

# TRANSCRIPT

## Framework of Interpretation Working Group

17 May 2012

### ccNSO:

Ugo Akiri, .ng

Keith Davidson, .nz (Chair)

Chris Disspain, .au

Dmitry Kohmanyuk, .ua

Desiree Miloshevic, .gi

Bill Semich, .nu

### Other Liaisons:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr, ALAC

### Staff Support and Special Advisors:

Jaap Akkerhuis, ICANN / ISO

Bart Boswinkel, ICANN

Kim Davies IANA

Kristina Nordström, ICANN

Bernard Turcotte, ICANN

### Apologies:

Martin Boyle

Paulos Nyirenda

Dotty Sparks de Blanc

Patricio Poblete

Keith Davidson: Hi, everyone. I think it's four minutes past five. I think this might be the sum total of the participation. Kristina, can we have a roll-call, please?

Kristina Nordstrom: On the phone we have Keith Davidson, Chris Disspain, Cheryl Langdon-Orr-- sorry, she should be under liaisons. From staff support and special advisors we have Jaap Akkerhuis, Bart Boswinkel, Kim Davies, Kristina Nordstrom, and Bernard Turcotte. Apologies from Martin Boyle, Paulos Nyirenda, Desiree Miloshevic, Dotty Sparks de Blanc, and Patricio Poblete.

Keith Davidson: Okay. And someone just joined the call?

Bart Boswinkel: Good morning. This is Bart.

Keith Davidson: Hi, Bart. Okay. It's a very thin team tonight but hardly a surprise given the time it is in the US and Europe generally. I'm just wondering what sort of real progress we can make tonight? There's probably not enough of an audience to really thrash through the details of the revocation document. I don't know how others feel about that. But my feeling is we could work through, if everyone's happy to, we could work through the rest of the agenda which is primarily detail and leave revocation for another day? I think we're scheduled to meet again next Thursday too? Unless I hear anything to the contrary I think we'll take that approach. I'm seeing general agreement and nothing to the contrary. Okay. Should we move on and look at the -- is there anything to change or add on the agenda other than the change we've already noted? Bill? You want to speak? Please, go ahead.

Bill Semich: Actually, in order to avoid taking it off mute, I nearly did the agree. Maybe my hand got raised by mistake.

Keith Davidson: Never mind. We'll note that as agreement. Okay. Should we move on to item three on the agenda which is the notes from the previous meeting? It's a very brief note I think. Is there anything to add or to highlight to that, Bernie? Bernie? If you're talking, you're still on mute. Let's assume Bernie's got a problem with sound. So, any issues with the meeting notes? I think everything that was noted as otherwise listed on the agenda. So, unless anyone has anything to raise, let's move on. We'll skip item four, revocation, move to item five which is the FOI with responsible submission on the consent document and Bill Semich and myself were to agree on some wording which we have done and I see collated back to the list about an hour ago. So, I hope Cheryl, Bill, and Bart, Chris, that you've had a chance to read it and I wonder if there are any comments? Any discussion? Bill?

Bill Semich: Just to reiterate I think this is a good solution and I'm happy with it.

Keith Davidson: Excellent. Thanks, Bill.

Chris Disspain: Keith, it's Chris.

Keith Davidson: Hi, Chris.

Chris Disspain: I--

Keith Davidson: Chris? Can't hear you?

Chris Disspain: Can you hear me now?

Keith Davidson: Yes.

Chris Disspain: I just wanted to say I agree with Bill.

Keith Davidson: Excellent. Not hearing any objections could we --

Bart Boswinkel: It's Bart. Sorry, folks.

Keith Davidson: Okay. Not hearing any objection then could we accept that wording and could we ask Kristina if we can file that document that I just circulated an hour ago on the Wiki in the document section so that it appears somewhere near the letter to the GAC?

Kristina Nordstrom: Absolutely.

Keith Davidson: Thank you very much. Okay. Moving on, we had the -- I don't know if we can do much with this on this call. But I think we probably need to discuss it because we have some deadlines emerging in terms of whether we can get this concluded by Prague or not. So, Bart, you were looking after the process of submissions and so on. Do you want to talk us through the suggested response to the one submission that we received from Antony Van Kurgan?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Maybe just at a very high level. It's a bit elaborate but I suggested this to the working group because it also makes probably -- excuse me. To a broad audience, that some issues are -- that Antony raised, are outside of scope of the working group and in particular outside of, say, the civ document and some of the issues will be addressed at a later stage, in particular his references to -- I think hostile re-delegations, the way he phrased it, that's part of the revocation discussion. Yes. That's all.

Keith Davidson: I'm assuming everyone here has had a chance to read the document on the feedback and that the absence on comment -- Bill?

Bill Semich: I just had a question on procedure. When we get feedback like this do we actually respond to the individual or group that submits the feedback or do we just merely answer our own interpretation and response in our reports?

Bart Boswinkel: As a procedure this document would go up to the ICANN website under the public comment and it closes off the public comment. That's why it's structured the way it is because it refers to the individual comments. And, yes. You don't have to respond to the individual. Politeness in this case might suggest that we send this to Antony himself because he's the only one that has responded.

Bill Semich: Okay. I think we should thank him for responding as a matter of fact. Okay. Thank you.

