

TRANSCRIPT

Framework of Interpretation Working Group Telephone Conference 6 February 2014

Attendees:

ccNSO:

Becky Burr, .us (Vice Chair)
Keith Davidson, .nz (Chair)
Daniel Kalchev, .bg
Eberhard Lisse, .na
Bill Semich, .nu

Other Liaisons:

Maureen Hilyard, ALAC
Cheryl Langdon Orr, ALAC

Staff Support and Special Advisors:

Bart Boswinkel, ICANN
Kim Davies IANA
Kristina Nordström, ICANN
Bernard Turcotte, ICANN

Apologies:

Martin Boyle, .uk
Patricio Poblete, ..cl
Nigel Roberts, .gg

Keith Davidson: Actually I suppose while we are waiting for Bernie to connect, we could look at the second item on the agenda, confirmation of the agenda, and just, if anyone has any problems that they could voice this now and we can make adjustments to the agenda along the way.

Unidentified Participant: Should we not first do a roll call?

Keith Davidson: Well, I think Bernie, normally is part of the recording of that, so I'm just asking if anyone has got any thoughts, yeah, they might like to voice them now, as that's probably the only thing that Bernie isn't directly engaged in. I mean, like everybody is happy.

Bernie: They are just getting things fired up here and I will be on in a minute.

Keith Davidson: That's right.

Bernie: I was about ready to head off to bed and I said: wait a minute I have something tonight. Yes, okay. Have we got enough people?

Keith Davidson: I think we do, just a few who are on the call and who are not in the room, and I think there's one or two in the room that are not on the Bridge as well.

Bernie: Okay. Excellent.

Keith Davidson: And collectively, we have capability of acting, but particularly since it's -- you know, we went through it informally, for the terminology paper at least, informally on the last call where there were two people.

Bernie: Yeah.

Keith Davidson: So I think we can regard this as our first reading, formerly, on it.

Bernie: Okay. Excellent.

Unidentified Participant: Bernie, is it okay if I make all the documents scrollable?

Bernie: Oh, yes. Sure. All right now. From Kristina, okay. And I need this. Okay. Now we should be heading into the Adobe Room, you just have to approve me.

Keith Davidson: Okay. And do you want to scrub the chat that's in the Adobe Room currently, Kristina, and we'll start from that meeting time.

Kristina Nordström: Yeah.

Keith Davidson: Okay.

Kristina Nordström: Just a second.

Keith Davidson: Okay. It looks like we have our quorum, so let's formally start the meeting of the 5th of February, of the Framework of Interpretation Working Group.

And Kristina, can you give us those present and the apologies received.

Kristina Nordström: Yes. Sure. From ccNSO, we Becky Burr, Keith Davidson, Daniel Kalchev, Eberhard Lisse, Bill Semich. From Liaisons we have Maureen Hilyard, Cheryl Langdon Orr. From Staff Support and Special Advisors, we have Bart Boswinkel, Kim Davies, Kristina Nordström, Bernard Turcotte. Apologies have been received from Martin Boyle, and from Nigel Roberts. That's all.

Keith Davidson: Thank you. Any further apologies received by anybody? I think it's -- I know this is a call at an awkward time, and particularly Europe and Africa, and a little bit in the U.S. as well, but it is a little disappointing to see the lack of interest in 2014. So, I think if any of you are talking to other members of the Working Group, please steer them up to be reengaged, even though this is probably quite a pedantic time to get the glossary and other bits finished off, I still would really appreciate everybody's input along the way.

Okay. Thank you. So it seems to me that the apologies and those present are noted, and I invited any debate on agenda prior to the start of this call, and nobody had anything to raise. So unless someone has something to raise now, we can treat it as a confirmed agenda. Thank you.

We have meeting notes from two meetings that we've missed; one from the 20th of November, and one from 23rd January. Bernie, do you want to just take us through anything of significance from either of those two meetings.

