

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
April 15, 2015
1:00 pm CT**

Coordinator: The recording sir has started. You may proceed.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And we just lost David. He'll be back I think.

Chuck Gomes: And Chuck is on the call as well Bernie.

Bernie Turcotte: Good. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. We should be able to dial back into it Alan but he's not here currently.

Alan Greenberg: I'm sorry Cheryl. I missed that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I said I'm assuming that David will be dialed either out to or is dialing back in. He's not in here currently. He was here and just...

Alan Greenberg: Understand.

Alright, sorry. Did I miss the - did we do a roll call or...

Bart Boswinkel: No but I can do one and note that the (unintelligible). Is there anybody just on the audio bridge and not in the Adobe room? We know (David Conrad) will be joining shortly. He's back in. So over to you Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, thank you very much. We have a document that was initially reviewed - an earlier version reviewed by (Bernie Turcotte) and (David Conrad) as we modified and reorganized somewhat and was sent out about two hours ago and a revised version factoring in comments David sent to the earlier version but I hadn't seen yet sent out I guess somewhere around an hour ago and that's the version that's on Adobe Connect right now.

We have received a number of comments from Milton and we'll try to factor those in as we go along. The timing right now is such that we are supposed to have something ready for the CCWG by tomorrow and my intent is to get it out by late today so we don't have a lot of options in terms of, you know, how many iterations we do of this.

The over - I've tried to arrange the document in two sections. One is recommendations that we believe must be acted upon - incorporated into the proposal that would be submitted on the transition and then identifying a number of areas that we believe should be looked at at some point, not necessarily before transition and perhaps not necessarily at all. Those are things that will have to be decided.

I see David in the chat saying he can't hear anything. Is David dialed in on his own or was he dialed out?

Bart Boswinkel: He dialed in by himself. He was in the Adobe room but he's not - he's going back in again.

Alan Greenberg: He is in the Adobe room right now or is he showing...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, yes. I just - I just let him in again.

Alan Greenberg: Okay but he says he can't hear anything.

Bart Boswinkel: No but that was just before he called in again.

Alan Greenberg: Ah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If I may in fact having done a lot of these calls via my mobile - if he doesn't hear now, you probably need to dial out to him. Don't ask me what the vague reason that all is but sometimes dialing out to a mobile seems to be better.

Alan Greenberg: Now he can hear but he can't talk.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes well we can't have it all.

Alan Greenberg: I'm going to let Brenda deal with that in the background and we'll keep on going. Hopefully we will be able to solve that before he needs to talk.

Alright, Milton made an overall comment saying this overall thing is far too long. I have absolutely no problem with that. If you recall during the first call, we said we better be very precise to make sure that everyone knows what we're talking about and I took pains to try to do that. We do - we are required I believe and (Bernie) and or Bart can confirm we are supposed to be submitting two versions. One is a one page condensed version and one is whatever full document we choose.

Is that correct Bernie? Is that something we're doing or is that a staff function once we finalize what we're submitting?

Bernie Turcotte: Well the summary - it's always best if it's done by the group but the idea is that there's a short form of recommendations as compact as they can be in whatever size document to support that as the group needs.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Going forward we're going to have to decide if what is in our second section is included in the short form or not or perhaps just a reference to it. Alright, the document is structured identifying the issues - first of all the issues related to the NTIA going away. That - sorry - the routine NTIA authorization going away.

I think I've used the word routine somewhere in this. I did that with a little bit of trepidation in that essentially the things that the NTIA authorizes through the system as opposed to major changes. So it does include re-delegations and such which are not routine but are part of the regular process. So if anyone thinks they need to change that word, just speak up.

The first issue is - sorry. The changes will be required to the function - to the software made - the software that currently allows NTIA to authorize the changes and I don't know to what extent. I'm presuming but I don't know for sure - Chuck you may be able to help - that VeriSign has no choice at this point but to wait. They cannot say I'll implement the changes without authorization.

Chuck Gomes: That is correct (Al).

Alan Greenberg: Okay so someone right now - either the software needs to be changed or someone needs to act as the NTIA in order to be able to publish root zones on a regular basis. So I think that's all the 1A is saying. Milton said we don't need that last sentence but indeed I think it is necessary because we want to point out on the short term the software does not have - necessarily have to be written. It may well be written well in time for the transition but we're simply pointing out it's not on the critical path.

One of the...

Bart Boswinkel: Alan Chuck has his hand up.

Alan Greenberg: Oh sorry Chuck. Go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. I sent some edits and highlighted some things in a document that I sent just before the startup because I'm way behind with everything else going on but why do we say in the very short term NA?

Alan Greenberg: Well because I'm assuming that the software which - and I, you know, I'm not quite - I think it's the software that VeriSign is running but it may be something related to what NTIA is doing also. As you just said, you're essentially prohibited from publishing changes without the authorization. Now either that software has to be replaced and switched on the day the transition happens or as David suggested and I confirmed with (Elise) that in the interim NT IANA could sign on as effectively impersonating NTIA and authorize the changes that they are submitting.

Chuck Gomes: And Alan this is Chuck. So my point is they could also take that over in the long term.

Alan Greenberg: Well yes but that's a rather crude way of doing it on the long term.

Chuck Gomes: Oh, you're suggesting that - okay so I don't think that IANA can take that over without NTIA doing something so I guess I'm not getting what you're - what you're suggesting here. It's...

Alan Greenberg: Is David in a position to talk yet?

David Conrad: Can you hear me?

Alan Greenberg: I can.

David Conrad: Lovely.

Alan Greenberg: I think David was saying was NTIA would give IANA the password and that could be handled that way but David say it for yourself.

David Conrad: Yes so as an interim measure, it's entirely feasible that IANA staff log into the NTIA UI and approve changes. That would mean that there would be no need for any code changes in the existing so it is a bit of a hokey approach but it'll work as a near term thing.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, this is Chuck again. So now - see I didn't pick up that's what you're talking about here in A so I just think - and we don't need to fix the wording here - but I just think we need to be a little more explicit that we're talking about it if needed - an interim solution - until the software can be upgraded could be this, you know, and say it.