Keith Davidson: Thanks. Any issues or concerns with that approach of just closing off the process and responding to Antony specifically as outlined?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Keith, Cheryl here. Thank you. My system is not -- I put my hand up. Just pointing out that practice in this other work group which I'm speaking this over, I admit, and in some cases it gets quite a number of replies, to make a response to substantial -- or comments of any original nature or advertising something or spammish, obviously we ignore it. So, perhaps the response outlined could be slightly more public than just a private email back. I think it's particularly good practice because the whole concept of reply and then reply, comment and reply is to make things more transparent, so not having a hanging ending on this, Bart's sort of solution. But I don't see why it should just be a private email if there's an

archive it can be matched up to. I think I would encourage us to go that way.

Keith Davidson: Thanks, Cheryl. That's probably quite a good point. Bart? Any comments?

Bart Boswinkel: If I understand it correctly, Cheryl, this document will be published anyway as part of the public comment process?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Our response to it?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm happy then. That's fine.

Bart Boswinkel: That was the first thing. But this was more in addition, say, on Bill's question, this is more in addition in this case because he's sending a comment that we sent him privately and maybe just refer to the public comment summary analysis?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks. I thought Bill was indicating instead of, not --

Bart Boswinkel: No. This is in addition to.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. I'm clear now.

Keith Davidson: Okay. We're all clear. By the sounds of it, we're all happy with that as an approach. So, I think we'll proceed on that basis. Thanks, Bart. Okay. Moving along, also regarding feedback, I talked to Frank Merch today as one of the GAC observers and asked him how it was going within the GAC and he said not going at all. They've been somewhat distracted by new gTLD stuff. And Frank himself has been away in the US for the last couple of weeks and so on. He was hoping to be on the call but hasn't made it. But he said he will take up the challenge with the GAC and try and elucidate a response to the document within the next couple of weeks. But certainly before Prague. So, I'll keep talking to Frank in that regard and hopefully we will get some more feedback as we head to the consent document. Okay. Anything else on the feedback?

If not -- I see Desiree has joined the meeting. Hi, Desiree. Desiree, just for your information, due to the very small number on this call, we've decided we'll not attack the revocation topic with any real vigor in terms of going through the document tonight. We'll hold that over until next week when we meet again. But in saying that, I would ask that if anyone has any specific points or issues that they'd like to raise or discuss relating to the revocation document that hasn't already been raised, please feel free to do that on this call. In fact, now would be an appropriate time.

Okay. Nobody's got any comments. Let's hold it till next time. Item seven on the agenda, racing through, the IANA implementation process for the recommendations from this working group. We had some discussion on this topic a couple or three meetings ago and it was felt by some that this working group isn't in a position to advise or provide advice to IANA about implementation and that it's out of scope for this working group to do so which is probably the case. So, in discussing that further within the

ccNSO council, it was felt that if the working group provided some suggestions of methodology for implementation to the ccNSO council, the council itself would look to ways of working with IANA on implementations. So, I thought that was a pretty good compromise as a way forward and invite discussion on that.

Kim Davies: It's Kim here.

Keith Davidson: Kim, you're in the call?

Kim Davies: Yes. I am. I would just say that I assumed there would be strong feedback about how the group wanted it to be implemented. But if that's not the case, that's fine too. Quite a case where we're insisting the group provides concrete guidance which the group just doesn't have an opinion, that's perfectly okay. But I think we just try to make sure that as much as possible we're working within expectations and we don't go too far in a direction that the working group feels is not matching what they intended.

Keith Davidson: Thanks, Kim. Yes. I think the working group is probably of multiple minds as to how to proceed with some probably very desirous of instructing IANA through this and others wanting to stay well clear. I think -- yes. Anyway, thanks for that clarification. And, Bill?

Bill Semich: Yes. I think maybe it would be good to table this until we've completed the revocation process and we know exactly what it is that's going to be part of the IANA implementation. I do think there will be strong opinions on it and we should create an opportunity for those who aren't on this call to chime in but it might be better to do that once the hard work of getting through revocation is completed.

Keith Davidson: I guess that's probably a fair comment too. Thanks, Bill. It will remain on the agenda anyway for next week's call because with all these things, we won't dispense with it as a topic until it's been through at least two iterations within the working group. So, probably valuable to make the same comment again next week too, Bill. Anything else relating to IANA implementation then? If not, can we look at our future meeting schedule? We're scheduled to meet next Thursday, the 24<sup>th</sup> at 1300 UTC and one more meeting on June 7 at 2100 UTC and we have a three hour scheduled meeting in Prague and I think Kristina just circulated today that it's in the Marco or Resaca room at Prague. So, it's 1 o'clock to 4 o'clock local time in Prague.

I think by that time we -- or my hope is that by June 7 we will have actually pretty much finished the substance of revocation and if there's anything else left that we use Prague to do the final tidy up and then be prepared for the consultation process pretty much straight away after Prague. Other than that, there's nothing more from me for tonight. Does anyone have anything further to raise? No?

If not, I'll thank you all for your attendance and apologize to those who have arisen in the middle of the night for a very short and uncontroversial meeting. Thank you for your attendance and participation and we'll talk to you all on the 24<sup>th</sup>.