

---

COMPUTER VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hi there. This is reassuring words. Hoping that people are checking their audio and mic now please.

AVRI DORIA: I can't say that I feel reassured.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, trust me, neither do I, but I was asking if someone could put some reassuring words to hear, and who am I to deny that request, sadly?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Hi everyone. We'll be starting in just one minute. Give us one more minute, and the call will begin.

AVRI DORIA: A voice of authority, reassured.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Avri, now I'm really, after the quick, my dear. If Jonathon can reassure you and I can't [heavy sigh].

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

JONATHAN ROBINSON: It's on.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi everyone. Welcome to the second call for the intensive work weekend. Today is 19:00 UTC, we're starting a little bit late because we had some technical difficulties with the phone bridge. We now have provided you with a new phone bridge, and I'm happy to assist with any difficulties if you just send me an email or write to me in the chat, I'll help you connect.

We're going to start the recording and I'll turn it over to the co-chairs.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay everyone, just one of the practical, this is Jonathan Robinson. One of the practical outcomes of that little hitch that we've had, is that you won't get a transcript as immediately as you might otherwise have done, because we have to wait 24 hours.

The recording should come soon, but the transcript may not be available swiftly. Have we got the recording going? Can I confirm the recording is running?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The recording is going.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: [Inaudible]. So welcome, again, to our second call on this intensive work weekend. Here what we want to do is go beyond what we talked

---

about in a previous call with the survey results, and start to consider some detail coming out of the area of convergence, that is areas that were dealt with by Robert on the survey that was highlighted in green.

And ideally also to cover some of the items in yellow, if possible. We may use the timer to constrain the talking times, try to keep us on track. We could extend the time available. We have the opportunity to go up to three hours, I think we might make a call on that later.

We'll work two hours, we'll work toward a two hour call, and see how we get on, and try to make as much progress. Our objective in this call is to really provide a concrete basis for further drafting on core concepts where we appear to have convergence, or agreement, and then that further drafting will come back to the group as a whole.

So let's have a look at those key areas. Let me just pause and see if Lisa or anyone else would like to make any comments at this stage before we move into the mechanics.

All right. Lisa is happy to carry on, so I'll work with her to do that. So really you should see, in the Adobe room now, what we've got is, if we pick up from the green areas relating to the customer service committee, or the CSC, we broke this down further into trying to think carefully about the purpose of the particular component, and thinking about the core functions and the issues to be addressed, and then to work with those areas of agreement that needed the further details, being aware, mindful, of the points from a public comment, including things like complexity or simplicity.

---

There is also a comment in the previous call to be mindful of areas of some of those groups where a significant portion of the agreement arose from the, is acceptable comment. So we'll be mindful of that. Another point that we've been asked to be mindful of in the past is to focus on effectiveness of the core functions, but to reduce complexity where possible. So we'll look for constructive suggestions there.

And then to think about the fact that this is ultimately going to be sort of handled within the RFP3, which is implementation, and RFP4 on consequences or implications of any particular area. So, those are the areas to be mindful of. Let's pick up on them. First of all, on the CSC and the areas, there is a green area. So under the remit, or function, which you'll see at the top of the notes section in your Adobe, the first point was that there should be a CSC, to carry out the task as defined by the CWG draft proposal, question 1A of the survey.

And that clearly had good agreement. So let me come to that and see if there are any comments on the detail arising from that, any...

So, there should be a customer standing committee to carry out the task as defined. And I guess what we're doing here is... Sorry Cheryl. I didn't give you the opportunity to make that housekeeping. Please note Cheryl's housekeeping point on the postponement of the RFP5 call.

So there should be a CSC to carry out the tasks, and I guess what we're doing here is making sure where there was, that there is an opportunity here to...

The phone is not on mute.

---

So here we had in 1A, strong agreement, agreement is acceptable. I note that we have a couple of disagree and strongly disagree. I should just say that this is an opportunity in sort of closing off these items to the extent that we can, or ensuring that the group is in agreement here, that if someone did strongly disagree, or disagree, it's an opportunity for them to make that point known, so the rest of the group understands why they were in strong disagreement.

So just because we are proceeding on areas where there is strong convergence, doesn't mean that if there is a strong reason why you disagree, there is no reason why you shouldn't raise your hand on that one. So, thanks Avri, I note that. And we're going to have to come back to the corresponding comments associated with these points in doing the drafting.

So yeah, that's a good point. Could we look at the comments? I'm slightly concerned that if we do the comments, in detail, we'll slow ourselves right down, but by all means, it is a good point, and raise the comment if appropriate.

So are there any other detailed points that we should note in relation to the fact that there should be a CSC to carry out these tasks?

Chuck.

CHUCK GNOMES:

Jonathon, I'm not going to respond to that, but I'm going to add something to what you just said a little bit ago, and more respectively in regards to Avri's point in the chat. Avri, we recognize our preference

---

between the two calls that we needed to integrate the comments where they fit into this work, we just didn't have time to do that so that we don't waste a lot of time on the call.

So we did we recognize that need, and the plan is to do that so that we can correlate the comments to the discussions that we are having. Unfortunately, we just didn't have enough time to do that before this call.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Robert?

ROBERT GUERRA: Yes, I'm just maybe, taking to Avri's point. I'm looking at the comments as we're going through this particular question, without necessarily attributing, one of the comments is that if we proceed down the route of CSC, what's needed? And it's needed to define its scope, its functions, its membership, that's one of the comments related to this question and something to think about, I think, going forward.

That one of the other comments related to this as we go forward in this section is that, the CSC membership should be diverse, with representatives from regions, so on, so the multistakeholder nature, and again, its scope. Those are some of the key comments related to this question that have been put down in the comment section in regards to the CSC.