Alan Greenberg: Right.

Chuck Gomes: That - I didn't get that at all out of A. That's why I wondered why you were saying it in the very short term. So again I don't suggest we fix that on the fly here but I suggest that it is more explicit.

David Conrad: I will do that - noted. The world I come from you make as few changes in exact parallel as possible. So if nothing else, it is prudent not to put two different software systems in place in the same day and then try to figure out where the failure comes from. So if nothing else, it would be nice to phase them in over a day or two even if the code was already done but that may be my anal way of approaching things.

Alan Greenberg: Chuck is that a new hand?

Chuck Gomes: Oh no. I'll have one on B but I'll put it down for now.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, alright. B says currently the cooperative agreement - there is a cooperative agreement between NTIA and VeriSign. They have said they're going to replace that in some way, somehow. We don't know the details. Once the details are known, we will then - can then react to it. We will probably need some level of agreement between IANA and VeriSign but that may be precluded by the form of whatever the new cooperative agreement is or something. So we can't really specify what it is.

Lastly there is a potential that NTIA will not do a transition at exactly the same time and therefore the cooperative agreement stays in force at which point I suspect there's some wording in the cooperative agreement which we'll have to change saying that VeriSign no longer has to wait for NTIA to authorize changes. I'm guessing that. I haven't actually gone back to refer to the words in the cooperative agreement and Chuck it's yours.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. In the third sentence there - I'm going to suggest some edits. They are in the red line that I sent around but they're simple enough I think to go over and I don't think they're terribly significant but because we don't know what NTIA is going to do and tying in with your last sentence in this, I suggest that in that third sentence we make these changes.

So the exact form of the latter transition is not currently known nor whether anything will replace instead of - what - okay nor whether anything will replace the current cooperative agreement.

Alan Greenberg: May I suggest what if anything?

Chuck Gomes: Well I don't care. That's the same thing.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I did this very quickly so...

Alan Greenberg: Yes, no you're fine.

Chuck Gomes: However there - and I suggest instead of will likely - there may be a requirement to have a formal agreement. It seems - it does - it may very well happen that way but again not knowing what NTIA is going to do, we don't know.

Alan Greenberg: That's correct. I mean clearly if - and I, you know, I understand not everyone...

Chuck Gomes: I'm only suggesting to change will likely to may.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. No, no, I fully support that Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: You know and although it's not what some people would like to see, if NTIA says ICANN you're now in charge of the cooperative agreement and you wish you want to VeriSign then clearly we don't need a separate parallel agreement. So we really can't speak to how it's going to play out at this point so yes, I think your changes are perfect.

Chuck Gomes: Okay and that's all I had there.

Alan Greenberg: And Chuck...

Bart Boswikel: Chuck can you put them in the...

Alan Greenberg: I'm not saying that's not going to happen. I wasn't predicting it was going to happen though.

Bart Boswikel: Chuck can you put them in the chat so I can copy them in?

Chuck Gomes: Okay, sure.

Bart Boswikel: That's easier down the road. I can open an easy document but...

Alan Greenberg: Well, you know, Bart I'm not worried. When I merge all of them together, I'll look at his copies. But if you can put them in the chat, that's even better but...

Chuck Gomes: I will. I just got to get to the right document.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Alright, C is something that David suggested. Do we want to specify as a recommendation that we've looked at whether other checks balances verifications are needed in light of the elimination? Now that means we have to do it in the next week or two or three or do we simply want to leave it as something that could be done as we go forward?

David Conrad: This is David. I'm sorry I can't raise my hand.

Alan Greenberg: Go ahead David.

David Conrad: The - yes my suggestion was actually just to one item that there shouldn't be a centralization of control that seemed to have some system within. The - it's on C. It would just be for the W2 recommendation but I actually asked this question. I don't have a strong opinion.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, you're jumping the gun a little bit. Right now it was the checks balances that, you know, do we want to add the kind of verification we are talking about to make sure that what NTIA or VeriSign publishes is the same as what IANA sent or that kind of thing.

My real - my gut feeling is there's no real evidence that we need additional changes. Going down that path to decide we do need some should involve a more detailed risk analysis and cost benefit analysis and we're likely to put into it and we should leave that as future work as opposed to design team F work.

David Conrad: Right and I guess the question here would be whether or not we want to make that as a recommendation that future work is needed in this area in order to leave it as an outstanding issue. I'm not sure what the distinction there is.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, I see what you're saying.

Chuck Gomes: And this is Chuck Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Because it's right along with what David's saying, what I actually suggested later - I changed the wording later on in number six to actually make that a recommendation rather than the way you did it but just I bring it in now because it's I think directly related to what David's saying. So I definitely think it should be a recommendation. Whether we put it there or have it in number six - I don't know that I care too much but I think it should be a recommendation.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. That I think is different from what we're saying here. The recommendation - the number six is the caution that we should not go to a single entity. We don't want a concentration of power.

Chuck Gomes: But that is a checks - the reason we want that is because of checks and balances.

Alan Greenberg: Well yes, okay but whether you - whether it's a single entity or multiple entities there may be additional checks and balances one can incorporate into the process.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: So C I think is a separate issue from that.

Chuck Gomes: Right and I think - I personally believe that it would be useful to make in this recommendation that this be a topic of exploration, you know, in the future.

Alan Greenberg: Oh, okay. So the recommendation is that this kind of analysis be done, not that something be...

Chuck Gomes: Exactly.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, that's fine. I'm happy with that. Milton to answer your question, a lot of what you were saying I believe and I just was skimming it as we're starting the call was to make it more concise. The - at the last call there was some concern that short hand was being used and we weren't being clear on what we meant so this version is indeed very verbose. My understanding is we are supposed to submit two versions - one well under a page and one perhaps longer and certainly the one page one will be much more concise.

