

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
March 16, 2015
11:00 am CT**

Coordinator: The recordings have been started. You may proceed.

Woman: Okay. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Stephanie, have you joined the audio? Okay. We'll get started. Donna Austin for the record. I think Stephanie is probably just spelling her name for the operator.

So thank you everyone for your contributions over the weekend. We'll go through those in a minute. I'll ask everybody to speak to their own respective pieces.

Just an update on a participation from Kim Davies and (Ashley). So Kim has approval to work with us in this group. And I think I sent an email to everybody. It was the response from Elise Gerich and then what I said might be helpful for Kim to provide to us.

And basically what I'm seeking from Kim at this point is his understanding of where the interactions are between NTIA and ICANN in the management of

the performance of the IANA function; just the day-to-day management of IANA as well. So hopefully we'll have Kim onboard soon. (Ashley) I am speaking tomorrow and so we'll get some sense of the extent to which she can be involved in this working group.

So I just wanted to - it's not clear in my mind how we're going to use either Kim or (Ashley), whether we want them on the manning list or whether we just call them into review things. So I'd just like to get - does anybody have a firm idea of how we can best use the expertise? Because I really like - I really would like to draw heavily on their expertise to the extent that we can. Go ahead Martin.

Martin Boyle: Thanks Donna. It's Martin Boyle here. Yes. I agree with you that we should try and use both Kim and Ashley as much as we possibly can. It might (be) unrealistic to ask to join every call.

But I certainly think when we finish a call we should be reasonably clear as to whether there are any specific questions that we'd need to raise with them and if they're willing to join (the call) because I think we should welcome them to join the calls because we really are going to need having experts advise from actually what is done by NTIA and by the IANA team to inform our discussion. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Thanks Martin. Staffan.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. Yes. Well maybe. I'm not sure whether we should (save) that Kim and (Ashley) from the fully mailing list. I guess they might get involved in several of these design teams, so. It could be wise to actually (save) them from the mails.

I don't think we'll discuss anything secret in that list especially not since it's public. But we won't - I don't think we can expect them to follow their email because we know how populated these mailing lists are.

But as Martin was into, let's have together specific sets of questions to really draw on their expertise what is done but maybe also what is their general remark after having read our text of our - what are their senses; what's set out for them to be (unintelligible), et cetera, so? (Thank you).

Donna Austin: Okay. That makes sense. Does anybody else have any comments or if you disagree with anything that's being said? Okay. So it seems like we have agreement. Sorry, who's that?

Bart Boswinkel: That was just me saying Stephanie's still not on the bridge but she agrees for the record.

Donna Austin: Oh, okay. Thanks Bart. So I think at the end of each call probably what we should do before we close out is just do a recap and identify areas where we'd like Kim and (Ashley) to provide any input. So I think that's probably an action item that we do that.

So in the interest of time because I'd like to wrap this up well before two hours if we can; hopefully we won't need that. I'd like to go through the document that Bart has up, which is a document that you've all been working on over the weekend. Thank you very much.

So we'll go through the responses and if you could all stick to your individual responses, that'd be great. So Staffan, I might get you to lead off because it looks like you've got Item A.

Staffan Jonson: Yes. Unfortunately I haven't looked it through very thoroughly yet. But I've started at least. So and during A - under the head of A I used text from old proposal from December. But I also inserted some blue text as new and quite putting up my chin here to see what happens because I'm testing the model as well.

So under A I made very specific that is technical operations - technical (security) just to (unintelligible) that resilience. That is the task for the CSC. And during - under heading F later on I'll - the specifics are saying that their role is not to talk about the policy - (politics) or in more general way. So I'm making that difference.

So my proposed difference is marked in blue in this case just to - so it stands out clear what is the difference. Hope I'm being - I haven't inserted MRT for example in this section. And that is frankly I'm confused with it to do it or not. But since there are several design teams, I haven't had time to look at two. But this is a - this is a way of starting at least looking through the document.

So you want to take - make me take - go through every sentence or every change of it? Or do we have any other way of handling this Donna?

Donna Austin: Staffan, I just - I think I'd like to just open up a little bit of a conversation to the group. So obviously one of the challenges we have in putting this work together is we don't know whether there's going to be an MRT or whether there's going to be Contract Co. on top of this.

