Transcription ICANN Singapore
ISPCP
Tuesday 10 February 2015
13:30-16:30 SGT

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.
On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#feb

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay anyway let me - I think we could formally start the meeting because of people are on the phone are also keen on that we start with the meeting.

My name is Wolf Ulrich-Knoben. I'm the Vice Chair of this of the ISPCP constituency and I would like to welcome you all here.

And if you don't mind we have also some people here in the room who are new faces as well, not just the incumbents.

We just would have a quick go around here to the table and tell me your names and your affiliation.

My name is Wolf Ulrich-Knoben. I'm from (Luttwig) in Germany. And I'm the ISPCP Chairman, as the Vice Chairman. And I am also a member of the ICCG which is the IANA Constituent Coordination Group. Okay please Malcolm?

Malcolm Hutty: I'm Malcolm Hutty from LinXs the Local Internet Exchange and Chair of US-British International Affairs Committee.

(Olivier Zuma):   (Olivier Zuma) from ECO and US (Patent).

Michael Otto: Michael Otto from (ECO) German Association for Internet service providers.

(Toshi):   My name is (Toshi) from Japan ISP Association.

(Alan Medlow):   (Alan Medlow) from Orange and also representing (Atno) and the (ISPCP) delegate to the nominating committee this year.

(Olivier Mereau):   I'm (Olivier Mereau) from Orange another (ISPCP).

Jim Baskin: Jim Baskin from Verizon. I'm a free agent.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I would like if you are not shy I would like to invite people sitting behind the table so as you can see we have empty chairs. We have - come closer to the table here. And it's easier for you may be as well. And I would like to ask you to introduce yourself please okay.

(Mark Huggenbergerr):   Okay. My name is (Mark Huggenberer). I'm originally from Switzerland and I am currently in transition to Singapore. So I'm trying to connect with the local community here and as well with the international communities. Thank you.

(Adrian Diara):   (Adrian Diara), (Academia) Georgetown University in Washington DC.

(Sebastian Goslings): Hello everyone. (Sebastian Goslings) here on behalf of AMS-IX, the Amsterdam Internet Exchange.

Tony Harris: Tony Harris from the Argentine Internet Association (CABASE) and an officer of the constituency.

Christian Dawson:Christian Dawson from the Internet Infrastructure Coalition.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thank you.

(Tian Licano):   (Tian Licano) from (Gos), Argentina.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thank you very much. And welcome also the participants in the background here. Christian can we come up with the agenda to the screen please?

Christian Dawson: Yes sir. There we go.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So we have a slightly full agenda today. We would like to have first to sum up a little bit what is going on the discussion concerning IANA stewardship and up the people as far as they've not been updated and then come to the point which really essential of us - for us here to talk about with regard that - regarding that item which is the to have an open discussion about what is on the table at the time being from the naming community.

The models they are on the table. And to find out what is open for us, what is important for us to know and how we - how can we proceed with regards to find to kind of view, a comment view within our constituencies with regard to those models. So that would be a major target of today to achieve.

In relation to that the third agenda item accountability is essential to that because it is a direct input, a direct link to all these activities regarding to a stewardship and it's essential also linked to the timetable.

And we have on the agenda the universal acceptance which we talked about this morning with the board. And we would like also to have an update and to know about to discuss how to proceed with that.

Point 5 (unintelligible) a review and structure reform, I suppose a little bit that staff is also may be helping us in that way. I'm not really sure about that but

maybe if it could be or otherwise we have some slides available to start the discussion.

And then which is also a very important point for us is it seems longer time we have outage activities on the ISPCP and we would like to talk about and in order to really achieve more attendance and awareness within the ISPCP world.

I'm happy to see a healthy coming in stepping in Tony. And I've I guess it's the right moment just to hand you over just introduced all of us, not you yourself but and the agenda items and then you could really start with the meeting. Tony please.

Tony Holmes: Yes, I think there was confusion because the meeting was actually scheduled for 2 o'clock not 1:30. But we've used our time wisely so that's OK.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So I do hope that the - didn't lose any people from the telephone connection because they are of the opinion right now we're starting 2 o'clock?

Tony Holmes: Possible, did we asked the people on the phone to introduce themselves?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No. Is there anyone on the phone?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Sir, can you tell if there's anybody on the phone?

Tony Holmes: We might when they join at 2:00.

Man: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Man: So we should keep...

Man: On sorry about that I was...

Tony Holmes: We should keep an eye open.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Tony Holmes: Yes so maybe you could let us know they might come in at 2:00 as scheduled.

                So we used our time wisely. That's the main thing it seems. So welcome to everybody as I wasn't going to start. Tony Holmes, the Chair of the ISPCP.

                I just wanted to check is or anyone here from the fellowship at all? Any new members from the Fellowship?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: And official schedule (unintelligible).

Tony Holmes: Okay. And I'd also like to...

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Tony Holmes: Fine. Would you like to come and join us (unintelligible). at the table

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Tony Holmes: I want you to feel a part of this. You're very welcome here so...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Tony Holmes: No I don't need that, not for now thanks. Just to say who we are can we move to that next slide? Yes so really just to position where the ISPCP is we do

represent ISPs across the globe. We're part of the Commercial Stakeholder Group. And members of this group also sit on GNSO council where we have two seats.

You don't need to attend all ICANN meetings to participate. We do have a number of email lists both from a technical perspective and a ICANN policy list.

And we would welcome anyone who wants to register their interest in becoming a member. And if you need to get added to any of the mailing list and Christian is the man to speak to, has the magic keys to the list.

So with that brief introduction I think you were looking at the agenda earlier Wolf...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Tony Holmes: And I'm sure we've got now through that item too which were the issues around stewardship. And I think there is a presentation that we we're going to follow on with.

So what I would suggest is that we take the opportunity Wolf for you as the ALAC representative not only from the ISPs but also from the Commercial Stakeholder Group on the Coordination Committee to guide us through this point. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Actually I - thank you Tony. I would like to bother you with a strong and long update. So we had certain opportunities over the weekend and until now to hear and to see where those various coordination groups are staying.

But maybe for those who are not that close to the process in total just two or three slides about that. So give me the first slide.

So this is it shows how the system of the approach to the IANA stewardship is organized here so on the left-hand side you'll see three groups.

There's the so-called ICG, the IANA stewardship Transition Coordination Group where I'm a member of. And it consists of at least 13 or 14 different communities, representatives of the communities.

So in total we are I think around 25 members and so including the Commercial Stakeholder Group here from the GNSO other part from the GNSO as well and ISOC IETF outside the ICANN the direct ICANN world.

This group has to solicit proposals which come in from the various let me say user groups or groups who are in direct relationship with IANA services.

So on the left-hand side the CWG is the Coordination Working Group, the Cross Coordination Working Group within ICANN on naming, on naming functions.

And the (CRIS) team in the middle is a coordination group with regards to the numbering part of the IANA services.

And the IANA plan group on the right-hand side is on the technical community which is related more or less to the IETF, the International Engineering Task Force, I think so yes and working on technical parameters, portfolio parameters with regards to the IANA services.

So that it's in total. And these three groups are providing and preparing their proposals with regards to the stewardship transition.

So what is the status right now? We have received already two proposals, one from the IANA Plan Working Group with regard to the technical proposal and one from the (CRIS) team with regard to the numbering proposal.

Just a on a very large scale the result of the proposal are the - these communities are satisfied with the existing model how it runs, how IANA is placed within ICANN, how the service is organized. And they would like to continue that in the future.

However it means there will be some one leg is in case it is transferred from the NTIA is a stewardship there must be something to replacing that.

And that is what they have in mind a total internal solution that means they have SLAs with the IANA and a technical and a contractual relationship that way.

And they would like to just transfer that and tell that other (unintelligible) with the NTIA it's not a big deal to them.

So the other thing is the Cross Community Working Group within the names which is a little bit more complicated. And they have provided - they have worked hard until now to provide a solution but it's not a final solution yet.

They have four models provided and they have asked for a new timeline to a with - to provide the proposal in June if possible depending on certain conditions. So that's the status. Next slide please.

Man: Supposed to go. Oh there we go.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. And that is then the - what I'm referring right now to the proposal from the CWG with regards to the naming aspect.

And they are different elements of the proposal, the draft proposal which was sent out for public comment in December last year which contains a contracting solution with an outside contractor and some elements regarding establishing some teams internally the community with the community right

which I control of the whole process. We will come to that later on in more detail.

Next slide please. Next slide, so and what I would like to emphasize so before we go in a detailed instruction is so we have solutions more related to an external part which means the stewardship function is going to transfer outside ICANN and the internal one is that the NTIA who holds the stewardship function right now is going to transition that to a - to ICANN internally. And ICANN internally has (unintelligible) is a community to organize how it should work regarding the accountability to itself as we say in this respect.

And these are the two ways at the moment. So there is no decision being taken about that. There are two solutions on each side or two suggestions on each side.

And so our idea now is to go more in details with those and try then to discuss it in order to find a common proposal for us or a common way how we should proceed from the ISP point of view.

I think I should stop here Tony and hand over to you if you don't mind here.

Tony Holmes: Yes thanks Wolf. I mean this is the...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Or yes, if there are any questions in general.

Tony Holmes: Well this is the key the key part I think for consideration here because some of the dialogue that we've had here has been very much around these two models and two options although there are options within each.

And one of the things we haven't actually done as a constituency is really head towards either version of these.

I'm aware Malcolm you've particularly been involved in some of this process and given some input on this but not on behalf of the constituency at this stage but on behalf of your organization.

I - would you like to actually comment on this because I think your as close to this as anybody around this table?

Malcolm Hutty: Well it's not an easy one to comment on to be honest. Speaking personally I think that something that may be helpful to those that are not closely involved in this trying to work out what is the difference between these two.

I give my personal selection. I don't think there was differences to participants in the discussion. I think they are.

You have two very strong camps in this discussion pushing the internal model or the external model thinking that this is the most important thing in the world.

But they're both speaking a degree of separability, that is the ability to push the button to say this is going to have to be moved away from ICANN in the ultimate results.

But there's two different mechanisms to be able to push that button where you're trying to ensure that it will get pushed if you want it to get pushed. And just as importantly that it won't get pushed when you don't want it to be pushed.

Now the criticism of the internal model or the external model people have is if it's internal to ICANN you can never be sure of that will be pushed. It's maybe not possible to push it.

The criticism that the internal people have are the external thing is you're creating this whole new structure that would be able to push this button. And

that might be just as problematic and might end up being pushed when it shouldn't be.

And it might be just as problematic as the system that we've got within ICANN at the moment.

But even that criticism has its own problem and that's this. The internal model depends on some variety of trustee. And sometimes it's in two variations of the internal model.

In one it's called a formal trust and in the other one it's actually something that probably when the lawyers have run over it will turn out to be the same thing.

But in that case you still got a trustee who's going to end up being the person that pushes the button or the entity that pushes the button.

And so you then got the same questions. How do you know that that organization or entity or trustee is going to push the button when you want it to and not going to push the button when you don't want it to?

And you get the same accountability problems so for that function internally as you do have if you put it external and create a Contract Co and an MRT and all the rest of it.

So these are really tough problems. And people are wrestling with them as best they can with these different models.

But I think the distinctions between these models are, you know, really fundamental to them. I'm not sure I agree they are different approaches that each have their own - they each have much the same problems, not even different problems but the same problems in (unintelligible) proposals.

Tony Holmes: Thanks. Do you feel that it is justified without getting to the stage where
                 obviously this is linked certainly to the Workstream 1 accountability issues
                 which we're going to talk about later and look at those questions?

                 But do you feel we can actually accept there's not that much difference
                 between these without getting to the stage where we have qualified that with
                 the legal advice? Because that could fundamentally change what you just
                 said?

Malcolm Hutty: I don't want to give the impression that there isn't a difference between these.
                 These are different ways of going about the same thing.

                 What I'm saying is that whichever model you go for you need some kind of
                 governance mechanism within it to ensure that the entity that you just created
                 or structure mechanism that you just created will act in a way that you're
                 hoping for it to. And in both cases there's a lot of questions unanswered
                 about that.

                 So it's not that there's no legal distinction or indeed that they might not end
                 up being very different if one of them develops and highly plausible and
                 detailed way of holding that system to account and the other one hasn't yes.

                 But I'm not sure that it's inherent that one or the other is going to end up as
                 being more attractive. It's whichever group gets there first as having really
                 answered those questions.

Tony Holmes: If it's purely - sorry. If it purely comes down to that then one of the
                 discussions about it must be about the effectiveness and efficiency of the
                 model and they are quite different but Wolf?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I'm just wondering, you know, how are we going to proceed now.
                 Because you come to the point I think that's what we need really is in order to

make it more transparent for us, for all of us now to look at the models, you know, to look at the models, you know, to look at the models.

But we have one point this is external internal. It seems to be to some extent these are kind of in the discussion kind of blocks, block buildings only. So one is one block is close to the external because they think yes it's better, it's outside ICANN it must be good. So well this is something yes? So what you hear from the community sometimes, yes?

And some of us are thinking okay the others might be easier because it looks complicated external if you look at the details.