Bernie: Well, there really wasn't anything significant. I mean, if we remember Buenos Aires, I mean, basically we selected new meeting dates, and Ken (ph) agreed to work on terminology was the biggest thing, I guess, so it was not much to point out on the 20th of November notes. And the 23rd January notes, we basically only went through the terminology paper, unofficially, to no comments. Over to you, sir.

Keith Davidson: Thank you. Just noting in the chat room, that Cheryl said, "Nigel sent his apologies, did he not?" And yes, he did, and I think Kristina read them out, so maybe you missed it on the list there, Cheryl.

Okay. Does anyone else have anything to raise in terms of the meeting report from 20th November, or 23rd January? If not, can we consider them confirmed, and move on to the review of the responses on revocation and on -- I'm not really sure how we want to deal with this, Bernie. Do you want to deal with them one at a time, or selectively?

Bernie: We can do either. I believe -- Kristina, did we upload the documents?

Kristina Nordström: Yes.

Bernie: Okay. So let's just go through them.

Keith Davidson: Okay.

Bernie: We should really not--

Keith Davidson: Yeah. Let's see what the members individually. So, if we could put out the Advisory Council one, and it's a reminder of Season Two, since we have members of At-Large on the call. And Bernie did --

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Keith Davidson: And Bernie, the floor is yours.

Bernie: Thank you. The notes didn't come through. I'll have to pull it up, hold on a sec. I annotated these, and I will pull it up. Public consultation (inaudible) --

Keith Davidson: And it's just while we are waiting, Ben, Heather Hart (ph) is asking if it could be made scrollable. Please, Kristina.

Kristina Nordström: It is.

Keith Davidson: Ah. Thank you.

Bernie: I am trying to find the right version of the annotations and will take a minute, and I will be right with you. I mean, essentially the summary of it was that -- I've got to go back to publication, I guess. Public Council, ah, here we go.

Basically my take on it, and it's a good thing we've got ALAC people, and we'll see if I can ask if I can -- if my take on it was actually correct. They supported a lot of the things that we were going with, but they were adding a few things, and my take on the stuff that was being added, was that it was beyond the scope of the Working Group.

I mean, they weren't bad suggestions in there, but it was basically things, that we either had formally agreed that we couldn't do, or were pretty clearly beyond the scope of what we were looking at. If we look to the summary, section four, the

first bullet, Implementation, Operational Details, those belong -- beyond the scope of the Working Group, if we take it specifically, specified further, the appeals mechanism. So basically my understanding of this is, you know, we would start getting into implementation details which we've had a chat about on several things, and have decided that it is really beyond the scope of Working Group.

I see Hal (ph) has his hand up, sir; maybe we can take the question now?

Eberhard Lisse: No. It's not a question. As usual, you are very polite, and ALAC misses the boat. Yeah. This is policy, we are not (inaudible) -- this is not in the resource document. It doesn't say we have been (inaudible) repeatedly. We should just take note of it, and agree with it, but say it is beyond the scope of this document. I actually can agree with it, it's just that there's nothing we can do about it.

Keith Davidson: Okay. Thanks. Eberhard. I'm just noting that Bill was giving an indication of his agreement with Eberhard's view. But Cheryl is your hand raised? So, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon Orr: Sir, thanks. Cheryl, for the transcript record. Eberhard, you're absolutely right, and I don't think it's so much a matter of ALAC missing the boat, or even feeling as though it has missed the boat. I think it's a matter of them wanting to make clear the concerns from the At-Large community on these matters. And a response that clearly shows that -- exactly as it was suggested. Yes these are issues, they are recognized, but it's to beyond the scope of this specific Working Group, it's perfectly all right. I don't think there's any difference here at all.

I think the ALAC was taking the opportunity to raise matters that they felt needed to be put somewhere, and whilst this may not have not been the perfect place; at least it gets dusted and dragged out of the cupboard. Thanks.

Keith Davidson: Oh. I think that absolutely does put on the agenda some points for further discussion that I think we've agreed as a Working Group, and the ccNSO has largely agreed with, so I think we are all in violent agreement here.

Okay. Anything else Ben -- or continue Bernie.

