

ICANN

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
January 19, 2015
3:00 pm CT**

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, operator. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening and even good night. This is the RFP3 call for the 19th of January 2015 Subcommittee of the CWG on IANA Stewardship Transition.

It's a busy time as we've come off of our intensive work weekend. The accountability group is in Frankfurt for their face-to-face and (report is) not far away and here we are. I hope that we can make some considerable progress on this call. Where I'd like to pick up is where we left off which is on - under Composition on Page 2 of this document. Composition has been somewhat of a Bermuda Triangle that I hope that we can get through it. And maybe see some potential compromises that could conceivably result.

So I don't know if you all have scroll control, but if you do use composition organizing principles. The changes that were made here are my changes or suggestions based on our last call. And I will endeavor to do changes from this call as soon as possible thereafter as well. Steve Crocker I see your hand is up.

Steve Crocker: Yes the wording there says registry representatives from cc and g community and a small numbers of others within the names community. So I'm not 100% sure what the - what set of people are in the names community that are not in the cc and gTLDs. I guess we could be talking about registrars.

Greg Shatan: Right if you look down at the next row that's the registrars, the commercial stakeholder group, non-commercial stakeholder group, GAC, SSAC, RSSAC and ALAC as our potential other members of the CFC.

Steve Crocker: I see, so just - I'm not sure what the intent is but this is probably a good time to get it sorted out.

I'm now looking down at the next box; I do see that there is the other GNSO stakeholder groups, three of the listed registrar, commercial stakeholder group and non-commercial. But then governmental - it should be governmental actually advisory committee, security (facility) advisory committee, root server operations group, well RSSAC - the names need to be fixed up a little bit and At-Large Advisory Committee, none of those are part of the names community per se. So it's a question of whether or not you want to make wording in the box above consistent with the list that you've got there.

Greg Shatan: Right, we could - and I think that - I guess part of it depends on how you define the names community with those (words) only in ICANN due to their association with names.

I think that's correct, we can certainly - I think it's more of a semantic distinction so I think it would be - I think in an earlier iteration it may have read other multi-stakeholder representatives, other multi-stakeholder organizations within, so we can certainly make that consistent.

Steve Crocker: Also missing in that list is the IETF...

Greg Shatan: Right, that's mentioned two more lines down when there's a question should other operational communities be represented. So there's a suggestion there that it could be the ASO and the IEAB or the IAPF in brackets...

Steve Crocker: I see.

Greg Shatan: ...that could also be seated on this.

Steve Crocker: All right, it's peculiar in a way to think of the IETF as operational.

Greg Shatan: Well that's by operational communities was meant numbers and protocol parameters. I think that's a - again these are all kind of terms that has - have been thrown around a bit.

Steve Crocker: I'll take my hand down.

Greg Shatan: Milton Mueller.

Milton Mueller: Hello, yes I'm kind of confused by this. I remember the survey results regarding the CSC very clearly and I thought there was pretty clear consensus that CSC should be very much focused on direct customers of IANA.

And what I have here in this column with all these other GNSO stakeholder groups and advisory committee is a recreation of the MRT. And I was under the impression that the whole purpose of having a CSC that was separate from the MRT was that one of them was very customer - I mean it's the name -

customer standing committee. And most of these groups are not customers, you know, so I'm - have we backtracked?

I know I've missed a few meetings but I don't quite understand why - anybody would want the customer standing committee to be a representative of every single names policymaking stakeholder group.

Greg Shatan: No you haven't missed anything nor have we backtracked. I think we're at - this is - we're actually kind of on the horns of the issue right now which is that there was strong support for a CSC that was primarily made up of registry representatives.

But not - there was not strong support for a CSC that was made up exclusively of registry representatives. So the - I would put the question or the place where we're at now is what (leavening) of the registry by other representatives would be useful and appropriate for this CSC, keeping in mind that the MRT would be a leap as has generally been discussed in more balanced multi-stakeholder organizations.

So, you know, the question as we - in a sense we have these ingredients on our list and some of them could be excluded entirely from the recipe, some could be added, but they need to be added in a way that is I think limited in nature. And that provides some multi-stakeholder transparency and accountability and voice but does not swamp the CSC and make it into a clone of the MRT. If that's what we've done then we haven't succeeded.

And we're not going to get the buy-in because it's not going to be primarily made up of registry operator representatives unless they put 20 registry operator representatives on there and that I think becomes a larger and probably unwieldy group. So I think the - and one of the things that we

discussed for instance in the high intensity work weekend with the possibility for instance of having all of the GNSO stakeholder groups that are not registries be represented by a single (feat difference).

So I would be interested to hear some comments on that possibility - I see Avri's hand is up, I don't know whether that's responding to this but I see somewhere in the general vicinity so Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Avri speaking while not in this room. Yes I think one of the things that there was also strong support for was the notion of including the various sorts of experts, certainly the stability and security, certainly the root server.

And then there were those of us that are arguing that, you know, there needs to be at least one expert or two experts - maybe one from both the c and g side on the policy implementation specialty. To make sure that that's - and then the other thing we have to consider is that we have been talking about possibly either minimizing the MRT or perhaps even doing away with it. We haven't quite concluded that discussion and if that were to happen then the rational that says but the MRT is the place for multi-stakeholder sort of falls apart.

So, you know, I think it's not a closed - I think the strong support for primarily remains but that doesn't mean that there's no one else on it, thanks.

Greg Shatan: Thanks Avri I those are real - that's all very helpful. I would tend to agree with that. I think though at the moment I think that we have to avoid what you've called the deadly embrace.

Where every variable is dependent on every other variable and therefore you can't discuss any variable because the - it looks so different if the other variable changed. I think for purposes of this discussion it's best to assume

that we have an MRT that is pretty much as was designed. Which is a - what's called widely - broadly multi-stakeholder organization with balance of some sort. So the idea is to have this group be focused on customers.

So I see some talk in the chat I guess, you know, the question would be for Elise or for Paul, you know, where would you see - would you see no role for any of the other GNSO stakeholder groups to have any representation in here? And then what about (Jack) SSAC, RSSAC again keeping in mind that the idea here is I think - I don't think anybody is pushing for a group that is not primarily registry operator representatives. So whether - really at this point what we're talking about is kind of to my mind proportionality.