So why don't we go to those models right now. And I expect also from the CWG in the end and they come up with the proposal they have to find something. So they can't come up with okay we have four models, just take a choice also that is not possible.

So the question is how they are going forward moving forward to find it - their choice? And this is a question as well to us.

And as a technical people normally you think about it okay if I have several alternatives I try to sort it out with the kind of criteria, kind of set of criteria (unintelligible) not clear along which we are going to discuss that. So we should maybe we should talk about a criteria to present in order to find to go that way before we go in the discussion of several inverse aspects of that.

Tony Holmes: I think that's good advice as well. We have actually got within this slide set as well there is more information. Maybe we should step onto the slides that give a little bit more information about the model.

I think it's if you go through where it says external models. Yes so that this is where it brings some new parties into the whole proceedings.

And I assume people have at least got an understanding of what has been built here although I think there's a common understanding of how it fits together and what the issues are around each of these.

Wolf is there any particular aspect of this you wanted to come to? You mentioned models in the structure before we get to a criteria?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No (unintelligible) no. Just in case now people are not so either involved or not aware of questions for understanding about the one of the other model so they should come up right now with those questions and then we can solve these first and then try to go along.

Tony Holmes: Well one of the things that seems to have happened certainly within the discussions that have gone out on the mailing list is that this started out as a fairly simplistic approach in terms of the formation of these different entities that are required to make this work.

But we seem to have got beyond that now. And there's a level of complexity around the formation of most of these new entities that wasn't anticipated to start with and where it actually mentions for instance on here that the Contract Co should be a small and lightweight company.

I think there are various elements surrounding that that have come up and discussion that would suggest it's not as straightforward or as simplistic as has been suggested. Would you agree with that Malcolm and Wolf?

So that what is presented here was okay as a concept that appears almost by the day to be getting more and more heavyweight and more complex and a lack of understanding of how it would fit together.

So the idea of actually coming up with a set of criteria on which to judge the two models side-by-side seems to be more and more appropriate.

So are there any specific questions that we could help with in terms of the understanding of what any of the issues are surrounding these entities or how it fits together? Olivier?

(Olivier Zuma): Yes. I wanted to tell little bit of the next step what's going to happen, who is going to decide what proposal is going to be sent and how (unintelligible) process?

Tony Holmes: Okay. Before we go there can we just go on to the next? I think there's one on the internal models as well.

Well the first decision about this is probably if you're going to look at the two structures is the internal versus external.

And we looked quickly at the external one. We should now probably look at this one as well. Anything you specifically want to point out here Wolf or Malcolm at all compared with the other approach?

Malcolm Hutty: You were questioning a moment ago whether the my (unintelligible) is actually these aren't all that - aren't as different as they look was overstating it. And here as and everywhere there is a risk of that yes.

This golden bylaw motion right, that is - it is very much a question, a legal question as to whether actually that could work. And that's one to some extent really that's one for the lawyers.

Tony Holmes: And that's the debate that's really flourished in the last...

Malcolm Hutty: Yes it's...

Tony Holmes: ...48 hours or so.

Malcolm Hutty: ...essentially if we have the Golden bylaw model and there were some sort of trustee or something or whatever the mechanism is that it makes use of that bylaw to get rid of the IANA to export the IANA function from ICANN.

                  And at the same time the ICANN board says no, don't take it away from ICANN which would prevail? That's a legal question.

                  And before going to the internal model route you would have to verify that ultimately the board would not prevail otherwise it hasn't done what it was intended to do what it's claiming to do which is provide that separability over and above the board's desire to maintain unity.

Tony Holmes: And the initial feedback of course from the ICANN lawyers is to say that that wouldn't prevail? That it would leave the, let's say the (unintelligible) with ICANN as a board.

Malcolm Hutty: Yes. That is the statement by the ICANN lawyers. It is challenged by others.

Tony Holmes: Right. So it terms...

Malcolm Hutty: But if ICANN lawyers position on behalf of the corporation.

Tony Holmes: Sure, and understandable. In terms of taking this forward it - which is why I raised this at the start, it seems very difficult for us as a constituency to really discuss one model with the other before you know what full capabilities are.

                  Most of that appears to come back to the question of legal interpretation. And of course that will be - that poses two issues.

                  One it will be legal interpretation if this new entity was based in California, and so you have California law. And if they interpretation there aligned with the ICANN lawyers then the other question that raises is what happens if you

move to a different jurisdiction, do you have the same constraints? Is that an option?

So there appeared to be many unknowns in the equation currently. So your question about what I think it was - no it was (Olivier)'s question about how do we move forward?

I find that really hard before we've got the sum of all the parts so we clearly understand.

Malcolm Hutty: Well I would suggest this that...

((Crosstalk))

Malcolm Hutty: I would suggest this. If we at some point maybe now or maybe later come to the view that on the basis of the advice that we've seen we don't have faith in the golden bylaw model. Te just think it cannot achieve the separate ability goal. Then we say we don't like the internal model. We have to go with the external model.

If we don't have that view we should maintain just the principle. We want to maintain a principal. And therefore the main question is the governance or the respective models rather than giving our support to one model of the other and instead focusing on whichever model is chosen ensuring that the governance of it meets the other requirements that we have and which we will have a lot to say.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Wolf. You just mentioned again separate ability and you mentioned that is from your perspective that is the issue the question on with regards to that...

Malcolm Hutty: It's one principle that seems to have reached a consensus in the...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Malcolm Hutty: ...stewardship thing. I mean, you've noted - it's noted on the slides as being comments...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Malcolm Hutty: ...with those models.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: For me and for us now to fully understand is what is behind that, what is the (unintelligible) separate ability, you know, so we have at the time be an existing situation we have a kind of separability given in the NTIA contract so the NTIA is able to choose another operator, another service provider in case it doesn't work, you know, very well.

So it's principle to - there's a principle behind. That means there are two contracting parties and both would be as usual in a position now to be able to step back from the contract so that's usual.

So this principle at first is about that I would say is not questionable to have that available in a new form of arrangement.

So the question is then well if there are other perspectives, other views well you can raise it.

But I would say okay in future also if you have two parties besides who have some arrangement may be in a contractual way or whatever so there should be the possibility given to step back from that arrangement.

So now the question for me is what does it mean? Does it mean a separate ability in general? So in any case whatever happens that there is a party which could say okay I don't like IANA, what else and then I would like to be - that's - set to step back from the contract or I like it under certain conditions and which are the conditions does this happen on that?

So from our perspective from a technical point of view and ISP point of view we rely on those services. It's more related to the services which are provided.

So if a service has failed then okay we would like to get rid of it and would like to get the service from another provider.

So how is that discussed in this model? I everybody - every time I hear only separate ability so that means pull it out from ICANN.

Couldn't be there a solution also an internal solution which where it contains a separate ability option in operational sense? So this is my question. I don't know whether it's understandable enough but that so this is my question here which I would like to talk about if that's possible.

Everybody is talking about or many people are talking about how it's only possible if you have an external contract provider who is external of - from ICANN.

Is there any solution possible which makes it possible as well? If it stays with ICANN that also it could be the service could be taken from outside ICANN?

Man: Well I'm sorry.

Man: I got hijacked by a bunch of 17-year-old Malaysian dancers on the way that are performing tomorrow so you should watch for them, very cute.

But there is a third possibility which has come up on the discussion list which is admittedly where the external entity as an existing organization right? You don't spit out something from scratch because that's expensive and rather risky.

I mean I don't know how much this has come up but what if you handed the external functions to somebody like ISOC or, you know, somebody like that, you know, make a list of high star entities and which one of them would you trust with that?

Obviously some of them it doesn't work because they're beholden to ICANN. In some way they have a conflict. You know, maybe ICANN would work or they may have too much of a conflict with ICANN and they couldn't take the contract away easily. You know, they would have to have that kind of independence.

But that's what - I don't like that. It feels to me because if you spin up an organization it's expensive, it's duplication of effort. It's duplication of administrative function, all these things happen.

If you use internal you have conflicts right? You know, you have conflicts of interest.

So a third is what if you tried to find an external, an existing party that had all this overhead already established and, you know, they could act as the administrator, you know, the administrator of the contract I guess would be a way to say it? I don't know has that come up or, you know, did you need more choices and...

Tony Holmes: I - actually in reference to that on the list. And I think the principle of it is fine. The problem I have is that every time I look towards any organization, existing organization to do that it's really hard to do it where...

Man: I agree.

Tony Holmes: ...you can't claim there's some form of conflict.

Man: I agree.

Tony Holmes: That's the problem with that.

So it's a neat solution if there wasn't a conflict but (Olivier) you're looking (unintelligible) do you think that's...

(Olivier Zuma):   Just two personal remarks. If you discuss an external solution you automatically open up a discussion about who controls the controller.

And that is my personal view one of the big advantages disadvantages because they have a question about controlling processes that you have regardless if you're talk about an internal or external solution.

Of course you need a (review) processes. You need (unintelligible) in case things don't work the way you like them to work.

This is a question about processes. And I don't think that's an excellent solution automatically it's the answer to these problems.

So if somebody votes for an external solution or is in favor of an external solution you also have to discuss this who controls the controller and you could even discuss who controls the one who controls the controller. So this is the unlogical part for me regarding an external solution.

At one point and another point that was mentioned by Wolf-Ulrich I think it's very yes difficult for us as a constituency to find a clear position regarding external or internal.

But one thing for sure and I'd like you to emphasize that again the current contract teased the possibility of separation.

And whatever will happen I think and one important point is that any future solution should also give the possibility of the separation as an OTM

(unintelligible) view yet one can discuss about what are the conditions the reasons for separation that's for sure.

But maybe just to kick off something for a position of the ISTCP if we cannot decide about external or internal maybe we can decide about that we are in favor with a solution that of course in the existing contract has the possibility of a separation if it should be yes, as an item (unintelligible).

Tony Holmes: Okay. It was (Olivier) that asked the question about where we go from here in terms of the broader group and where they look towards taking this work forward.

And I would assume that they must also be considering this issue of the criteria by which they'll make some judgments.

And I wonder particularly with the remark that you made (Olivier) if we were to develop a list of criteria I wonder if that criteria for ISPs would be a little bit different or maybe focused on some different areas which are particularly important to us, an area operation where is - I mean the key thing for ISPs is you need some stability and security in the system.

And I wonder whether our criteria would be a little bit different from a broad criteria that would be mapped out.

Well I assume that is the next step Wolf-Ulrich and Malcolm. Maybe you can guide us on on this.

But we are at the stage where my understanding is that the decision's been made to get some external legal advice.

I don't know what the timeframe for that is. What else is going on to help steer that toward some form of resolution because you're going to have to

have a set of criteria that hasn't been developed as far as I'm aware in the broad group.

And I going through my mind was whether we should perhaps be doing that in terms of ISPs because the point you raised about maybe having some existing organization you can even make that judgment until you know what the criteria is so...

Malcolm Hutty: I think that's where we could add most value to be honest. I mean us going out and getting lawyers Is like how much does that help? There'll be other people doing that as well.

And to be honest I very much doubt that there will be definitive answers from lawyers anyway. There will be difference of opinions.

But if we - whichever model we go for if we proceed without having those questions much more clearly answered we're not going to be happy with either model.

And this - and it's very difficult to work through those questions and the more people that can apply their efforts to it the better. So I think that's where we could as a constituency could have most value.

Man: So (unintelligible).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes well to your question from a timeline I understand the lawyers input is expected by mid of March or so I think so, yes because so as you are and exploring sorting out which lawyer companies they are going to contact with and that is expected.

Well and under these conditions while they are also maybe to provide something by June so with regards to our input where they maybe would be helpful.

So I'm - I would take that, you know, to find out starting with some bullet points some criteria. So but if there is now here already input, you know, for that some questions regarding those models in general which we could put on this list it would be very helpful.

And then I would send it to the list so that they start this discussion internally. And I also would like to suggest I think tomorrow there is a working group, there's a meeting from the Cross Community Working Group.

And I could also input, give an input to that not with a list to that but just with the question of the procedure because the question is still open to my point of view how to proceed.

Everybody's waiting for the legal input. And then the question is what is going to happen then and how we deal with that and whether the coordination group is in the position also to work on print on criteria to sort out these proposals.

Tony Holmes: We can do that in two ways. We can start the discussion here.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Tony Holmes: When I say here start that discussion within the OSPCP.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Tony Holmes: But I don't think it's too early to actually raise that within the meeting here either because that everyone's going to have to buy into what the criteria is so the sooner other groups start looking at that as well.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I don't mean to come up with our criteria tomorrow...

Tony Holmes: No but to make the point that that is the next (unintelligible).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Tony Holmes: And we could work on it anyway I mean...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Tony Holmes: ...we could use the list of those questions...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Tony Holmes: ...maybe do it in the form of a wiki where we can (boil) in a few thoughts on this.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: You could try - I'll bring any ideas - okay just example, so with regard to some criteria with those - with regards to those proposals which it could take into consideration and put it in on the list if it would be helpful as well.

Tony Holmes: Well one of the key criteria was the very point that Malcolm raised about the ability to basically take some form of action that does override the existing organization that set that out. That seems - this issue of that the golden, I forget the term that was used.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Bylaw?

