ICANN

Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
January 7, 2015
3:00 pm CT

Coordinator: Recordings have started.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much. My name is Cheryl Langdon-Orr, this is I think 2100 UTC but it's something along those lines on the 7th of January and this is the RSP 5 call, our fourth call, and one that I'm hoping will be a little bit productive. Although I fear some of our action items may not have proceeded very far.

We have in this wonderful world of stewardship taken to not doing roll calls of any sort but having staff note who is listed in the (Adobe) connect room. So I will now call on anyone who is in the audio channel, the phone channel, who is not in the (Adobe) connect room listed as a participant to make themselves known so that they can be recorded as an attendee.

And also so I can know that they're on the call and give them a virtual hands-up when they want to get in speaking queue. So is anyone on the call but not in the (Adobe) connect room?

Not hearing anyone, not seeing anyone waving at me to make any other comments, let's move on. I'm unaware of any apologies that have been received by staff for this meeting and I'm just looking at - yes we do, we have an apology listed on the agenda page from (Nishuki Tamara). So we'll note that apology. And I'll ask if anybody is aware of any other apology?

If not let's move on now with looking at the agenda. The agenda is suspiciously familiar to those of you who were at the last meeting because it's an almost perfect duplicate of the last meeting in terms of agenda. Although we do have a couple of action items that are slightly different. First of all I've got to ask is there anyone who has any particular - any other business or item they'd like to put to the agenda before we start?

Not hearing anybody, assuming that I'm hearing audio that means that we can just move with the agenda draft and move it to adopted. And that first piece of (unintelligible) is the matter of continuous disclosure.

I'd like to call now if there's anyone who has an update to their statement of interest they can raise it now for us all to know under continuous disclosure and of course I encourage you all at any time something happens with change in your circumstance that you just go online and update your SOI and then let us know at the following meeting. That's pretty much standard across I think you'll find most of the calls that happen in our (unintelligible) these days.

Not hearing anyone update the SOI's let's now move rapidly to the review of action items from our last call. At the moment there's not really as many (ticks) as we would like to see. As we know a lot of what we're doing is waiting to some extent treading water for work that we hope will come out of this intensive work weekend which is ahead in the next couple of days

because our work is contingent on the closure of RSP 3 and RSP 4. Let's look firstly to our action items.

Action item was first of all for staff to look for time during the intensive weekend for RSP 5 meeting. There's been a bit of (toing) and (froing) with the coach here's on this and you'll have noticed if you've had a moment to yourself to look at your emails the doodle went out probably only ten or 15 minutes ago and that doodle is offering us - (Liz) and (Jack) have already filled it on, thank you (Jack) and (Liz) for that. Offering a couple of times on - one on the Sunday and one on the Saturday.

So if you can be so kind as to fill that in that will allow us to steal a piece of the intensive week and work for our RSP 5. So we will be ticking off that action item and thank you (staff) for doing that.

Next one is to for everyone to try and bring forward any particular points onto the (wiki) or to the list that they believe needs to be picked up in the section five under the requirements that the (NTIA) have put out.

We obviously can just do a simple checklist but we're asking for anyone who has any particular points at this stage that they'd like to bring forward to do those to either list or (wiki). I am unaware at least up until the last hour of any of those coming through. But if you have some available put them through to this meeting or as I say to the list of the (wiki). If not we will be discussing those in detail at our meeting over the week - coming weekend.

Next one - so that's an action item stays open. Next one was to put to our list the five (skeleton) items and seek volunteers to hold the (pin) on these. That has been done and I am unaware unless staff has some update for me that anybody has rushed forward to respond. So we might need to start

volunteering people on the weekend call if need be. That doesn't mean not turning up will let you escape, perhaps you should turn up so you can argue why you shouldn't be volunteered. So that's an action item that's going to stay open as well.

We also said that we were going to circulate to the (wide) list, the link to the (wiki) page and seek feedback that has been done as part of the other action. In fact what we've done is put out a single message although I do think (Grace) also duplicated one to - the link to the (wiki) page and seeking feedback so I think we'll still (tick) that one off. I'm unaware of feedback coming in as of yet.

The next call that as an action item we've got done the display I believe we've said to (Jonathan) and (Lisa) that it would be good if in our reporting, in our meeting coming up sometime in the next 24 hours that we could actually display our draft (wiki) page as we're reporting on what we have and what we're needing to do for RSP 5 to the cross-community working group as a whole.