You know, part of it in a sense may start with how many registry representatives would we want on this. You know, some might look at it as being regional, does that mean that there should be five from each side. Or do they - should they be regional or does the c's want rationality but the g's not? So if we start perhaps with an assumption of ten registry operators' representatives? And how many non-registry operator representatives could you have before they were too many?

So that's some (music) and I see Paul Kane you have your hand up.

Paul Kane: Thank you very much, good evening everyone. I think if we just go back to basics, the customer group already looks at the IANA performance reports and evaluates those reports and highlights inefficiencies or inconsistencies or noncompliance to the expectation that's been said.

So already there is an unofficial - for want of a better word - customer grouping and I don't think there is necessarily a need to have a barrier to participation. Anyone can highlight where ICANN IANA is failing to live up

to the high standards it's set itself. But based on past performance technical operation of the IANA has been pretty good. And so I would prefer we don't get hung up with how many seat are there at the table because I hope it is not a formal table.

I hope you all as a community will review the performance reports that are published and if we identify an inconsistency or something wrong we bring that to the attention of the global community. And I would hope IANA could justify reason. So I don't - would prefer not to get hung up on who's at the table because I would certainly prefer it to be focused around customers, people that are reliant on a robust real-time technical function that IANA is.

And I prefer it not to get sidetracked into being something like the MRT or some policy body because IANA is a technical function servicing its customers.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Paul, could you provide a little bit more detail on the current customer group that reviews IANA performance? You know, how large is that, is it both Gs and Cs, etc.

Paul Kane: So as I mentioned at the Frankfurt meeting already the IANA produces performance reports, those are publicly available.

And any member community can review those reports to identify if the report is accurate and if it's living up to the expectations that community considers appropriate. So it's not a well defined group, there aren't ten people sitting around the table once a month. All look at them periodically, including NTIA periodically to ensure compliance with the published contract standards and they're living up to their SLAs. So everyone today could look at them if you so wished.

And it's a - type into a Google IANA Performance Reports, you can see the reports that IANA has published. And if additional information is wanted in the reports one can (raise) with IANA staff and they would consider placing additional parameters within their report. So it's already a fairly efficient service and I'm just worried we're creating a mechanism that is quite onerous, burdensome, significant weight is being added to what should effectively be a light weight technical performance review process. But we do it anyway as a community.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Paul, just one more question for you before we move on. In addition to the registries themselves who do you think should be on this group's of those that have been batted around such as the ASO/NRO, IETF, RSSAC, SSAC, etc.?

Who do you think would be useful from the point of view of a mandate as well as the mandate of multi-stakeholderism?

Paul Kane: I don't want to exclude anyone, anyone can review the report. I don't think we need to have a set number of seats at a table.

You could review the report right now and if it - if you had reason to believe that the report was inaccurate for whatever reason then it should be highlighted. So we are all running registries 24 hours a day, we're all monitoring things 24 hours a day in the real world. So I don't think we need to get hung up over customer support bodies because we're doing it anyway. And IANA is doing a good job in delivering a service.

I sincerely hope they automate their processes as again we discussed in Frankfurt and the cc community has been advocating for years partly because

that is the only downfall that IANA currently has - it is too slow at making changes. It used to be changes were done in real-time before ICANN came into existence, since ICANN has come in it got slower and it started to improve but its still days - plural, for updates to happen. We work in the real-time, customers do not want to wait days for changes to occur in (GNSO) infrastructure.

Greg Shatan: Absolutely not and I'm hoping that no suggestion there - a development that we come up with would cause there to be any delays. But Paul are you suggesting that there should be no customer standing committee and that it should just be an ad hoc communication among customers? Or are you suggesting it should be a...

Paul Kane: I think...

Greg Shatan: Go ahead.

Paul Kane: So I think there is merit in having an ad hoc group. I think there is merit in having a placeholder to having a customer group.

But I think how - and how often would that customer group meet - once a year, once every two years? Because the community will announce to the globe where IANA is deficient in failing to live up to the expected standards, so that will be real-time announcement. I'm just worried we're getting very bogged down in creating a heavyweight organization rather than a lightweight service focused organization serving customers. So but that's my opinion, I'm opened to others. I just like to keep the status (report) as it is.

The reports IANA produce are excellent and I would far rather we keep the good service that IANA currently delivers, howbeit it desperately needs to be

automated for both cc registries and gTLD registries that want end-to-end automation or real-time updates.

Greg Shatan: Right, thank you Paul - I'll move on to Donna Austin.

Donna Austin: Thanks (Greg), Donna Austin. So I'd lastly want to support what Paul has just said with a couple of caveats.

I do think there is probably merit in having a formal body CSC now that - because things are changing so it doesn't hurt to formalize it. But I really think we should take the lessons learned from the ccTLD relationship with IANA that's developed over time. And I really think we do need to look at that and take the best of that that we can. I've said previously on a number of calls that the cc's are the ones that have that relationship and we can build on that.

The g's are yet to experience that relationship given that, you know, there many new gTLDs coming online now. And I think that we will look to the cc's and their relationships and the way that they've managed that with IANA over time to work out what's going to work for us as well. (Greg) I just wanted to address the question you had about RIS and IATS being involved as part of the CSC. I think the registries stakeholder group comments supported this idea and I can't remember whether it was the CSC and the MRT.

But the reason behind why we supported it was because they are direct customers of IANA. And if we had concerns about performance that was from IANA we would talk to the RIS and IATS and see if they had the same concerns. Because I think as also being direct customers I think there's some value in having that kind of feedback and direction from the other direct customers. So that's why we supported it and I think that still stands.

As other customers of the service I think it's important that you have some kind of cross-connection - that's the wrong word but some opportunity to see whether the other customers are experience the same problems. Understanding they're not, you know, we're not comparing apples with apples but I think there is a relationship there that is mutual so we should to the extent that we can use that particularly if we're looking at - if performance levels were getting to such a point where there is genuine concern and there is a possibility of rebid with the intention of changing the IANA functions operator - thanks.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Donna, I'll turn to Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. Maybe because it's late at night here, I've had a very long day and I didn't get much sleep the last coupled of days.

But I'd really like - as I said on our weekend calls, I suspect multi-stakeholder who were assigned to this will not end up participating a lot. And if they do it's another set of eyes. And let's be blunt, what's the harm of pandering to us? I haven't heard anything against that.