I think the final - the full one will probably be somewhere in between what you're talking about and the very concise version. I hope that addresses it. I don't really have any specific comments because I didn't absorb them well enough to address the specific ones. If you want to highlight anything that you really want to discuss while you're still on the phone, please let us know.

Alright, the second formal recommendation - the second main recommendation is pointing out that the NTIA plays a large role and in fact after a long talk with (Elise) yesterday, it's clear now it's a larger role than I understood in virtually any change that goes on in the process - in the processes associated with the maintenance of the root zone - the management of the root zone rather.

And it was highlighted in - in a comment that comes up later in the report in this document on the publication of re-delegations. That is an alert saying a re-delegation has been requested or is being discussed and that was something that was put in the 2012 proposal to NTIA that IANA was suggesting it be done and it's something that three years later is now - is still being discussed. So NTIA - my understanding - my now understanding is they get into a fair amount of the details and the question is how does this get replaced.

I'll stop there. There's a comment in the chat from Kim. Is that - I haven't read it. Is that something we need to bring in at this point or not? Okay, no he says.

I open the floor to essentially point number two. Are there any other comments? It goes on for several paragraphs in the document. Yes Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I'm going to respond to Milton's suggestion. I just looked at it now for making it shorter. I wonder if Milton's suggestions for abbreviated texts could be used in the short form and then we use the more detailed text in the annex.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I think that's - I think we're going in that direction.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, good. Yes, sorry if...

Alan Greenberg: I thought I said something like that but obviously not clearly enough.

Chuck Gomes: You probably did but I'm reading the documents and trying to participate at the same time.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. No, the - certainly the short form has to be well under a page so there's no question that's going to have to be abbreviated. Any comments on the overall jest of it?

Now the question is are we going to make - and it's highlighted in the second paragraph - are we going to make a specific suggestion at this time as to who is it that's doing this, you know? Is it the CSC? Is it the something else? Do we assign it to Chuck as King or are we simply going to say that the CWG has to come to closure but it's not - but the DTF is not going to do it right now?

Chuck Gomes: Alan this is Chuck.

Alan Greenberg: Oh Chuck go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: We really - we need to be really careful as you know I think about suggesting that the CSC do it.

Alan Greenberg: No, no. I - that was a little bit tongue and cheek.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: As was Chuck the king.

Chuck Gomes: I got that one.

Alan Greenberg: Any other comments or do we have...

Chuck Gomes: So what about the go, no go decision or are you not there yet?

Alan Greenberg: I'm losing track of where we are at this point to be honest.

Chuck Gomes: You're in two, right?

Alan Greenberg: I think...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, we're in two.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, we're on the section of go, no go. Yes, that's exactly where we are. That's where the highlighted - the part is - the part that's highlighted in yellow. So the question is are we going to make a recommendation as to who is it that now has the new authority with the absence of NTIA or are we simply going to say the CWG must discuss this but it's not - we're not taking it as a DTF responsibility. Remember we're supposed to close down in the next week or two.

No thoughts?

David Conrad: This is David. This is David. I think that because of the sensitivities associated with various entities, you know, proposed entities are doing - I don't think - at least I don't have a good enough idea of, you know, what the roles are going to be assigned. I think, you know, or what would be appropriate for who. So I think it would probably be worthwhile to rate this as a recommendation.

Say that there is an issue here that - oh dear. Hello? Am I still on? Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I don't know what happened but you're here.

David Conrad: Man, it's an Adobe thing, man. It's really impressing me. So the - I think it would be appropriate to make a recommendation that you see that the - explore this and identify a party who will perform the sum of the oversight or

at least understand the issues involved with the oversight and identify if necessary a party that will perform that role. I don't care who it is and, you know, it could actually be ICANN as the IANA function operator but there needs to be some acknowledgement that there are verifiable NTIA performance in the context of the oversight of our contextual changes and that needs to be addressed somehow.

Alan Greenberg: You know, I tend to agree. I don't think we're going to get anything done in the next few days on this and there has been a moderate amount of discussion in the last couple of days on the CWG on exactly what groups do we have and who does what. And as you know, people have tried to put things into the CSC and, you know, they perhaps don't fit with the absence of the MRT and that becoming a periodic function. There may be a gap in who does what in the current proposal.

And until we have some more - a firmer knowledge of that - I'm not sure if we can identify whether there's a suitable entity or we have to invent a new one. So I think that's probably a wise - a wise change to punt it essentially to the CWG in general but not something that we can do in the very short term.

David I have a question for you though. How many - again this is out of date but you're the one we have on the phone right now or Kim if you're still on the phone. How often are these go, no go decisions made? It's clear that there are a lot more than just, you know, D and S sec and IPB6 addresses for root servers that the day to day things are being enhanced on a regular basis and there are no go no go decisions being made on a regular basis but I don't have a sense for is this something that happens, you know, daily, weekly, monthly.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Go ahead.

David Conrad: So - and Kim - if he's still on - can probably answer better but there's sort of different classes of activities, right. One of the things that exists within the current IANA functions contract is that essentially ICANN cannot discuss anything having to do with that IANA functions contract without essentially prior written approval by NTIA. So any time there's any sort of discussion or any sort of change, that has to be approved by NTIA which, you know, obviously has an impact on the day to day operations.

I don't believe and that's putting it mildly that a continuation of that practice would be warranted regardless of who fills that role in the future post NTIA. There are - the separate categories are structural changes to the existing root management system - things like ENSI, things like key rollover, things like IPB6 in which the infrastructure itself is being - there's a proposal to change the infrastructure.

Those changes are quite rare but the last major one was deployed to GNF sec. That was five years ago. The current one on docket is key rollover. That'll probably be another year. You can have six years in the future but those require a higher level of oversight than NTIA is able to provide themselves and that's why they go out to folks like (unintelligible) DHS or other entities.

