm just wondering where we take this. I think it was a little bit - thinking about this from a structured meeting point of view. I think it'd be quite useful to sort of wrap up the Design Team work now. Take our break. And then come back and talk with ((Sydney)) and get into some of the advice and their response to our request for advice or input and so on.

But a couple of thoughts really. Obviously we've had the input from the CCWG this morning. And that offers us - sort of offers us a platform. And we certainly need to cross check and ensure that the requirements of the CCWG are being met. Including reviewing the CCWG's stress test that we talked about doing.

I'm keen to understand exactly how the contingent relationship between our work and their work will pan out. I think - I know that that's something that Jordan for example is keen to see. And we need to make sure that that link is properly understood. And cemented. And that we can have confidence that into the (unintelligible) we're building our understanding on its works. That's all about Work Stream One.

In other words those mechanism required for a successful transition on which our work is essentially contingent. We have a plan tomorrow morning to assess the work of the Design Teams. But I'd love some input from you now to inform that session. So that we can use that as kind of planning information for that session.

You know, we've covered the key subjects. Some of the things you might want to suggest is "are there any Design Teams that anyone - that's come out of today work that you think should be on the list as a perspective Design Team?"

You know, we've done a reasonable job I think of separating out the functional and structural components of the discussion. And on more than one occasion I think we as chairs have acknowledged two things. One that because of the interdependence between the Design Teams you can't completely parcel them off. And there's an (execrative) component to it. We made an analogy when we set this up. In Singapore this was analogized to the agile software development. Where you go off and do the work. Bring it back in. Check for this meeting the spec. And cross check the Design Team's against one another.

But also that these will need to iterate one or two iterations further once we understand the - how the structure discussions panning out. I know they don't exist entirely independent. There's a degree of artificiality separating them. But it's a useful device to make solid and concrete progress as we were under some - under essentially a requirement to do in order to produce a response to the (RFP).

So really-- what I'm doing is opening up a broad-based comment on the effectiveness of the Design Teams. The scope. Have we gotten them all in there? Any other things that you feel haven't come up that you'd need to see as we move forward towards knitting these into a proposal.

So there's three hands up. And we'll go to them first. And then see if any other join it. Jordan go ahead.

Jordan Carter: Thanks Jonathan. Jordan Carter here for the records. I was just wanting to come back to my previous question/suggestion whether there should be a Design Team to design the terms reference for the Customer Services Committee. That's all.

Jonathan Robinson: That was the (unintelligible) for terms of reference (Gregory). So let's just - we will - I think we'll probably capture that. Because what we're going to do just so you know we're going to huddle at the end of this. And look through the notes. And pull out the actions and try to knit all of this together to prepare for that. But it's a good point and thanks for reminding us. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes. I think that there should be a Design Team for the IANA budget. It was suggested by (Aubrey). And I think it's kind of two fold Jonathan. I think it would be very good if we looked at it in light to possibly giving some input into the budget process that's under way.

But secondly the longer term in terms of the needs. It's a - in the short-term in our comments we can actually maybe impact some change in the next fiscal year. The longer term of course is - may go a little bit beyond that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck. I know that Lise wants to respond and I suppose a third component of that is what - in case of - explicit in what you're saying is that we're our driver's budget drivers for the CWG.

Woman: I think it's a very good idea Chuck to have a Design Team on the budget. It's also been something that the Accountability Team has (unintelligible) to say. They're going to have budget as one of their issues. But specific IANA budget is not going to be fleshed out in their part.

So if we want this to be a part of this we need to have our requirements specified. So I think it's a good idea. And I also know that being a part of the (HRNT Two) Team that we handled some of this. And I think that could be also some integration for what's at stake. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Mindful of that requirement for coffeecakes and of course the later session, I'm going to close the queue at this point. So Chris Disspain is last in the queue. And Olivier is next in the queue.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks very much Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And I have a question with regards to the number of pages that we're going to generate out of these Design Teams. You mentioned earlier I think this morning that there needs to be some kind of a balance between the different proposals. On the one hand the protocols. The other hand the numbers and the names proposal.

And seeing the amount of work that's been done here. I'm absolutely agreeing with the amount of work that is being done. I would perhaps ask that we keep track of how many pages we're generating here. If we end up with a proposal that's 500 pages in length we've got a major problem on our hands.