Tony Holmes: Yes the golden bylaw because that without that then it seems that one option is that it's just a showstopper for the whole thing.

Man: Did have a question?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Man: I'm very much an outsider. I'm from Academia and I'm only learning about this. But some of the early questions come in my mind as an outsider.

The first one is has there been any assessment of the IANA functions implementation today. Because when we are talking about either keeping internal or external function the question that comes to my mind is not being fully (unintelligible) where the function as being really done before transition.

So one way may be to proceed may be to really as said what you want the IANA functions to be. And based upon that add the criteria, technical operational and whoever can (unintelligible) criteria either internally or externally that can help decide on (unintelligible).

Tony Holmes: That's a very reasonable point in terms of the assessment of IANA. I mean the performance, the operation and performance of IANA is constantly assessed.

And in terms of where they are today from where they were a few years ago it's improved beyond recognition which unfortunately just lends you back to the key issue which is the issue of final oversight of the system.

Because in terms of its operational performance and excellence I think it was in the 90s, the 90% plus that people were happy with the performance.

So I don't think there's an issue about the ability to perform the task. That's fine. It's just this final issue of oversight that's the key thing.

And the internationalization of that moving it away from oversight from one government to an acceptable solution internationally. So it's more of a difficult issue because of that.

If - I think if everyone was unhappy with IANA then we've probably find is an easier task.

Man: Clearly. I just want to make sure that...

Tony Holmes: Yes, no in terms of where it is. And it's one person here that actually used to work for IANA so maybe you'd like to say something in his defense in terms of...

Man: In it's defense? It's really an important point and a very good point in something that is important to us.

                       All three areas of IANAN now under, work under service level agreements to their particular stakeholder groups.

                       And those service level agreements are what the - are the metric by which people decide whether or not they're meeting a goal?

                       The service level agreements in at least two of the organizations, the numbers part of the organization, the protocol organizations are reviewed annually.

                       So the service level agreements don't get stale over time. Instead what happens is that they evolve as the protocol parameter requirements evolve and also as the numbering requirements evolve.

                       Roots on management service level agreement is relatively new and it's one that - it's the only one of the three that's actually between IANA and the US government. That's the one that's kind of the odd one.

                       But I would say that it's important for the ISP is to have that is part of a if we're talking about criteria that the service level agreements are the trigger by which you decide whether or not the organization is meeting its stakeholders needs.

Tony Holmes: So that's got to be one of our criteria as well for making any...

Man: Again just that would be one man's opinion but it's the service level agreements that in the end help you decide whether or not they're meeting their stakeholder communities' requirements.

Tony Holmes: Yes Malcolm?

Malcolm Hutty: The - I'm going to be controversial here or I may be controversial here. But I would say that I think that this needs to be - we need to apply a linkage with the accountability issue as well.

                The question on the table is not how is the IANA function best running a government. Some people keep - would like it to be that. Some people would like to insist that it is that but that is not the question on the table.

                The question on the table is should the NTIA step away from being the contracting council party for the IANA function? And if so what should happen before that happens?

Tony Holmes: Well...

Malcolm Hutty: And that means that leads to a whole bunch of questions related to - that are not at all related to IANA are related to the answer to the question.

                Now if the IANA transition should not happen until certain ICANN accountability things are in place that's got nothing to do with IANA then no proposal should go forward that doesn't have as part of it what those things should be.

                So in terms of the set of questions how do we maintain linkage with the accountability track is something that we should want to emphasize.

Man: I'd like to ask a question because we're talking about linkage. We're talking about things that would potentially (unintelligible) timeline now.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Intentionally loaded question.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well but we have a ICG, the Coordination Group has set a timeline not - and it's also we can say in this circle here which is not a deadline, you know. It was perceived as being a deadline.

It is a target line was from the beginning when we set out the RFP for the proposal. And that is to meet September of this year because the expiring of the present contract, NTIA contract with IANA, ICANN about IANA.

So it is a targeted because this contract could be extended twice by two years each. So and it was said also several times by people on the NTIA restricting others. Well it's not the problem about this target line or this deadline 15th of September this year.

So now the ICG has a control of the overall timeline has input. And so we have in your timeline from the ECWG this in a best case scenario to come up by June this year with a proposal.

So what we are doing the ICGs we are discussing right now we would like - and this must be to keep the motivation not to pressure, I wouldn't say to pressure on the people or the motivation or to keep track of the work and not saying okay they lost their timeline and now okay it is not clear and if NTIA is saying okay you can extend by four years or so. This is not the case really.

So it should be motivated. So we still keep as a timeline as it is discussing with the CWG as well how realistic that is well as we approach the June of this year and then we can see what is going happen.

So but there may be some, also some more fine-tuning available which puts us in position now to keep that timeline.

Tony Holmes: And so just to summarize where we are purely on this element which is the stewardship what we said is that we would start to define criteria and we could carry on discussing it here. It probably isn't the best use of our time but we do need to do that exercise as ISPs.

It would also be helpful Wolf already gave I think you on our behalf raised this issue of trying to get some broader set of criteria work within the stewardship group that doesn't appear to be happening.

And it's almost on hold now because having listened to what you said about the timeline for legal advice that's a real holding factor.

So if we get to the stage where by the time that advice is coming through we've actually got some, a good idea the criteria is to be used. And I think the debate is moving forward. So we should plan our part in that.

And with Malcolm's point about linking it with accountability maybe that's where we should go with our discussion here now.

So let's move on. It was the second item or third item on our agenda. Let's move on to the issue surrounding this because on accountability there's a set of questions that had been posed and we should get to those and look at those.

If we could put up the other presentation?

Yes. Right maybe we should just step through these quickly. I think for most people the early ones we can probably just step through really quickly.

So the whole issue of ICANN's accountability very quickly got to the stage where there is the proposal to have two workstreams. They're both listed here.

The first one is identify mechanisms that must be in place within the timeframe of the stewardship transition. So elements that had to be addressed before there's any transition at all.

And then the second stream are the broader issues of accountability. And what happened here was that to try and define how they would work that there was some impetus to develop a set of stress tests that actually now would be able to make judgments around these things.

I can't remember how many items were on the list but it was about a page and a half and 25 is that? Yes and certainly the discussion we had from the mailing list in the ISPs around those to me suggested there was quite a divergence of views around those 25 points.

I know Malcolm as a member of that group you'd would actually gone in the (unintelligible) in your organization and highlighted what you thought were the key things.

When we looked at giving some feedback on that list as a constituency the list suddenly got a lot longer so people felt should be on it.

The good news is the list I believe I won't say it disappeared but it got taken off the table because my thing was the meeting that was held in Frankfurt I think there was an acknowledgment that getting any agreement on that list of 25 items was going to be really difficult.

So what they did was group them and put them under the headings of principles, so you moved the discussion up a level.

But the detail hasn't gone away. Those issues they've still got to be addressed sometimes, is that correct?

Malcolm Hutty: The way I would describe it is that they were, yes they were categorized and into categories of problems in the hope that we could then develop answers that would deal with anything that falls within that category so without having had the argument about specific items within that category just have something that would deal with anything of that nature, yes.

And then in the hope that once we've done that we'll come back to it and say yes this actually covers all of these things.

You can't really knock things off the list of stress tests and there's a reason for that. The proposal when it comes - when it finally comes out and goes to the yellow NTIA is going to need a broad community consensus of this to support it.

The items on that list of stress tests are items that some people think are not going to support a proposal if it still - if it doesn't solve this problem yes? That's what that means? That's what a stress test means yes?

And so while you could develop mechanisms that you hope will deal with the whole plus while thinking, while having a disagreement whether or not a particular thing on that actually fundamental for somebody it's fundamental yes.

And ultimately they are going to be applying their favorite stresses is one's that they care about to determine whether or not they support the outcome. So in that sense you can't knock things off the stress test list yes.

But as a mode of working forward rather than arguing about what's on the list they're taken the approach of well hopefully we can build some things that will

deal with this area and that area and hopefully that will end up having sorted out everybody's problems.

Tony Holmes: And that's what drove the list of questions that we're going to look at now is that correct? So maybe we should step on and move towards that list.

So within this presentation and we'll load this up on our Web site. I mean there's a lot of information about involvement what they set out to achieve, we move on again, a explanation of what accountability was, what we're really talking about, to whom should ICANN be accountable, absolutely key issue.

Now we get into the different so work stream requirements. That step on again.

A little bit more information about the two, different ways of approaching this within the working parties. A number of these have been developed so let's trek on again.

The second one is review and redress. This is the revised timeline. We already touched on that. And maybe that's something we need to come back to give Wolf a little bit of steer from our constituency perspective but let's go on again.

And I think the questions probably after this one if I'm correct.

Malcolm Hutty: Right.

Tony Holmes: So these are the key things that are going to help shape that dialogue to take it forward from here.

And there's been a request made at least a couple of times during this ICANN meeting for the community to actually try and get some steer and input back on these.

And the first one was actually the issue that Malcolm raised earlier. Maybe we can try and tackle these and provide that steer.

So the first question do you believe transition from NTIA should happen and the reasons for the answer?

Maybe there's an easier way of wording this is does anybody believe that it shouldn't happen and what are the reasons rather than the first one? Malcolm?

Malcolm Hutty: Yes actually I - my support for it personally is entirely contingent.

Tony Holmes: Yes?

Malcolm Hutty: I'm okay with it happening provided we can get the things done that needed to be.

But I'd much rather it not go ahead than go ahead without having solved some of the things...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: That's different.

Malcolm Hutty: ...(unintelligible) different place. Yes.

So when you pose the question do you think it should happen that can then lead to a okay we say yes and we say well it's only likely to happen if we do it

in this timeframe. And so this is as much as we can achieve within that timeframe so that's as much as you're going to get.

And I'm basically saying actually if that's the way that the answer this question's going to be used then my answer's no yes? It's actually no.

Well my answer is I'm okay with it happening provided these things happen. But don't place constraints in order to make it happen because I'm not going to accept those constraints. I'd rather have a no than a yes in that case.

Tony Holmes: Maybe I'm too simplistic but I think this is just a question of principle. It's nothing more than that.

So you can't put a whole host of caveats on it if it's just a question of principle even...

Woman: Well...

Tony Holmes: ...whether it's acceptable or not that the way it's going to happen is a separate question.

Malcolm Hutty: In that sense okay maybe I'm different then is the answer here. I'm more concerned about what happens when it happens than I am about whether it happens.

I mean I've given my reasoning. I don't need to take up any more time. You understand where I'm coming from?

Tony Holmes: Yes. I think you're mixing things up personally but (Mark)?

(Mark Hookendecker): Well I'm pleased and I off the record will show that this is one of these times where I agree with Malcolm and so that's it for 2015 by the way.

I do think that the answer - I don't think it's confusing anything. I think the answer is contingent. And the answer is do you - and the question is do you believe that the transition from the NTIA should happen? The answer is only if and then a set of criteria.

Tony Holmes: And the criteria?

(Mark Hookendecker): I mean there is a long list here and I think Malcolm could do a better job than I can. But only if number one the required accountability mechanisms are either in place or have been guaranteed to be in place.

I don't like the second clause of that. I've never liked it. I think they should be in place before the transition takes place.

But I keep hearing that language that there's some accountability mechanisms that might not be able to be put in place prior to the transition. That seems wrong to me but that's a language that's out there.

And then I mean I think there are other criteria and maybe Malcolm can do a better job of articulating them. But the answer to this question truly is contingent.

Tony Holmes: I'm not so sure you're exactly on the same page because when we talked about that list of 25 items I think Malcolm had actually noted four or five of those that you felt were - it was absolutely contingent upon those.

Your - I think you said (Mark)...

Malcolm Hutty: We may not even have the same criteria. We may or we may not. But actually in terms of the principle, the answer to that question you said it's a question of principle Malcolm I think to be entirely on the same page is to have answered that (unintelligible).

(Mark Hookendecker):   And I agree with that. And I think also the criteria is something for the constituency to...

Tony Holmes: Right.

(Mark Hookendecker):   ...agree to.

Tony Holmes: Which is what we said we would work on. It's the same list isn't it, exactly the same list?

                Okay. Any (unintelligible)? Jim?

Jim Baskin: Thanks, Jim Baskin.

                The - this question or the concept that some of the accountability mechanisms might not be put in place before the transition it seems to be rooted in a presumption or the wrong thinking that the transition has to happen by a certain time that will - they could be before these transition accountability mechanisms are put in place.

                If you can understand and I think we already talked about it but there is no deadline. I mean I don't know what happened if in two year extensions they still haven't gotten anything done what happens what - where - what happens to IANA in four years but well forgetting about that, if it takes three years to get all the accountability mechanisms in place we'd wait three years before the transition occurs.

(Mark Hookendecker):   Although we do need to take into account that we're going to have a different NTIA at that time and there may be political implications to waiting beyond honestly 2017 I think that we're going to be in a situation where we may need to reinvestigate whether it's possible to move forward.

Tony Holmes: There's two answers I give to that. One the first is your use of if nothing has happened in that time. Actually if you've started the process you've started implementing these things, you've started the process of making transition but completion of it or execution is still waiting for some deliverable milestones then you haven't done nothing, you've done it yes? And so in that sense that could kind of bind that political thing.