Greg Shatan: Thanks Alan, I guess to play counterpoint that I just made, one harm to pandering as you put it - somewhat (jocularly) is that it could create a situation where it slows down the process in some fashion.

I'm not saying it would, but I'm saying that that's one of the things that we've been hearing is a concern that the CSC itself could become too bureaucratic and too slow in its ability to reach. Or could possibly insert itself into the middle of situations that are working well with a - without a lot of intervention and somehow kind of muck up the work. I guess that's a concern, I can't say - I'm not saying I agree with it but I'm saying that that might be the concern.

And I'm as concerned with anyone that we don't get bogged down here, but I think we need to see if we can have a resolution. I think that other than the most straightforward type of resolution is to have fewer multi-stakeholder representatives than the multi-stakeholder so to speak would prefer and more than the registries, that's kind of the old fashioned split the baby compromise. Other options are to have - to change the relationship between the MRT and the CSC in some way.

And, you know, I think (Jonathan) I think had suggested earlier and I'm trying to find where in the - here he states in the chat, my suggestion during the weekend session was to consider MRT as the place for multi-stakeholder and to then view the two and then integrate it holistic fashion. My personal prospectus still leans in that direction, so I'm not exactly sure how you operationalize that but I think that - and I note several of Avri's comments.

You know, that the - having a certain amount of multi-stakeholder representation on the CSC is a form of accountability, so that's, you know, one of the arguments in favor of. So, you know, part of the issue here is that we can stake out relatively far apart circumstances, we won't really get anywhere that way. Or we can try to see what sort of compromises could potentially work. And I think a lot of this depends on making sure that the functions of the customer standing committee stay narrowly focused on technical and operational review.

The idea that the CSC would only meet once every year or two seems to be at odds with the idea that originally started out that the monthly report would be reviewed by this group. And as long as the monthly report showed no negative number so to speak, nothing that was at odds with SLAs that there really wouldn't be anything for the CSC to do and it wouldn't slow anything down.

As the issues get a little more interesting if you will and the - when there is some sort of performance shortfall - Milton I see your hand is up.

Milton Mueller: Yes I think there are actually clear and present harms or dangers to mixing up the roles of the CSC and the MRT and I think this is precisely what some of us are sort of leading us into doing.

If you put a bunch of policy people into the CSC which is supposed to be monitoring very technical forms of performance and implementation then I think you're asking for policy considerations to start (looking) about with the technical implementation, I think that's just an inevitable thing. And to say that oh they're just going to sit back and be quiet and not do anything is again - if that's actually the case then there's no reason to have them on there.

A compromise - now I think Greg is correct that we need to be talking about that is to maybe indicate one kind of let's call it an (Ombuds) person but not in the specific sense of the ICANN Ombudsman but a, you know, kind of a single designated person who's there to kind of keep an eye on the registries and provide a window into what evil conspiracies they're cooking up while going over the IANA reports. I could accept that as a compromise. But other than that I think it's just registries, RSSAC and SSAC.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Milton. Hopefully they're aren't evil conspiracies, so I know that you were speaking for effect. And if there are hopefully other forms of transparency will also be available.

I assume that the work of the group will be open in terms of observers and in terms of any and as Paul had mentioned the reports themselves are very - are open and available as well. Avri says I'm looking for one or two people not bunches mucking about. So it seems that there is - the idea is to have a small

representation. So it could, you know, as I said earlier it could be a single person representation the non-registry GNSO stakeholder groups.

And maybe what Milton is going at this, you know, one step further it could be somebody there who is generally representing the what you might call the policy side of the house. Such as, you know, represent the - all of the GNSO stakeholder groups - the GAC and the ALACs or the multi-stakeholder group in general. Or it could be a, even a single representative of the MRT chosen from the non-registry members of the MRT that would sit there and be that person.

So I see Avri saying one or two, Milton saying let's agree on one. Alan saying I'm glad that we've now gotten down to just the GNSO and eliminated the ravel, which I think that was speaking from an ALAC perspective - a self identified ravel. And so I think if the one person - the one person - if we take the one person from the MRT it doesn't necessarily have to be from the - instead of being a non-registry person it could just as easily be an ALAC or GAC person from the MRT as it would be CSG or NCSG or registry - registrar person.

And the reason I think about it being in the MRT is that we at least have their kind of a ready-made grouping of the multi-stakeholder interest that could be reported back to. And are kind of gathered so that it would be reasonable for say an ALAC person to be there and have a reporting process to go back to the MRT and to speak, you know, for - and have some reasonable capacity to speak for kind of the non-registry stakeholder as a whole.

Not necessarily formally but to kind of have a communication line that would be identifiably the multi-stakeholder seat or two seats at the most which I think we could get there - Olivier Crepin-LeBlond.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thanks very much (Greg) its Olivier speaking, can you hear me?

Greg Shatan: Absolutely

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Okay excellent thanks, I'm looking at the results of the survey that we had and looking at the, you know, the CSC survey - CSC IT summary results.

Looking at the answers of the one, it looks like Question 2 where the question is the CSC membership should include a substantial multi-stakeholder component has I would say a very small majority of people saying they disagree or strongly disagree. So I would say this is a split answer on there. Question 3 the CSC membership should be restricted to ccTLD and gTLD operators, thus making it entirely just cc's and gTLD registries. Here there is again a split between the two with the majority - small majority of people would be okay with that.

That side when Question 4 I think is the important one, the CSC membership should primarily consist of ccTLD and the gTLD registry operators with related experts. And I just don't see - I understand that - the thing that operations might be slowed down if you start having a huge CSC with people that are not directly related to those functions. But I don't see why there would be anything against related experts there. We're talking here about representatives of some parts of the Internet world that know what they're doing and that would be appointed.

They wouldn't just take any Tom, Dick or Harry, they would appoint someone who would - I would hope know what they're talking about. And I would actually perhaps even say primarily ccTLD and gTLD registry operators and I

would be happy with (the results). And in fact I don't know whether the CSC would ever have to vote or anything like that. I'd imagine since it just has to review customer level agreements and SLAs I'd say there wouldn't be any (voting) and so we don't even need to go as far as that.

