

Addressed(?)

A1. PTI-as-an-affiliate does not offer meaningful separation or oversight (JustNet-18, S. Randel-33, DotConnectAfrica-44, .NA-85, INTA-110)

A2. Internal solution preferred (DomainMondo-53)

A3. Multistakeholder organization should perform IANA functions (DSCI-130)

B4. More detail about selection process for CSC and IFR is needed (50)

B5. Separation between ICANN and PTI

B5a. PTI offices, information infrastructure, and business-critical systems should be physically separated from ICANN (114)

B5b. PTI should be required to document how it is separate from ICANN (23, 89)

C1. Remit of PTI and/or PTI Board needs to be explicitly limited (29, 81, 92, 102)

C2. Composition of PTI Board

C21. CWG should be asked to consider that PTI Board be comprised of the ICANN Board itself or a subset of ICANN board members (31, 92)

C22. Caution against a PTI Board entirely represented by governments and/or private companies (102)

C23. PTI Board should be geographically balanced, and should be based on the number of Internet users within each geographic region in order to adequately represent the interests of the Internet users within these representatives' regions (50)

E. Bodies established in names proposal represent GNSO community at stakeholder level (IPC-125)

We do believe all of these are either resolved, or out of scope.

CRISP / IANAPLAN - PTI

B. (B. Carpenter-2, R. Dara-23, Google-31, Dyn-34, CONAC-50, ISPCP-64, IAB-72, J. Panday-89, IA-103, F. Hopkinson-105, CDT-107, P. Nagaraj/G. Varma-113, NCSG-114, Access-116, ICANN Board-121, Intel-122, K. McCarthy-128, DSCI-130, CRISP-133)

B1. Clarify that IETF and RIRs will contract with ICANN, not PTI

B1a Affirmed by 72, 133

B2. IETF and RIR MoUs/SLAs need to clarify that subcontracts are allowed

B3. Details of subcontract(s) between ICANN and PTI for protocol parameters and numbers need to be worked out during proposal phase

B6. Performance reviews of IFO; participation of OCs in IFR, CSC

B6a. Proposal should clarify that IFR applies only to names (34, 72), CSC applies only to names (2)

B6b. Numbers and protocol communities do not plan to participate in IFR or CSC (72, 133)

B6d. Complying with IFR recommendations should be mandatory for PTI (80)

B7. NRO/RIRs not capable of holding contract with ICANN (105)

Clarification exists in comment 72 and 133, but question is whether:

- Do 72 and 133 cover the issue?***
- Should text from 72 and 133 be included in ICG text?***
- Should text from 72 and 133 be part of the CRISP proposal?***

PTI Board related issues

B. (B. Carpenter-2, R. Dara-23, Google-31, Dyn-34, CONAC-50, ISPCP-64, IAB-72, J. Panday-89, IA-103, F. Hopkinson-105, CDT-107, P. Nagaraj/G. Varma-113, NCSG-114, Access-116, ICANN Board-121, Intel-122, K. McCarthy-128, DSCI-130, CRISP-133)

B6. Performance reviews of IFO; participation of OCs in IFR, CSC

B6d. Complying with IFR recommendations should be mandatory for PTI (80)

C. (D. Huberman-29, Google-31, CONAC-50, PiRRC-51, USCIB-81, ICANN BC-92, ISOC China-95, PK-102)

C3. Proposal should describe how PTI Board selection process will be decided (51, 95)

C4. Limited remit should be embodied in the CWG's proposed set of guiding principles for PTI's service level expectations? (92)

Various clarification questions related to PTI exists and must be clarified.

Separation related issues 1(2)

Refer to community

D. (R. Dara-23, D. Huberman-29, PiRRC-51, NZ gov-56, USCIB-81, CENTR-83, ALAC-88, J. Panday-89, ICANN BC-92, PK-102, IA-103, A. Doria-104, F. Hopkinson-105, CDT-107, INTA-110, ICANN Board-121, IPC-125, CIS-126)

D1. More clarity needed about escalation processes prior to separation, who will be involved in them, what standard should be for separation (29, 51, 81, 83, 88, 92, 102, 103, 105, 121)

D1a. Should escalation process be simplified? (56)

D1b. Different separation scenarios should be listed and include a risk assessment at a high level, including financial impacts (83)

D1c. OCs should establish separation coordination process (during implementation phase) (88, 107)

D1d. Concern over expanded GAC role in Separation Working Group (125)

D1e. RIRs must establish a dispute resolution process (89)

We do believe in general two actions exists:

- ICG clarify current and tomorrows situation on registries.

- Cooperation between OCs seems to be important. Is it possible to get some clarification on that cooperation / collaboration?

Separation related issues 2(2)

Clarification requested

D2. Separation process should not require ICANN Board approval (110)

D3. ICG should ensure that the Continuity and Contingency Document that resides in ICANN be updated to address partial separability should 1 or 2 of the OCs decide to move to a new IFO, and included in transition proposal (23)

D4. Do all three OCs accept the fact that each of the other OCs may choose to move to a different IFO in the future? (29)

D4a. Separation Working Group relies on Sole Member – is this okay given that protocol parameters and numbers are not represented? (29, 89, 92)

D5. IANA functions should not be allowed to separate from each other (104)

D6. IANA functions should be run by three separate entities to ease movement to new operator(s) (126)

We do believe in general two actions exists:

- ICG clarify current and tomorrows situation on registries.

- Cooperation between OCs seems to be important. Is it possible to get some clarification on that cooperation / collaboration?

Suggested process

- a. Review clauses for clarification
- b. Need for clarification? Refer to comment?
- c. Refer to community.
- d. Addressed by community/refer?
- e. Refer to community