So I guess what potentially I would like to do is to set aside all of that and just say what would a CSC look like without anything that sits above it. So the CSC is whatever we decide the roles and responsibilities are. But can we make the statement that we are not assuming that there's an MRT or a

Contract Co. or a golden bylaw that sits above any of these that we can - that we try to develop this as a standalone.

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Donna Austin: Does anybody have any thoughts on that whether that's an appropriate way to do it? Okay. So I see that Sarah and Martin agree that we, you know - so I think for this exercise let's assume that this is a standalone committee and we'll just move forward on that basis.

So once we've identified - once we are okay with what we think the roles and responsibilities are, we should be able to move forward with the rest of the pieces.

Staffan Jonson: Okay. It's a good approach. So we're walking through the text then, right?

Donna Austin: And if anybody has any comments, just raise your hand and I can interrupt Staffan. Thanks.

Staffan Jonson: Okay. So what is new is that we're establishing of course that CSC take on the NTIA responsibilities with (unintelligible) managing the IANA functions operator and the reports of performance.

There is a pointer saying where the reports are I hope at least. I cannot confirm that yet. It is also specified in lieu of the first sentence saying the CSC task is to continuously (set) operations of the IANA functions based on technical security, stability and resilience aspects. It really should be (unintelligible) have not problem setting or reevaluating general policy. So we're setting all of IANA policy aside in this.

Donna Austin: Staffan, can I just interrupt for a sec?

Staffan Jonson: Yes.

Donna Austin: So Kurt has asked in the chat what specifically do you see as the security, stability and resiliency role? How does that relate to monitoring IANA SLA performance?

Staffan Jonson: Well it's just a baseline of assessment actually reporting back on their reports per se. The reports being - having (unintelligible) IANA functions upgraded on a regular basis. Does that help you? Or - I'm also mentioning the CSC composition in itself that it should be limited to direct customers of the IANA naming functions mainly (to the) operators.

And that certainly (unintelligible) of the naming community (actors) or stakeholders might be invited to ensure some (unintelligible) explanation among impacted parties of the IANA functions. I'm not sure if I'm answering your question or...

Donna Austin: Kurt says to continue with your description and then we can open up for questions afterwards.

Staffan Jonson: Okay. And then in the text at least there are some notions of MRT. But I'll continue with the CSC function. The CSC would receive a review IANA functions (unintelligible) to the report as mentioned and escalate significant issues to the MRT.

And specifically the CSC would take into the duties that is currently performed by the contracting organizations (as today). And there's a definition of exactly what kind of - that would be. This is as far as I've gotten. So - and I

haven't (fulfilled) yet. But so if you - if we put the questions later on, I'll maybe be able to - I can give more.

Donna Austin: I guess I - now that we've made the decision that we consider this to be standalone and not, you know, worry about an MRT. Does anybody have - because the escalation issue is going to be something that we do need to have a common understanding about.

So I guess what's our sense of in the event the performance isn't going terribly well, we think there's some problems associated with it, what remedies or how do we manage that escalation process? Who talks to who or who does what? Sarah, do you want to go ahead?

Sarah Falvey: So one thing we can do is we can put some comments in the doc or make a note and just go through the whole document and see if the other questions sort of elicit that conversation.

And the only reason why I mention it is because I was responsible for G, which is consider whether it would be appropriate for the CSC to be an initial point escalation. And I put some text there.

So I think a lot of the questions that you're asking are really (unintelligible). But we may sort of get to that point as we go through the document and we see sort of what people are thinking and what they've put in the document. Then we can maybe come back and see what unanswered questions we still have. I just thought that might make more sense.

Donna Austin: It's a good point. Thanks Sarah. Kurt, did you want to say something - have something?

Kurt Pritz: Yes. First I agree with Sarah. The second is yes; I have some questions on this Staffan that we can, you know, think about answering later. So I firmly agree with - that it'll have no role in setting or reevaluating general policy. So that's really good that you added that.

When you say that the CSC's role is based in security, stability and resilience through, it triggers in my mind that we're going to do - the CSC would do security reviews or SSR reviews of IANA. And I'm - so if that's what you meant, fine, but I'm not sure that's it.

And I - when we think about a monitoring role as to whether they meet SLAs or other delivery requirements, you know, rather than an SSR role, I would characterize that as an operational role. So I don't know if you're thinking is matching my thinking in what you mean by SSR. But I wanted to make that comment there. And then I have two more comments but if you don't mind answer that first, it'd be great.