Bernie: I will un-mute myself and that will be better. For a second bullet, request, the IANA maintains accurate and formative reports in case of re-delegation and to record receipts of delegation, transfer, consent, et cetera.

I think this is in part related to the last issue to be considered by the FOI Working Group, which is the IANA reports, so once we get through with the terminology we can do that. It's also in part, again, an implementation, operational issue which is beyond the scope of the Working Group, and I certainly support the ALAC making it -- I think it's something we all want, but it's also something that everyone in the Working Group has agreed that is beyond the scope. I'll be glad to take questions or comments at this point.

Keith Davidson: To make a broad observation on that point, I think we did discuss, and Kim has given us some input about the idea of having some sort of flag on the IANA database, so that if there was a re-delegation of requests received for any ccTLD that could be noted by changing the color of the flag, or something like that. Well, some of us thought it was a good idea, and I think we decide -- oh, Kim's indication that there were sufficient, frivolous or non-serious re-delegation request would just make it very difficult and unnerving on everybody. And I saw that most of those would be dealt with because they are just coming from people who have some local dispute rather than any sort of series with delegations.

I see Kim has raised his hand, so I'll hand over to Kim.

Kim Davies: Yeah. Just for clarity. Under the IANA contract we've actually stated that we will publicly, on the outstanding re-delegation request, we don't have a formal critique for it yet. As you know, I think we need a procedure to discriminate various requests from those that are legitimate. The notion is that, rather than a re-delegation request, have seen a surprise for the (inaudible), because the first they've learned about it on -- perhaps the agenda for the ICANN Board, that we would note it somewhere -- excuse me -- in advance, and allow people to be aware that one is pending.

Keith Davidson: Okay. Thanks, Kim. So that's the whole absolute transparency role dictating, I guess. So it would be interesting to see how that implements. But thank you again, Kim, and that probably helps At-Large with the answer. Okay. Is there anything else? Bernie.

Bernie: Yes, sir. In the full statement of the text, ALAC statements on ccNSO FOI Working Group interim report, the fourth paragraph, makes a good point. The Working Group indicated that it had considered whether the GAC principles and accompanying guidelines are in (inaudible) for the RSC 1591, and whether they provide an aid to the Working Group's interpretation of Section 222. We do not see any conclusion to these considerations. We note that in Section 4372, appears to factor the GAC principles, and specify in the IANA operative revokes the delegation, it should attempt in collaboration with the significantly interested parties, blah-blah-blah.

Yeah, it's a good point, and I think Keith can attest to the fact that we started discussing this at the exact level to understand exactly how that works, and to start having a look at how the GAC feels about this. But maybe you have some words of wisdom on this one, Keith.

Keith Davidson: Not really anything to add. I mean, it's the start of a process (inaudible), so I think it's -- yeah, it's good that the issue is raised, and it's something that will be at least more of the implementation, so it is--

Bernie: The last point is -- on point 2: do the issues identified by the Working Group for this topic capture all the major problems associated with the topic, is not what is missing.

And the ALAC says, "Yes. For cases that involve operational problems, and substantial misbehavior on the part of the incumbent ccTLD operator, one of gap that is of concern to our community is the consideration of whether or not the IANA operator is empowered to act in cases where there is a request for revocation from a local government which is backed by local law, et cetera, et cetera."

And my annotation to this was this was beyond the scope of the Working Group, as there is no policy statement in RFC (ph) 1591 regarding this, and that the GAC principles are non-binding on managers. So, yeah, that's always a question. And I see Becky has probably got a point on this, so I'll turn it over to you, sir.

Keith Davidson: Okay. Becky, I'm not sure whether it's at this point or the previous point, but--

Becky Burr: No. It's this point. I just think that this is a little bit beyond the scope of our work, but the ccNSO is so -- is on record with respect to the new IANA function, the contract as saying basically, you know, that work went to -- IANA is bound by the rule of law, but IANA cannot be called on to interpret whether any particular local law has been fully complied with, or whether due process (inaudible) translates with respect to the law has been followed. So I mean I guess -- I do think that

there is a fairly clear statement here that IANA is not -- cannot be called on to interpret what it means that for a -- what backs by local law is.