So there are - yes I think it's important - yes I don't know what you discussed with (Elise) yesterday but my suspicion is it was in the context of all, you know, all the ways in which NTIA sort of asserts itself into the day to day operations. The IANA functions operator - most of those in my view are not really operational in the sense of it impacting the root zone itself or the root who is database.

They're more in the - how to say - sort of the presentation of the IANA functions operator and the relationships with their management partners and how those - how the activities of that operator are impacting the community in relation to the IANA functions down the tracks. That was clear.

Okay, thank you. I sense from what you're saying that yes, there are certainly different classes of these things. Just the example I raised of the NTIA - of IANA not having the prerogative right now to publish the existence of re-delegation of discussions - the re-delegation - the fact that a certain one is on - is under investigation says that currently they are exercising a detailed level of control not on the overall root architecture but simply on the operational details of what IANA does. So the question that will ultimately be asked is does anyone need to do that or can we trust IANA to do it properly with appropriate consultation or do we need someone else signing off on it?

Kim are you in a position to speak? I see your hand is up. Chuck did you want to speak first?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, mine's not related to this. I have to jump off now and go to a policy and implementation working group chairs call. If that ends early which it does sometimes - it's only a 30 minute call - I will come back in. At a minimum I will certainly review what comes out of this and provide my feedback later today. Thanks.

David Conrad: Yes and I've got several more hours of calls today. I'm not quite sure when I'm going to get this revision done but I will get it done as soon as it's physically possible.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

David Conrad: Okay, thank you. Kim you're on.

Kim Davies: Thanks. Can you hear me okay?

David Conrad: We can.

Kim Davies: Great. Yes, just to expand upon what David said, I think that you could probably categorize the kinds of things we go to NTIA for authorization into some different categories. They're sort of the structural changes to how regional management is conducted such as implementing an automation system. We went to NTIA with proposal for that. We got their approval and then we implemented that in 2010 and implementing root DNS sec and so on.

On the day to day we actually go to them quite regularly. You know, in the current environment we need to get permission from them to post any kind of reports on our website. You know, on a monthly basis they need to authorize before we're allowed to publish our performance reports on our website. You know, we need to go to them to get approval for the kinds of metrics that we report publicly.

So it's a relatively detailed arrangement where it involved at a fairly specific level about what updates IANA is committed to do. If we want to publish a new document on our website, we would send it to them for prior authorization.

For example I think a few weeks ago we updated the document on our website that describes how our public boards are conducted. We sent that to NTIA prior to publication. So that's just a sense of the current relationship I think just echoing what David said. I think that moving forward you would want to look at sort of what are the - what are the lines around what requires

community review and what are the elements that IANA's considered appropriate to be able to make the judgments on and then be accountable to the community after the fact for doing sort of these day to day postings and updates.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, thank you. You - a couple of questions come to mind very quickly. On the authorization of changes it has been set that essentially they have not rejected a change in peoples' current memory and therefore the - although the existing of the check of the authorization being there might have changed peoples' behavior, the authorization itself has not changed the outcome.

How often do you go to them for, you know, approval of publishing a new report or changing the format of something or something in that level of detail that they say no or that they tell you you have to modify it before hand - before you can do it and to what extent is it a rubber stamp and to what extent is there really acting in a formal capacity.

Kim Davies: It's hard to sort of answer that numerically. I would say that, you know, probably somewhere between five and ten years ago we were trying to greatly expand the amount of documentation available on the IANA website pertaining to the regional management function and other functions and at that time we were not approved to publish that kind of documentation. That's changed under the current IANA contract - the one that's been in force the last couple of years.

We finally - in the language of that new contract there was a framework under which we could publish that kind of documentation and so we've taken a number of steps toward increasing the amount of documentation. I mean without going into specifics about what those discussions were from time to time there's, you know, it varies between, you know, it's no problem, please

publish to minor editorial suggestions to some lines of documentation we've not been authorized to publish. You know, I can't give you a numerical answer as to how often it's happened.

Alan Greenberg: No and I wasn't asking for one. Alright so you're saying that they do take their job diligently and their answers vary from yes to suggesting minor changes to perhaps requiring minor changes to saying no. So it is a real function that is being exercised right now and therefore it's going to have to be replaced - perhaps replaced with nothing but it has to - it can't just be ignored and it's happening often enough that this can't be some - a discussion that we spend nine months - nine months having post transition.

It's something - it's part of your day - enough of your day to day life that we do have to think about ahead of transition. Is that a reasonable summary?

Kim Davies: Yes, I definitely think it's a topic that needs to be considered and, you know, I think it comes back to setting the threshold for what are the kinds of changes to the operational environment of which the community expects there to be some kind of third party approval process, you know, and anyway there's a line there and below that line is what's considered ordinary day to day updates to the environment and above that line are things that are material or considered important as that kind of review is necessary.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Milton asked the question do you know what the criteria was that NTIA uses to decide what could be published and what not? Is it a security issue or something else and your answer may be, you know, but you can't tell us but can you add any insight into this?

Kim Davies: Well I can't really speak for them, you know. They exercise their authority as the contract manager to advise us sometimes we cannot proceed with certain things. I couldn't speak to what their rationale is in a general sense.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

David Conrad: Right and this is David and speaking from a historical context because I obviously can't speak about the current contract - there were a number of sensitivities that were raised about ICANN presenting - NTIA was - in past history was quite concerned about how the IANA functions contract was first enacted. So there were times when I was actually called up on the phone and yelled at because I had, you know, said the US government was doing something or going to do something and I was informed quite directly that IANA is not a spokesperson for the US government, particularly in the context of the IANA functions contract - those sorts of things.