But certainly having those extra pairs of eyes on there that would certainly make I would say our community very happy. Because ultimately as it's been repeated many times over this CSC is just going to look at SLAs and SLAs are available for everyone to look at. But it's one of these things, you know, just making sure that everything runs well. So I hope I've kind of shown that, you know, we're happy with - I mean I'm certainly happy with having primarily cc's and g's and just a few more pairs of eyes out there.

And looking - having more people with more representatives let's say, you know, five people for the GNSO and five people for the ALAC I think would not be constructive. These people can act as liaisons back to their groups, thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Olivier. Back to you, Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks (Greg), Donna Austin. I just wanted to pick up on something that Olivier said and I just want to clarify what we're talking about here.

Olivier referenced that the CSC could potentially slow down, you know, changes that were requested or some of the operational work that's going on from IANA. As I see this group they are looking at monthly type reports, so they're not actually - my concern here is that Olivier might be talking about when there's a request that goes through for authorization that the whole committee looks at that and I certainly would hope that that is not the case.

So if what we're talking about is just a monthly rolling look at the service level reports that IANA is issuing then that's fine. But if we're talking about this group getting involved in a day-to-day changes to the Whois database or potential change - potential delegations or re-delegations then I have a real concern. So I'd just like to get some clarity about what we're talking about here.

Is this a group that looks at the potentially developed SOAs and monitors performance against that or are we talking about something where this group can potentially get in the middle of a request for changes for IANA makes them? I'd just like to some clarity around that.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Donna. From my point of view in remembering what has been discussed it's been my thought that the CSC is - as you (discussed) - is not going to be the new authorization function, which is not something that we have resolved whether there will be a replacement for the authorization (funds for GNSO) what it will be.

But I think the - that this is - we're not speaking about having the CSC be the authorization function. And I do see them as essentially meeting if you will, you know, on the phone monthly to at least, you know, have a quick spot check or gut check or whatever kind of check you want to have - a comprehensive check of the reports from - that come out of the IANA function group.

And then have - if there are any issues would decide how to make a first attempt to resolve them in the same kind of back and forth way that, you know, Paul has indicated, you know, has taken place in the past. You know, directly speaking to the IANA and only if there is no ability to kind of resolve things quickly then that would be escalated to the MRT.

But presumably the majority or even vast majority of operational shortfall could be identified and discussed and a resolution passed - agreed by the CSC without the MRT ever being activated for that purpose. At least that's my thinking on the subject and I'll go back to Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you (Greg) it's Olivier speaking and I'll agree with you absolutely.

And I - when I mentioned slowing things down if have a CSC that is too large I was only repeating what's been said on the call a little bit earlier today. So, you know, ultimately I don't know whether it would slow things down. We're starting to really look too far ahead, but certainly keeping it compact, keeping it with people that know what they're talking about is what's important on that - (Donna) thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Olivier, Paul Kane.

Paul Kane: Just very briefly I would like to -I've been looking at the chat. I would like to agree with Donna, (Greg) - what you've been saying and Alan.

The CSC no - in no circumstances should slow anything down. It should not impact the day-to-day operation of how the IANA delivers service to its registry customers. With respect to the authorization function apparently performed by NTIA , that is a role that was introduced around about 2000ish. Before 2000 there was no authorization function, the regis- the cc registry operator was the party responsible for all entries in the IANA database.

We used to have real-time updating of that and the registry manager that was accountable to it's user community and so it was in the registry managers

interest to make sure that the information was the most accurate and entered in a timely and efficient manner. There was no way in which changes were slowed down when NTIA came into being - or sort to have oversight of entries that was checks and balances pro- routine. They didn't authorize a change, they confirmed that the process had been followed.

I sincerely advocate and hope that we will return to fully automated interface for those registries that want it so that the accountability rests with the registries to delivery a quality of service. And so there is no opportunity for those registries that want to be responsible for their entries in the IANA database to have any third party - ICANN, IANA or anyone else interfere with the changes they make.

They are accountable to their users which include governments, which include a legal contract with their registrants and they are accountable under the rule of law in which the registry is based. And so the CSC should not be an authorization function, it should not impede the ability of the registry manager to perform its function. Certainly the ccTLDs and very largely I probably I think probably for the gTLDs.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Paul, I think there seems to be strong support for that. I think that's one thing we can put to bed.

And I'd say that from - I'm seeing some convergence around the idea of a CSC that would have a number to be decided of registry operator representatives. A representative of the SSAC and RSSAC and some sort of multi-stakeholder representative for kind of everybody else that may be a liaison from the MRT. And that would provide kind of both a conduit and a little bit of transparency and a seat at the table but would clearly be as I - as we said it would be primarily and predominantly registries.

And I'm not sure - it would be nice to get some idea of what the registries think of how many registries should be on this - whether it should be one or three or five or some - if there's a number that is rational or based on - breaks down to registries as they currently stand. But I'd like to see if there's some general comment or strong disagreement with a - with that thought as well. So I don't know if (regis-) - Avri asked why don't registries get as many as they want. I'm not sure - it doesn't become a useful group if it's large.

And I think arguments about it being, you know, compact and lightweight kind of fall apart if there are 40 registries on the group. The IANA group, whether you're in the group or not doesn't affect your access to the reports, it's just providing some sort of a customer body that would in essence have a combined voice to go back to IANA. And one other - not to throw another item in here, but one other item that's been discussed about CSC functions is to have some voice on innovation.

And not just to review kind of current performance but to also have a voice on performance improvements such as, as Paul mentioned of automation. Which given I understand that it's basically existing but unplugged may not be so much an improvement issue per se, but it's a fair enough example. So I think maybe - I see Donna's hand is up.

Donna Austin: Thanks (Greg), Donna Austin. I guess I was going to make the point that perhaps, you know, we - you could - if you wanted to you could set a minimum requirement for what you want the CSC to be.

My minimum requirement maybe two ccTLD operators and maybe two gTLD operators and the rest are an (up) team. I'm pretty sure that Paul can probably confirm these is that cc's participated if they wanted to. So there was no

requirement for all cc's to be engaged in discussions with IANA with regards to improving performance. So maybe if we can just set a minimum requirement with the idea that others can opt in if they wanted to at some point in time.