And hopefully, we'll be working on those going forward.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: So our intention is to make live notes on these contributions get made, and that's... I mean, in essence, Robert, thank you, that's where this piece of work goes to, because we're going to look at the remit or function, look for the detail on it, look for any additional complimentary detail on composition, and so on. So Alan, Alan Greenberg, your hand is up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I have a question, or maybe a suggestion in the area of the composition and simplicity. Is there any reason this group can't be an ad-hoc group? Whoever wants to be there, is. If multistakeholders don't choose to show up, then they're not there. That's their choice. Registries presumably will participate, because there will be registries who will be reviewing the reports on a regular basis anyway. Why do we need to make it complex?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. Robert?

ROBERT GUERRA: So again, this is one of the other questions that, I think, one of the results as well too, is we haven't gotten to it yet, is that there is a question, there is also a high level of agreement, in terms of who should be on the CSC. And it was basically, some technical experts together with, I guess, clients or the way it's defined now. I don't remember the exact question, and so we haven't gotten to that point yet, but I would

---

---

say that's a good point Alan, but that's one of the other findings that kind of came up as well.

And so, you know, let's maybe park that for a moment and revisit it when we're there, but definitely... But to you Jonathon and...

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I thought Jonathon was asking comments on composition as well. My apologies.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. So, I see that the hand has gone down. So the next point is, the role of this, I'm moving on from point A to point B, the role of the CSC should be focused on service level commitments as indicated in quality assurance, which is question 13 of the survey.

And you'll see that there was some very limited strong disagreement and no opinion, was the bulk of this strong agreement or is acceptable. So the question is, are there any detailed points or issues that should be fleshed out in this area that members of the group would like to comment on, or make sure are covered here? In further refinements of the draft, and development of the draft text that exists already.

No? Yes, I see a hand from Robert.

ROBERT GUERRA: So I'll just raise the hand. So I think it's just in regards to going forward. If we accept this, is there any reference that we want to make, are the



---

existing service level agreements defined? Is that something that needs to be defined later? But I think it's just something to think about. But I think it's just that, you know, again, if everyone is fine or do they want a nuance, just a little bit, just kind of curious to get across the room at this time.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Chuck.

CHUCK GNOMES: Just to try and help you out a little bit, Jonathan, in terms of this, but let me add another question for this. Are there any other action items on this statement that the CWG should work on to make some progress in terms of this particular issue? One of the things that I think would be helpful coming out of this meeting today, if we knew what additional steps might be helpful to firm this up even more.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks Chuck. Greg?

GREG SHATAN: Greg [inaudible] here. It's an answer to the question about service levels. It seems to me that any group that is going to have service levels to deal with, is going to want to review the current service levels, which are in the... Largely, I think, in the IANA contract is going away. So, I would not think necessarily about them blindly.

---

I find that they are completely appropriate. There would be a review of that, and question of where those service levels would live, if there is a service level agreement, even if there is not a contract. Otherwise, but you know, in terms of function, they're focused on service level commitments, key performance indicators, and quality terms, they want to be, I think, an initial group as this new group took this over, and not just inherit blindly the current situation.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: So actually, that's a good point. Should be really a continuous review and update of current and future service level agreements, right? It's a periodic review on updates of service...

GREG SHATAN: It wouldn't be continuous, it would be [inaudible] much... Hopefully this thing will be fairly stable.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yeah, periodic is probably a better way of putting it. Donna, sorry your hand is now down. You put it down. All right.

Donna go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks Jonathan. Sorry, I guess my guess is probably similar to what [inaudible] said. That there should be continuous review by the CSC in terms of what their focus is on, and I think some of the outcome of

---

whatever the service levels are, might determine whether there is other focus areas that they should be looking into.

So I think it's... While focus on service level commitments, performance, and quality assurance is a good starting point, I don't think it should be restricted that, and I think it should be up to the CSC to determine what that should be in any given point in time. They should have that autonomy to be able to do that.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay, thank you. So that [inaudible] that's just come in there, continuous review of initial and future service level agreements. Was that a question in the survey?

DONNA AUSTIN: This is [inaudible], so that's...

JONATHAN ROBINSON: That's a note, yeah, okay....

DONNA AUSTIN: And comment, which...

JONATHAN ROBINSON: That's helping. That's why I wasn't sure if I had missed it. It felt like it was something new, but it didn't have a reference to a question in the

---

survey, so yeah, good. Thank you, that's helpful. Alan Greenberg, your hand is up.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, question. If the CSC establishes or decides on new service levels, they're not empowered to enforce them, since that's likely a contractual terms, unless of course, the IANA voluntarily says yes, we'll do that. Am I missing something?

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

That's a good point. What authority does the CSC have? How do we confer some form of authority on the CSC? Greg, did you want to respond directly to that?

GREG SHATAN:

Yes. Whichever structure we end up with, if there is a contract, it's fairly straightforward. If we go with a non-contractual solution, then there needs to be some sort of an arrangement within ICANN and IANA to agree to the service levels that are proposed by the CSC. And going back to the question, I think there was slightly stronger support for the CSC initiating service levels, with review by the MRT than there was for the CSC having kind of free reign to go and set new service levels just kind of amongst themselves.

So, I guess the kind of relationship between the CSC and the MRT.

---

JONATHAN ROBINSON: But nevertheless, in either case, there seems to be a requirement here that maybe we should capture, I don't know if we can capture it here, but a requirement to have a binding commitment to service level agreements.

GREG SHATAN: Right. Of some sort, through some like, some vehicle.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yeah. A mechanism for... Really, what's required is a mechanism for binding the entity to the relevant service level agreement.

GREG SHATAN: [Inaudible] an internal one, then we may have a situation where the bylaws that says that the service level be adopted, unless there is a 75% vote against by the Board, or something like that, or even if 100% of the Board votes against this. We're not going to get to that governance question right now, but... And again, if you have a contract, then it's just somewhat easier, although even there, you have to get the contract, has to setup, how that would be agreed to between the two parties.

The parties, you know, providing the service and the party receiving the service, have to come to a mutual understanding, the contract hasn't been a very big, hasn't been very popular in [inaudible] unilateral contract.