Staffan Jonson: Okay. Sure. The first specifying technical security, stability, resilience is a way of actually saying we're not doing politics here. And this is the message maybe could have been refined a bit. I can assure it could have been.

What the CSC is not supposed to do is define under having F what it's not supposed to be. So there are areas to define what is not supposed to happen within this section. So there are ways to come around this.

But - and more in a general way of - method for this work Donna and others I think this is where we have to handle it - what is specifically to note down in the Google Docs document. What is missing in this (reasoning)? What is not being addressed at all? And then I guess we could start because then we have

a more complete document for Istanbul and then we can start to argue the pros and cons of every aspect (that is there). So yes.

Kurt Pritz: Okay.

Staffan Jonson: And continue.

Kurt Pritz: Okay. That's a perfect answer. Thank you very much. And then on the liaisons I wonder about the purpose of them. So I can see certainly a liaison from the RARs and the IETF because they're the other two customers of IANA. And if one of us is about to, you know, escalate issues inside IANA or ICANN, then the other two should certainly know about that.

I can also make a case for the Root Server operators or RSAC being a part of this because if they have any stability issues coming up or anything like that, it'd be good to have that liaison. I'm not so sure about SSAC or ISOC having liaisons with the CSC.

You know, gTLD and ccTLD our operators largely, you know, make up a big part of SSAC. So we have plenty of technical knowhow. And, you know, I'm not sure the role ISOC would play in it.

And the only reason why I would, you know, keep the liaison number as narrow as possible is that we want to be as nimble as possible. So if we want to reach out to SSAC for a technical question we can. But we don't want SSAC sitting at the - this is a scenario.

So I'm not saying anything bad about SSAC but, you know, we don't want SSAC sitting at the table, you know, possibly slowing things down or interjection where it's not required. So, you know, I'm for the liaisons, I'm for,

you know, the direct customers and maybe RSAC. But not necessarily SSAC and ISOC.

Staffan Jonson: Okay. I see. Yes. The general idea of this is the wording could be invited to participate to ensure seamless coordination and to me it's not really (unintelligible) on who is actually being invited. But it opens for what I hoped would be a flexible way of having seamless coordination without a gigantic organization. And then the goal is to keep it really small since this hopefully will end up in very technical aspects of deliberations. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Thanks Staffan. And I notice that Stephanie has actually addressed composition later in the doc as well. So we can have that conversation as we get towards Stephanie's piece. Kurt, have you - do you have anymore questions or is that it for now? Okay. Thanks.

Kurt Pritz: Well I had a third question but with the Sarah rule, I might be deferred to later.

Donna Austin: Okay. Thanks. Martin, do you want to - do you have a question? Statement? (Something)?

Martin Boyle: Yes. Thanks Donna. I think I've got a sort of couple of points that were sort of similar issues and concerns that I had with Kurt. One of the thoughts, and certainly when I read Staffan's security, stability, resilience point, it occurred to me that one of the obligations currently on the IANA functions operator is to undergo a regular security audit.

And I certainly agree with the idea that the CSC shouldn't be getting stuck in to do any of this work. But I think the work done on the audit rather than results of audits should probably be made - drawn to the attention of the CSC.

The other point of the size of the group and the liaison and the number of liaison, at first I must admit I thought the idea of getting an SSAC liaison or an RSAC liaison or both seemed to be quite a good idea because of the link with the security side.

So when I was doing my piece on Section C, it occurred to me that probably a more effective way of doing that is to consider it as part of a general outreach that the CSC I think should be doing so the outside world knows that it's doing its job properly.

And the people outside the CSC can also have an opportunity to raise questions, raise issues. So I wonder whether doing the - I wondered at that stage whether doing liaisons that brought valuable partners into the group rather than inflicting on them monthly reports and reports that they need to read and as you say the flexibility and (a fleetness) of that activity whether it is something that perhaps be done on - more on an annual basis. That was just the way my thought went. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Thanks Martin. Staffan, did you have anything else in relation to A? I noticed the - Bernie, I know you're staying pretty close to some of this stuff but the IANA - the current NTIA contract and the IANA functions part that reporting is currently provided against. So they're the clauses in the current contract where reports are provided.

Staffan Jonson: It's a question for Bernie or for me?

Donna Austin: For either. I just know that Bernie's been pretty close to this so if he wants to comment.

Staffan Jonson: Yes. I wouldn't know.

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: Okay. Bernie.