But I think by trying to - I don't know I just feel that we've been down this road before. So perhaps let's set a minimum requirement of what we think is reasonable and maybe in every (I take it) point that we haven't agreed on at MRT but perhaps we need to think of the MRT in terms of what role it has in some of the functions that perhaps we're trying to put into the CSC. So I don't know I can - if it's possible to set a minimum requirement and then can we just move on?

We've done this at (Nozene), we've done it a few times now, so if we can at least agree on a minimum maybe we can move forward tomorrow.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Donna, I think we certainly have discussed this - (I don't know the point of (Nozene) but I think the sticking point has always been the size if any of the multi-stakeholder component that would be here.

And I think we have made some forward progress if there is some convergence on the idea of a single multi-stakeholder representative. I do know I think a comment by Alan that he said he did not think he heard any support from any one rest - from the rest of the multi-stakeholder world for that. I think - I mean not to speak for anybody else but in terms of the scorekeeping if you will I've spoken in favor of it. I think Milton, so that's at least the CSG NCSG, I don't know if we have a registrar or representative on the (scanning this year).

And ALAC and GAC, I saw GAC support for that as well I believe. So it seems to me that we did have kind of fairly broad support for a small (unintelligible). And (Graham Button) is here - I don't know (Graham) if you have a thought on that. If you're okay, you know, sharing a - kind of a multi-stakeholder representative kind of for all of the (quality) - all the other stakeholders in the list. Not as SSAC, not as RRSAC but the ALAC, GAC and the rest of GNSO does not rest - in fact registrars might grumble.

Well there's going to be grumbling of - in a sense that the CSG would certainly like a seat. The constituencies that are in the CSG which operate essentially independently would each like a seat but I'm sitting here saying that I think the sense I have of a CSG is that given that the multi-stakeholder action really occurs at the MRT that a single set of eyes and ears that is non-registry would win some day. So (Graham), you know, is going to take it back and (in spirit) he thinks he can make it work.

So I think that is the idea if we can get to that point that we have at least not - at least it doesn't look like a closed shop which gives people pause. It's not going to be full of a bunch of policy types wondering around, you know, wondering what IANA stands for I know we could get somewhere on this point. In any case I think unless there's anybody else who would like to speak to this topic, I see no hands - I think we could move on. I think this is - we've not only beaten the dead horse, I think we've (probably been eating) the dead horse.

So next point on this is (the line) how will the member seats on the CSC be allocated? I hopefully don't have to spend too much time on this. There's a suggestion that it will be done by this working group or it could be done by the MRT. And there's a suggestion that was made by an anonymous person so

I'm not sure if they were making the suggestions seriously or in just they could be done by the registry stakeholder group and the ccNSO.

I think that - if that's meant seriously that would be, you know, exclusively a stakeholder group of registries - or rather a CSC only registries. So I think we discard that - Donna I see your hand is up.

Donna Austin: (Greg) I'd just like to let you know that I am the unanimous contributor and I...

Greg Shatan: Oh okay.

Donna Austin: ...was it, I did within my comments I felt I had my name underneath it but obviously I didn't. So as the primary customers of this function I was very serious that those seats be determined by the registry.

Greg Shatan: Now certainly the registry seats should be determined by the registries.

And if we're talking about SSAC and RSSAC as having seats and would you think that the - who sits in those seats should be approved by the registries or by the CWG or CSC or whom else? And I'll ask essentially the same question for what we'll assume, you know, for the purpose of discussion is the single MR - multi-stakeholder seat?

Donna Austin: So perhaps I misunderstood what the - what the point was trying to get at. But I - I'm still a little bit confused in my head because we haven't agreed what representation would look like. So it's a little bit difficult to decide who's going to determine who will grace those seats.

One of the discussions that we had - I think Robert Guerra mentioned this during the discussion on the weekend work. Was that similar to what the SSAC does perhaps you actually have an application process whereby you can attest to certain technical expertise that would be useful in the work of the CSC. And then there is a selection process as to who is actually placed on the CSC.

So that was something that resonated with me and I thought it sounded reasonable but I don't see that as being identified here in any way, shape or form.

Greg Shatan: Right - Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you (Greg), it's Olivier speaking. I'm not against an SSAC type was it selection process or some way with, you know, applications and then peer review, etc.

That would certainly seem to be a nice way forward to have people that know what they're talking about. That said I wonder why we need to define the selection for this committee which is just going to be reviewing SLAs. Are we starting to really micromanage a bit too far on this? Because the - I would imagine the registries that the g's would want to have their own selection process, whatever process they put together to select people on that committee.

And the cc's would also want to design their own process and certainly if they're - any other seats that are there the various communities would design their own process. So I don't know why we would have to design this, if you could please clarify - thank you.

Greg Shatan: Yes, Olivier actually I tend to agree with you that the - each group should come up with a selection process.

And as Paul Kane notes the ccNSO may not be the right place for the cc's to make that decision since many cc's are not in the ccNSO. And that increasing number of g's are not necessarily in the registry stakeholder groups either among the new registry. And I don't want to belabor this so I do think that a selection process involves - it's primarily driven by the group who is putting folks on there with some form of credentialing. Or maybe it's at least an honor (forward) form of credentialing that would take place so that the people who are on there are useful (for any commenting).

And from the working weekend we talked about a two stage process to ensure they're a valid candidate. So I think we could - I don't know, I don't recall exactly what that said. And I see (Eduardo) saying what we decided about the final composition of the CSC, nothing was decided. There seem to be some convergence around the idea of a multi-stakeholder seat for the - for those that - other than SSAC and RSSAC and the registries.

And that there was also support for either representation or liaison depending on how the overall solution gets worked out with the IETF and the ASO so that the other - the numbers and protocol parameters customers are in synch with the numbers customers - the names customers rather. So I think that's somewhat where we're at and I think that needs to be floated back out to the larger group to see if we could get some support for that. And (Bernie) says reminding on the home group would nominate and some other independent would validate.

I'm not sure who the independent group would be and I think in the case of once a CSC is ongoing it could be the CSC or it could be the MRT. I think

this - the idea is if it is, you know, supposed to be a narrowly focused group that having somebody in there that doesn't know what they're doing isn't going to do anybody any good. But I would hope that there would be some recognition that contributions need to be valuable. I think we can roll past this to the next, unless there is any other comments on this point

The question here is will there be participants in addition to members? I know I see Alan Greenberg's saying the - one multi-stakeholder seat certainly will send a message to those that oppose the multi-stakeholder concept. I'm not sure what message it will send. Frankly it shouldn't be viewed in isolation, it should be viewed in conjunction with the MRT. And I guess the message is that the same multi-stakeholder type of representation, you know, should not be used for every organization.