But and the second part of my answer to that is well that's what I mean by a contingent yes. Ultimately these things are going to happen or we're not able to agree on the things that need to be done beforehand and that consequence of that is that we lose the political opportunity of that transition.

That would be a lesser evil in my mind...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: ...the going ahead without having got it right.

(Mark Hookendecker): Yes understood.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

(Mark Hookendecker): If we don't complete all the things that we would now agree have to be completed in that four year timeframe it's not that nobody did anything, it's just that we didn't get to where we were where we determined we needed to be.

Tony Holmes: But you can't get - you can't have, you know, a transition sort of execution program that actually has become - is not past really decision points and become really well we're only going to complete execution once we've

checked off this other execution criteria yes but, you know, but you understand where I'm coming from on that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well I also would say well the first question is connected to conditions.

Tony Holmes: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So it is as usual if I'm asking in a general way are you thinking of what you are doing we should do that in two years of this one or that one I would say it depends.

So and then I come up with a set of criteria what are the dependencies on that?

So I would say all of this is one of the criteria I would like to put in the list here with regards to the models as well the timeline is in criteria it should be one and it's impacted by several other conditions. So that's what I understand.

So this is the first question is would have an easy answer. The question is just it depends.

Tony Holmes: So what I heard was that the answer to the first question is contingent upon meeting a set of criteria that we would develop from an ISP perspective.

And that set of criteria will also include the appropriate accountability mechanisms as well. So that was what I heard is our answer.

Okay. Just a question to you Wolf. It was your group that posed these questions.

When is the session you're looking at getting some feedback? Is there another session here that is going to occur during this ICANN meeting? Is this for tomorrow?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I'm not sure. Are these the questions from the Accountability Group or from the CWG the - do you know that Malcolm this -question is this...

I think maybe it's from the in the paper from Greg Shatan from the...

Tony Holmes: Oh okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...on the - on that.

Tony Holmes: Right.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So it's sent out to the community. They are waiting for - there is, well, it's within a dedicated time I don't know...

Tony Holmes: Right.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...which one but they were sending out it to the community.

Tony Holmes: Okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...as a whole.

Tony Holmes: So there's no great timeline. So let's move on to the second point then which is the second question are you comfortable with ICANN as policymaker also being the IANA operator without the benefit of external oversight?

Do you want to go first Mark or were you...

(Mark Hookendecker):   I'll just repeat my answer from the first question. It depends.

Tony Holmes: Right.

(Mark Hookendecker):   It depends on the accountability and mechanisms being put into place right?

And so I have almost the same answer to this question as I did to the first one. And that is that this is completely contingent on the linked accountability components of the community and for the stakeholders the three groups of stakeholders for (unintelligible). That's just one person's opinion.

And could I just respond just very, very quickly to Jim's point about well what would happen if you went for two, three or four years and you were unable to get the contingent accountability mechanisms in place? What I'd say to you Jim if that happens then we have much more serious problems than the IANA transition.

Jim Baskin: I think the issue there the word external is key to that because I don't think anybody would be comfortable with ICANN also being the ICANN IANA without the benefit of oversight of some capacity.

But we haven't gotten into the whole idea of whether that should be external or internal. And it's tough to solve that issue in a question. So I think external means that you need to go with it depends.

Tony Holmes: Okay so that one is also dependent upon the contingencies that are in place and the accountability components of that. That was the answer to that one very similar to the first. Anyone have a different view?

Good because I hope on the third when we can actually be more definitive.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: For a second.

Tony Holmes: Pardon?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: For a second one...

Tony Holmes: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...before moving on.

Tony Holmes: Right.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Second one right.

Man: Second one, yes. Yes I (unintelligible) from (Japanic). I kind of agree what
                 (Mark) said. But I would like to make sure that it is not for the, you know, so-
                 called ICANN accountability discussion because the questions here number
                 two is, you know, IANA operators which is ICANN and ICANN is the
                 policymaker as well as the IANA function operator.

                 In that case that's the assumption is that making the IANA function and the
                 accountability mechanism internally which means creating something new
                 rather than, you know, discussing the accountability at large of the ICANN
                 which is now being discussed in CCWG accountability.

Tony Holmes: So this presupposes another answer to...

Man: Right.

Tony Holmes: ...a different question is your point (unintelligible).

Man: Yes. I don't like it confused. You know, maybe we need to establish that, you
                 know, special some sort of accountability mechanisms for the IANA
                 operations...

Tony Holmes: Right.

Man: ...IANA functions not for the, you know, entire ICANN accountability. It's I think needs to be distinguished.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: So well this was the focus of the original script between Workstream 1 and Workstream 2...

Man: Yes to do yes...

Tony Holmes: ...to do exactly that.

Man: That's a good put - yes.

Tony Holmes: Okay. Thanks. So let's go to the third one then and I will change that response accordingly. So the third one should registries as the primary customer of the IANA functions should have more of a say as to which transition propose is acceptable?

Man: No. No.

Tony Holmes: I was expecting a pretty resounding...

Man: We're all...

Tony Holmes: Nice to be all in agreement. And pretty strong.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Tony Holmes: Yes. Yes I can almost - I think I could predict all these meetings taking place at the same time here. You can predict the answer to this one for most rooms.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: And we don't have to (unintelligible)...

Tony Holmes: I think it speaks for itself. You're right. Okay...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Malcolm Hutty: We do not accept the claim that because the registries have direct day to day engagement with tank they are more impacted by this than we are.

We are impacted as well. These are decisions here are fundamental to the entire ecosystem. We need to make that statement in reply.

Tony Holmes: Yes. Because if there's one reason why ISP should be concerned about this it is the whole issue of operations and disability of that. I completely agree.

Malcolm Hutty: Yes. But I'll - it's worth - worth setting this out as a statement on our part because otherwise...

Tony Holmes: Agree.

Malcolm Hutty: ...well, any...

Tony Holmes: Yes it looks...

Malcolm Hutty: It looks better.

Tony Holmes: ...territorial otherwise.

Malcolm Hutty: Yes.

Tony Holmes: Agree with you. (Mark)?

(Mark Hookendecker):   I think Malcolm would agree with me also that question three contains something that's demonstrably false. It says should registries as the primary customer of the IANA functions, well quite frankly ISPs don't think the registries are the primary customers of IANA functions.

Man: What?

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Mark Hookendecker):   Yes exactly 33.3, that's a good percent.

Tony Holmes: (Mark) and Malcolm agree on even more then amazing.

                 That'll be my one for 2013, 2015.

                 Okay. So let's move to the fourth one. Jim are you going to disagree?

Jim Baskin: No, no I'm not going to disagree. But I think we have to give the - not have to but we should give the registries some acknowledgment that as a customer of the - that 33% function they probably should have a great deal of say in the transition, not the accountability so much but the transition of that function so that they do maintain a system that functions for them but they wouldn't have the full, the control over that transition.

                 But for those things that are unique to their relationship to IANA they probably have should have the least amount of say.

                 So we don't want to cut them out entirely so you guys know you guys are just 1/3 of everything. At some parts they should have a little bit more to say about things.

(Mark Hookendecker):   I think Jim that's a subtle point. And that's a good point. And I think that the way that that should be dealt with is in the SLAs that existed between the stakeholders of IANA for particular services and the IANA itself.

So the registry community should have a very, very important voice in setting up the SLAs for root zone management. I have no problem with that.

But I think the ISP community should have an important voice in addressing for instance right? And so the way to express that maybe is at an operational level through the SLAs rather than a strategic a component of transition.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Mark Hookendecker):   I would call the three the addressing community, the protocol parameter community, and the stakeholders of root zone management.

Barry: (Unintelligible), I'm sorry?

(Mark Hookendecker):   Of root zone management. Yes we say names all the time but truly function in IANA is root zone management.

Barry: I mean what about the (unintelligible) Community At-Large? IANA pulled the plug. They don't get into it anymore?

(Mark Hookendecker):   Right but are they direct stakeholders of one of those three functions or are they actually stakeholders of all three functions Barry?

Barry: I don't know, I'm just saying (unintelligible) ever, you know, we keep ignoring the sort of billion people...

(Mark Hookendecker):   Oh no, no I'm not ignoring them at all.

Barry: Not anymore but, you know...

Malcolm Hutty: I just wonder whether that root zone management is going to be understood
                  by...

(Mark Hookendecker):   Oh, please use a different term then. All I'm doing is identifying the
                  function that's inside of IANA. But using more description a descriptive name
                  is just fine.

                  But I think Barry's point is worth not losing here is that...

Tony Holmes: Yes.

(Mark Hookendecker):   ...from the ISP community our customers the broadsword of
                  Internet community...

Tony Holmes: Yes.

(Mark Hookendecker):   ...well I mean that's where the thought is how those stakeholders
                  are engaged and whether or not our answers should reflect their needs or
                  that we as ISPs expect their needs, the broader customer community to be
                  reflected in the answers from some other part of ICANN.

Tony Holmes: I'm going to write this up afterwards. And I think we need to probably use a
                  language that's out there because everyone's seems to be understanding
                  what that means.

(Mark Hookendecker):   Perfectly fine. Yes sorry, perfectly fine.

Tony Holmes: Malcolm?

Malcolm Hutty: I'd say that everybody has a stake in these functions working well. And
                  therefore the transition proposal is about whether or not we can have
                  confidence the outcome will be good.

Everyone has got a stake in that. So the registries have should have no special play to say in the transition proposal.

That's not to say that the registries don't potentially have a special say in certain things that might happen...

Tony Holmes: Right.

Malcolm Hutty: ...after the transition.

Tony Holmes: Yeah.

Malcolm Hutty: The external model as it was constructed had this customer standing committee that would receive reports on operational issues and that would have a right to receive those reports to define what reports were needed and to review those reports and to flag up operational problems and that the registries would have a special place in that. I think that's entirely appropriate.

But that kind of special engagement with the mechanisms that carry on is quite different from the special say in whether or not the transition proposal is acceptable. They're completely different issues.

Tony Holmes: And I think the language we came to did indicate that. And a good example was the reference to SLAs where I don't think anyone would dispute that.

Man: But the nature of multi-stakeholders is what (unintelligible) people, a lot of organizations.

Tony Holmes: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible) and that's good I mean an organization be. But as an example I'm just trying to throw it out there I think if the end-users had a voice

(unintelligible) I think they might've said that the slowness was before B6 transition ends up getting them stuck behind (unintelligible) right?

There was just (unintelligible) they basically had no way out of it. And they want the entire end to end criteria (unintelligible).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Please use your - please use a microphone please. This meeting is recorded. I'm sorry (unintelligible)\) to say that.

Man: I understand.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Man: But I'm just saying that that they do have an interest in these addressing functions. I mean before B6 would be an example of that okay?

Tony Holmes: Yes. So that's the broader stakeholder perspective.

Man: You know, I just buy one example might be...

Tony Holmes: Yes.

Man: ...worthwhile for the (unintelligible).

Tony Holmes: Okay. Let's move on four. I've got that one. What does functional separation of IANA from ICANN mean to you?

(Mark Hookendecker):   It seems to be simply the desire for us to not allow ICANN to simply write its own meal ticket because that's that basic concept there right?

Tony Holmes: Jim?

Jim Baskin: Well I think the functional separation is to keep the personnel for instance that do that function separated so that they're not so integrated into other functions that you can't move those people along with the functions to someone else when you need it.

You know, so that's...

Man: Okay.

Jim Baskin: ...the - that's maybe not the whole thing but to me that's a big piece.

Tony Holmes: Wolf?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: That was exactly my question at the beginning, you know, so with regards to the internal and external solutions.

So I would like to have a possibility of a functional separation. You know, but the question is to me well, is it feasible or what is the distinction in order to make it feasible? And it's in these two options external and internal.

I was talking a lot to some to lawyers as well here. And they every time they come if you do it external it's easier to handle whatever that means.

So from a legal aspect or a contractual aspect so...

Tony Holmes: So it's cleaner in other words.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: That's from their perspective maybe cleaner so...

Man: Now are you talking internal and external. I think I lost something there. Is - does that - Are we still talking about the same question of...

Man: (Unintelligible) support.

Man: Okay. But when you talk about external what are you saying that it's no longer a part of ICANN?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Man: But it's managed by ICANN?

Tony Holmes: Oh no you've seen in the scenarios that we talked about before for internal, external.

Man: Right.

Tony Holmes: And you're relating this to one of those which is no matter - it doesn't matter what flavor of external.

                But when we were - when we looked at the internal and external propositions before it's pointing in that case towards the external.

                My question is if you if it's an internal I've always found this a little bit confusing. If you went for an internal solution the two flavors that were put up earlier for internal solution is that functional separation or not?

(Mark Hookendecker):   I think the words you need here to answer the question what does functional separation of IANA from ICANN mean to you, it means that the strategic and operational function of IANA is separate from ICANN.

                And so it's not just staff but it's who the IANA is accountable. It's accountable to its three stakeholder groups right, that operationally its priorities are set externally not by traditional ICANN management right and operationally its decisions are made independently of the rest of ICANN.

That's - so there's a operational, strategic and accountability separation and it's those two things that I'm I think make functional separation work.