And I think what appears to have happened was that was basically encoded into the IANA functions contract to minimize the probability that that would ever occur in the future.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Milton has said and I support it 100% but I'm not quite sure how we do it. We would want to know what the rationale was for their decisions in the current sense because it might provide us some guidance. What path do we have - I think I'm asking this to staff - do we have to try to get that guidance from them or do we just have to divine what we think it was?

Kim Davies: Kim here. I mean that's not something I have a good answer to. I mean you might - you might want to share with NTIA but I would also suggest that, you know, it's really a question about what does the community want. I mean if the community is taking over oversight, what does the community believe is

appropriate and I'm not sure that, you know, beyond knowing that there is a role for the oversight of the IANA functions operator to approve certain changes, I think the community should decide what they want those to be and set up a mechanism for it.

I'm not sure that it's able digging into the past to know precisely the second chances of individual requests that have happened in the past.

Alan Greenberg: I guess I half agree with you. On the other hand if there are issues that we are simply oblivious to but are important, somehow we have to get in the loop. Well if they're just sensitivities of the US government, it's not as much concern but there may be real issues that we're simply not aware of so - at least I'm not aware of.

Kim Davies: I mean if I may just very briefly say that I think, you know, I've come to realize I've been doing this role for about ten years now. You know, every party has their own sensitivity and, you know, definitely having different perspectives on an issue helps.

I, you know, I can't speak to the validity of certain sensitivities. I think that whatever the process moving forward is having the model right that, you know, the community has input where sensitivities may occur.

I'm not aware of any sort of, you know, specific whole line of sensitivity that is pertinent to this discussion that you wouldn't otherwise be aware of other than obviously in government has a different perspective to ICANN. ICANN has a different perspective to VeriSign and CLD operators (unintelligible) have their own unique perspectives.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. I guess I agree with that. We have a - David you have your hand up so why don't you speak first?

David Conrad: Right. So yes, my impression is that, you know, one of the concerns that had occurred in ancient history was that by IANA staff or ICANN staff asserting, you know, information into discussions related to the IANA functions contract but it would - could have an impact on policy. In the what lanes version of the IANA functions contract, you know, there was an exclusive - exclusion of IANA staff from being involved in policy related discussions.

So I suspect that - I don't know for sure but I suspect that the more substantive aspects of this particular issue have been addressed, right but, you know, in the post NTIA future what it appears to be the case is that the community wants to insure that there is a separation of IANA staff away from any of the policy related decisions and that seems to, you know, that corresponds with what has gone in the past as a result of, you know, the changing IANA functions contract so that's just a continuation.

This - the other stuff about at least the things that occurred a long time ago about, you know, sensitivity associated with, you know, representation of the US government position. That obviously will not - that's not relevant in the post NTIA future.

So my suspicion or my hope maybe is that the focus should be on the structural things that have direct operational impact as opposed to the presentation of things and call that the stuff that IANA staff currently has to undertake to get clearance and see, you know, discuss, you know, particular approaches with implementation of policy with the community. All of that stuff can simply sort of fade away in the dark recesses of history.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, thank you. One more question. To what extent do you believe that a lot of these issues can simply be handled internally or go out for public comment? Are there likely to be things that are so sensitive that they need to be discussed outside of IANA but they should not be discussed publicly? And I'm being vague because I don't really have a scenario in mind. I'm just trying to phrase a concern. David or Kim - whoever.

Kim Davies: Kim here.

David Conrad: You know, so speaking personally - oh, go ahead Kim.

Kim Davies: I was just going to say I can't think of scenarios that can't be spoken to in the abstract when they're definitely specific to unique, you know, customers or unique situations and I think, you know, the CSC design team's wrestling with those kinds of questions. But I think I'm not aware of issues that can't be discussed openly then in a generic general sense.

Alan Greenberg: Yes and presumably if you have intelligent senior management, they will cover those in whatever way they are necessary if and when they do arise. (Bernie) and then David. Can't hear you (Bernie).

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you. Yes, I just want to make certain that we're in a way - dog's getting excited at the door - that, you know, from experience I think we've failed to get information from IANA not through their own fault but rather because they were prevented of getting it from NTIA but they were checking with NTIA as we've heard in the last few minutes.

In removing those requirements, let's not forget one of the things we were looking for in the CWG is insuring transparency and understanding from the community. If - I just want to somehow capture the notion that if we take

away the requirement to check for everything which I think makes perfect sense, I mean I think it obviously slows down things and creates overhead and the rest of it so that doesn't make sense in my mind and I agree with what David and Kim are saying.

However on the flipside I think we want to be understanding that there is some sort of a formal requirement to be open so that we don't end up going the other way completely. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, I'll give a completely unrelated analogy. As chair of ALAC I am bound by no government contracts or ICANN guidelines as to what I talk about in public and what I don't and consult privately with people on but there are plenty of both of those and you have, you know, I'm expected to use discretion and presumably anyone in a management position is faced with that kind of decision on a regular basis. David.

David Conrad: You know, so I think, you know, (Helen) and I were on ATRT2 together and one of the things that (Avery) had put forth very early on in the discussions was that there should be a default towards openness and transparency and I think in the context of particularly the IANA functions operations the default should really be focused on openness and transparency and I personally would very much like to minimize any confidentiality requirements that are placed upon IANA staff as a policy matter, right.

So there are operational considerations on occasion where confidentiality may be required. I actually can't - there might be some security related stuff that this is relevant to but I don't think there should - I think that I - my policy then should be open and transparent unless there is a justifiable and documented reason why it cannot be open and transparent.

So, you know, one of the challenges that I had long ago when dealing with doing the IANA general manager position was all these unusual requirements for confidentiality that didn't really make any sense in the grand scheme of things in my mind so I had to struggle to figure out how to present things in a way that kept those requirements for confidentiality but at the same time address the community's need to understand, you know, for example why today's were occurring or that sort of thing.