If IANA is subject to a court order that binds it, then IANA is subject to a court order that binds it, but calling on IANA to interpret, you know, and to make judgments about whether due process, and rights and stuff has been followed is a dangerous precedent.

Keith Davidson: Okay. Thanks, Becky. And Bill has his raised also. So, Bill.

Bill Semich: Yeah. I think there's a little bit of confusion as to IANA's role in this case. I think most of the conversations we've had relating to this we concluded that this was a local matter. That if local law was to be imposed then it would be solved in local courts, and the vocal manager would notify IANA of the voluntary re-delegation under pressure of local law, or some such similar act. And, again, that would keep IANA out of the business of, number one, figuring out what our local government is. In other words, which branch of the local government has the authority to make these decisions, or not. And number two, interpreting local law when that's a local matter.

Keith Davidson: Good point, Bill. And does that help with the -- does that help clarify for At-Large, do you think, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon Orr: Yes, indeed. It sure the record -- I do think that will help clarify, and I would very much like -- that Maureen, if she could, to capture as much on this, and perhaps work with Ernie, just to make sure that her notes should go back to the ALAC on the issues, it would show an accurate record of what I think is a very reasonable set of checks we've had on each of the points. But, you know, many of them have agreed with, that are out of scope, and the ones that they need clarity on, which is really only the last one in view. Perhaps, Becky could pen a little short something as well, and Maureen can also put that back into the Wiki page, which is there, At-Large community, our Wiki page which is where that At-Large community would look to it, and that would be handy. So, thanks.

Keith Davidson: Okay. Yeah. Thanks. Bill, is your hand re-raised?

Bill Semich: No.

Keith Davidson: I don't think so. So Bart -- Is his hand raised? Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Cheryl, this is Bart. What will happen is, say, these comments and analysis of the Working Group will be included in the -- say, the formal document to close off the public forum. So as soon as this is -- say, as the Working Group has looked at the different comments, it will be included in the closure (ph) documents.

Cheryl Langdon Orr: Bart, Cheryl here. Thanks. That's great. But I do think Maureen also needs to have it in the same space as our -- Committee's comments were developed as well. So it's not a matter of duplication, it's a matter of publication and all that kinds of things.

Keith Davidson: Oh, good. It sounds like we have some clarity about that, I suppose. Maybe if on reflection, Maureen, there's any further, sort of wording, editing, or clarifications that could be given, perhaps raise them on the FOI Working Group during the week; so that if there's any amendments, we can attend to them on next week's call, on the next call of this Working Group. Okay. Anyone else has any issues. Back to you, Bernie.

Bernie: Thank you, sir. And if people need to get a hold of me for any of those questions, you know where to find me. All right, let's move on to the Eggleton (ph) document, which also doesn't have the annotation on it. I believe the file that was sent with the agenda had that, and if you don't have it, let me know, I'll be glad to send it to you.

Keith Davidson: It might have been in my conversion to Rich Text format, deleted some, but anyway.

Bernie: All right. So, our second posted comment was from Mr. Eggleton, it wasn't bad really. The first part -- my first comment was he expressly (ph) agrees to these issues identified by the Working Group where this topic after the major problems associated. Really talking about implementation details, or appealing a revocation, which by formal decision of the Working Group has said it will not do, as it is out of scope, and for IANA.

So, again, people wanting to dive in, and they are good comments, and even ourselves we -- as we all know we tend to go down some rabbit holes, but really, we've drawn a very clear line, and I think we can give a very good answer relative to that. Any questions at this point?

Keith Davidson: There doesn't appear to be.

Bernie: Seeing none, I'll just keep going. Is the proposed interpretation of the relevant actions of RFC 1591 effective and supported?