Similarly speaking I think and I'm sorry if I couldn't allocated to anyone but someone in the group I think put on the mailing list that the perfect is the enemy of the good. And we need to make sure we don't overcook this report. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Right. Two things. One I think you might be quoting Greg and the perfect being the enemy of the good. But I'll leave him to confirm that or not. We have a kind of - vision. And if you like that word but a view of what the proposal will look like. There is going to be in the view of the co-chairs a -

what I would call a short form proposal. A short form proposal will have all of the headings required by the RFP. And by the directly comparable and sit easily side-by-side the other two existing proposals.

In addition that will be supported by a long form proposal which will be in essence exactly the same proposal. But with significantly more substance --in it for those that require that substance. And then a third component will be work with the Communications Specialist. And I'm ready to fill that down into a very short communications form of collateral. So that can be used for - for the purposes of those that are not interested in the proposal as such.

But the essential outcomes of the proposal. So that's the way we envision it shaping up. And much of this material these pages that you're talking about will end up in the long form. But not necessarily in the short form.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I'm very glad to hear that. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Olivier. Okay. Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I wasn't on the call when the Red Team was first conceived. And I asked about it on the next call. And my vague recollection is it included functions like checking for coherents and gap analysis. We're going to be doing some of that as we go forward in the next day in a bit. I think the Red Team needs to be convened.

So going forward after tomorrow we're doing that on a semi-regular basis. So I think that group needs to be pulled together. At least part of it. Because Point Number One. Point Number Two is we may need to have specific requests from the CCWG. That is we identify accountability measures which aren't the

more general ones that we want to see. We've already talked about a few of them.

I think we need a mechanism for making sure that those are tracked. That maybe the chairs, co-chairs responsibility. Or we may want to delegate it to someone else. But I don't think we want to drop the ball on that one. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. I'm wondering if the stress tests are essentially that the crosscheck in the stress test will essentially cover that second point. Hopefully, that's the intention. Okay. Stephanie.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Going to back (James)'s presentation. I think we should have a design team on the non-technical aspects of a transition of the IANA functions with a particular focus on how the IANA functions would be funded and supported post transition.

Man: How the IANA functions transition?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. I suppose that - I would think that's budget. But that's an interesting one. That's a question for budget. So let's discuss that (a moment) because I think there's two different issues. One is our capability to separate in the event of that requirement. And the second is, are we talking about the funding to support a separated entity?

So in a sense I suppose that's a form of tests. I was wondering where that fits in with us? Let's think about that. Let's make up - let's get the point on record. But it's really - it doesn't make - I'm not sure I have a view on that yet. It may be something we need to discuss more. Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. A couple of random unrelated comments. First is a general plea to provision Design Team G on the IP because the other two groups submitting proposals have already dealt with a number of IP issues. And we need to catch up with them so that we can correspond with them. I think that goes to larger point of us corresponding more with the other two groups. I think that we received a request which maybe is being dealt with later our agenda to kind of inter-relate more with the other two groups. And clearly are new proposed model for our proposal is intended to allow for greater correlation between the two.

Second just as a point of clarification I don't understand the request for a new Design Team for terms of reference for the customer standing committee. I'm just not sure how that differs from the existing Design Team on the Customer Standing Committee. So maybe I'm just not getting something.

Jonathan Robinson: It's a good point. Because it could easily be a follow-up I would imagine from - I'm getting (unintelligible) eyes from -...

Man: I can tell you from the back of the room here that Jonathan would be delighted to...

Man: At least he's volunteered to you (Chris) so that doesn't count for the record. We'll leave that on record. That's an interesting point whether there is a follow on piece of work for that same Design Team. And okay. Thanks' Greg. Paul.

Paul Kane: So very briefly I think the earlier comment about 500 pages, 200 pages. That's a big "turn off." And you mentioned your Communication Team. I think as part of the consultation process if you're Communications Team can come up with some sexy pictures that convey the message, we might stand a chance of engaging the community. I'll take anything.

Jonathan Robinson: So for the record I'd like to be clear that even a two page document with this content I wouldn't consider a "turn on." But I think we've got a clear indication of what excites Paul.

Paul Kane: I think the sexy pictures you have to have Page Three. Don't you?

Jonathan Robinson: So I think that sounds like an opportunity for a break. Thanks very much. We'll see you back here in 15 minutes or so. 15.5 actually.

END