I'm hoping that in the post and tag world the vast majority of that stuff can simply go away because the IANA function - everything that the IANA function does works, you know, these are all a couple of databases. By definition they have to be public. So the interactions associated with those databases should in the vast majority of cases be open and transparent to allow the community to see exactly what's going on and why things are occurring the way they're occurring.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you David. I'll point out and Cheryl is saying similar things in the chat that in ATRT2 (Avery) did make those comments before that - the chair of ATRT2 - (Brian Kute) - who is also the chair of ATRT1 started off with the premise that transparency should be in the DNA of ICANN and I think you're just saying the same thing here. But the fact that it was said in ATRT1 and then came back in ATRT2 and the review team in a number of cases was very dissatisfied with how ICANN handled transparency implies it's not quite in the DNA yet but I think we're all agreeing on where we should be as we go forward.

Alright, this is a very long discussion. I'm not quite sure how I'm going to summarize it and try to be concise but I will do my best and I'm sure someone will tell me if I get it wrong. As I...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Chuck's hand's up.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, thank you Cheryl. As we go forward - as I said - there's going to be a really tight turnaround on this so I do appreciate quite answers. Chuck yes, go ahead. Can't hear you Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Sorry about that. I was on mute. I totally agree with David with regard to the fact that the root zone file is public so is root zone who is so but what we're talking about is timing with regard to sharing some of this information. If we're talking about making it public after it's already public, it should be a nonissue totally but if we're talking about transparency before it gets - the changes get implemented - that's different because you might be dealing with a public company that has some restrictions or you might be dealing with some political issues with governments with regard to their CCTLD's.

So I think we need to keep in mind when we're talking about transparency totally agree that if it's after it's already been published should be a nonissue. Nobody has a leg to stand on. But if it's before, I'm sure there will be instances where it is a problem.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you Chuck. Any other comments on this? Then let's go onto whatever the next section is. Three - the design team notes that IANA budgets must not only address the operational cost but also development costs and investigation and these can be substantial. To Cheryl or Chuck - whoever can speak - to what extent was this already implicitly in DTO or do we have to make it as an explicit recommendation?

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck. Well DTO didn't deal with it at the level of DTL that is suggested here. What DTL has recommended though and I think the working - the cross community working group has accepted - is a recommendation that

as the solutions get more well defined that we go back and look at these kinds of things and see whether the budget has adequately covered this and then that could be even after the budget's approved in June so depending on when the transition proposal is approved by the FO's and AC's and then ultimately by the ICG and so forth.

So I think we have a general recommendation that covers that but I don't think it would hurt to say something along the lines that this needs to be looked at as the budget process goes forward to make sure that it's covered.

Alan Greenberg: Yes and I'll point out that this is the kind of thing that may vary highly from year to year but it's clearly something which is going to be important that it be funded appropriately. Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Alan. Cheryl (Unintelligible) for the record. I just want to come in behind Chuck. I think what would be useful - see I'm following you again Chuck - that's a joke for the record. If in this document the DT does say something along the lines Alan of in addition to or following on from the basic recommendations regarding budget and the budget transparency by DTO, DTF specifically notes that and then goes into IANA budgets must not. Well even I don't really care about the must not.

What I do care about is include. I'd actually ditch the first part and go include a component to allow for the investigation development, etcetera, etcetera.

Alan Greenberg: Got it. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We've got to keep building it better. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Alright, the next section - that covers all of the - all of the things that were formal recommendations in this version of the draft. The next section talks about things that we think might warrant community discussion as we go forward. There was a recommendation by I think David that we put in the recommendation that four should be essentially mandatory that the community - that the community must make a conscious decision whether to proceed or not proceed on the items that are listed in four. Is there a general consensus that we want to do that?

I personally don't feel very strongly about that. I think simply identifying the issues and they'll either bounce up to be relevant or not in a post IANA - post transition era is sufficient. I'm not sure I really want to charter a risk analysis group as a mandatory task but that's just my position. How do other people feel about it? (Bernie).

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you, sir. Let's not forget that we've got two other levels of oversight and matching. We've got the equivalent of the periodic review team which will be doing an in-depth analysis and going through quite a lot of detail so that's an opportunity to identify and bring up these things. And the secondly according to where we are in the CSC, we would certainly have a significant conversation with IANA every year and publish some things and again so that would be an annual opportunity to look at these things.

I'm - so I'm just simply pointing out if we don't make a hard and fast recommendation here but simply list the things, I think that there are ample opportunities where these things can be picked up if necessary.

Alan Greenberg: Alright and we can even make reference to that, you know, that the CSC in periodic reviews will have opportunities to pursue these should it become something that, you know, might be necessary or of interest. David go ahead.

David Conrad: So this is where my OCD engineer hat sort of sticks out. I, you know, the structure of the group metric system - if it's considered critical infrastructure and if, you know, organizations depend on it operating flawlessly then I believe that we - it's necessary to look at these issues and I would actually argue for stronger language.

And so, you know, these are things that the CWG or, you know, that at some point in the future this must be examined in detail particularly as the transition proceeds because I'm afraid that if we don't and something falls through the cracks in the intervening time between in the post transition once we start and when things get into normal day to day usage, I fear that we would be held responsible in a way.

Alan Greenberg: Alright, that's a compelling statement. Anyone else? And I see some - any tick marks? Do people agree with David and we should put a strong recommendation in that the study must be done? That doesn't mean we end up implementing anything but that we look at the issues, look at the risk analysis and proceed forward.

I see no one commenting. That means you're leaving it to the discretion of the chair, correct? Okay. I will take it under advisement. And we have two people who I think are agreeing to leave it to the discretion of the chair but I'm not 100 - they may just be slow on their tick marks.

The discretion of the chair right now is edging towards following David's recommendation just for the record. To what extent can we or should we increase transparency? Alright, this is the question of what should be public and what should not be public. I think I sensed from the earlier discussion that we may actually want a recommendation explicitly saying to the extent

possible and practical IANA should be - transparency should be the general rule.