Tony Holmes: So your interpretation of that means that the current - and it may be good that (Icanori)'s here for this but your assumption is that the current proposals on the table is both the numbers and protocols have functional separation?

(Mark Hookendecker): Well, I wasn't going to - I was just going to answer question four here. I wasn't going to answer your question. So it's what does functional separation mean to you? It means in these three broad areas, strategic, operational, and accountability that it's not ICANN that does those three things.

It's IANA stakeholder community that does those three things. It's not just staffing, it's setting the budget, setting the strategic direction, setting the operational priorities in a year, right. I want those - you want those done by the stakeholder communities, not by ICANN management.

Man: I get that but (Icanori).

(Icanori): Thank you, (Icanori). I'm a bit - you know, apart from answer the objective to this question I think that the current situation which ICANN has is that the IANA function is quite separated from the policy making part of the ICANN activity. Is that correct? Then if it is correct we are now considering the new accountability mechanism with which ICANN is properly operated. Then that will make us to form some additional accountability for the IANA function itself apart from the policy making part of the ICANN.

So if I answer to the question number three I would answer in that way to have that - then I am now agreeing that maybe that (Mark) said that have the additional accountability mechanism by the committee or something, especially set up to the IANA function.

Tony Holmes: All right. Okay, I'm going to (unintelligible) (Wolf).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I still - I understand this question, which is not up to the screen. And I sense that this question into that direction so that's - you know, in brackets it's - it's not deferring to an external solution, another operator, yes.

So rather than - that means it's proceeding an external solution and means internally of ICANN a separation of the IANA function with this regards to also including an override function. So this is also for me a question. So is that feasible to do that, you know?

We have a - if you have an ICANN management but there is a kind - a separate organization of whatever else, entity or institution, in that (unintelligible) which could be handled in certain ways separately. So this is - the question behind that, how I understand that. And in this sense I'm looking for an answer. I don't have an answer. Is that possible or not? And what is the implication of that?

Man: Some of this is well-trod ground in corporate governance. For example, in financial institutions they deal with these problems all the time. And they use terms like Chinese walls and various game theoretic message, which, you know, basically amount to you cut and I choose. And so - or information kind of pass between organization and so forth, you know, specialized to the goals.

So you can create mechanisms, you would have to speak to accounting firms or people who are expert in this sort of game theory of how to create these separations. But I - you know, I don't know in this case whether there are specific problems or (unintelligible) that would make it possible. But it's not a new problem, that's for sure.

Tony Holmes: And probably the reason they've asked this question is because there's a lot of confusion around this, the only reason (unintelligible). Malcolm.

Malcolm Hutty: Sorry, I put myself on the microphone. I wouldn't use the same type of analysis that (Mark) used. The - because the issues that - when ICANN is running these functions it's - to me, entirely appropriate that the way that they're run should be managed or should be supervised (unintelligible) consultants for the mechanisms that ICANN has for engaging the community.

And so I wouldn't have separate staff from there because ICANN is a mechanism for engaging the community and the staff. And so in that sense I disagree with (Mark). My answer is I trace differently and in a much more - almost much more simple and principled way. To me functional separation means that in the - means that the...

Man: Sorry.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Yes, I was listening.

Malcolm Hutty: That's okay. I was just speaking through the chair so, you know. In the circumstance, consider the circumstance where it's decided to move the IANA functions away from ICANN.

Functional separation is the arrangement of circumstances such that if it were decided to move the IANA functions away from ICANN there would not be a particular reason not to do so on the grounds that it is impractical or practically challenging to achieve that.

Man: Jim?

Jim Baskin: Personnel- the systems, the - you know, they should be pretty modular in that you could pick them up and move them to a new physical location. You know, you've got some logistics of communications, equipment and what not.

But you know, it's the - you could pick it up, put it down somewhere else, and have a new management on top of it but it's still basically works the same the way it did before with the same people, the same systems. That's the functional isolation that we need. I don't know that we need to create a new method of policy development for them.

I mean you can still have the other pieces of ICANN do that. Now we may have some people in this whole process now that are looking to get ICANN out of those things. You know, like in the numbering part, you know, I think we've - there's a whole big thing. ICANN doesn't have to have anything to do with that.

Now maybe IANA can still keep the computer - the database but, you know, there are people - anyway, I'm getting off the subject. It's my idea of a - what's the word, functional separation is having it in a box that you can pick up and put somewhere else.

Man: I don't see any difference personally between what you've said and what (Mark) said. The words are different but the functions are the same for me. So maybe you can trust me to write that up, (Mark).

(Mark Hookendecker):   I think I'm trying to set the bar slightly higher than Jim and in the context of this discussion I'm willing to just stay silent here. But I think it's more than having the ability to take the function staff and the resources that actually operate it and take it out one day on a flag day and move it some place else, right.

I think you're talking more about - because the end of the question is - what you're talking about is the internal separation from ICANN and IANA in the context where ICANN is the IANA operator. And I think there's more than the lift and shift part of it, right.

I think that - so - and gently I'll disagree with Malcolm here, I think there's more to it. I think the policy apparatus has to be separated. I think the management apparatus has to be separate. So I think Jim and Malcolm are close together here and I just think the bar needs to be set higher.

Man: Yes, the decision making process.

(Mark Hookendecker): And the strategic direction setting, right, the interface with the stakeholders have to be separate as well. So I just think there's more to it but...

Malcolm Hutty: Yes, I think I actually almost - you know, would positively disagree there in that that's not the functional bit. Because if you did want to move IANA away it would be to get it away from those things with the strategic and policy mechanisms within ICANN.

The reason they want to move it is because you were dissatisfied with those and put it under a new set, not to just change it in a way where you're changing the name of the corporation but actually you've got the same corporation.

(Mark Hookendecker): But I think the funny thing about that, Malcolm is that this disagreement is going to show up in the next question because it will be simpler to answer yes if the bar is set lower, right.

So I would be tempted - I would never put words in Malcolm's mouth but I would be tempted to say Malcolm might say yes to number five and I would be tempted to say no. And so this definition, this answer to question four is important.

Malcolm Hutty: Agreed and you're quite right.

Man: I would try and write up four from what I'm understood because I think I have a slightly different understanding so I may be...

(Mark Hookendecker): I think you should write up four from the point of - I was backing away here. I think you should write up four from the point of view of Jim and Malcolm's point of view that it's this lift and shift functional separation that's important.

Man: But I'm more on your side for once on this because I see it as a little bit more - as well.

(Mark Hookendecker): Wow, can we just get a note of that. Yes, I mean - I think from a policy point of view, I think it's really important to have all the parts of this. But I know exactly what Jim is talking about.

Tony Holmes: The words we used earlier about Chinese walls and I still see that as a fundamental part of separation.

(Mark Hookendecker): Well, and I think Berry's point was - and not to put words in his mouth is that this is something that happens all the time in other kinds of companies and that using a model that is well established in the business community for solving this particular problem is probably the right approach.

And I think that's true. It's just I take it a step farther than staffing and money and operations.

Tony Holmes: Okay, Jim? Last word on this one.

Jim Baskin: Yes, I don't want to take it too much further. I think the firewalls or Chinese walls may be a little bit more than is really necessary. In financial and other things, you separate people - you separate groups because their interaction can harm the customers of one of the other group.

And this case, I don't think that you have to put up a wall between the rest of ICANN and the IANA function. Because I don't think there's things that could really harm customers too badly if you don't have that total separation of all the people and no talking to them and whatever. But there probably has to be some separation, I just don't know that you have to be quite that much.

Barry Shein: Well, again, as a game theoretic model, you might decide - this is Barry Shein. You might decide that - for example, they could - the board can make a decision on budget but not on policy or certain areas of policy can't be touched by the board.

You know, it can only be done internal to IANA, that would be more the sort of thing I was thinking about as opposed to conflicts of interest in a financial where you try and separate the brokerage house from the investment house, you know, that - it's a different problem area, you know.

But I was thinking of, like, limiting which policies or which areas. You know, you can approve the budget but you can't tell us what to spend it on, you know, this type of thing to try to kill a policy, . It's not easy.

Tony Holmes: I think I've got it. I'll write it up. You can all fire arrows at me after, thanks.

Barry Shein: (Unintelligible).

Tony Holmes: Let's go to five. Do you believe the IANA function is adequately separated from ICANN under the current arrangement? Internal separation. Malcolm, you answered this earlier and your answer was...

Malcolm Hutty: To be honest we get to the level of where there may be some detailed factual stuff that I'm just simply out of my depth. But to the extent of my knowledge I feel comfortable with it.

Tony Holmes: I'll take that as a yes. (Mark)?

(Mark Hookendecker):   You know, after the discussion about question four my temptation here is to just roll over and say yes too. Because I think ICANN and IANA have done a very good job of ensuring that the stakeholder communities are not just adequately consulted but have a real impact on the day to day operations and goals of the existing IANA.

I think that's an important functional part of separation and so yes, I'll just - the place where I have reservations is that ICANN still has - still provides direction to IANA in operational issues, right, in terms of how you spend money, what services you support and things like that. And that separation isn't - I don't want to make too big a deal of it but that's for me still.

Tony Holmes: It does say adequately, it doesn't say...

(Mark Hookendecker):   Yes, it doesn't say perfectly. So I think the answer is yes.

Tony Holmes: Okay. Follow on. Yes. Yes, we need to work through these a bit quicker. Six? Any views on six? What importance would you give the ability to separate IANA from ICANN?

Man: The difference here would be for me, Tony, separability is a precondition of transition. The other factors are operational - operational parts of transition.

Tony Holmes: Any other views? This isn't the final take on this because when you see what comes out you'll have to - the ability to change it. Did you want to add anything to that?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: As I said before, the - well, the - yes, here it's about to separate IANA from ICANN, not to separate the transfer - to transfer the function to another operator.

Tony Holmes: Right.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: That's different, yes?

Tony Holmes: Yes, it is.

Man: I'd say this is trying to - or it's not that - this is inviting us to prioritize, isn't it? And I think that we should reject that. I think that we should say that these are requirements. We need to be satisfied on all of them. We decline the invitation to prioritize.

Tony Holmes: (Mark) said it was a precondition to separatability.

Man: And so are the others.

Man: So I would say the quality of service is an operational issue between the IANA function and it's stakeholders. So I don't think that is an example here. But they're picking out - I mean one of the things that I would say here, they're trying to separate the issue of separability from the other ones, right.

                  And I think Malcolm's right that we should indicate that we think certain features of this conversation are preconditioned.

Tony Holmes: Okay. Seven? Given the IANA functions could be separated do - maybe be important for community to obtain from ICANN on an annual basis for cost.

Man: The only words you need, there is no accountability without budget transparency.

Tony Holmes: My words was shorter, just a yes but it's the same answer, yes. That was one of the easier ones. Eight?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Sorry, the sub-question, the separation of cost between particles, numbers, and names.

Tony Holmes: I don't know whether it's important. I think it's a good idea.

Man: I think it's important because it goes to the issue of separability, right. You could have a separate IANA operator for the addressing function and a different one for the protocol parameter function.

Tony Holmes: Thank to that.

Man: So the answer is yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: But that leads to another point, there is the separability in three IANAs so which is another item, which we didn't discuss.

Tony Holmes: No one's looking for that at the moment. It's a possibility, yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, talking about but do we have an opinion of that?

Tony Holmes: Well, I certainly do.

Man: And I bet we agree but still the question is would it be important to separate out those costs. And I think the answer is...

Tony Holmes: Just makes good business sense for me to do it anyway regardless of what it can facilitate, which I shudder at a little bit. Jim?

Man: To put it another way, if you don't do it then you don't really understand what you - you've just asked for the cost. If you don't get some reasonable breakdown of how that cost is - it doesn't mean anything. You don't know what you're looking at.

Tony Holmes: No, that's right. Okay, Jim?

Jim Baskin: And just the ability to understand how much cost is assigned to each doesn't help separate them. It just says, okay, I've got half of this person does this, half of this person does that, so I can assign the cost but you've got to move the functions apart.

You can't deal with that half a person any more. So it's not just knowing mostly how much money goes into each of those three functions but...

Man: Makes good business sense, okay.

Man: I could - if I could recommend you, there's a session early morning tomorrow or the day after tomorrow from IANA what is IANA, what is IANA doing. And we could put all these questions to them.

Man: Okay. Number eight, could there be unforeseen impacts relative to selecting a new operator?

Man: Yes.

Man: Sure.

Man: (Unintelligible), yes.

Man: An example of - if one entity has the policy role and makes determinations of thing that the other entity needs to do it's going to impact the other entity's budget.

Man: Right. I think it's yes at every aspect of that. And...

Man: (Unintelligible). Now (unintelligible) community is satisfied with ICANN and strongly supports continuing that and working to maintain ICANN - maintain that (unintelligible) separation as a last resort function.

Tony Holmes: We're going further than we need to and I think it's fair to say that any move has some potential risks for SSR, that's probably as far as we need to go. I don't think we need to - I think you're taking a big leap there from how far we've discussed this.

But I'm happy to refer to it in terms of the - there has to be some risk for this, yes, there has to be some unforeseen impacts. Otherwise we might disappear down a different rat hole there.

And the easy one, question nine, I think we should focus on where we are on this.