---

JONATHAN ROBINSON: So [inaudible] what's required, I think, under point C is peer review of an issue service level agreement, and then in brackets, and a mechanic to bind IANA to those, or bind the IANA function to those. Right. A string of hands have come up, so let's open up to Martin Boyle next. Martin go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Martin, if you're speaking, we're not hearing you.

GRACE ABUHAMAD: Hi Martin, it's Grace. You're not muted in the room, so perhaps if you haven't connected, I can private chat you and we can figure out what the technical difficulties with your phone line, maybe we'll come back to you at the end of the queue.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You have a microphone...

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay, let's go to Alan and then we'll come back to Martin. If you could drop your hand and re-raise it, or keep it there Martin, keep it there, and we'll come back to you. Too late. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. I presumed that it was a given that if there was service levels, there is a commitment to meet them or explain why, but I have more, I have some concern on changing service levels mid-contract if

---

there is a contact or whatever, without mutual agreement. I mean, service levels can have significant impact on budgets and other things like that.

And so it can't be something that's just unilaterally imposed.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I think that's a good point. Maybe as a bilateral mechanical something like that, so we need, but this is the kind of detail that we need, maybe it's an additional point. Does that satisfy Alan? A bilateral mechanic to bind...

ALAN GREENBERG: I think service levels don't have any meaning unless there is a commitment to try to honor them, but it was a changing them that I had a problem with on a more ad-hoc basis.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Gary, your hand is up.

GARY CAMPBELL: So I think just in addition to the service level commitments, I think that's equally important too is the publication of the performance indicators as well. There are a lot of comments, and I think it's some of the SSAC comments as well, I think these are these other aspects that it's important for those to continue, and to possibly if there is any improvement, that they be there as well too.

---

So that party insurance and performance indicators aspects are key elements to the CSC as well.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: So the notes that [inaudible] publication of QA and performance indicators.

GARY CAMPBELL: Yes.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Martin, can we come to you again and see if we're able to hear you now?

MARTIN BOYLE: Yeah. Can you hear me now?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yes.

MARTIN BOYLE: Great. It's Martin Boyle here. Yeah, it was about the service level agreement, and I was trying to remember back to the current contract, which if I remember correctly, required the service level agreement to be discussed and agreed between the IANA functions operator and the customers. Now my understanding was that was done, and it would seem to me anyway to be fairly good practice for service level



---

agreements, and performance indicators to be agreed between the supplier and the customer anyway.

So in fact, I wondered whether we could be looking at the bilateral mechanic as being that you end up with an agreement, and you published [inaudible], and that is and what is being monitored against. And that seems to me to be, you know, where we are at the moment, and the most satisfactory for both sides. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: All right. Thanks Martin. I think we'll leave it, that makes sense. Avri?

AVRI DORIA: Yeah, thank you. This is Avri speaking. My question has to do with, yes, the role of the CSC would be focused on the service level, but are all of its message of doing something about it depends on some other part of the architecture, some other part of the plan, or do they have some methodology for some avenue for fixing things.

Do they have any enforcement capability, or compliance capabilities vis a vis the contract holder, in this case ICANN's fulfillment of those SLAs? Or is it just something that they report to someone else, and they deal with it? Thanks.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks Avri, that's a good question. And just a point not necessarily related to that question, just highlighting. So the purpose of what we're trying to do here is establish that there is no disagreement, or no subtle

---

disagreement with elements from the survey that have come out with high levels of agreement. And then to look for, as specific as possible, statements or text or input into how other complimentary items can be drafted.

Greg, you wanted to respond, or...?

GREG SHATAN:

I was going to respond directly to Avri's question. I think as originally envisioned, the CSC would have, if it's an issue, a service issue level arose, they would be kind of the first level help desk, if you will, or mediator, and try to have a conversation with IANA function to resolve that issue. If they failed to resolve it, it seems like it wasn't going anywhere, they would go to the MRT, which would have an escalation, and then there would be probably a similar escalation within the IANA function operator to bring it up to a higher level.

And then if that did not result in a resolution, then return to kind of contractual, there would be further escalation, within the contract or whatever document was, you know, documented the relationship, would then ultimately maybe [inaudible] but there would still be, I think, in any case, a number of levels of escalation before you ultimately got to some sort of nuclear option, which hopefully you would never get to.

But that I think is the general view, is that the CSC doesn't have quote/unquote enforcement powers, but it has remediation powers, unless if its efforts to solve the problem don't hold, don't bear fruit,

---

then it goes up to the MRT and things get, you know, tougher and tougher. It's just like dealing with your parents or something.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: So good point Greg, thank you. And Avri makes it clear in the chat, that therefore, if we should make that explicit. If the CSC is going to be a diligent customer, that doesn't necessarily have any escalation powers...

GREG SHATAN: Well it has escalation powers....

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Enforcement, I'm sorry, enforcement powers.

GREG SHATAN: And that's always, that's not even implicit in its own situation. It can say, you know, if there is all of this here, then we're going to escalate it. Then it becomes a multistakeholder issue, and then it becomes a bigger issue, and then it becomes a contractual issue. And then it becomes an RSC, and then you're done. Not having that power doesn't necessarily mean that they can't rattle the source.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks Greg. I think that the previous hand that was raised has gone down. So, if you could lower yours as well, that would be great. Good.

---

So unless I hear other comments in and around remit and function, I'm sure there is potentially plenty, so without wanting us to jump all over the place, if you do feel that we've missed something, we'll come back and raise any other points. And if either the coordinators, or if anyone wants to ask any questions for clarification of the group, by all means, do as well.

But let's move on then to composition, which is the next key area. And question 11 deals with the fact that users of the IANA function should be able to address issues directly with the IANA functions operator, rather than being required to go to the MRT. And the basis of that was, well you can see in your document under page 11, I won't attempt to summarize the level of agreement, but it was certainly [inaudible] to be green in our terminology.