I think I heard enough statements about people feeling strongly about that. So if I don't hear anything otherwise and I see some tick marks, I think we've added a new recommendation or I think a new recommendation needs to be added on the whole issue of transparency.

Now the question is if we do that is five still relevant or are we just moving five up? Alright, five is actually - is speaking explicitly to changes to the root zone and that is can we or should we be looking at whether we can make these things public prior to the max lee being deployed?

Chuck's comment basically said that there may still be some issues related to confidentiality. That means we should not be publishing these ahead of time. I - that may well be an issue but I'm not sure that's a reason to preclude studying whether they can be made open but I don't think we're in a position to recommend it now. David.

David Conrad: Yes so I would, you know, I'm sure that Chuck isn't on the call at this point but my - I would suggest that, you know, there are phases of the - of the root zone management process, right. So the point at which a ping request whether it's for the roots and database or for the good news - the point at which the validation has been completed so and the staff has gone through and insured that the folks who are requesting it are authorized to do so and that the change makes, you know, technical sense and all of the various checks that are done by IANA staff.

At the point when that is completed, the only real difference between publishing that information at that point and publishing it after the root zone

has been updated is essentially a 12 hour window, right because, you know, there's no mechanism by which a change at least in theory from the point that it has been validated to the point where it gets implemented can be modified unless there's some sort of technical failure that occurs in between like the TLD administrator changes the main server after the validation but before it's not actually implemented - that sort of thing.

So you're looking at a very short window in all things considered and I would argue that what really matters is that the change has been accepted for processing because then it's just essentially an automated process to the point where it actually gets published. You know, before the validation is complete then I would agree that there's probably a good reason for that to be confidential information because it could be rejected. You know, there are various scenarios where you can imagine where that information might be sensitive in one way or another.

But after the validation then it's purely a mechanical process between that point and when it actually gets published so I don't see any need for confidentiality at that point.

Alan Greenberg: Alright but we're not at this point actually recommending lack - we're not recommending making those available. We're simply saying that it should be studied.

David Conrad: And I would agree that it should be studied.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

David Conrad: (Kim) has his hand up so he trumps my comments.

Kim Davies: Look. I fully agree with what David said and I just wanted just to add to make sure input that I think this is a semi controversial topic in the community and I think there's a consistent view as to what elements of requests should be public so I agree that more study is appropriate.

I will say that there has been a lot of feedback that in the specific case of delegation and re-delegation of CCTLD there is a - there is a view from a number of parties that this should be an opportunity for third parties to be able to participate in that process whereas today they might not even know such a request is pending. So that's something that I think that process will need to tease out and work out an appropriate transparency approach from the IANA to address those community concerns.

Alan Greenberg: Kim I agree and you'll note although it folds onto our next page with incorrect paragraph numbering that there is a discrimination between changes that are requested by the registry and those that have to do with delegation and re-delegation prior to or after the - this thing has in fact been approved. You know, clearly with CCTLD re-delegations it is public because the board makes, you know, the board decision is within a reasonable amount of time is a public issue that may well have - may well be published before it enters the root zone.

But the discussion of the existence of a re-delegation discussion and that's something that I made reference to earlier, you know, the RFC explicitly says the community needs to be able to get in on the discussion and currently they may not know the discussion is happening so that is problematic but they're two very different situations I believe.

Number six in our document is currently updating the root zone requires the active participation of three parties. Post transition there'll be only two and

this is where we get into that we're not - we're recommending that we should not have power concentrated. Do we - we talked about this as a recommendation. I'm not sure that it is relevant right now since we have no control over - as discussed earlier - what's going to happen with the cooperative agreement.

But putting - I think leaving it here is something to mention and we don't want to lose - lose a record of it I think is important. David and Bart - I'm not sure what order the hands went up.

David Conrad: Bart was first.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes just for the - say just for the conversation - what you already see in the notes was say a suggestion for language by Chuck so that's recorded.

Alan Greenberg: Alright. David go ahead.

David Conrad: Yes I was just going to say that sort of regardless of what happens with the cooperative agreement, I think making a statement regarding the principle that there should not be centralization of power is - it is appropriate, you know. If NTIA chooses to, you know, continue the cooperative agreement or whatever and otherwise chooses to somehow ignore that principle, I still think it's important that that principle be understood within the context of the CWG community.

Alan Greenberg: Okay so this is actually - we're actually looking at a separate section I think and I think the next one falls into it's not issuing - it's not issues regarding further study. It's principles that we believe should be adhered to.

David Conrad: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: And I think - I think seven falls into that category as well and perhaps even the transparency one does. Seven is don't do things that will unreasonably slow things down and I suspect the transparency one is another principle that must be adhered to going forward. And Cheryl in the comments - sure I understand what it says but...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's not relevant to your last statement. It was relevant to David having audio issues earlier.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Bart is that a new hand?

Bart Boswinkel: Apologies.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, okay. So is everyone happy with creating a new section on principles? It seems to be the thing to do in documents these days. I'm not seeing - one checkmark - that makes the majority. Thank you.

Anything else we need to cover? I'm not at all sure how I or with the help of staff am going to integrate all of this together in the timeframe we have but is there anything else anyone wants to add to advise us before we call this call to an end? Kim yes go ahead.

Kim Davies: Just a quick comment on seven. I'm just reading it for the first time. I mean I think it's conceivable that the community might come up with some kind of policy for the root zone management that requires further review than is done today and it might necessitate longer processing. My initial read is I wouldn't be so absolute and phrase it in such a way that, you know, a priority is fast implemented in changes and any changes that might delay processing or

extend - increase the speed - sorry - reduce the speed of processing needs to be considered carefully against what we're trying to achieve.

Something along those lines that - I would hate for this to be a hard fast rule that ultimately results in ICANN saying we can't do that because it will make the process slower even though there's a community mandate to do something in particular.

Alan Greenberg: Noted. Good point though. Any other comments? Cheryl pointed out accuracy is important too.