And if that hasn't been approved by the co-chairs I'd ask staff I don't know who owns this but certainly somebody needs to check with (Lisa) and (Jonathan) that that is okay and of course most importantly whatever staff is supporting the cross-comm - (unintelligible) community working group for the (Adobe) connect room that they're ready to have that (wiki) page displayed. We don't want to be having delays in uploads when they're unnecessary.

So that will tick off as well. Then we need to seek additional assistance from (unintelligible) (rips) to provide input and assistance to prepare response specific to I think it's number three in listing and Berry sent out an email

immediately after our last call and Berry I don't know whether you've had any feedback to that but I do thank you for sending it out. I'm pretty sure most people have been fairly busy with the other activities, any update? Over to you Berry.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Cheryl, this is Berry Cobb for the record. Yes I did send the email out following - immediately following the call to the three registry representatives that are part of the CWG and (Chuck) responded back fairly quickly.

He didn't think that they had any existing documentation about (GTLD) delegation that kind of aligned with the survey that was compiled with the CC community. But he did suspect that the registry operators would have a paramount to say about things like pre-delegation testing and the like. I think we offered up that they could potentially do a simple survey of registry experiences with the (INS) services and that he would discuss that will the RYSG but I'm not sure if he's managed to do that given his activities with the survey tools.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Indeed he has been very busy lately so we'll - what we might do is take him up on that offer and perhaps if you don't mind we could pin back to him after today's meeting to say that would be grateful - we'd be grateful if that would be possible. And it may be something that we can also pick up on, on the weekend as well. I don't mean to get the outcomes; I mean to make sure we follow through to see if he's had any feedback with the RYSG group. Anything else on that Berry?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry, just to respond, I think what might be good is that maybe we even if there is a brief summary on the agenda item for tomorrow's call that maybe we even just mention it you know maybe even make reference back to

the (CCTLD) survey has well as doing the generics as well. But I'll send back a list to (Chuck) and see if the stakeholder group has talked about it at all.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh that's excellent, thanks, Cheryl for the record. (Burney) I notice you're on the call. I'm wondering if we could have a link or URL reference to the (CCTLD) survey that we could put into the chat space while we're doing that at the main working group call because that was a survey that was more widely on customer satisfaction and data commerce.

Steve Crocker you've just mentioned (unintelligible) is that considered part of the (INS) functional part of ICANN's administration of the generic (TLD)'s? That might have just been Berry using that as an example but we certainly are more interested in getting the wider feedback on the (unintelligible) commerce satisfaction commerce that the customers of (INS) have a (merely) (silent) evidence that there's already been some work in the (CCTLD) world.

But we're trying to get something out of the (GTLD) world as well that will allow us to then make a statement saying the messes of customer satisfaction are being considered in the proposal that is put together, or not, that's yet to be determined.

Okay thanks for that Berry I appreciate that. And we will pick that up at our main call, the committee in the next 20 - 12 - 24 hours, I really can't, so fuzzy at this point I can barely word out how many hours.

Pretty much takes us to the end of the action items with the exception of all of us getting onto drafting text and table and I suspect that the reality is that most of you are spread so thinly at the moment that it probably won't be until after our intensive work weekend that the creative juices might be flowing and

some of the drafting might come through. But we will be settling who is pinning what at that call on the weekend.

That brings us to the close of our agenda item two and onto agenda item three which allows me to have sip of coffee and Avri Doria to catch us up on the shrill tact and exciting world of RSP 3 and 4. Over to you Avri Doria.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks, now I know why the brevity of my report last time bothered you so much. I didn't leave enough time to (unintelligible) our report could even be briefer which is to say neither one of those groups is ready to deliver anything that we're ready to talk about.

So I mean I could go slightly further which is it say in RSP 3 we're still doing the analysis of the comments and in some way we're still stuck in meta-analysis of the comments. There's been surveys for us to be able to try to figure out what we think so that then we can just comment. But in any case we're in that process and hopefully that process will terminate in this week and we'll actually get to the point.

But the initial analysis has indeed shown that there are some fundamental differences you know the notion and (unintelligible) - the notion (unintelligible) and its application you know strong sentences, weak sentences, the absence of it. That discussion is still you know very open and very much even if you know the (unintelligible) might not be clearly defined of who thinks what. So that's still going on and until that settles down to some point everything else remains in the air.

The first survey on the (unintelligible) and the CSC is just about over. That one terminates tomorrow. And we're just about to - I don't know if it's just about to – 'cause we didn't get very far in the meeting to come out with the

next survey on the IAP and contract co and the alternates to an external solution, etcetera. So all that you know that survey is still on the design and (unintelligible). As far as it be a collection of (unintelligible) there's still no clarity and I'm being very sort of subjective in my analysis but there's no clarity yet even of which of those risks is applicable to the (unintelligible) and which is applicable to ICANN. That division hasn't quite happened.