So I'm going to state these out as a given, and really hope that the group would challenge these, or seek new answers, or make points in and around them, because really what's really useful for us is to be able to do two things. One, establish that the group, the CWG, is in agreement with these concepts, and two, to the extent that they are not feel unable to say so, and three, to the extent that the detail requires addition to the drafting, that the group is able to make.

Thank you Matthew. I see that you say 11 and 12 should be taken together. Let's look at 12 then. 12 talks about...

So let's look at them together. We said that we would consider looking at the yellow, and in this instance, it probably makes sense to look at a green and a yellow, so question 12 is a yellow point, but nevertheless,

---

so 11 is address issues directly with IANA functions operator, rather than being required to go to the MRT, which is a green. And 12, address issues directly with IANA operator rather than going to the CSC.

They're closely related. Any other comments or points on that? Greg.

GREG SHATAN: Yes, 12 doesn't mean that dissatisfied customers can't talk to the CSC. It just means that the CSC is not blocking customers from talking directly to IANA that have questions. And that's important to understand.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks Greg.

MARK CHAPMAN: Mark Chapman. I think we need to look at 10, 11, and 12 altogether. 10 says, users of the IANA naming functions should be required to go to the CSC or the MRT, to address issues relating to the IANA functions operator. I think this one was taken directly from a public comment. And then 11 and 12 were drafted by the survey makers to provide kind of alternatives to flesh that out, and as we can see, that was pretty strongly disagreed with.

So the idea that the CSC functions as a gatekeeper for all of the registries, that can't go talk to the IANA functions operator themselves, was fairly soundly rejected. Although I should say that two people strongly agreed that the CSC should be the only way that the registries

---

should be able to go and talk to IANA, and six others agreed, and eight others found it acceptable. That's kind of interesting, the responses.

But nonetheless, came out of 16 and 18 disagree or strongly disagree, so it's 64% or so. [Inaudible] there is only one no opinion, so [inaudible]... So basically the question is, okay, rejecting that idea that the CSC is the only people who can talk to IANA, then the question was whether they would be required to go through the CSC or through the MRT?

And basically those were both answered that they should be required. They can go directly to the IANA, without having to go through any intermediary body. So the three of these together basically say that the CSC nor the MRT should be a gatekeeper for registries to go and talk to IANA if they've got an issue.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: So can we capture that then, this sort of effective summary of 10, 11, and 12, which is that users should have the opportunity, in essence, that users should have the opportunity to go direct to the IANA functions operator, and not have to go through an intermediary.

MARK CHAPMAN: Correct.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yes. Thank you Brendan in the chat and Matthew for helping us to get to that point. I note that before we go back on the queue, that Erik has

---

said, shouldn't there be clarity when the CSC can address direct to IANA? Yes, so maybe that's a point in, Erik, maybe that's a point where...

Yes, so I'm wondering whether Erik's point highlights that there should be some kind of threshold for, almost when an issue is sufficiently serious that the CSC needs to go direct to the MRT, rather than... That's something to think about. Anyway, let me go back to the queue. I've got Elise in the queue.

ELISE LINDEBERG:

Thank you this is Elise. [Inaudible]... have a dialogue with the IANA, even [inaudible] this model. I think otherwise this model [inaudible] possibility to [inaudible] having this dialogue. It needs to [inaudible]... So I think we should [inaudible]...

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Elise, we're having a problem hearing. I'm sorry to interrupt you. We're having problems hearing you. I'm not sure if you can speak closer to the mic or something. It's hard for us to hear you.

ELISE LINDEBERG:

Okay. Can you hear me?

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

That's better now. Yes, much better. Thank you.

---

ELISE LINDBERG:                      Okay. So you didn't get anything of what I said basically?

JONATHAN ROBINSON:                Not really. It would be useful to have it all again.

ELISE LINDBERG:                      Okay. Now, it was just to support what Greg was saying about, to be specific in our text and our model, and the explaining to the community that the direct customer support have the right to bring things directly to IANA. I think if we are not cautious about having that very clearly in this model, it would fail, because I don't think we have the possibility to stop a dialogue between direct customers and IANA.

I think it would not be wise. So just to support that. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:                Okay. Well thanks for reinforcing that. I think that what effectively what we have got out of 10, 11, and 12, but that's very useful that you've reinforced that. Avri, let's go to you.

AVRI DORIA:                            Thank you. Avri speaking. One of the issues I have is fuzziness between the micro and macro of this. Like in the conversation we've just had, we talked about individual customers, individual issues, and those being directly to IANA, and I have no question with that. My question was, is the CSC working on aggregate information, and SLAs in their statistical



---

macro overall sense, or are they actually involved in the day to day issues of registries with IANA?

In terms of the NTIA, you know, function replacement, certainly there was no daily, you know, go running to NTIA to have issues, individual issues dealt with. So I feel there is a fuzzy border here, and I don't quite understand how we deal with the micro/macro division. Thanks.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Well Avri, maybe I could ask to... I mean, would you care to make a suggestion as to how to remove that fuzziness? I mean...

AVRI DORIA: I mean that's just it. I mean, all of this conversation we've had about, you know, the customers and registries being able to go directly to IANA, seems to be almost it shouldn't be a conversation because individual issues would not be going to the NSC, or would that? And that's really where I'm asking a question.

I think if we're dealing with service level agreements, we probably need to say, dealing with them in the aggregate, or is it dealing with specific case by case issues. Thanks.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: I think it's a good point, and it's good that you've fleshed that out, and it's necessary to have that clarification, but it appears if we have that clarification currently, and from the responses to 10, 11, and 12, together with the reinforcement made by Elise, that we will have that

---

clarity in the future as well. But it's good that you flesh it out and highlight that we need that, and so that is the kind of guidance that we are looking for, to contain that level of specificity in the draft. So that's helpful.

Alan Greenberg your hand is up next.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I guess I would look for simplicity, and don't add bureaucratic barriers when they don't need to be there. So that says an individual customer can talk to IANA and maybe resolve an issue, if there is an issue. If not, that issue maybe noticed by the CSC, or could be brought to the CSC by that customer, and if the CSC can resolve it, fine.