Bernie Turcotte: Yes. Can you hear me?

Donna Austin: Yes.

Staffan Jonson: Yes.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. Yes. The reports are (unintelligible) throughout the document, that is the NTIA, IANA functions contract. And I think it's quite clearly spelled out. What we don't have is a summary that gathers those up per category. But I could work on that if that would be deemed useful.

Donna Austin: Okay. Thanks. Sarah, did you have something?

Sarah Falvey: Yes. So actually this was a part of my group. And I went - I don't know if it's complete so that's why I'm looking forward to the discussion. But I went through and picked all the reports that I could find that were mentioned in the contract, what section they're in, sort of what the requirement details are.

And then I was thinking we could go through them when it's - when we get to my section on whether or not we think the CSC should perform the function or serve as a coordinating function or whether we think that the reporting function is really good but it needs to be strengthened in any way, you know, things like that. So I think that hopefully the next table has most of hopefully what you're looking for.

Donna Austin: Okay. Terrific. Thanks. Staffan, do you have anything else on your piece? Otherwise we'll move on to Sarah's piece looks like.

Staffan Jonson: Please let's go ahead. I have nothing more right now. (Unintelligible).

Donna Austin: Okay. Thanks. Thank you. Sarah, go ahead.

Sarah Falvey: So I'm just going to pull my doc real quick.

Bart Boswinkel: Bernie, just is that an old hand or is that a new one? Okay. Sorry Sarah.

Sarah Falvey: No worries. Okay. So for B I was assigned to look at the list of the reports that are currently provided. It said provided to NTIA or provided as a result of the context.

So I took that - I took a broad interpretation of that to mean any sort of reporting function that the IANA - that IANA does in either to NTIA or to the public basically.

And I put the list down and I put the section. So I'll just explain the table. On the far left is the section where it is currently in the contract. The next box is sort of what it - the requirement around what it deals with.

The details should provide a bit of guidance around what are the performance indicators or what sort of - what are we trying to get at with this requirement. And then I tried to start to fill out what I thought we had general agreement on in terms of whether or not we thought the CSC should perform this role moving forward.

And then whether or not - I took this from some other tables that people have been passing around, the observation section on whether or not we should improve that function. And then I could build out more. I can provide some greater detail after this discussion below the table. But that's sort of what I put together to provide a bit of discussion for the group.

And then the one thing I did do, which I noticed was in Stephanie's grouping, was there's been some - I read through the whole document and there were some suggestions on things that - reporting that we thought the CSC should do but isn't - but that function isn't being reported now. And so for that I put it as a new category.

So for example, in Stephanie's - her subsection she mentioned something around a customer satisfaction survey. And so I can flush that out. I didn't have a chance to talk to Stephanie this morning but I can - we can add that to the grouping of things that we think the CSC should be doing.

So if people don't have questions, we can just - I don't know what we're (starting at). We can go one by one or...

Bart Boswinkel: Donna, are you still there?

Donna Austin: I thought I got disconnected. Oh yes. No, I'm just talking to myself. It's okay. So I think (around sure) one by one. We are at 9:30 or 12:30 or...

Sarah Falvey: Yes.

Donna Austin: ...or whatever 30 you are in Europe. So I guess let's try to move this through quickly and...

Sarah Falvey: Okay. So for this first one, this is just a coordinating function that IANA has with the IETF. It's actually the IETF that publishes these performance reports. So my thought would be that we would not - the CSC would not do this but that we would continue coordinating with the IETF to publish those performance metrics.

The second one is the (rezone) and Whois change request. So the one - so I think that this would be something that the CSC would do. And then one question is whether this was in the initial report and whether or not we would want the post - so ICANN does it on a monthly basis.

And there was a piece in the initial proposal that was put out in December on whether or not we would want these requests to be more timely - published in a more timely fashion. So when the request comes in they would be published on a Web site. So I provided - I added that as something we might want to consider doing in terms of improving the function. I think there was - people generally agreed that that would provide greater transparency.

The second one or the third one is the delegation and - CC delegation and re-delegation. And this is just publishing - this is not obviously deciding but publishing what requests have been approved, what ones hadn't and sort of what the end result was. So I thought that the CSC should pick - need to do that.

Same thing with the gTLD delegation and re-delegation. But we may want to figure out ways that we might be able to provide a bit more context around those reports.