Man: I have a question. I have a question. Are there other transition models than we assume the external internal - what is that, the three scenarios, right?

Tony Holmes: There's the two flavors that are currently there, the external and the internal. And existing so are you suggesting that there is another one?

Man: No, no, no. Okay, external, internal, (unintelligible) internal, these three.

Tony Holmes: Yes, they're just flavors, yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Are they asking also for flavors, for different flavors? So it's what I understand so...

Tony Holmes: It's open ended.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Internal, external, it's - okay, it's binary. But the other question is are these kind of Chinese wall. This is a different flavor or not. I'm asking that...

Man: No, that's just the way to manage the internal - it's just a management method or corporate governance method. But I was going to throw in what I said earlier about choosing another external - I don't know if that's a third.

You're using existing rather than creating a new organization, using existing organization as a transition model as a holder of the contract as opposed to creating a new organization of - I don't know if it quite rises to the level of a third model but it was a compromise of sorts.

Man: Yes, the bit I struggle with is they're not saying - I think the question is are there other models that should be explored? That's the way I read, this not the fact that there are other options around it.

Man: Do we face it more (unintelligible) I'd say? Do you have another model that is not being considered that you would like to put before us?

Tony Holmes: Yes, that's the way I understand the question as well.

Man: And therefore - you know, it's not yes, no. It's like, let's hear it then, yes. Unless we have something the answer is we have nothing for you at the time.

Tony Holmes: I like that interpretation. It makes the answer easy. Okay, Jim?

Jim Baskin: Have we talked about the funding issue? We've talked about budgets and things but if you separate IANA functions in certain ways where does the money come from to run it? And if we're not careful we'd have all kinds of problems there with people with...

Man: That's the consequence.

Jim Baskin: people that have the money that needs to be used to fund it controlling it just by the fact that they make funding difficult. How do you guarantee that this separable IANA can remain solvent?

Tony Holmes: I see that almost as a consequence that's got to come out to focus when you get the answers back, when you get some direction on it.

Man: (Unintelligible), I don't think we are but (unintelligible).

Tony Holmes: You can't ignore it, no. No, you certainly can't ignore it. Okay, I'm going to write that out and get it in a form so we'll then pass it to you, Wolf, for submission into those debates.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (Unintelligible).

Tony Holmes: Yes. So we'll put that out on the list. Okay. It's taken a lot of our time but I think it was beholden on us to try and give some answers to this. We're now going to go move on down our agenda to universal acceptance and to start this off I'll ask both Tony and Christian to once again bring us up to date where the discussions are.

There was some reference to this when we had the CSG meeting with the board. But this is of real importance for us as ISPs. And we do aim to get involved in here quite extensively. So maybe you could just say where we are now one or the other?

Man: Yes, I'll say a few words and then defer to Christian.

Man: Okay.

(Tony Harris):   Yes, for the record this is (Tony Harris). Last year I had a couple of conversations, one with (unintelligible) and one with Fadi where I really stressed how concerned some of us in our constituency were. Since we'd been hearing reports of the non-resolved being new gTLD situation.

Some of you who probably were at our last meeting, the last ICANN meeting in Los Angeles remember that we had a visit from (doughnuts) and they showed us on the screen a lot of instances of people trying to do home banking and using - when they completed the template with their data on the

screen and the home baking application, the moment they put it - an email address with a new gTLD it was thrown out and they were asked to put in a .com, .net, or .org address. That happened with some of the major banks.

So obviously that problem was not fixed although years ago we saw that when they brought in .info and .coop, that was in 2003. And all these years went by and people had been programming - not taking into account the fact that there are more strings out there and not just .com, .net, and .org.

So that situation today is magnified by the amount of new TLDs that have come out.

Fortunately I - we seem to be taken seriously because this was given to (Cyrus Amasi) of the ICANN staff. I had some conversations on the phone with him too and then finally they convened a meeting to get interested people together about this and this was in Washington and I'd like Christian to tell you about that. And then from that you can also tell them how that is scaled. Okay?

Christian Dawson: Thank you, Tony. So we ended up convening an all-day workshop session of people that were interested in trying to make an impact when it comes to universal acceptance and we were talking about how we are going to try to address this issue, who should be responsible for addressing this issue, and how we were going to try and come together as a community to tackle the problem.

At the conclusion of the meeting we had actually gotten a lot done, a surprising amount for a one-day workshop.

Took home - we basically managed the things that we wanted to accomplish between then and Singapore in the three workflows and built those workflows into the creation of last night's 5 o'clock meeting on universal acceptance

where we stood up and called to the community to join us in the creation of universal acceptance steering group.

Now it's important that the steering group title is very important. We noticed that this is not a working group because this is not a policy issue. We're - obviously we're a policy creation body for the most part but this is an issue that isn't policy, it's outreach.

The thing that we need to do to address universal acceptance issues is to address - determine what the topline issues are and then figure out how to build best practices around addressing those top line issues. And then go ahead and do outreach to the communities that need to address the issues. And we're talking about web hosting providers and cloud providers.

We're talking about potentially ISPs but more likely their customers. We're talking about people who have web forms and databases that need to be updated and so we're ultimately talking about a whole lot of coding. So this is an issue that is going to take years to resolve.

Now that doesn't mean we can't get a lot of stuff done in relatively quick order. Some really easy wins at the beginning of this process but I think that we're going to find that this is a project that's going to take us ten years of outreach and education in order to get right.

So we called for the creation of this group. We did it through putting together a letter, which if we - if you guys would like I would be happy to circulate a letter - copy the letter to the ISP list. So it's been placed online now on the ICANN website calling for this group.

And created - sorry, we've put three points in the letter that we wanted to address and it's very important to note that these are not items in a charter because the group - once it is founded, now we can say the community

bought in and we've got a group. It was just a bunch of people who attended a workshop saying we should have a group.

So we didn't feel like we should create a charter for the group that didn't yet exist. So maybe some of these guiding principles will end up making it into an eventual charter but these are not charter points.

The first is that the ICANN community should support the creation of the steering group to guide the identification of topline issues and proposed solutions as well as the creation and dissemination of best practices and general outreach information about universal acceptance.

As this is a project that will take years to make progress on the steering committee will be a standing group who's membership may fluctuate over the years. ICANN should be prepared for the steering group to drive action over the course of the next ten years of group leadership terms and structure should be reevaluated every two years.

I believe that (Tony Harris) and I both have an intention to join the steering group and participate on half of the ISPCP. And we - not that we needed to have a way to participate because it's, again, just an advocacy group.

Second, ICANN staff should be the key coordinator in a formalized community effort (unintelligible) personal acceptance and provide a resource to the community in order to address this important issue. By resources we probably mean going to them for a big budget to try and help us do - to do actually outreach and advertising with it.

Not advertising of the new gTLDs but activism, going out there and finding the people that need to fix these things and convincing them to fix these things. We've got a whole bunch of really interesting ideas such as sponsoring hack-a-thons and things like that that could be impactful.

Third, is the call for general membership that we did at the event yesterday. I can just leave that up there for a second but it's relatively self explanatory.

I - we - I've got a slide here on what the role of community is going to be and that basically says what I talked about before about it being - it not being a policy body and not meeting with representation. And then the role of ICANN staff, project managed - publish outcomes, provide budget to support the initiative. And acting as a secretariat.

So we're breaking down the group into two work streams, high priority issues and communications. And here's the information if anybody wants to join in and support the efforts alongside Tony and myself.

Tony Holmes: It's really good the way that this has taken off because when we came here this was a big issue for us as ISPs and it was more of a problem space with no answers. Over the week with the discussion with other parties, registries, registrars, etc., and ICANN staff this is really moved forward.

I'm particularly glad to see Chris Mondini here as well because I thought about how we can move forward on this and help ourselves in other ways at the same time because you used the word outreach.

Christian Dawson: Yes.

Tony Holmes: And there's a huge issue about outreach here and some real challenges because whilst we can probably get out to ISPs - ISPs aren't going to solve the problems on their own. There are other parts of the community.

A big part of that community that we need to engage with and reach, they're not even here at ICANN and they're the people that through the applications and provide some parts of the infrastructure, software developers. They're all people that are impacted by ICANN but they're not advocate here at all.

So there are links here with maybe some knock-on effects where we can pull other parties in so that's quite good. The other thought I had around this was I think it would be really good if we heavily engaged in this project as ISPs because it is so big for us. And I think it would make sense to do it almost on a region basis as well. And if we do it on a region basis it fits with a lot of the outreach capabilities that (Chris) has put in place as well.

So I don't want to sort of drop this coldly out here but we've got two guys here who are already engaged in this that cover quite a large parts of the world, even within their local regions. But I think it would be good if we could engage in this from the ISP perspective on a regional basis.

And that would mean we need to hook in people that cover certainly Europe, Africa is one of the most challenging areas, and Asia. And I wondered whether initially trying to get this off the ground we could come to people like - and I'm sorry I haven't had a chance to talk to you before, (Icanori).

But from your part of the world you've got some really good links in through (unintelligible) and through the addressing community to reach out to ISPs. And that's a start.

I mean it's not the whole answer but to get involved in this I think we can change the personnel as we go along. But I wondered if we could maybe ask you to cover off that perspective from Asia. Sorry, (Icanori)?

(Icanori):   Thank you. Right now it's me - let me (unintelligible) here. Is not thinking about the (unintelligible) in the - coming (unintelligible) Japan with the greater systems with Christian.

Tony Holmes: (Izumi) would be a brilliant ambassador for us on that so thank you.

(Icanori): To have the (unintelligible) in the coming (unintelligible) meeting, to introduce some activity from ICANN then that - that are the rest of this - other decisions will...

Tony Holmes: That's really great and I'll follow up with (Izumi) on that so thanks for that. The key thing is that you've got the contacts in some of the areas that we need initially to start working with and that's why it's such a great fit.

And I know Christian has similar and certainly in the Latin America area Tony has. On the European area, we need someone to cover that and (Mark), I know you've been doing quite a bit (unintelligible).

(Mark Hookendecker): I'd be willing to help out.

Tony Holmes: You'd cover?

(Mark Hookendecker): Yes.

Tony Holmes: Cover the European, that would be a really good way of doing it. And we need to find a way of hook-in representation from Africa in here, which is pretty...

Man: Relative to (Mike) (unintelligible). I'm sure (Mike) will send someone.

Tony Holmes: We need someone to sort of cover our - immediately. We can talk to (Mike) and if not we'll have to find just an interim solution to do that. (Mark)?

(Mark Hookendecker): I can be an interim solution until we find - I'll be going to the African Internet Summit later this year.

Tony Holmes: Yes, I know you've done some stuff in Africa so maybe.

(Mark Hookendecker):   I could be the interim solution and then find someone that was - or find people who are the right people.

Man: Tony?

(Tony Harris):   Can I say something else?

Tony Holmes: Yes, please do.

(Tony Harris):   I'd like to add something which I think is very encouraging and I'm surprised really how quickly this happened. But we have the support of ICANN as far as funding is concerned and Fadi Chehade today said that ICANN's completely behind this and Steve Crocker was sitting next to him and said the same thing.

So this really has legs now to do things. And it's not going to be a talk forum. It has to be an action forum.

I rather like the term taskforce more than, you know, working group or anything like that. We do need a steering group, correct, but we do not need a lot of people, well-wishers who cannot do actually action - cannot perform in the field and bring in the big software organizations and associations and all the people we have to get to who can scale this outreach out to other people.

You can't do it on a one-to-one basis, it has to get to hundreds of developers at the same time. A good example are the clubs of developers that are run by the cell phone companies and the cell phone manufacturers. Through them we can get to thousands of programmers of apps in a matter of two or three months.

So it's - again, I think this is - as Tony says, a great opportunity for us to show really ICANN the importance of our constituency. We're service providers. We're on the front line of this. All of the complaints will end up in our call

centers so it behooves us really to work on this and get it - get it solved as soon as possible.

Man: Great speech.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I have a - thank you, (unintelligible). I have a question to that, it seems to be well organized but I saw from your slides that it's a very long term project.

Man: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So it is - I'm asking myself is ICANN already committed for the next ten years to - because that is really...

Tony Holmes: I think you're asking a somewhat impossible question. I think Fadi's being really positive about long term and obviously we'll probably live or die by the success and how effective we are. From the indications and discussions that have gone on, if it takes off in the right way and is effective I think it justifies itself. And I would expect it would get that level of support.

Man: And the only thing I'll add is they have not made any sort of budget commitment beyond agreeing to secretariat support at this point. And so the community has said we need a ten-year - we need a ten-year group and we need you to be able to consider budget support but also give us secretariat support. They're saying, yes, sure, no problem, secretariat's not that big a deal for us.

Tony Holmes: So my other immediate questions here are to other people around the room that have links in to quite a bit of the industry. One is Malcolm and once we get materials on this I hope that we could use some of your channels to at least start getting messages out there.

And the other is (Oliver). I wondered through the (unintelligible) we need to do a similar thing. So once we get the basic material, if we can start using those channels certainly...

Man: (Unintelligible) this is principally aimed at software people.

Tony Holmes: It's a big part of it, software.

Man: Certainly. I mean I say when Christian - when you introduced this with - mentioned advertising, I started to say whoa but Tony's explanation, clarification there shows what good hands we're in. So thank you both for your efforts in this respect. It...