And it only gets escalated to the MRT if the CSC is frustrated and can't resolve the issue. I don't think we need guidelines as to what goes at what level, let's try to solve problems at the lowest possible level, and escalate when you're not being satisfied. I don't think that we need a lot of bureaucratic rules to define these things.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

No, I didn't hear that we were, and I think that's well informed bureaucratic rules, and I think... My sense was where we were going is in agreement with what you just said. What that means, de facto, is that if an individual customer has performance issues, may in effect, use the CSC as an escalation path as well.

---

But yeah, I didn't sense that the direction the group is heading in is any different to what you've just said.

ALAN GREENBERG: Jonathan, for clarity, no the group was not, but there were comments in the question, in the chat area about clear rules on when things can be escalated and when they cannot be. That's what I was...

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay, thanks. Yeah, all right, thanks. Elise, you're next.

ELISE LINDEBERG: Thank you. It's Elise again. Just to, I agree that we shouldn't have rules for where we have to bring things, at least not between the users, direct users, and the CSC. We can have some guidelines on how we can use the CSC as a direct customer. And I think the CSC will have experience, maybe also some knowledge about if this is a problem for other customers, if it is a general problem, if it's only your problem after direct customers [inaudible].

It might be, I think it would be a place where the direct customers who would want to go with their issues, but maybe have a direct dialogue also. So I think it would probably stop in that [inaudible] again. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks Elise. Robert?

ROBERT GUERRA: It was an old hand, but I was about to put something in the text chat that I'll maybe mention here. As we're talking about items, we might want to say that follow substance [inaudible]... which is common in Europe, which is trying to go at the smallest, lowest, or least centralized authority first. And that was put in, in some of the comments as well too. So that we have the thing to put in here.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Great. Let's capture that then, that's helpful. Thanks Robert. Donna?

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks Jonathan. Donna Austin. So I agree wholeheartedly that the registry operator should have the discretion to resolve problems with IANA internally. I guess the question is, how is that information captured? So if the CSC is not aware of individual cases of where a registry operator has had issues with the service being provided by IANA, how is that actually captured?

So I think there has to be something reflected somewhere that IANA perhaps is keeping some kind of performance levels on how many, you know, complaints, complaints is the wrong word, but how many issues that they've had to resolve individually with a registry operators, and what was the force of that?

So I think it's important that that information is captured in some way, because it actually goes to the performance of IANA.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, that's a really good point as well Donna. So I suppose, I'm just wondering where we capture that, which section we capture that in. It looks to me like, under, okay. Bernie wants to respond directly to that, so go ahead Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: There is already a report that's produced on that specifically, by IANA, for the NTIA, which covers all of those points. It's not a public report. It's a private report that just drives the incidents of the various points. So, and it's actually described in the NTIA contract, and when you go through it and try to map out to all the public reports, all of the sudden, you find this one, and it's not there, and you talk to them. I've seen an example of it, and it is quite detailed relative to what we're talking about.

The point is, do we really want that as a public thing? So the information is being captured, the information is being forwarded to the oversight body. It's not a question of that, it's a question of, do you really want to make that policy? Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks Bernie. Well I think, I noticed that Brenden has highlighted in the chat, in fact, the ticketing system, some form of documentation that could be covered under, as a SLA detail. I don't know. Personally, I don't have a view on whether it's public or not, but I think the most important thing is to have a function.

---

---

I think the fact that which elements of that reporting is public or not can be brought out as a detail. So, is that a new hand Donna? If so, please go ahead.

Chuck, your hand is up, please go ahead.

CHUCK GOMES:

Yeah, I just wanted to say, I mean, a variation of that that we could consider is, reporting the data without, and redacting the names, registries, and so forth. I'm not necessarily advocating that, but that would be a variation of that where you could... Where, for example, the CSC could see the information without knowing the particular parties involved.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

And also possible an aggregate on a quarterly basis as well, something like that. [Inaudible]...

Bernie? Oh, sorry Donna. Donna, please go ahead first and then Bernie.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks Jonathan. So I support Chuck's idea. I think what the important information is, [inaudible] enough to redact the registry operator, but I think what was the issue that was important. So if you see a recurring problem within IANA's performance as it relates to X, Y, Z, and it is a consistent problem that is being identified by a number of registries individually, that seems to mention that needs to be captured.

---

So it's the source of what the actual complaint is.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Okay. Thanks. Bernie.

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Close enough to what Donna was saying. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: All right. So [inaudible]...

Bernie, you have another point to make?

BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yeah, one more small point is that part of this is tied into the review of the NTIA contract for the really down and nitty-gritty details of where various reports go, who they get looked at, and where they are. And this is one good example of things that have, can't carry over perfectly one for one. That's all I wanted to say.

And therefore, it's important to understand and that we're going to have to go through this with a fine tooth comb, and to count those items so that there is an adjusted version that can work. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Good. So where have we got to here? We've got to, we've moved a little into lines of reporting and created and underline some reporting, but we also have, we didn't... [Inaudible] continuous existence, which is

---

question eight of the survey. It fits under, broadly, under composition. And you'll see that that has pretty strong support. So I'll just really see if there are any comments or issues on that.

It seems to me like we're there already as a group. Item I, says that, it should say the CSC not the CSC, the CSC membership should primarily consist of ccTLD and gTLD registry operators, with related experts. And that's question four. So, I guess, was there a yellow around question four as well? Similar to the previous one, question four, yes there was a yellow in five and six.

Okay, yeah, I see some hands up. So let's hear from Donna first.

DONNA AUSTIN: Sorry Jonathan, old hand.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yeah, Donna and Robert are old hands actually. New, Robert, okay, go ahead.

ROBERT GUERRA: So this is just maybe to where we are now, but also adding to Bernie's comments, Donna's and Kurt's as well on the chat, in that in going through kind of the reporting, some aspects of the reporting will perhaps require certain levels of confidentiality that the CSC may require, but it might be an issue if it goes to the public, and so there is going to be a challenge in regards to confidentiality and that needs to be worked out as well.