The allocation of Internet numbering resources is again just publishing sort of the request and how long it took, things like that. So I thought the CSC could do that.

And then the monthly performance progress reports is the same. And then the standard report and then the customer service survey all go to the same Web site. And then the final report is just a review of everything up to there and then the final publication.

And then the only two that I think were - I don't know what we would think about is there's two reporting functions that IANA does that pertain to audit. So they're required to publish and to keep all this documentation and then publish it as a part of an - the annual audit report. So there's - that's C51 and C52.

So I'm not sure if we would want this to be done by and independent group or to do an independent audit or if we would want the CSC to do that. So we can look at that.

And then - oh, the last one is the customer satisfaction survey, which I can fill in once I hear what Stephanie has added to her grouping. And if anybody else has anything else, I can add that as well.

Donna Austin: Thanks Sarah. Looks like Kurt might have a question. Kurt, go ahead.

Kurt Pritz: Yes. Sort of a point of order question. So I, you know, I sought to undertake something similar to what was done here in mine. And it made me wonder whether or job is to go through all the reports, report on the detail and then report how they should be changed or not or whether we just say, you know,

here's the composition of the CSC and here's how it works and here's how it operates.

And, you know, the first job is, you know, to go through all the reports and determine, you know, how they should be changed. So it's sort of a, you know, existential what's our role question.

And what caused me to answer it is, you know, these reports are going to change over time. So one of the roles of the CSC is going to be to continually monitor, you know, evaluate the reports as to their usefulness and over time change them.

So my question really goes to, you know, how much of it - how much of the - is it this group's responsibility to create a final template for the reports and any recommended changes and how much is it really just for us to define what the CSC's role is and turn it over to them do we think?

Donna Austin: Thanks Kurt. So Stephanie's put in chat that she thinks this is covered in Section D. So we might hold off on answering that until we get down to that page. Staffan, did you have a comment? Question?

Staffan Jonson: Well yes. It's important. Kurt is - the question Kurt has raised is (unintelligible). But I guess it's more than that actually. It's also presenting this to the Istanbul meeting saying these are the main things and try to list off what might be controversial in some way to resolve it hopefully in (unintelligible) in those days. I hope we can manage that as well. But I'm afraid there are both things actually. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Thanks Staffan. So yes. I mean once we've been through this we need to understand what form of document we want to put forward for Istanbul

understanding that we've only got really like a week to do that. So we probably should discuss that at the end of the call. Sarah.

Sarah Falvey: And just to add a point quickly. You know, I mean the reason why I think this group was supposed to be made of CC and G sort of registry operators with an understanding of the operation behind this is so that we could have a discussion around the exact points that, you know, Kurt and others have brought up so that we can provide - I don't want to say necessarily a recommendation but we can say we've looked into these issues.

And, you know, as a subset of folks who could potentially be on a CSC depending on what the makeup would look like, this is kind of what we think works in this scenario.

So I think it's worth it for us to - and we don't have to have it on the call but to have a discussion or to think about what we think this should be and present a view at least at the Istanbul meeting or at least an output of what our discussion has been and what the sort of key points were so that we can, you know, provide that viewpoint to the rest of the group.

Donna Austin: Yes. Thanks Sarah. So I think we're good on B. So I think we'll move to - Sarah, no that's all right. We can come back to it. Martin, do you want to move through C now please?

Martin Boyle: Thanks Donna. Yes. Well right to C. (A through C). The - I interpreted this as really trying to without using a diagram establish some sort of flow mechanism for the CSC as to what it then does with the reports and so it's net results. I probably move a little bit further into other people's territories but well, what the heck.

The first four items I'd see as being the regular monthly grind of the CSC. And in that it will receive an alert from the IANA functions operator that the reports have been published with the link.

They would then check out the reports were actually received within the timescale that's been set within the service level commitment. And then would look at the output from those reports. Again, it's the target and if anybody has any specific questions on what was happening, they could raise those questions with the IANA functions operator.

Then five moves us onto then what would happen if it appears that the targets that's sort of being reported against were not being met. And in some cases that could well be just simply because of exceptional circumstances.

So for example, ccTLD delegations and re-delegations can sometimes take quite a lot longer than would actually be the fault of the IANA functions operator.

And so essentially we're trying to understand those which were circumstances and those which are identified indicated some more systemic failure. And then I quite happily blunder into trespass over escalation process because I think that reports are actually not - they're not so good unless you're actually getting involved in an engagement of discussion and looking at how you use those reports to inform improvements.