Tony Holmes: And there's two aspects here, you're right. The community that are going to have to help us solve the problem, a lot of that is software applications. But the ISP side of this is that they need to know what's going on because they're going to end up with customers who suffer from this so their customers, they're going to be confused. They need to know what's going on.

We need to get at least the message out there to say, yes, we know what this problem is and we're doing things to solve it. And the other thing is a two-way feedback. When customers start complaining they're going to be the ones that point us toward the information that we need to fix the problem.

Man: So no doubt, you know presentations of things like Internet Exchange Meeting.

Tony Holmes: Right.

Man: Fiscal Meetings.

Tony Holmes: Exactly.

Man: Operator Group Meetings like (Nanog) and APRICOT and so forth and (Ripe). I mentioned these are all on your plan already or if not they're amongst the thing yet to be elucidated.

((Crosstalk))

Man: They are. And coincidentally they're also on the list of areas in which the ISPC wants to do outreach so we...

Tony Holmes: Well that's why I mentioned Chris's...

Man: Right.

Tony Holmes: ...ability to help us there because Chris has helped us a lot with the outreach for the ISP and using programs like CROPP to get people into the right meetings.

               Well this is twofold because when they're going along to do outreach now we've also got a double agenda, another agenda is getting this information out to that further community.

Man: Exactly.

Tony Holmes: So I'd like to think Chris maybe we can tie some of that stuff together and make it a double pronged approach. And possibly where we run into maybe restrictions on funding we could use programs like CROPP to A, do the outreach and then apply this message at the same time.

Man: Yes. Hi. If I can just jump in, I think you're right. We can double up, triple up, streamline. I know there are other topics that your broader community of ISPs need to hear about so we want to be as efficient as possible.

I wanted to raise something. I don't know if it has come up in your discussions about formation of the task force. But the discussion about avoiding problems that relate from the introduction of new gTLDs on universal acceptance is one-half of the equation.

But there's a very significant community that has an economic interest in the success of new gTLDs and they also fit in this community called ICANN.

And to the extent that you're looking for the people who could invest in an effort to get the word out that it would seem to me that they're gathering, they should be engaged as well to help on the proactive support side.

Man: So one note about that is yes, many of those organizations have actually joined, the DNA which I'm sure you've heard of. And the DNA is doing a number of efforts around this.

The issue and the reason we really wanted to make sure that the ICANN - that ICANN was a central coordinator on this is because there's actually a lot of groups doing a lot of work. And there's a lot of duplicative efforts.

And unless we have some central coordinator, yes, you're going to have the DNA doing some stuff. But you're going to have 50 other organizations doing their own little projects. It's not going to be efficient.

Man: Okay.

Man: One thing that we proposed at these two meetings we had here was that in order and to know the first doorbells we have to ring there should be a repository where all the instances of non-resolving DODs could be logged into some central let's say database or repository.

So at least you know those are problems that you have to solve. You know you know you've got a problem in Bank of America and Citibank and in eBay

or whatever is. Those are the first people you have to go and see. Because otherwise you're looking at the entire cosmos of programmers and applications out there and a lot of them don't need to be addressed because they've done the right job.

So I think that's a good point decide is you've got trouble tickets, well try and close them. That's something that has been proposed. And I think it was pretty well received by the group.

Tony Holmes: And there's two additional elements that we're going to have to use. And there's one groups like Brand Registry Group that might be a good target to get in at some of those potential problems.

And obviously we need some association with ALAC and people like that because it's the users that are going to provide us again with the information of where this stuff is going wrong.

So haven't talked about it. I think it's appropriate to swap our agenda items around and go onto talk about outreach because we've referred to outreach and how we can capitalize on our outreach activities with this particular issue.

And in a way it's a pity we weren't more clued up on this before because we've done some pretty substantial stuff on outreach.

Maybe I should start with you on this Christian because you've been very active for the...

Christian Dawson: I'd be happy to do so.

Tony Holmes: So if you could just bring us up-to-date on where we are.

Christian Dawson: Certainly. Well, you know, I actually just was out a couple of weeks ago meeting with Chris Mondini in DC talking about what we can do and it'll drive outreach forward for the ISPC.

What we actually - and there is a specific meeting if this is something that you're interested in helping drive forward tomorrow. Let me - tomorrow at noon in which we're going to be talking about these things further. I'm going to be bringing to that meeting a proposal for our CROPP budget for the year.

CROPP is an area where - so we get - Chris correct me if I'm wrong. It is five or is it four? It's five. Five sponsored travel events that we can do each year within region - within each region. Well no. So one within a region, right, so okay, so five worldwide but somebody needs to be traveling within their region in order to go to an event and do outreach on behalf of the constituency.

So we have been researching various NOG communities that we want to do outreach into and I will be bringing up a proposal for which specific events our group is - I would like to see us do as now the new CROPP Manager so that we can try to get out to these events.

(Unintelligible) you mentioned APRICOT. That's one of the events that's on our list where we're going to be trying to go and do sponsored travel outreach to try and get more people involved in the ISPC.

One of the other things that we are doing in order to try and pull in more people is reforming the web site. And this is something that I still need help from. Chris and I are talking about the way - the best way to approach that.

But in London we sat down as a group and we made a list of things that we want for a new web site.

And I got to say we haven't made much progress since London. But we need to do that and if we - if I can get your help with some of the resources that we discussed in DC we can try and move forward on that because I think that one of the problems that we have right now is that we aren't the most inviting place on the web when it comes to if somebody says oh, this is a constituency I might want to join, they end up having a stone wall in front of their efforts when they get to the web site.

So there's something that we can potentially do about that. We'll be working on that next.

Lastly as far as outreach efforts go during the LA Meeting we discussed the creation of a technical list that would focus on policy issues that we deal with that are relevant to the technical community.

And as part of our outreach into the NOG and technical communities we wanted to be able to have a specific list that deals with tech issues. I actually sat in on the Tech Day for the very first time this year. And it's fantastic that we do that in conjunction with ICANN.

And I'm looking around the room and I'm seeing - (Martin) you were in there. (Martin).

(Martin):   (Unintelligible).

Man: You were indeed so...

(Martin):   (Unintelligible).

Man: You absolutely were. So you're the type of individual that we were likely trying to target with this new technical list. We're trying to find individuals who can beef up our bona fides in the technical community with regards to the issues

that are going to help us solve problems that end up having trouble tickets opened at the ISP Help Desk.

So the goal is to finally launch that list later this week after getting the feedback that we're going to be gathering from our - whoever shows up tomorrow to our Outreach Meeting so please show up to the Outreach Meeting tomorrow.

Tony Holmes: And just a plea for me on that, with the CROPP Program Chris I think and I know Christian mentioned he's doing quite a bit of work on this but I really think that the next round of meetings that we look at for using (CROPP) I think we should seriously consider making sure that we try and target those where the universal acceptance issue will be a bit part of that and link those two together.

Man: Yes.

Tony Holmes: Tony did you want to add anything? I know you've done a lot of work on publications, brochures, that sort of thing so.

(Tony Harris):   Yes. I think actually we did prepare content for a brochure with the hope that we might print it for this meeting. But time didn't work out on our side unfortunately.

But we do have a meeting scheduled with Chris here, with Chris Mondini. And I understand Chris you're going to propose some way forward so we could have some dynamic or dynamic - new dynamics built into this.

Chris Mondini: Yes. Thanks. So just more broadly, if you don't know me, I'm Chris Mondini. I have a role. It's called Business Engagement. But it's broad across all of ICANN and all different kinds of business. And I also lead North America Engagement and again across a lot of different stakeholder groups.

But we've spent - the Engagement Team and the staff of ICANN has spent the better part of the last 18 months trying to raise awareness and bring people sort of to the edge of the community.

And now going forward I think we've been tasked as a team to really partner with you to help lead people into more active participation in actual constituency groups like yours.

And I have to commend you because you within the Commercial Stakeholders Group we're really an early adopter of this model of having an Outreach Committee with (Icanori) and Christian and Tony participation of.

And so the fact that you dedicated some bandwidth and some thought to this means you're actually a little bit ahead of some of your colleagues and the other constituencies.

On the - so we have a room. I think it's the (Van Cullen) Foyer tomorrow. But it's noon tomorrow to talk about outreach.

In meeting with you and with my colleagues in communications I actually learned that as with the CROPP Travel Program and as with the Special Community Requests for Project Budget there is a small pool of existing funding for web design and communications design which is available for partner activities with again community groups.

And I think the advantage of pulling together both our web design person, Chris Gift, and Jana Juginovic who is a communications sort of collateral producer, tomorrow we'll be able to work with you to have a welcoming. Not just a welcoming look and feel but also to begin to do what you're describing which is create some differentiation for those audiences you're trying to reach because you have diverse audiences even within this group we call IPC as you've identified.

Some are very interested in making an impact in policy. Some are very interested in technical issues and we need them to address and share, evangelize even the technical issues that they need to pay attention to.

And then of course you have the sort of the membership management issues too which and at these meetings and your list you discuss all of them.

But one thing we're learning about attracting new volunteers is in their cost benefit analysis they've looked at the cost and barriers of joining. But they also look at where they can have an impact.

So if they can say I'm very passionate about the broader ICANN accountability debates, I want to participate in that discussion or they may say I'm really a technologist who wants to know about net - how network operations are affected by ICANN policies. You're already taking great steps toward differentiating the message and providing multiple ways to come and participate.

So I hope that tomorrow if anybody would like to join under again the leadership of your Outreach Committee to discuss the collateral, the new - you know for example the newsletter will have some things which are evergreen things that will all - you know for a while will be true about the constituency. They can reside on the web site.

But then we also have some very good articles about recent events. But I think we'll be able to support you and partner with you to get you something that provides a tool for onboarding and facilitation of communication of what you're talking about.

So anyway I'm sorry. I took a little bit of time to explain what I hope is a vision that will be helpful to you.

Tony Holmes: And just to add to that I've got a meeting tomorrow with Chris Gift to talk
about the changes possibly to the ICANN web site that could help with that as
well. So if anyone's got any views about that, any particular ways of
improving it, give me a shout beforehand, before tomorrow afternoon.

Mark.

(Mark Hookendecker):   This is mostly for Christian. But I think one of the things in terms of
outreach that I'd like to make a pitch for is that we do - we take advantage of
this Travel Support Program for the African Internet Summit.

And the reason that I think that's so important is because the African
community actually organizes that African Internet Summit so that AfNOG,
AFRINIC, AfrICANN, a whole bunch of organizations meet at the same time.
It's an opportunity to do outreach to a very, very broad community.

And again (Martin) and I went last year. And well I can't speak for (Martin). It
was a very - it was a well-organized event and very effective in terms of
making contacts in a variety of communities throughout Africa.

So in terms of I don't want to say bang for the buck but in terms of being
effective with the small resources we have I think the African Internet Summit
is certainly something that should be on our list.

Man: Okay. Well I'll take that into account. Also I've done proactive outreach to
(Mike Silver) on the Board from South Africa. And he has offered to help us
with our African outreach.

Tony Holmes: And the good news about that is that with the help of these two guys and
Chris we've now got a library full of presentations and material that we can
actually help with that which is another real plus. Okay.

Man: And (Ricardo) who's been helping us (unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: Very much.

Man: ...relation as well.

Man: Yes.

Man: And (Ricardo).

Tony Holmes: Yes. So the - just on our agenda, one is the GNSO review and structure reform, just to make sure everyone's aware of what's happening on that. I think a number of you have heard across the past few days that there's certainly a building pressure I think to look at GNSO structural reform in a different way.

And we had some discussions about this when we had an Intercessional Meeting of the Non-Contracted Parties House that was held in Washington just after Christmas.

And both sectors of the House came together to say to ICANN that for us the current structure of the GNSO is really not working at all, that this bicameral approach.

So it was quite evident from the debate we had there, we've got widely different views on how to fix it or what needs to be done. But we all buy into the fact that it needs some urgent attention and proposals for reform.

The GNSO review is not going to tackle this in a way that's going to solve that problem. So there has been some dialogue that's gone on across this week with certainly a number of the Board members who are now saying to us that

you do not have to wait for any form of second review or any other activities. If you have thoughts on this then you need to basically pitch them in.

So with that I have given an undertaken that we will come back and present some views on that before the next ICANN Meeting in Buenos Aires so anyone who wants to help with that activity.

And we've had some discussion around this in the past. We have got the basis of a draft paper on this. Please give me a shout if you got any specific desire to help with that.

It's a really big issue for us. And we need to get something out with the backend of this constituency and into the part so hopefully that'll be discussed in Buenos Aires, how to fix things.

Tony Harris: Can I make a comment?

Tony Holmes: Tony.

Tony Harris: Yes. And I'd like to add to what Tony said about structural reform. Something about we were discussing last night.

As an old-timer in ICANN I was always amazed of the fact that we were seen perceived as the enemy by the Registry and the Registrar communities. And we were always the guys who were, you know, we banded together with the IPC and the business constituency to complain about Whois and Intellectual Property concerns with domain names.