---

JONATHAN ROBINSON: All right. So underline the reporting, we have, not lines of reporting. Where should this go? Where should we record this? I guess it is lines of reporting. It all needs to be detailed on issues of confidentiality needs to be resolved, or to be satisfied, needs to be specified.

Alan Greenberg?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Two points. The original proposal, I believe, did say that there should be a multistakeholder component to this, and that was not explicitly asked in the survey, so I'm presuming that has not been altered. So the primarily, where we're talking about registries and other experts, would not necessarily exclude other multistakeholders. I'd like confirmation of that.

And the second point is my earlier comment, which was made out of turn, is, do we really need to designate composition, or can it be more ad-hoc?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: So Alan, on point one, if you may, question two says, the CSC membership should include a substantial multistakeholder component. That didn't meet the green or yellow threshold, but if you go to question four, the CSC membership primarily consists of ccTLD and gTLD registry operators, with related experts, received stronger, noticeably stronger, that was a green as opposed to three, previous to it, which said the CSC should be restricted only to ccTLD and gTLD operators.

---

So you've got multistakeholder doesn't meet it. You need [inaudible] ccTLD and gTLD doesn't meet the threshold, with addition, with related experts goes into the green, and then five and six, which is predominantly, sorry. I need to ask [inaudible]... Well no, those go into performance issues, so it might be different.

So of those, it's really two, three, and four are in a cluster, and four seems to stand out there, which is, it's multistakeholder to the extent that it has representatives of other technical communities, or related experts, but not multistakeholder in this sense.

ALAN GREENBERG:

For the record, I read the primarily as modifying the rest of the sentence, not primarily registries and the non-primary DNS roots. I don't know how many other people read it that way.

GREG SHATAN:

This is Greg Shatan. I wrote the question to be read that way. So, if somebody is reading it differently, to exclude multistakeholder, then I would think that's a misreading, or just an ambiguous question that raises an issue. I'm not sure how many people read it as...

ALAN GREENBERG:

Greg, you're saying that there is still a multistakeholder component in your mind, allowed by this question.

---

GREG SHATAN: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I didn't hear that in the discussion, and I was trying to verify that, so thank you. I do agree and raise the issue of ad-hoc, we're looking for simplicity, here is an opportunity. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: So if we could just.... So I've got Chuck next.

CHUCK GOMES: Yeah, and this is, I guess, directed at Alan Greenberg and anybody else that wants to respond, but also in the interest of increasing the simplicity, reducing the complexity, if the CSC was totally transparent in what it did, and have the limited functions as designed, is it really necessary to have a multistakeholder component? And I throw that out for a response.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yeah, I guess... I'm just wondering if, we've got quite a queue here. I'm not sure how many are responding directly to Chuck, but let me work through the queue because I've got Martin in the chat saying he would support complete openness. I assume that they're not going to all align as you describe, which obviates to some extent, the need for multistakeholder.

But let's hear what people have got to say. Greg.

---

GREG SHATAN:

I would assume that under any model, the CSC would operate with as much transparency as possible, regardless. So I don't think having transparency obviates the need for a multistakeholder model. In terms of the survey, two, three, four, five, and six, really all of these need to be read together. And five is not about function, it's about two clauses flipped around, which is the CSC may consist predominately of registries, if the CSC's only task is monitoring IANA performance.

So I think four and five both, you know, indicate that a predominately or primarily registry composition, seems to be reasonably acceptable to a majority. But I don't think any of those are excluding having the multistakeholder component. And when you get to three, there is, which is what says should be restricted to registry operators, the answers are kind of much more negative.

Although it still seems to be to add the top three, there is more support for that than there is against it. Just to talk about solutions and not just about endless analysis, it may be that a small registry, or small multistakeholder component, might be sufficient, at least in terms of complete transparency and kind of, and allowing people to participate, allowing some multistakeholder participation.

And so it would not be operating kind of out of sight of, or kind of out of reach of the multistakeholder community. I think, you know, taking the non-contracted parties, the commercial, non-commercial stakeholders, and ALAC, for instance, and just saying you can't come into the CSC, I think is strong, but turning it into a clone of the MRT is also not

---

appropriate. Assuming the MRT has a balance multistakeholder component.

So I think the question is, can there be some multistakeholder component that kind of opens up the CSC a bit, but if it isn't just everyone gets their feet on the bus, that's not the right answer either. So I think a seat, or a couple of seats, that kind of represents the remainder of the multistakeholder community, might be an approach, a compromise that would allow there to be kind of the voice of the rest of the pyramid of users, the ultimate end users of the Internet, without kind of taking it away from being predominantly a registry related function. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Thanks Greg, that's [inaudible]... Just note, the questions very much focus on qualifying that to, on 26, relevant technical expertise for related experts. They do very much put a qualifier in that point. Quite a queue building here. And that's Bernie next.

And then Avri next.

AVRI DORIA:

Okay, thank you. Avri speaking. In terms of this, first of all I have to say, I read the question as indeed excluding multistakeholder participation in the CSC, and hence when I saw experts, and that thought of the experts as the liaisons that have been discussed on the lists, but never in the questions were, and I think this is similar perhaps to what Greg said, were filling that function of the multistakeholder.

---

But, as it was written, the experts very much stayed in the technical realm, and didn't have experts on, such as, you know, consistency with policy implementation guidelines, etc. type of experts. So I think that the whole notion of keeping the CSC small, tends towards including experts but perhaps broadening out the expertise slightly broader than just the technical aspects. Thanks.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Yeah thanks Avri. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Chuck asked if everything is open, is there a need for multistakeholders? And my answer is the reverse, is there any harm in it? We continually preach multistakeholderism to the rest of the world, maybe it's time to live it. And just for the record, the reason I was suggesting ad-hoc is if multistakeholders want to participate, fine, chances are they won't, but why not give people the opportunity?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Chuck wants to respond directly to that.