That's not necessarily a bad message to send that we can be somewhat more flexible and build things that are fit for a purpose. That's a I think, you know, not a bad message at all. But getting back to this point, so the idea is that there would be - would not be participants in the sense that there are participants in this group who participate on an equal footing other than the rare vote or consensus polls. But inserted here based on some of the previous discussion that observers should be allowed consistent with transparency and accountability.

You know, the mailing list should be open and that - and the meeting should be opened to at least on the - on a listen-only basis -so any thoughts on that? Or should I say any disagreement with that as a concept? Being none I will move on, will there be alternate members? No, but members will need to provide a proxy for purposes of consensus policy will miss a meeting. This would of course kind of speak against an ad hoc organization of amebic size.

Should ccTLD registry representatives (seem) to be allocated by region? It says here TBD, I think I would take the - (to heart) what was said earlier that each group should figure out how it wants its representatives to be chosen. (Max) so I think, you know, seeing what you said a little bit earlier in the chat about (composition), that seems to be roughly where we're at as a - maybe as a slightly more - something more than a straw man and less than a final decision.

Yes (Purvoi) says note that SSAC has no operational role in ICANN's processes so one wonders whether a permanent role would be accepted by SSACT. Well if SSAC thinks they have nothing to bring to the table on a - kind of a monthly basis they can certainly - and they're of course always to be brought into a situation that's the CSC belief there is one that require SSAC response. I don't think anybody has to have a seat that is - that doesn't believe their organization should have a seat.

You know, there are some organizations that are clamoring for seats and the question is whether they should have one and then others that may think that they don't want one, which is to my mind just fine. In fact we've been saying since Frankfurt that this should be boring and that there should be some drop-offs over time. One would hope it's not boring to those who are doing it, you know, being a watchman in a sense is boring, but not when something is going wrong. In any case I digress a bit - a question of whether - (unintelligible).

So I would say in this case to let the cc's decide amongst themselves whether they are going to have representatives by region. Since they only have two representatives as, you know, might be a - one version of this then it seems to me they probably would not be by region. So the next question, should there be any other balance considerations (by) - from balance among stakeholder

groups which, you know, we agree is not going to be so balanced given their remit from the CSC and the distance of the MRT.

So the answer is no but the focus should be appointing qualified and dedicated people, so we're back on qualification again, which tends to be agreed on. The idea that members will be chosen by their stakeholder groups using (precedence) developed by these groups that seems to be getting a general support - Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Yes thank you very much (Greg), it's Olivier speaking. And I think that if there was boredom that came to some of the representatives in the CSC it might be a good idea for - and that's probably something for us to determine, whether the committee needs to appoint people to the CSC are able to recall them or replace them.

Greg Shatan: Right, yes I think that's actually two or three lines down. And yes obviously we don't want people just failing to contribute.

There is - should be enough interest that if someone falls away they should be replaced. So just going down next, how would these CSC meet - following Web face-to-face answer? You know, meetings will be primarily by phone and Web promote participation types. And face-to-face meetings could occur at ICANN meetings and doesn't necessary have to happen. Although I think that, you know, given a somewhat more frequent meetings of the CSC having them at the ICANN meeting would make perfect sense.

Then the next question I think gets to what Olivier brought up, can members be recalled by their communities and/or the MRT? It says yes they should be specified in the charter and each community should be encouraged to implement a method for recall. In addition to the MRT - maybe this should be

the CSC rather than the MRT - can remove a member for failure to participate pursuant to an escalation process to be determined? In other words not one strike and you're out but missing a certain number of meetings without proxy or apologies and maybe missing slightly more meetings.

If you have proxies and apologies yourself but haven't really participated on your own would be reasonable. So if anybody thinks any of this is unreasonable, you know, please speak up. Next can members be removed for other reasons in stated number of absences as we discussed? The MRT though I think this probably should be the CSC should be required to replace that member. Term lengths and limits, CSC member should be appointed for limited term.

I don't know if there's an opinion on how long those terms should be, I'll float two or three years out as possibilities since the first year is, you know, a learning process for many. Or even if they know what they're doing they don't necessarily know how to do it (in this content). Member staff term should be staggered to ensure continuity, that seems to be generally a popular idea. So it should not have - if there are say two representatives from the c's they should not work (it off) at the same time. Milton your hand's up.

Milton Mueller: Just on the terms I just wanted to throw in there the idea that some of us support periodic contracting think that the term length of the members should somehow correspond to that contracting cycle so that they would be in a better position to provide the input and oversight that would be required to do that.

Greg Shatan: So are you suggesting that - I know that we talked about that in the MRT. And given the MRT's involvement in the contracting that certainly makes sense. Are you suggesting that would also make sense here?

Milton Mueller: Yes. We certainly - my understanding is that the CSC would be able to elevate things to the MRT or provide the MRT with information.

And that I think we're also talking about one of the members of the CSC being a liaison to the MRT. So I think it makes sense to synch up the contracting cycle with the MRT term lengths and the CSC term lengths.

Greg Shatan: Okay, now that would mean if there were say a five year term for a contract that are you suggesting that members should be on four or five years or that they should not rotate off during say a contract review process? Or how would you match it up with the contracting cycle assuming there's a contracting cycle?

Milton Mueller: I guess it would mean that - so yes if the contracting cycle is five years yes you could have staggered terms but they should be at least five years so that nobody would go on or off the CSC without being part of at least one contracting cycle and the continuity to the newer members going into a contracting cycle.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Milton.

Milton Mueller: Does that make sense?

Greg Shatan: Yes, yes it does - any thoughts on that - agreement, disagreement? Being neither I'll move on - I did see some discussion in the chat of about whether meeting schedule should be set.

I don't think it's overly prescriptive to say for a group that's reviewing monthly reports that you should be once a month possibly after those reports come out. Whether the meeting takes 15 minutes or longer or people agree that a

meeting is needed that particular month (because that) everything - everybody agrees that the report was just plan vanilla, I don't have a problem with that. And in five years it seems like it may be long for a lot of people. It seems long to me and I understand that, you know, the desire for some institutional knowledge.