Again, it seems to be referencing -- referring to the establishment of formal criteria which is an operational matter for the Working Group. So, very eloquently put; some nice ideas. I'm sure that we can tuck these away and IANA can consider them, but when they are considering implementation details. But they are implementation details.

Next point: are the proposed recommendations effective in addressing the concerns raised by the final report of the DRD Working Group regarding this topic?

About half-down that paragraph, it doesn't seem however, as though there is communication set up between the IANA operator and the parties locally, whomever those may be.

And my comment on that was two points, the first being governments are sovereign, and so (inaudible) applies. And second, that the manager has an obligation to work with the local community. So again, we haven't gone into that because I think to a certain degree, governments are governments, and (b) managers are required to work with their local communities one way or another, but we are not the group that are going to tell managers how they have to work and interact with their communities.

Right under that we have: if there was more communication set up initially, like the required notice given, would be set up between IANA operator and the manager, between IANA operator and the local body, there would be much more to evaluate on, blah-blah-blah.

Again, interferes with local authority diving into very deep details and beyond implementation recommendations of the FOI Working Group, but actually going into how, local governments and local operators should deal with their local communities, and which is, I think, not a good idea for us to even entertain. Any questions, thoughts or comments?

Okay, so wrapping it up, and the end, there is this note, this rubric (ph) idea was thought of to help with either just the evaluation of the manager through the time of management, to help the IANA operator keep tabs on that manager, or to trigger the step in for revocations, clearly to be used as a tool, the preparation would be much less difficult.

English a little rough here. Again, implementation, operational concerns, these are beyond the scope of the Working Group.

So that was about it, unless there are other comments, that are obviously, whoever -- or Mr. Eggleton could have spent a little bit more time on the grammar, re-reading this, but at least they gave us a second comment. EI?

Eberhard Lisse: I have read some comments by a lawyer once. "Dear Sir, we remain confused by your device." I, myself, find the document almost impossible to comprehend.

Bernie: Yes. That is the EI way of saying it, and my way was, it could have used some more editing, and I'm certain we all agree with that, and we are not going to spend more time on it than we need to, unless people would actually like to. Sir? Keith, are you on mute?

Keith Davidson: Yes. I am, indeed. Yeah. I don't think it would serve the interest of the Working Group to spend too much time on this. I think there are clear observations and -- well, unclear observations, but I think let's consider them dealt with, unless anyone has any objections. Okay?

Okay. So I think that deals with the two items of input. So thanks for that. Shall we move on to the terminology paper? Not hearing any opposition to that, so yeah, let's put out the terminology paper, and take it away, Bernie.

Bernie: Yes, sir. Thank you, sir. So for those who missed it last week, this is -- we've all been at this for a while, so this is not a version 1, but a version 0.1. You're getting used to how I do these things. I kept it short. I've brought up the sections which ask us to look at these things. I've listed the objectives, and there is one thing we should be aware of. Under objectives, "Produce a list of unique identifiers to be used for the administration of ccTLDs," and that is slightly different than what we had, which was, "Produce a list of unique identifier for all the parties identified." And I think with the work we've done and everything else we've had, I think it makes sense to put in that amendment, but that's up to the group to decide.

And then we -- since there are no real applicable policy statements, but just following format, then we go right into terminology definitions, there are not a truckload of them. I've gone through all the documents, I've tried to pull out the relevant sections and note where things come from, and what we've used. So, given there is not huge volume, unless there are questions at this point, we are going it series item, like we did on the previous calls, and take questions as they come up, if that's okay with everyone.

Keith Davidson: I'm not seeing any objections, Bernie, so please continue.

Bernie: Thank you. 41 consent: (for delegation or transfer of the ccTLD). Definition, consent must be specific, informed, unambiguous, affirmatively communicated and freely given. So the references are of course, RFC 1591, Section 6, for any transfer, blah-blah-blah, we all know this backwards and forwards. And Section 4122 of the FOI Working Group, consent recommendations, and Section 7141; consent must be specific, informed, unambiguous, affirmatively communicated and freely given.

So, questions, thoughts, comments on consent. We have invented nothing, this is straight, pulled-out definitions from things that exist and have been approved.