CHUCK GOMES: This is Chuck. Very simple response. It's more complicated when you do that, and I was trying to suggest something that might be simpler. That was my thinking there.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: And I provided a simplicity to go along with it. Thank you.

CHUCK GOMES: But it's still more complicated. And [inaudible] to ad-hoc, since you brought that up, I was going to jump in on that later, but the problem I have with ad-hoc is that it's not reliable. And I think the functions that we have the CSC performing, need to be reliable.

ALAN GREENBERG: Jonathan, you want me to answer that or wait my turn?

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Come back briefly, and then we'll...

ALAN GREENBERG: A very brief answer. If there are no registries who are interested in participating, it sends a rather strong message. Since I believe registries really want this to be reliable, there will be participation. But if there isn't, there is a message in that also. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: There is an interesting point from Matthew Shears in the chat which says, of course, this would be largely mute if the CSC were a subset of the MRT. And that's an interesting point where, in a sense, where one could imagine the CSC being the primarily technical function, and then the periodically meeting MRT would have the CSC together. Almost like, I guess I imagine in a corporate structure where you have an executive,

---

and not an executive Board, and a non-executive has more of a review, and oversight function, and the executive has a more of a management function.

Yet when the Board meets, the executive and the non-executive meet together. So it maybe that in the interest of simplicity, you can capture that as a possible construct. I think it's interesting to suggest, I don't know how much that's been made before, but certainly Matthew has made it there, and it might give us both of our functions, but potentially deal with some of the, maybe have a magic bullet type of effect. Elise, let's come to you. You've been waiting.

ELISE LINDEBERG:

Okay. Thank you, thank you it's Elise. Now actually, I've now read the existing suggestion as excluding stakeholder in the CSC. I always read this as kind of a package that we have looked for, and I see that [inaudible] arrangement, we had the CSC as effective, and small, and based on customers as possible. And I [inaudible] the GAC [inaudible], multistakeholder side, so what I see is that at last the MRT, as I've said before, has a strong multistakeholder component.

I think [inaudible]... model to related to everyone. It has had a more pure multistakeholder in the MRT, and the more direct customer based CSC. The other thing we can do, is to of course have some service dialogue put in the written procedures [inaudible]... Of course it should have an arrangement, but it can also have meetings of the reporting, whatever, to make everything transparent, and to make [inaudible]... in the package of overseeing IANA more visible for everyone. [Inaudible]...



---

I think that is more, it's a better way of improving [inaudible]. That is my opinion, and not the [GAC's?] opinion as such, but the way I read the [inaudible] from other [GAC] members [inaudible] response [inaudible]... so much in the CSC. But it is acceptable also for the GAC [inaudible]... Okay. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks Elise. So that's appears to [inaudible] seen there. Eduardo.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you Jonathan. I have to point, I was under the impression also, and I didn't see any functions that the CSC was going to make sure that IANA was following policy in terms of their day by day work, other than SOA and performance. And does indicate many of these groups will be believed a different kind of, you know, other than a registry group, would have more people in terms of participating on it.

And there point is that point K on the composition, consists of CSC as a subset of MRT, if I read question number seven, which says something that the composition from the CSC should come from the MRT, my impression is, and the answer to your questions is that most people disagreed with that, which cause creating a subset of the MRT. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: So, there is a couple of key points Alan. Just to deal with it in reverse order. Question seven says, the CSC members should be drawn from the MRT so that there is coordination between the CSC and the MRT.

---

And actually that didn't really meet the threshold, just to be clear. I don't believe that that's what we've been talking about up until now. We've been talking about sort of the area that's come out in the most recent conversation was, the CSC predominately along the lines as originally drafted with some subtle discussion that we're going to be having around it, but nevertheless, that somehow or another, there may be a way of, in the interest of simplicity, integrating the CSC and the MRT.

And that is different to what question seven asks, which is pulling the CSC out of the MRT. Separately, you asked a question about policy, and the CSC's role in policy, if I understood you now, I don't know what you meant by policy there, so I wonder if anyone would like to respond specifically to that. Bernie, would you like to...? Go ahead Eduardo and then see if Bernie will respond.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Yeah, maybe I want to be more clear. It is I believe we had this conversation before where a group, not the CSC of the MRT, makes sure that IANA is following policy, not making it, following the policy that is in place. Contact with the CSC was going to be [inaudible], and if that is the case, and I might be wrong, then the composition of the CSC would require more people than registries, or you know, [inaudible] registries. Other people [inaudible] in participating in that group. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Chuck, if you're going to respond.

---

CHUCK GOMES: I'm going to respond. Eduardo, I guess first of all, do you mean SLA policy? If you mean more than SLA policy, I'm not aware of any suggestion that the CSC should do any policy monitoring at all. In fact, I personally would strongly oppose that. So if they did, we would absolutely need a multistakeholder component there.

EDUARDO DIAZ: This is Eduardo. Registries, mostly I think I was referring to things like the frame of interpretation type of things, which, you know, provide some kind of framework where IANA is working on. Really the SLAs on the performance indicators. It's how we perform the work in terms of following policy. That's the best I can explain.

CHUCK GOMES: Thank you. This is Chuck again Eduardo. And again, and somebody can correct me if you think I'm wrong, but I don't think there has ever been any suggestion that that kind of monitoring go on. And again, I would certainly oppose that.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Okay, fine. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks Eduardo for the question, but that's clarified that then. Bernie, is that a hand that you would like to retain?

---

BERNARD TURCOTTE:

Yes. Thank you. In answer to Alan's discussion of an ad-hoc committee, I have, I was glad to hear Chuck's response, but I have another angle on it, just from a really practical point of view. I know we don't want to make it bureaucratic and all of this, but people aren't exactly going to walk off the street and know all of the processes and procedures, and the format of the reports, and how they've been trending. And then all of the sudden we're going to pick seven people that show up at a meeting and they're going to look at this?