And they treated us as enemies from day one. I mean I was personally insulted by people from the Registrar community on more than one occasion for nothing. For trying, you know, trying to bring them together with us.

And I think due to that we ended up being put in a basket with two other constituencies who have an entirely different agenda to us. And gradually found our voting rights getting smaller and smaller to the fact that I mean today we can't really have the slightest influence in electing a Board Director for example from the GNSO.

So structural reform to me sounds like welcome news. I mean we should reevaluate really who our friends are, who or who we share common interests with and perhaps have a different position within the ICANN infrastructure then than we do right now.

Tony Holmes: Okay. I know a number of you have views on this. So this is your chance to help. We progress on this so we've got something out that we can help move this forward.

So I'll now come to (AOB) and I know that you have something to raise on that item as well. So I can hand over to you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: It's a point coming back - which comes back to the (unintelligible) IANA (unintelligible) transition, more details on that.

That is a question of - if I understand, the activity right now is in the CWG, Coordination Working Group, that they have come up with this proposal.

And there's different committees for the external solutions and a lot of these committees is CSC, the Customer Standing Committee which I think a list exists or its draft list. I don't know the stages exactly or obligations in terms of tasks of these committees.

I - there was a discussion here on the floors about that whether the other side of the IANA Services that means dealing with the root zone and one of the so-called ozone maintainer with Verisign if that is covered in these obligations

or these tasks for this year's (C level) to take an oversight of the operation of IANA.

So the question here is, this an item so the - and the CSC which is going to have to do some regular review of the IANA tasks, the operation, does this include the ozone operation as a whole including the various IANA activities. So that was the question here.

And I would like to get some opinions on that where this would be raised if that is not covered. The CSC suggest that is to be raised by us and to be input - as an input for the task of CSC.

Tony Holmes: So the issue as I understand it is that the role of the root zone maintainer that Verisign perform now, if we are setting up a different - potentially a different oversight motor for ICANN where does that responsibility lie and is it part of that discussion? And that I think in a nutshell is what you were...

Man: Yes.

Tony Holmes: ...asking. And my question on that is within the CCWG is that something that's been raised or discussed?

                 And Malcolm can you give any idea of whether it's been on their agenda or is it not even on the radar as part of the dimension, the whole package?

Malcolm Hutty: (Unintelligible).

Tony Holmes: The role of the root zone maintainer that Verisign perform now, if we're changing the oversight of IANA where does that responsibility lie and should it be part of the discussion that's currently going on? And if that's the case has that been raised?

Malcolm Hutty: So (unintelligible).

Man: Put your mike on.

Malcolm Hutty: (Unintelligible) as far as the accountability phase concern, no I'm not aware of
                      it having been raised.

                      As far as the stewardship group is concerned I would think the action would
                      probably belong in the stewardship group rather than the accountability group
                      at a guess.

                      And it may or may not have been raised there. And I later signed off actually.
                      Wolf-Ulrich do you know - has it been discussed in that group?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No. I was raising that question, the same question (unintelligible) before
                      because if it's not then is the question for us should be deal with it if they're in
                      a common understanding on that that this is an issue which should be raised
                      in the - in that group. It is not clear in that group because there are different
                      interests, you know.

Man: Yes.

Man: So there are also two contracts that are in play here. There's the contract with
                      ICANN for IANA and there's a contract, separate contract between the U.S.
                      government and Verisign for the functions that they provide in the root zone
                      management.

Man: Right.

Man: So yes, I believe that and I've seen it. I don't know where I've seen it recently
                      and which discussions. But it's been made note of that and I think along the
                      line that yes, we do have to resolve that issue of how to deal with Verisign
                      and the fact that it has a separate contract which is related but not the same
                      as the IANA function contract.

Malcolm Hutty: USG has certainly noted in public that any transition would have a knock-on effect on that which would have to be dealt with.

But I don't think that that particular acknowledgement that I'm talking about amounted to an acknowledgement that it was for us to engage in that.

Tony Holmes: And does it make a difference potentially if you have an internal or external approach to this? I mean with the next general approach I assume that responsibility for that contract goes to what everybody - external body would be formed. If it's an internal approach it gets a bit muddy from here as to how that would work.

Malcolm Hutty: Your supposition actually there. I'm not sure that it's necessarily so. But it might be possibly so. It would very much be a question that probably the - those developing such an approach would have to address, ought to address.

And if you've got the contract (co) model here, what contract (co) also be placing the contract with Verisign...

Tony Holmes: Right.

Malcolm Hutty: ...to replace the corporation agreement or would you place the contract with ICANN, contract - and place contract with ICANN and then ICANN then place the contract with Verisign to replace the corporation agreement?

Either of those look potentially ways that one might in principle be able to do although one might clearly be better than the other. I don't know. But it should certainly be specified.

Man: So.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: And you can look at this, you know, from the beginning of that discussion though, it was well heavily objective from - okay, from Verisign and others as well that the contract to Verisign is in scope of that group at all.

So the question comes again, (unintelligible) when it comes to the point of the structure of the contract (co) and the customer service coordinate or committee, yes, Customer Standing Committee, and the tasks, you know, means so reviewing IANA performance, you know. And the question is the (unintelligible) related activities also in scope, you know, so and then should deliver you with it, that' sort of the question coming from that side.

So and we could - if there's an interest from our group to do that so we could put that as input to that group and as a task for the customer Standing Committee.

And I was not really referring to the question whether the contracting activity at all is then - should be discussed there. But that could also be a point.

Malcolm Hutty: To clarify, are you saying that it's Verisign's position? Because I'm not - I don't know Verisign's position.

But is - are you saying that Verisign's position that the corporation agreement after transition would continue to be a relationship between Verisign and USG?

Tony Holmes: No I think what's being said is that - sorry, I should use my mike. I think what's been said is that - sorry, I should use my mike. I believe the current situation is that the initial understanding by Verisign is that that isn't part of the current discussion which leaves the whole thing hanging if you come out with a different solution.

So I think what Sir Wolf was asking really was is there a feeling that needs to be included as part of the debate because it's part of the big picture and we should be making that point or do we just leave it and see how it all rolls out.

Malcolm Hutty: Supposing we went with the external model just for the simplicity here, it strikes me that if either Verisign became as a result of that change a contractor with ICANN as the counterparty or if it became as a contractor with contract (co) as the counterparty, in either circumstance you would need to have thought about that and what the responsibilities were as part of this current process.

But I don't think it's at all sustainable to say that's out of scope. If you're in a position of that neither of those two things would've happened and was actually maybe for example would continue as part of the USG as with USG continuing to (unintelligible) and then I could see how you can make that case. And so then you'd want to know okay, well is that what we want to happen and or, you know, are we willing to happen?

I don't see how it's - if you actually think - if you thought that either of those first two things could happen, I just don't see how it's sustainable to say that it's out of scope. I just can't.

Jim Baskin: This is Jim Baskin. I - from discussions with Verisign I think they are very concerned. I don't think that they believe it's out of scope. I think their concern is that it is in scope but won't be handled properly.

Man: Oh look at.

Jim Baskin: You know and that it could end up causing problems if it isn't handled within this whole process of the transition.

So I don't think they're saying that they want to stay in a contract with the U.S. government necessarily. And I haven't heard them say that.

But I think they just want to make sure that that function is considered properly in the overall context so it doesn't just fall off the edge.

Tony Holmes: Well the words you use Jim, I would suggest that we do as a result of this is ask Wolf to use the words that you use virtually as part of this project that's considered in the appropriate manner as part of it. Just to get it in the agenda because it seems to be missing as part of it now.

Malcolm Hutty: It seems that the final proposal would not be complete without something that address that.

Tony Holmes: Addressed it appropriately as Jim said.

Malcolm Hutty: Addressed it appropriately. Yes.

Tony Holmes: Yes.

Malcolm Hutty: I - actually if I were in that position I would - and in fact even not being in that position I would share those concerns so I think that I'm entirely sympathetic to what you just said that they worry about but.

Tony Holmes: So we'll leave you to follow that one up Wolf and get it on the list of things that...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Tony Holmes: ...need to be addressed as part of the overall IANA.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: It is all - it's really - as you say at the time being it's out of scope because it's not, you know, we'll be looking at the - to call the - NTIA contact this regarding IANA, NTIA contact so.

Man: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: That's what we are looking. That's to...

Man: Can I ask one question?

Man: Yes Jim.

Jim Baskin: There is one other - there's...

Man: Yes.

Jim Baskin: ...one other piece of information that everybody should have that it's my understanding that Verisign does not get paid for doing that function. They - and they're not looking I don't think to get paid for doing that function. They just want to make sure that it gets done right and they think they can do it the best.

                So let's not get things too screwed up. But they're not in it for money in this particular case.

Malcolm Hutty: Obviously if only it mounted to - if all addressing this amounted to was again using the contract (co) example, was a similar statement of what's said at the moment with regard to ICANN it is the opinion of this CWG that in the initial phase the contract should stay with ICANN and that in transition the IANA functions contract should stay with ICANN. And that in the transition process once these new mechanisms put in place the parties should move expeditiously to implement that under the new arrangements with ICANN, i.e. a clarification but this isn't a proposal to move everything away from ICANN.

                If a similar sort of thing that was said in regard to the Verisign relationship I would be entirely comfortable with that. And it would have meant that we

weren't dropping it off the end there. You know it may not be anything more than that. But it seems incomplete without it.

Man: Yes.

Tony Holmes: Okay, so we'll record that in our notes and that's something we will propose gets picked up.

Man: All right.

Man: Must read to you from - I actually think I know the answer to this or I thought I knew the answer.

ICANN when the NTIA announcement was made issued a Frequently Asked Questions page. And one of the questions was will the results of this process affect Verisign's contract to operate the Dotcom Registry.

And in that particular case it says no. That's a separate contract between Verisign and ICANN. For Verisign the only potential change will be the maintenance and publication of the root zone which Verisign has performed as a community service spanning three decades.

So apparently the management of the root zone isn't part of the Dotcom contract.

Man: No. That's right. No.

Man: Right.

Malcolm: And it's a separate thing, that (unintelligible) is entirely accurate.

Man: But it's not...

Malcolm: Yes. There's no reason why the running the Dotcom Registry should be in any way linked to this.

Man: Well but my point was is that I don't think it's - I don't think the root zone management part is actually contracted between NTIA.

Man: There isn't.

Man: There's some kind of a formal agreement. I don't know if it's called a contract or not. But there is a document. It's more than (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Malcolm: I though it's called the Verisign Cooperation Agreement. Isn't it?

Man: (Unintelligible). It is a formal agreement.

Malcolm: Anyone else know?

Man: Between the U.S. - between NTIA...

Malcolm: Yes.

Man: ...and Verisign for that, nothing to do with Dotcom or .Net.

Tony Holmes: Right. But Mark you said that that read that it would be impacted.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Tony Holmes: No, no. The Dotcom wouldn't. Dotcom will not be. But the root zone aspect would be impacted is what you said. Correct?

(Mark Hookendecker): (Unintelligible) yes.

Man: Just (unintelligible) someone else on that (unintelligible).

Man: Right.

Man: Let me see if I can...

Tony Holmes: But it makes sense to actually get it...

Man: Yes.

Tony Holmes: ...on the agenda for completeness.

                    Okay, any other business for anyone to raise, if not, we're at the end of our agenda? Even on time.

                    Okay. Thank you very much. And I would circulate the notes. Did you raise your hand Berry?

Barry Shein: No.

Tony Holmes: Oh okay.

Barry Shein: (Unintelligible).

Tony Holmes: (Unintelligible).

(Icanori):   And just other business, this is (Icanori). But I have one thing to ask is that I am involved in NETmundial Initiative Coordination Council and the NMI has now called for input to the community to - for us to craft the terms of our refinances of the NETmundial Initiative.

So please visit the netmundial.org and you can find the call for input. That's (the same) questionnaire for the - to major - the communities preference, how the NMI should be crafted. Then please visit and make input if you can. Thank you very much.

Tony Holmes: Okay, I'll note that. Thank you. Mark are you bringing that to the list as well for people who aren't here?

(Mark Hookendecker): All right, I will do that. Thanks.

Tony Holmes: Okay, thanks. Jim.

Jim Baskin: Does the ISPC have a position on NETmundial Initiative?

Tony Holmes: No.

Jim Baskin: Okay.

Tony Holmes: Respond in your own manner.

Jim Baskin: I - well...

Tony Holmes: No. You're free to respond today.

Jim Baskin: No. I just wanted to make sure that there wasn't something already on the table.

Tony Holmes: No there isn't.

Jim Baskin: And I - from what I have seen there are a lot of people would rather the NETmundial Initiative not move very much but I haven't formed an opinion.

(Icanori):   That's actually right. A lot of people questioned the NMI. And a lot of question complaints. The preparation process is unclear. Not really open and bottom-up. So I know that but still I was nominated to the council to...

Jim Baskin: Yes.

(Icanori):   ...somehow get it right. You know there's such a - you know actually we've already got just, you know, input from the community. And some of them are really, really bad so you know, of the other section or not really counteractive for the initiative.

               But still we are really happy to have you or Frank and (Brian) inputs for us to craft it. Thank you.

Tony Holmes: Thanks very much. Okay, meeting closed. Thank you very much everyone.

END