**Notes of Meeting of .mu select committee held on Tuesday 17 March 2015**

*Venue: ICTA’S Board Room*

**Present:**

Mr S. Moonesamy - Chairperson

Mr T. Dabeesing

Mr B. Gentil

Mr G. Ramalingum

Mr S. Beegun

Mrs L. Rety – (acting as Secretary)

Apologies

Mr A. Radhakissoon

Mr. Halkhoree

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

The meeting started at 10:00 hrs.

Mr Moonesamy expressed his warm welcome to members present.

1. **Introductory Matters**

The first meeting of the .mu select committee was held pursuant to agreement with MTCI whereby a .mu select committee was to be set-up to work on the .mu problem. The aim of the meeting is to discuss, on whether there is consensus among the local Internet community that there is (or not) a problem with the present .mu administration framework.

 2. **Matters Arising**

To set the tone of the meeting, Mr Moonesamy made a small presentation with some facts on the actual .mu structure. He explained that the .mu problem is not only technical and expressed his concerned on structural and administration problem as well.

**2.1 .mu problem identification**

Mr Moonesamy and all members unanimously agreed that there is a problem with the actual .mu framework.

Mr Dabeesing observed that if the community indeed agrees that there is a problem, the committee needs to propose an action plan to move forward and formalise the process ahead. He suggested to enlist appropriate consultancy services and proposed that the MTCI contact Mr Chris Disspain for this purpose, as he is a member of ICANN. The committee hasn't yet decided on the enlisting of Mr Chris Disspain.

**2.2 Set-up of .mu council**

Members agreed that the .mu council goal is to implement the new .mu administration framework, which will ensure full transparency and accountability towards the Internet community of Mauritius, and the rest of the Internet community. The .mu council objective is to come up with the remedy to the .mu problem. Mr Ramalingum mentioned that Afrinic can advise the committee on how to proceed and contribute to move towards the three tier model in order to comply with the best international practices.

Mr Ramalingum further mentioned that for the past 10 years government has been negotiating with Mr Kowk and no agreement has been found. Mr Dabeesing replied that during these years there were problems with the law, the community and technical issues. He pointed out that at first instance, the law should have been changed. In second instance a forum/community should have been created. Once the .mu council is set-up, there was only the need to regulate it, but each time there is a change in government and that is why the project did not go through.

**2.3 Re-delegation issue**

The committee agreed that to obtain full control of a Top Level Domain (TLD) there is the need to undergo the re-delegation process. Mr Dabeesing informed member that in a previous meeting, the Registrar community didn’t find any problem with the actual .mu administration. He added that a formal transition process is required even in the case of an amicable settlement with the present .mu ccTLD administrator.

Mr Ramalingum suggested that once the forum is created and duly registered, the forum can deal with IANA for re-delegation. The committee found it reasonable to set up .mu administration before request for redelegation is made.

**2.4 Back-up plan**

With regard to the back-up plan, Mr Ramalingum mentioned that the risk Mr Kowk switched off everything should be evaluated. He added that in such case there is a need to go for parallel running.

Mr Dabeesing replied that the best scenario is that Mr Kowk should keep his infrastructure in place. ICANN can get a second sever but for Mr Dabeesing this is the worst case scenario. S. Beegun replied that a back-up plan should be worked-out so as to be ready to face the worst case scenario.

**2.5 Infrastructure -** who will control the infrastructure

Mr Gentil stated that he is opposed to the fact that Mr Kwok controlled the infrastructure; he said that the situation will be same as today. Mr Ramalingum observed that Mr Gentil is probably right but with the actual situation Mr Kowk cannot be set aside.

Mr Moonesamy explained that the ideal scenario is that the committee should deal directly with IANA.

**2.6 Set-up a model based on international best practice**

Coming with the proposed model, Mr Moonesamy explained that the discussion can be divided into 3 components: policy making for dot mu administration, management of the dot mu ccTLD DNS servers and commercial operation.

Mr Ramalingum stated that members can look at best practices and possibly amend existing model to fit in the Mauritian context. He further stated that the .mu committee should be the one to approve the model. Mr Moonesamy laid emphasis on the fact that the committee should demonstrate why there is a problem with the existing framework.

Mr Dabeesing mentioned that he is agreeable to work on a proposed plan by the end of this week.

**2.7 Single point of failure**

S. Beegun pointed out that for the actual .mu framework there is a single point of failure. Mr Moonesamy agreed and added that the present .mu framework is based on the hierarchy model. Mr Moonesamy questioned member how they think the committee can manage and reduce that point of failure. S. Beegun replied that it is the forum responsibility to take that decision. All members unanimously agreed that the forum should decide on how to proceed to tackle this issue.

**2.8 Pricing of infrastructure**

Mr Beegun questioned if ever there is any indication on the price of the .mu infrastructure. In reply to Mr Beegun, Mr Dabeesing stated that he will share by email the cost worked out by Mr Phil Regnaud, a consultant who was appointed in 2007. Mr Ramalingum added that the infrastructure can be probably set at GOC and at the same time in US or UK.

**3. Way forward**

Mr Moonesamy mentioned that Mr Dabeesing will be working on the draft document then shared it with the committee. Members will add their comments and once the draft document is adopted at the level of the select committee same will be presented to the Ministry.

**4. Conclusion**

To conclude, Mr Moonesamy stated that the target date, 31 March, set in previous meeting with Ministry will probably not be met. He proposed to schedule the next select committee on Tuesday 31 March.

Mr Moonesamy thanked members for their participation to this first select committee meeting.

The meeting ended at 11.00 hrs.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_