I don't think that's practical in any way, shape, or form, if you want to ensure that what the CSC is doing as work, is quality work. I mean, you need people who are going to, you know, work with other people at understanding these things. There is going to be a learning curve, and there is going to have to be experienced past on, and a variety of these things.

So in no way see this as possibly being ad-hoc, quite the contrary. I think it's going to require that we pick people very carefully, and that, you know, there is knowledge that is codified so that as people change over the years on the CSC, that they have the appropriate information at their hands, and the appropriate expertise, to look at the things in the proper way, and understand when to make some of the decisions, because if we go through the conversation we've had today, we seem to be supporting the notion that if registry operator is having issues, and they can't resolve them directly with IANA, that they should be able to talk to the CSC and maybe, if the conditions are right, the CSC will make the call to talk to IANA about the issue.

---

These are a lot of decision factors. I don't think I want people who just decided to show up at a CSC meeting to all of the sudden have that responsibility. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Let's have Donna, Alan, and then I'll put myself in the queue. Greg jumped in ahead of me. Robert, Donna, Alan, Greg, and then myself.

ROBERT GUERRA: Great. Thank you. Just maybe following up, kind of two comments. I think adding to Bernie's, or adding kind of detail, one of the things that we want to put down is that selection process, and details around that, are particularly important and need to be furthered defined going forward, and there is a variety of different ways that can be done, but further work is needed, but definitely adding the knowledge and skill component is key.

I think secondly, so I would agree with that. I think secondly, going to your earlier point Jonathan, one of the tasks that we're trying to do is take one of the general comments that have been put in, just we're trying to simplify what we have at the table, and being able to collapse different things together, talking about that and seeing, so definitely that's an interesting approach. And I think something that, I know some conversations with some [inaudible] colleagues, they said, "Well, this looks like it's very similar, why can't we together?"

So definitely you were talking about ways of joining, or collapsing, or finding structures that encompass the CSC and MRT, for example, and

---

that's something that is worthwhile to investigate. And it makes, as the co-chair of RFP4, for them to find things going forward, one less structure that we would have to create, which is particularly important, less time to do. So that's, as we go forward as well, let's think about ways to simplify the task, but also all of these entities will have to be created.

And the less that we have to create as possible, the better. Thank you.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks Robert. Donna.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks Jonathan. Donna Austin. I raised a question in the chat about, you know, maybe we can think about this in the context of how many people do we think should be on the CSC? One of the concerns I have about when you say this should be a multistakeholder representative of multistakeholders, then that number tends to blow out. Perhaps one of the ways that we could get around this, and I'll state that I have a very strong preference for registry operators to be the core of this CSC because they have, directly impacts them at the service levels, that's something that Martin illustrates a few occasions is, in developing the SLAs, maybe that's a multistakeholder part of it.

That it is put out for basically a survey that we think we should hold IANA accountable, to put that out for public comments, receive input, develop further if necessary, but the actual monitoring of that should be to a quote, smaller number that has the expertise that Bernie has

---

spoken to, and perhaps that's a possible way forward. Just a suggestion.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks Donna. Greg, you're next.

GREG SHATAN: Greg Shatan. Thanks. In thinking about the composition, and I don't know exactly what size is possible, and if we want to have representation that's regionally diverse. But, you know, just as an example, I'll throw out a concept, there could be say three gTLDs, three ccTLDs, one registrar, one CSG, and one CSG and one ALAC. Just as an example. [CROSSTALK]

[Laughter] ...other than the registries, the experts... There is also the technical experts, such as SAC, RSAC, IETF, perhaps. But that's kind of a separate bucket, but among kind of these issues of where the kind of ration between the other kind of GNSO types and, be lucky to have a single [inaudible] for kind of each major group, and outweighed by the cc. So, you know, [inaudible] throw in the SSAC, the RSAC, some will throw in the RIRs, the ISOC, and IETF.

I don't know how far you go with that expert, but it seems to me RSAC and SSAC will probably have value to be there. [Inaudible] even go the next step and say have a single seat that represents all four kind of non-technical stakeholder groups, which I mean ALAC, the GNSO, and other groups. Although, who you say is technical and who you say is non-technical in terms of ISPs, would consider themselves non-technical.

---

But in any case, I think if we have a small bus, like a mini-cooper sized group of multistakeholders, not a station wagon sized group of multistakeholders, then you might be getting somewhere in terms of compromise. You don't need to have every stakeholder group kind of fully represented, but just to have a piece there to kind of keep this from looking like fox is guarding the chicken coop.

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

So, I thought I was asking previously as a chair, when I was responding to Matthew's comment and was bringing that in and making sure, but I'm speaking now I guess as a contributor, and I've picked this up and I'm sort of running with it a little bit myself. It's Jonathan speaking in case my voice is unrecognized.

But you know, I'm starting to think one of the public comments we've had is to drive simplicity. And it really feels to me that we should think carefully, and really consider this concept of the two being linked, because it seems to deal with a number of factors, and potentially deal with a desire to have a multistakeholder component. And I guess I'll think of it, I'll continue the corporate analogy.

Where your general registries are customers if you like, management level customers. Your CSC is an executive manager, they are more composite, or a higher level of the customers, and then your MRT is your, as I've said before, your non-executive Board, but type of situation. If you can view it in that way, you can find a way in which encompasses a need for relative expertise, and yet deals with a



---

multistakeholder component. So I think we should give serious thought to that, but maybe we don't need to push that too far at this stage.

GREG SHATAN:

Jonathan, it's Greg Shatan. When you say the word link, what are...?

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Okay. So I'm envisioning, in the interest of simplicity, and the interest of some form of convergence, I'm viewing the CSC and the MRT holistically. So those of us that say, "Well, we really want to see multistakeholder in the CSC," is saying, if we can see them as holistically, in other words, perhaps they meet periodically, together, whether it's annually or quarterly, it doesn't matter, but such that desire for representation is met by the convergence of the groups occasionally.

Then it may mean that we don't need to replicate that desire, for example...

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]