Keith Davidson: I think -- I'm hoping this will be pretty straightforward because, you know, we've had the debate over the construct of these things, yeah. And no one is taking the floor, so I think there is agreement. So, please continue, Bernie.

Bernie: Thank you, sir. 42, delegation. Definition, the process by which the IANA operator initially assigns management responsibility or transfers previously assigned responsibility for the management of the ccTLD.

And the only reference we have, this came straight from Section 411 of FOI Working Group Public Consultation on Revocation, so this is one of those terms that we manage to get done with the very able help of Becky, and I think it serves us well. Any questions on delegation? Seeing none, I'll move along, sir?

Keith Davidson: I think you should. Yeah.

Bernie: 43, manager of the ccTLD. Definition, the entity (whether an organization, enterprise, government or individual) which is the trustee of the ccTLD (as the term is used in RFC 1581), supervises the domain names in the ccTLD operates the domain name system in the country or territory associated with the ccTLD, and is listed in the IANA database of ccTLDs as the manager for the ccTLD.

The references are, of course, RFC 1591, which uses the term trustee, and we've beaten this one to death enough, I think. And IANA currently -- I have a note, that IANA currently uses sponsoring organization instead of manger, and I think we've beaten that one to death pretty much also.

I note under Section 432, that there are some qualifiers. Incumbent manager, same as manager, however, the term is useful when differentiating from the proposed manager in applications for a transfer; and in 4322, the proposed manager, the entity that is listed as the proposed manager in the application for transfer.

Yes, Hal, it is "circular" I'm sorry, I was tired when I was writing it, and we may take another go at it.

433, are the references, RFC 1591, Section 31, the key requirement, blah-blah-blah. RFC 1591 Section 32: these designated authorities are trustees. FOI consent section 7121, where we go through this in great details.

That is manager, are there any questions?

Keith Davidson: Yeah. Ben, these -- well, Becky is just raising in the chat, the question whether variance might be a better word than qualifier.

Bernie: I always defer to Becky on the proper use of words in the English language, in a formal setting like this. So this is why it's a 0.1 folks. Go ahead.

Becky Burr: Just a suggestion, an interesting question, Bernie (ph).

Bernie: Ah. Your suggestions are so good. All right, anything else.

Keith Davidson: Well, I think that might be helpful, actually, because it's a little bit more prescriptive and yeah, well, Nigel is not on this call, and he may have (inaudible/no microphone).

Bernie: Sorry.

Keith Davidson: Help him to clarify, pre (ph) Nigel, might be useful.

Bernie: Yes. We miss you, Nigel. We can write that in the transcript. Okay. All right; does that -- so variance; and that would conclude the section for manager, unless there are other points.

Keith Davidson: No one else is taking the floor, so I think we are okay. You can continue, Bernie.

Bernie: Thank you. 44, revocation of management responsibility for ccTLD: The process by which the IANA operator rescinds responsibility for the management of the ccTLD from an incumbent manager.

Again, straight lift from Section 413 of the FOI Working Group Public Consultation on revocation. There is actually no other reference to that for a definition. Of course revocation is mentioned in RFC 1591, and I should probably add that in there, that there is not definition, which is why we are doing what we are doing.

So, a note to myself to add the reference point in RFC 1591. Any other comments?

Keith Davidson: No one is taking the floor. I think that's quite clear, and I think it's proper to add the reference to the 1591, yeah. So I think everyone is happy.

Bernie: All right, moving on. 45, significantly interested party, set definitions. Significantly interested parties include, but are not limited to, (a) the government for territorial authority for the country or territory, associated with the ccTLD; and (b) any other individuals, organizations, companies, associations, educational institutions, or others that have a direct material, legitimate and demonstrable interest in the operation of the ccTLD (s) (ph).

Again, straight lift from the FOI Working Group, (inaudible), recommendation Section 711, which is included right in there, so you can see exactly where it is. There is also the reference to RFC 1591 Section 3.4, which talks about significantly interested parties. We have certainly, over the many months, beaten this to death many a times. But if there are any questions, now is a good time.