And then my last point was to try and get us away from the fact that the CSC is oblivious to anything that is happening around it. And I think that the CSC itself should be drawing attention of - no, the members should be drawing attention of their own communities to the report and any specific issues or trends that are happening.

And that could be used as the basis for comments and discussions in the - perhaps the regular ICANN meeting cycle with the registries concerned. And if you're doing that sort of meeting then perhaps that is a stage where RSAC and SSAC liaisons could be involved rather than them having to look at every report. And that's roughly the idea that I came up with for dealing with the reports on a monthly basis. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Thanks Martin. So I think the escalation question is certainly one that we should get some, not guidance, but understand from NTIA's perspective and also IANA's perspective how any escalations are handled at this point in time. I think it would be good to understand that. Martin, I like to (see it) in terms of, you know, monthly, quarterly kind of public reporting on the performance against the reports.

Does anybody have any questions for Martin at this point or we continue on to D? Okay. Looks like we're moving to D. Stephanie.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Hi. So my understanding in filling out D was that C was supposed to be the process that the CSC was using to actually look at the reports whereas D was like a regular review of content for the report and whether that should be changed. I hope that's correct. It seems that was what Martin just talked about. But Donna, let me know if that's wrong.

Donna Austin: I think that is right. Thanks.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Okay. Perfect. So I did about 50% of this. I did it for the reports that were available to me and I had a fairly good understanding of. And on the last call we generally agreed that we were happy with the actual kind of content of the reports themselves that were currently being provided.

I think this document we're going - or this session we're going to have to take a second look at once we see what comes up from the SLA design team. Because if they're recommending to make any of the metrics change, then we should see that rather than - I currently started from that position whereas a part of this process we're going to be keeping the metrics the same.

So what I did I - the first one that I came across was the delegation and re-delegation of the country code top-level domain report. I review a few of these. But because they're a lot more narrative than the gTLD reports, I wasn't sure whether there was a kind of standardized logic to them and whether that's set forth anywhere and who came up with that.

So I wanted to before I took a kind of blind stab at it put it to the ccTLD operators in the group and perhaps of Bernie too. Where is the best - where's the best place to find out about the across the board requirements for the reports for delegation and re-delegation of country codes? Martin has his hand up. Martin.

Martin Boyle: Thanks Stephanie. Yes. There's been a - lots of work in the ccNSO over what's it - probably the last three or four years looking at the whole issue of delegation and re-delegation of the ccTLDs.

It is a difficult one. It is not as - because it's not dominated by contracts and contract conditions it is I won't say more subjective because some of my colleagues might kill me for saying such a thing. But it needs a lot more explanation.

And I think the idea of a process for such reporting is probably a process that belongs in the ccNSO for defining and identifying the transparency that is

needed on something that is essentially most frequently a discussion, an argument, a fight within a particular country within a particular jurisdiction. And the IANA function operator's role very often is to try and get both sides to come to some mutual agreement.

So, you know, this one I can understand why you found it difficult Stephanie. I think anybody who's been involved in this process the last few years in ccNSO would say yes. Thanks.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes. So Martin, I'm just going to ask a question and this was what you just said. Do you think that it is - it would be appropriate for a body like the CSC as we're currently talking about it to have a role in the ccTLD delegation and re-delegation report or do we just not want to touch it and have that be something that sits in the ccNSO or elsewhere? And if they do have a role, where does that begin and end?

Martin Boyle: I see Bernie's got his hand up as well and he'll probably give you a very much more politically correct...

((Crosstalk))

Martin Boyle: Yes. Probably (safe).

Stephanie Duchesneau: Do you have a response?

Bernie Turcotte: Don't know if it's going to be more politically correct. But the only thing the CSC should be doing with delegation and re-delegation reports is making sure they're published in a timely manner and they're complete. That's it.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Thanks. And you now make this section a lot easier. So then I...

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: Hang on. Stephanie, Staffan's got his hand up and so has Kurt. So maybe Staffan.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you Donna. Yes. I would echo both Martin and Bernie in this. And I would like to be even more - a little more blunt. I would not recommend CSC to have any advice on the delegation and re-delegation. That is to my - in my view at least really out of scope for the CSC first. And secondly, it would be really danger for the ICANN model as a whole. So I would recommend (let's not).

Donna Austin: Thanks Staffan. Kurt.