But I think, you know, by and large there's going to be a lot of institutional knowledge around outside of the representatives as can be seen by the people who are around the table or even on this phone call. And so I think if we think of the representatives as representatives they should be able to call on their predecessors and those with longer beards so to speak in their groups. So that would be kind of my thought that we may get (probably) somebody there on a five year tour of duty may be - that maybe as discouraging as anything else.

Although if somebody wants to stick around for five years or even ten or fifteen years that may not be an issue. So anyway let us move along because we're now at a quarter past the first - into the second hour. How will the leadership be - of the CSC be constituted to suggest at least a chair and a vice chair typically of minimum to function - any thoughts on that? It certainly seems reasonable to me - seeing no thoughts at the moment. How will decisions be made?

It says whenever possible decisions will be made on the basis of rough consensus. Decisions I suppose might be more talked out in the sense of if there is a shortfall what is the best approach? At what point does a decision have - and whether it's time to escalate to the MRT versus not might also be the type of decisions that could be made. If it were necessary or formal since census poll would be conducted among the members and then some disagreement here in the sense there are possible two variables, whether there should be voting or no voting at all.

Or whether there should be voting but that uses a super majority voting concept? Any thoughts on this - Donna Austin.

Donna Austin: So (Greg) I guess when I saw this it raised the question of what would they possible be voting on. I think this is kind of a collegiate group, not necessarily a voting or a decision-making group. So I'm just curious as to what things you think they would be voting on?

Greg Shatan: Yes I tend to agree, as I said I think, you know, decisions that might be made are when to escalate something and perhaps the approach that might be taken in going back to IANA to discuss the performance short - for shortfall.

But I agree that, you know, generally the multi-stakeholder model voting, you know, is the exception in the sense rather than the rule. I'm not going to pretend to be a scholar on the multi-stakeholder model but from what I see. And that I would probably say that they should stick to the rough consensus model and that there would be not voting. So these are just, you know, alternatives that were, you know, in the mix in our discussion.

So I'm throwing out and part of the trick here is to eliminate, try to get down to some things that might actually be statements that we could all reasonably get behind in a consensus compromise of sort of fashion. So anybody who likes the idea of voting for this group I will ask them to state their case. Nobody among the current participants stating their case, I think that we can remove voting from this list and stick to (rough consensus) and decide whether coming is going to part of that or not - I mean made within the CSC.

Will the CSC have other advisors including legal counsel? The answer there is there should be none given their responsibility. I think, you know, the only

advisors if you will be going to be, you know, there's the RSSAC and then there's kind of liaison but not really expert advisors coming in from protocols and numbers. But I think this seems to be kind of the right answer to me with regard to experts. I hope that there's expertise and expect that there be, you know, expertise within the group on this point.

Communications for the MRT - CSC will communicate all formal and required manners in the writing to the MRT and emails accessible but not social media, text or chat. Some will get into the weeds on that point and again I think the only communications that are going to be an escalation which one (should) hope (unintelligible) would do in a Twitter in a tweet. So that also seems to be fairly straightforward and agreeable. Some of this is supposed to be noncontroversial so it's good to see that some of it may actually be.

Support needs - CSC role requires a secretariat. It would be nice to have some help, I don't know if it will require a secretariat but there should be at least some help. They could share this with the MRT and we'll need kind of the usual - some sort of a Wiki in place to store its information, especially for transparency and accountability reason should have that. In terms of secretariat for my particular constituency our secretarial - secretariat I believe were we get four hours a week.

So we're not talking about a full-time secretariat, so we're just talking about a little bit of, you know, clerical administrative assistance so that we're not all engaging in self-help at all times pitching our own tents. So I think that's what we're talking about there. And whether if a secretariat is a little bit of extra help is not needed and never called on then, you know, that can always be taken out of the budget.

Or if there is a member who contributes kind of secretarily because they happen to have, you know, the good support in their own place that's also fine too. Compensation for members - members will not be compensated except in banks with the community. Travel support - this was to be determined. If offered at all members should receive travel support only based on need. E.g. for members who do not have travel paid for by their employer or their organization and only for face-to-face meetings that are not ICANN or Internet governance meetings.

Which I guess would be some sort of a special purpose CSC only meeting like a - the Frankfurt face-to-face for our group - which was unique to our group. Anybody who thinks that there should be more travel support for members of this group than that or that it shouldn't be need based. I guess the point of need is that they're - is to allow for some issues that may come from especially developing countries where the expense of getting to a face-to-face meeting, if there ever was one.

And there may never - as Donna said, I can't envision a situation where travel would be required. Because under these circumstance it would only be a unique kind of CSC only meeting or maybe a CSC/MRT meeting. So I think it's - that we may be talking about (MC)s at this point. So I think we can probably move on on this point and say basically no travel support unless somebody wants to make an argument that there should be some need based travel support. (Matthew) says - plus one to Donna all the check-ins at ICANN meetings might be useful.

Certainly nobody's going to stop a bunch of people saying the CSC is going to meet in the lobby bar at 6:00 PM. That might actually increase participation in the CSC. When was the CSC - the CSC will meet at a minimum on a monthly basis to review the performance for it. I would take out at a minimum, I would

say more that they would meet on a monthly basis subject to the group deciding that a meeting was necessary based on the monthly report. Funding, same as MRT that's kind of a punt at the moment but I think we'll leave it there.

Capture, the safeguard is supposed to be in place to ensure that the CSC remains independent of "ICANN corporate" but also it cannot be captured or unduly influenced by government, IGOs for specific economic or ideological interests or I would add, you know, particular stakeholder groups or ACs conceivably. Any thoughts on capture? I know we have some people for whom capture is a potentially hot issue. Avri says who's already captured by registrar - any response to that?

I guess the issue is for what it is doing is this really capture? Is there an ability for the group to do something that would not be in - a benefit to the Internet community as a whole? I don't think we want to say that from every imbalanced organization has been captured. I think there's some who would say every organization that doesn't have a representative from every possible group has been captured by everybody else, so that's my - I don't find that to be compelling. I think capture needs to be looked at on a case by case basis.