Keith Davidson: I can't believe everybody is so happy, but nobody is seeking to interject. So, please continue, Bernie.

Bernie: All right, we are almost there folks. Stakeholders: definition, stakeholders encompasses significantly interested parties, interested parties and other parties referencing RFC 1591.

So, if we remember the discussion, there were significantly interested parties, but RFC 1591 does mention other categories. So we defined, and if we looked at the wording we've been choosing over the years, with IANA, and in other areas, it seems to make sense to bring back that definition of stakeholders which came up from our discussions. So -- and it's also in the GAC principles, so that's an added point for us. Any questions, thoughts or comments on that?

Keith Davidson: And perhaps not all (inaudible) surprisingly, everyone seems to be in some agreement, or no one is taking the floor, so please continue Bernie.

Bernie: Okay. For 7, transfer, (inaudible) incumbent ccTLD manager to a proposed manager: Definition, reassignment of the incumbent manager's role as trustee for the ccTLD as the term is used in RFC 1591, to the proposed manager including, without limitation, changing the entry in the IANA database.

So, we've got some notes right under there in RFC 1591, the terms trustee is used to describe the manager's duty to serve the community and not described the specific legal relationship of the manager to the delegated domain. This is our mantra; we've been using it for a few years now. I think we all know that one.

4712, the term re-delegation and un-consented re-delegation are widely used by the stakeholder community when describing the reassignment of the ccTLD manager. Given there are no references to the term re-delegation in RFC 1591, and that there is no policy basis for an un-consented re-delegation, the FOI Working Group recommends that the use of the term re-delegation be dropped.

So that was my own addition. It's not a definition, but it's a comment, on why we are bringing in transfer. I tried to capture the various discussions we've had as a group on this, and to sort of give it some flavor, but I'll be glad to take direction on that one, if people don't feel satisfied with it.

Keith Davidson: Just noting, Bill Semich is indicating agreement with what you have stated, Bernie, and no one else is seeking to debate it so, potentially, a useful addition.

Bernie: Okay. And basically that definition came from FOI Working Group consent, Section 7121, and just a minor edit of that. So, unless there are other questions, we've actually done it. So, over to you, sir.

Keith Davidson: Are there any questions on the overall things? But, Kim, can we ask you, is there anything that causes you any concern from -- an implementation perspective, and is there anything in terms of a gap. Kim, something that you would like us to, perhaps, clarify or better define?

Kim Davies: Hi. Thanks. My feeling is that I have no real concerns about the definitions as they are stated. My only question; and I don't have direct, specific question for it, is some of these definitions in which specific circumstances do you expect IANA to be using them? For example, you've defined significantly interested parties, and then defined stakeholders. Is there a particular distinction that (inaudible) needs to be drawn about it, which circumstances? IANA uses the term stakeholders and these were significantly interested parties, for example.

Bernie: (Inaudible) one that comes to mind.

Keith Davidson: It's not unreasonable either, so yeah. Bernie, any thoughts?

Bernie Turcotte: From my point of view, significantly interested parties is that clear section which refers to that point in RFC 1591. The stakeholders are a more general point of reference that gathers up everyone which, sometimes we need to talk about. So I think that's why I had put it in there, is that we've gone through that, and came to that decision a while ago on the stakeholder point. And I thought it was just useful to have it in there, but when we are talking about really the brass operational tax of the thing, the things that we referred to are the significantly interested parties.

If we want to talk about the larger community which may have some interest but does not meet the qualifications to be considered significantly interested party, then we can talk about the stakeholders. I don't know if that helps.

Keith Davidson: Just wondering if for the sake of just clarification, is out of the definition for, you know, stakeholders, we could say stakeholders include significantly interested parties and may also appear to a broader range of stakeholders and, you know, and something along those lines, just so it gives Kim a point of differentiation where he might use one against the other.

Bernie Turcotte: We can look at doing that, sir.