Man: Milton had one in the chat.

Alan Greenberg: Milton had one. Milton - we actually have two different interpretations of the separation of root zone manager IANA principle. One talks about concentration of power and the other about checking errors. I'm not sure I understand that.

Certainly when, you know, having two entities may mean they check errors but it may also mean they introduce errors. Milton asked what is the purpose of the separation and Milton is going to answer that I suspect. We have a number of hands. I'm not sure how many of them are old or new. Kim and then David.

Kim Davies: Sorry, old hand.

Alan Greenberg: Yes and Milton says no, he in fact is asking what is the purpose of separation.

David Conrad: So from my perspective one of the keys to separation of the roles of the IANA function manager or actually more granularly the ability to edit the zone

versus the ability to sign the zone versus the ability to publish the zone is to insure that you actually have what's called two person controls.

If you concentrate all of the power into a single entity then that single entity can either accidentally or maliciously change, you know, the roots of (unintelligible) base without any secondary checks to insure that those changes are appropriate. So if you have two person control, you greatly reduce the risk of changes that are done either in error or direct in their various purposes can actually get published and there are approaches that if depending on how you split out the actual tasks associated with root zone manager that can be done that would insure - that would minimize the chances that an arbitrary change could be made outside of policy outside of the expected norms of the system.

Alan Greenberg: I - yes than you David. I support the concept. I'm not sure it's there today though. Right now as I...

David Conrad: No and that is I believe a problem.

Alan Greenberg: Okay but having the two parties doesn't do it. Right now as I understand it - once the change is requested by a registry, IANA does not have the ready capability of changing the content of that - at least that's what I understand that, you know, if the registry types the wrong thing in mirror requesting the changes, they would have to do it again. They cannot - someone in IANA cannot fix it.

But if indeed someone in IANA could fix it then they could also change it to be something completely different yet something that would pass the technical validity checks. You know, it is a DNS server but it's just the wrong - or it is a

server but it's not the right one for that registry and that conceivably is something that IANA could do right now and VeriSign could not catch it.

I don't think the two parties fixes that kind of problem. Controls within IANA would fix it.

David Conrad: Right. So a two party control would insure that if a change is proposed that the change that actually gets implemented matches the change that is proposed and steps could be taken, you know, if for example the change gets published publicly after it passes validation of the IANA function operator and if the change that ends up getting proposed to be pushed to the root server, the auditor function that we had discussed with whoever that was could insure that the change that they received to be pushed out to the root servers matches the change that was made public after the validation.

And to answer Milton's question in the chat, it's actually both.

Alan Greenberg: I'm sorry. What was the question?

David Conrad: The question is is this - what was it - so you see - where'd it go? I lost it. Oh, are we talking about avoiding mistakes or abuses of power or both?

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Alright, I just wouldn't want to go overboard saying two party control fixes all of the possible things that can happen. It catches some of them. Certainly and the kind of change we're talking about would catch the root zone maintainer making an arbitrary change or an accidental change due to a software glitch. It doesn't necessarily stop anything in the intent process - everything in the intent process.

David Conrad: And what I've recommended in the past is that this be a topic for exploration by technical folks because I actually think a properly designed two party control system could actually address potentially all of those particular concerns.

Alan Greenberg: Alright, I'm not quite sure how I'm going to put all of this together but I'm going to try and yes Cheryl mitigation is a good word.

Man: Milton has his hand up I believe.

Alan Greenberg: Milton are you going to speak? Yes, go ahead. Haven't heard you yet.

Man: Milton you're so faint we can barely hear you.

Milton Mueller: (Unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: And Milton if you're saying no Milton we can't. I will use the cat instead - oh the chat. I thought you had a new technology here. While Milton is typing is there anything else anyone wants to raise?

Alright, his question is given the purpose of the separation, does it make sense for ICANN to contract with the root zone manager or should the contract come from someone else? That's a really good question and one that I don't think is within our domain to say how it's going to play out.

Anyone have any thoughts on that? Is this something we should be discussing? Is it in our domain or not?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Look, Cheryl here. I'm not sure whether I agree that it's in the domain or not but I actually just - I agree with David. I don't think it matters. It should

be able to be contractually constrained as robustly as it is contract through to distinct parties or contract from ICANN. It's - I actually don't care that much about who does the contracting. I care about what's in the contracting for that.

Alan Greenberg: Except who does the contracting controls what's in the contract. David let's try to wrap this up because we're running out of time.

David Conrad: Yes, I was just going to say that I think that those sorts of explorations are something that should be done. I think that the key is to state that the exploration shouldn't be done from the design team. I don't think, you know, I think there are arguments that can be made both ways and there are a bunch of different variations that, you know, exist in this space. I don't think it would be a good precedent as a reason.

Alan Greenberg: Oh, okay. So what you're saying is the current six which declares there must be no concentration of power should be changed to something saying that discussion must be had.

David Conrad: Well no, I'd say that there must be no - excuse me - no concentration of power and that help has to implement that should be important.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, okay. Of course all of that may - may be taken away from us by how NTIA chooses to replace the current cooperative agreement should they actually go ahead and do that but yes, life - we can't control everything in life.

Okay Milton says he agrees with the last formulation. Bart did we capture that correctly or does it need to be restated by Milton - by...

Bart Boswikel: It's in the recording.

Alan Greenberg: It's in the - I know but I'm not going to get a chance to listen to the recording again. Okay, I trust that between Bart and (Bernie) they'll make sure that was captured and I am going to call this call to an end and I thank you all and I'll try to have something out before I go to sleep tonight - whenever that is.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: What is this thing called sleep Alan? Go on.

Alan Greenberg: As you well know, I don't do a lot of it but occasionally it does help the quality of my writing.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks everyone.

Alan Greenberg: Take care. Thank you all.

Man: Bye, bye.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye.

Man: Thanks.

END