Also in terms of how like many of them are to happen versus how serious any of them you know any of them happening versus happening is the kind of analysis we just started to talk about. But at the moment if you look at the risk - I mean if you look at the list of risks you know a supernova and me breaking my shoelaces have the same likelihood and risk. So you know there's a problem in that. That is working them out. But as I said because of all that I don't think either of them has much to deliver to this group yet, thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl for the record thank you very much Avri and I actually managed 2/3 of my cup of coffee so I'm particularly appreciative of you filling in greater details than you did last times call. I was caught somewhat short last time having my sip of coffee.

With reference to the RSP 4 and the risk assessments that are currently being text in and tabulated in (my net) I'm also aware that (Olivier) out of our RSP 4 meeting has written to (Mikey) who is one of the other coaches of the (Defunked), DSSA, security and stability analysis working group that was one of the earlier cross-community working groups in ICANN a couple of years back. Because we had some very, very useful tools that were worked through there so that breaking your shoelace and a meteor hitting the earth don't have the same level of writing which you're point is well taken.

And it's risk assessment that always has to take and manage very effectively.

I was copied in on that request but I have not seen a response. So again perhaps that's something that after this intensive work weekend we might have a little more comfort in assuming that there will be some closing of the communication there. It just may not have happened in the last day or two.

Okay that takes us now to looking at our actual drafting (wiki) page and thank you (Marika) for putting that on the shared screen. Of course it's not an active - I mean (Marika) could be in there changing it right now and that would be live editing. But you will note that there is a temporary message on that page that makes it very; very clear that more than one person can be on this (wiki) page and editing at the same time.

So fear not if one of you has a rush of blood to the head and desperately wants to put keyboard strokes together and do some text writing even while (Marika)'s in there now. No harm will come, it will be fine. And welcome (Grace), good to have you.

So with this particular drafting area it's still in a shameably (scaletal) state. I would very much like to if we aren't able to pin people down before our weekend meeting on who will take pin-ship on as we thought we might do, divvy up the five requirements if that's not going to be sorted out before then. I would still encourage you to make topic text or structural contributions to the drafting of section five.

At the moment it's a fairly lean skeleton. It has your usual introduction executive summary, it has what we agreed which would be a tabular form, a checklist form where we could say that the (unintelligible) that the (NTIA) requirements have been met by the proposal that was put forward by the group. A slightly expanded form of that where we have - and what's now live

of section 5.2, thank you for scrolling I appreciate that (Marika). Where we can have - whether we have or have not in our opinion met those criteria or requirements with the proposal with some brief details and notes available.

And the proposal originally was perhaps we may wish to make some sort of affirmation or statement but that last column can possibly be deleted. Your comment on your opinion on all of that structural stuff is still welcome and would still be appreciated. Just to get you to scroll a little bit further down (Marika) and I believe everyone in this working group does have access to the (wiki) with a logon and if you can logon onto the (wiki) you can edit this document.

If you do believe you do have that sort of access or if you've lost your logon credentials then let (Grace), I think, know and she will ensure that the (magic) team in IT get that to you post face.

The structure, proposed structure, then follows that we will address each one of the five requirements in a paragraph form. It doesn't have to be a long paragraph, it could stretch to two paragraphs (unintelligible) but this way we can be somewhat more expansive. And certainly on some of these things we can be quite brief. But on others you might feel more text is required.

I've got a new piece of table in the (wiki) page and some of you looked at it perhaps and that's where I still hold out hope being the eternal optimist that I obviously am that we'll be able to assign pin holders to each - at least one each - to each, I shall try that again. Okay, that we will be able to assign pin holders at least one to each of the listed requirements. That sentence shouldn't have been that difficult to make, I apologize.

And obviously the - perhaps in many cases the most important part is the fact that we have the ability to if we scroll all the way down to the bottom (Marika), to take comments on anything we write here. And that is - I left a comment section open so anyone's logged in or anonymous could make contributions without editing the (wiki) directly and hopefully that's where we'll get some feeding from the wide across community working group or indeed the community more at large.

At the moment I've got just some introductory text, very, very rudimentary text that I would very much appreciate people to re-pin, pull apart and start writing. But I'm also very aware that in the real world of most of you spending an awful lot of time on other RSP group meetings and the other committee meetings that you're involved in that might be difficult before the intensive work we gained.