I think if there is a - since this is a customer standing committee as Milton said this would be like the NTSG being captured by non-commercial interest. No one wants to argue whether certain non-commercial interests have captured the NTSG to the exclusion of others. We probably could argue that about every single stakeholder group in AC. You know, so unless we're doing this over, adult beverages, I don't think there's anything valuable to be gained by saying who's captured by whom. More generally Milton your hand is up.

Milton Mueller: Well again, I just - I think the word capture is thrown around in a way that is getting to be a little bit ridiculous because, you know, you have to look at an entire, you know, what power is it that is being captured here in the CSC?

It's - we were having this discussion earlier and Donna Austin got a lot of plus one's who's saying that she didn't think the CSC would be making that many decisions - it's more a oversight and escalation and reporting. So what exactly is the, you know, what are you capturing if you captured the CSC? The right to do a lot of, you know, reading of SLAs or - I just don't quite get this, you know. If you want to talk about capture you're talking about power and you have to pay attention to where power really is.

And you don't necessarily protect against capture by just having a lot of different stakeholders, you know, normally different categories of stakeholders on a group either. There's all kinds of fully open representative entities that can (inside) be captured by small elites who perpetuate themselves. So let's not throw this term around as if we were discussing, you know, who was the President of the United States or whose going to have their finger on a button that launches nuclear missiles.

We're talking about, you know, the customer standing committee that, you know, looks as IANA.

Man: Is (Greg) muted?

Greg Shatan: Sorry I was talking to myself, I left the mute button on - sorry about that. But I think in terms of capture given the narrowness of a remit which is, you know, one of the ways in which capture is controlled for is, you know, to narrow the power of the group.

I think that is the kind of the capture protection here and the transparency and the accountability. So I'm not sitting here sweating capture personally. And I'm not necessarily someone who, you know, thinks there's never been any capture in the history of ICANN. Last question here which is kind of, you know, ending with a whimper rather than a bang, how does the CSC conduct site visits which are in the current IANA function contract? And we did have it confirmed that the NTIA does in fact conduct site visits.

So the first question may be is it the CSC that should conduct these site visits which are annual or should it be the MRT? And if so should it be the whole group or something less than that? Alan Greenberg I think its 11:30 at night and hopefully Alan has been enjoying some of the fine native beverages of Frankfurt - suggests that CSC conduct site visits on site. (Fulcan) suggests site visits are not needed. That's certainly a valid point, they are not, you know, they're in the contract.

I don't know if the NTIA ever got anything good out of the site visit. I'm certainly not one who's sitting here arguing that site visits have to exist -
Donna Austin.

Donna Austin: Thanks (Greg), Donna Austin - so I don't know this for certain but I think some of the site visit was associated with - obviously it's a relationship thing.

I think the other possibility was that in the most recent contract that NTIA has with ICANN there was to be a separation in terms of China's walls I guess within the ICANN offices itself, so I guess there's merit there and sort of NTIA to have site visits. But I also want to point to something that I had in the chat and that is that IANA has provided updates to the ccNSO on a regular basis at ICANN meetings since I've been involved in ICANN. I expect that

that kind of reporting will start to appear during the registry stakeholder group sessions.

And I think IANA also does (our positions) during the ICANN meetings as well. So to Paul Kane's point about whether a site visit is actually required, I think there are ample opportunities at the ICANN meetings that if you want to have some interaction with IANA and question what's going on then there are opportunities to do so. I don't know what value a site visit would be, perhaps to see how the service are or something like that. But if there was to be a site visit I would say it would be two or three representatives of either the CSC or the MRT. It does not have to be the committee or the team as a whole.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Donna that was my thinking as well that there should be a small group if it's needed at all. And, you know, given that, you know, the site visit doesn't seem to be like this would be all that thrilling.

It's not like we're looking at a physical site where there are going to be, you know, extreme needs, you know, for the site to be prepared in a certain fashion. And that it's really more, you know, speaking to the people that's kind of the essence of the site visit. I mean I suppose one could see, you know, make sure that they are not running IBM PC XT's or Capros and that they are not sitting on boxes.

But I'm not sure what would really be accomplished by a site visit per se, especially since there could be pictures and (unintelligible). So I know, you know, Paul Kane and (Mary Uma) asked, you know, what about registries that do not attend ICANN meetings? I guess the question is, is there a need for in-person interaction with the IANA staff that should be satisfied in some other fashion for those who don't attend ICANN meetings?

Frankly I'm not sure that there needs to be, there is Webinars that could be handled, you know, seeing at Elise Garrett on your computer screen may not be completely as thrilling as seeing her in some exotic local, though it seems to me just as functional. I see that IANA staff to attend regional meetings, maybe a briefing recently so that seems to be handling it, right. In any case it is the CSC site visit, you know, it's not a huge number of registries that will be there.

It's just a couple of people we're talking about regardless, so maybe be mixing things up a bit. So I think we've gotten kind of to the end of this issue - Donna is that an (end ap)? Both hands, we're now staring at a blank expanse. It's now 5:34, before we move off of the CSC I'd like to ask whether there's an general issues of the CSC that we haven't touched on? I think we've certainly not just touched on some but have mauled them like kitten with a dead mouse. So if there's any - this is kind of the open chat version here.

I see a suggestion from Milton that we could adjourn given that it is a holiday in the United States and that a number of our participants are sitting in Frankfurt and have an early call for tomorrow. I do not find that to be a bad suggestion at all. So and I think that anything we start at this point we won't finish and that we will have some (flagging) folks who might actually want to get back to either sleep or a day that's been declared a holiday in their country or by their employee. I see a plus one from (Bernie) so I will ask for a last open - the mic is open for anybody who would like to say anything about anything.

I think Avri says this meeting will drive me to drink as soon as it ends - hopefully you can do that in the (Casa Blanca) bar or wherever you are - that was the bar in Frankfurt when we were there. In any case I think MRT will be next up. We've been at it for - the MRT before actually and haven't really

spent any time on the IAP or contract so those I think are actually next up. But I will try to circulate some more documents.

Both go back to the MRT documents and prepare similar documents for the IAP and MRT and also a summary of the functions that we've assigned to the CSC which I think have been touched on in the call in the previous one already. So with that and I see that some members are indicating they are drinking during the meeting, I should allow them to enjoy their drink. And I will bring this meeting to a halt - a close. And thank you all - operator you can stop the recording.

END