Keith Davidson: Okay. Okay, any other comments? I can't believe it could be this easy.

Bernie: Wait. Nigel will be on the next call.

Keith Davidson: That's nice then.

Cheryl Langdon Orr: (Inaudible).

Keith Davidson: Yeah. That's true. So, yes, if Nigel and Martin were here, their own particular flavor, but the use of English language may add some (inaudible) color on that. Okay. Well, I think we've done the topic, unless anyone else has anything to raise? Shall we move onto to item 6 on the agenda, the GAC (inaudible) date?

We've been working on a document. Yeah. I think we've talked in the past about having a webinar or offering a webinar, or whatever the GAC might want to get up to speed and up to date. And we've been working on a document within the GAC to say, what do we need to do between now and Singapore to, you know, make sure we are -- that the GAC is focused in understanding and can hopefully add their agreement to the framework (inaudible/audio skip), and I think that will probably go to the (inaudible).

And I think the GAC is of a mind now to understand that they have to commit to finishing their contributions to this Working Group, so. I've just come back from Los Angeles, I was in the ICANN Office for the last couple of days, with Suzanne (ph) from the GAC, and we had a couple of discussions on the point, and she's preparing to be refocused. And just in the last couple of days, I've received some emails from Frank on various topics around the framework and other things. So I think the GAC is ready to reengage, and so we'll take a sign of willingness to make some progress between now and Singapore, and hopefully have some finalization of the framework on the agenda for Singapore.

I hope everyone is happy with that. If there's nothing else, can we move to the next meeting? We have one more -- two more calls. February 20th, and March 6th. So let's hope the February 20th call can go as smoothly as today, then we can finalize the terminology paper, and hopefully by then we'll have some better construct around the GAC.

Becky has taken the floor. So, Becky?

Becky Burr: Yeah. I just wanted to point out, I think that there's a conflict with a ccNSO Council Call on February 20th.

Keith Davidson: Oh. Okay.

Becky Burr: And I just think that there's an overlap, so as our call was FROM 6:00 to 8:00 a.m., my time, and I think that ccNSO Council is 7:00 to 8:00.

Keith Davidson: Oh.

Becky Burr: So this just--

Unidentified Participant: Becky is right.

Becky Burr: --some of us have to be on both of those calls.

Keith Davidson: Me too. Sorry on that.

Becky Burr: Right.

Cheryl Langdon Orr: (Inaudible) not there, for either way?

Becky Burr: Well, we should just finish it in an hour, that's all.

Keith Davidson: I guess that puts attention on -- for us to do that. Yeah, I think -- because it's scheduled -- or, let me -- let me have a look at that, and I'll come back to the Working Group if there is any change within the next day or two.

As a new topic, can I suggest to Working Group members that they have a look at the webinar outputs from the Paul Mockapetris high-level Panel? There's an interesting suggestion that for the future of the zone file, changes for ccTLD; ccTLD should make a -- recommend a change to the IANA database, is a public statement, and other ccTLDs should vote and just as a 51% threshold of other ccTLDs approving that ccTLD's changes, then it should be made in the database.

I don't think that's in any way consistent with anything we've done or the ccNSO desires, and so it may be something that members of this group may wish to comment on to that high-level Panel.

I see Eberhard seeing the floor. So, Eberhard?

Eberhard Lisse: The words dying and ditch come to mind.

Keith Davidson: Well, you know, I think each of the panels is going to refer to the IANA database, or the globalization of the IANA database in different ways, and I'm a little surprised that a group comprising Mockapetris, Alexi, Jesus and so on, and could come up with a suggestion like this, but there you go. Anyway I'll -- I don't think our Working Group should have any formal position on it, but it's about to our interest didn't fall on those panels that might be worth thinking about.

Okay. If there's nothing else I think we will reconvene on the 20th. So thank you all for your participation and I think we -- this has gone surprisingly well, and let's hope we can continue, and let's hope we can get it done in an hour on the 20th.

Thank you, all. And good day to you wherever you are.

Bernie: Thank you.