So with that world wind tour I'm wondering if there is any commentary discussion or contribution that any of you would like to make now regarding the structure function and text on the (wiki) page? I see Avri typing, you can talk to us Avri, you don't have to type.

Where is this on the (wiki)? Okay we better put - can one of the staff cut and paste the URL. That would be terrific. It's in the agenda as well it is listed in the agenda but let's have it in the chat. There we go, thank you very much (Marika), appreciate that.

I don't find it listed on the main page for RSP 5, well that is disturbing Avri and if that's the case obviously I have just been going straight to the page. But if that's the case can someone with a lot more (wiki) skills than I have make the tree connect to each other so all the right pages are connected. Main thing is we need to be able to get to it and if Avri can't find it I get seriously

concerned. Okay. And so she has recognized the name, so that can be fixed up and that's very, very useful because of course unless people can find the page they can hardly edit it.

The link however, thanks (Grace); I appreciate that editing going on. The link however (Grace) you did definitely put into an email sent to the full list. So someone responding from the email has hopefully should they want to go to this page be able to find it by perhaps more accidents then we were planned but now we're getting the design right, so thanks Avri that's really important feedback. Any other comments on this? Yes, thanks (Grace) is confirming that she did send the direct link to the full (CWG), I noted that earlier in the action items.

Okay well-being (unintelligible) with fairly serious silence here today, I'm getting somewhat tired of the sound of my own voice, I'm going to now suggest that only half past the hour that we move to the next agenda item. But we will be focusing pretty much only on the discussion and input into section five and the allocation of who's going to be writing what bits and our meeting on the weekend. So moving now to call for any other business. Avri's typing; I'll wait to see what she says. Avri, I doubt you have bad habits when it comes to (wiki).

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you for fixing that for us because if you can't find it then I really do worry that others less motivated in practice will be able to. Okay, so, while that's all being fixed I'm just going to call for any other business again. Not hearing anybody come forward I would like to raise formally now as I mentioned earlier when we were going through the action items that the doodle for our meeting time over our intensive work weekend has recently

gone out and encourage you to please before you go onto the next part of your lives at the close of this call to fill out that doodle so staff can organize our weekend activity amongst the biggest schedule and that would be greatly appreciated. And I'm sure the sooner the better would be the catch cry from us all on that.

I'm going to now mention in terms of review of any action items, I think ones been done live in front of us while the editing of the (tree)'s being done there are no specifically new action items beyond following up with (Chuck) on his offer to see if he can reach out to the RYSG. And also to have each of us pick up on the still open action items including on the drafting of this page.

Ladies and gentlemen the next call after the weekend is going to need to be we agreed a two hour call in the week of the 12th of January. I remain relatively concerned that we need to have our drafting call at a time which is appropriately positioned after the work of RSP 3 and 4 comes home to roost. Now I've asked staff to be quite careful about when they have all of the calls lined up, I think I'll use to (Grace) if she can get all of her ducks in the right order that would be appreciated. I see (Grace) with her hand up, over to you (Grace).

(Grace):   Thank you Cheryl this is (Grace) for the record, I just wanted to confirm that what we're doing for the calls going forward is we're trying to coordinate among the different subgroup leads to get regular times and we're going to do you know so they would be in order as you had requested so they would have you know for example RSP 3 on Monday, RSP 4 on Tuesday and RSP 5 on Wednesday. And we're going to try - so we'll try to schedule a call next week. Right now it looks like it will be Wednesday for RSP 5.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you very much for that and all I can say is we can but try, thanks (Grace). Alright so you've got fair warning on the probability of the call next week on the 12th of January.

We'll currently schedule it for two hours and I'm more than happy to give time back if we don't need it. But if we can avoid having other commitments just in case we do have some serious drafting to do that would be appreciated. I think we've zipped through the agenda but then I was highly motivated to zip through today's agenda. So unless anyone objects I'm going to make one last call for any comments and give about 25 minutes of your lives back to you.

Nobody's arguing with me on that - oh Avri you're arguing with me.

Avri Doria: I just (unintelligible) editing (unintelligible) big colorful link to drafting work place workspace. That will help me immensely (unintelligible) so thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well said and indeed our thanks on that. And with that I think I'm going to call this as possibly the shortest on record RSP whatever number call. And I'm going to proudly hold that mantle. I'd like to see somebody break this record. After some 33 minutes of conversation ladies and gentlemen I want to thank you all and look forward to talking sometime over the weekend. Bye for now and for those of you who are moving onto your next meeting I hope it's as speedy and efficient as this one is. Thank you one and all, thank you staff, bye for now.

Coordinator: That concludes today's conference. Thank you for your participation, you may disconnect.

END