Kurt Pritz: I took my hand down.

Donna Austin: Okay. Thank you. Bernie, is new hand, old hand?

Man: Well both of Bernie's hands are old?

Donna Austin: Okay. Thanks. Stephanie, do you want to continue?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes. So then I went on to the gTLD reports, which are a lot more standardized. And so I just tried to - I operated on a baseline that we weren't going to be changing these as a result of the transition. But of course if something comes out of the SLA group that changes the metrics associated with this, I'll reflect that as a section of the document as well.

And then I didn't think that for what is provided in these reports - they're very high level in nature. And I just tried to focus on the sorts of technical and procedural changes that might affect the content of what is provided in this report.

So for everything that's delegated pursuant to this round, my sense would be that it would only be, you know, a change to the services that affect any procedural checks or a change to the confirmation requirement or new guidelines coming out of the IETF or another appropriate technical body that affected what actually could exist in the root.

But if other people have ideas about triggers that would make it appropriate or necessary for the CSC to be changing the contents of the reports, I would welcome additions to that document.

And then I just described a pretty simple process where if any of the foregoing conditions are met, anyone in the group can phrase it. There's an expectation that you have a collaborative discussion with IANA, the CSC about the need for the change. And then it has to be approved by a majority vote and you work with the IANA operator to identify an implementation timeframe.

I think these are pretty procedural. So it should be - I don't imagine it being hugely contentious but if people think there needs to be more meat around that process, I welcome that. I think Bernie has a hand. Bernie.

Bernie Turcotte: Maybe it's covered in your document and, you know, I will admit to not having read it so sorry. I'm trying to catch up as we go along here.

Some of these things are very, very sensitive to the community. And does your process include a system where you would be double-checking with the

home communities meaning as a minimum the ccTLD and the gTLD community?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Staffan or sorry, I don't currently have a formal complication built in. But that's good input and I'm happy to build that in. Staffan.

Staffan Jonson: The short answer is yes. We do have. But we also have a very wide community in CC world - CC land. So we're constantly trying also in parallel processes to come back to our community and inform them what is happening and also to get some more specific mandates on specific issues. So we're (constantly usually) doing this I hope. You know. Thank you.

Stephanie Duchesneau: And then through the gTLD report, I just identified that (if) the subsequent round was approved ICANN should be the party that prepares a template of the new delegation report. It could be that they meant the delegation readiness report that is in the current round.

It could be something different if there are new policy requirements as a part of that round. But then that that would be approved in consultation with the (SE) and their implementation timeframe would be worked out by the (unintelligible) the IANA functions operator. But again, that's dependent - that would only apply to a subsequent round for gTLDs, not gTLDs for the current round.

So then I skipped over - so I skipped over the two sections related to the annual audits because I don't have transparency into the contents of them. That is one of the areas that I'm happy to back and prepare questions that I think would benefit from having questions responded to by IANA staff and by the NTIA because I didn't want to take a stab in the dark at saying what

should be in these annual audit reports without having seen what was currently being carried out.

I don't know if anyone else has access; knows what is being provided in the annual audit better than I do. But if not, I'm happy to just prepare it as part of our functions to IANA and to the NTIA.

And then the last one that I did prepare content for is the monthly audit data. And as for the other ones it could - it's initially going to remain unchanged. But that - if any new services are approved, the CSC would be responsible for determining whether it affects the new - whether it requires tracking new metrics or it affects the targets associated with existing metrics.

And that the timeframes would be worked out by the CSC and the IANA functions operation. But I think the same requirements for community consultation around this could apply to this category as well. So I'll take that back and build that in.

Does anyone have any questions or comments? Staffan, is that an old hand or a new hand?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Stephanie Duchesneau: Kurt.

Kurt Pritz: Hi. Thanks. One really simple comment. I think under D I'm not sure if gTLDs are re-delegated. I think they have changes of control. So want to...

Stephanie Duchesneau: (Unintelligible) the language right out of the proposal. I'll cross check and make sure it's just consistent with what's in the contract right now.

Kurt Pritz: All right. And then this comment - and we can table this topic for later but this comment goes to yours and Martin's also. An additional surveillance or checking that the CSC might do is sort of an ongoing process control kind of review so that it, you know, it's ongoing.

So if problems crop up, we don't have to wait for the end of the month and then the time period for the report to be pushed and then a review of the report but there might be some ongoing, you know, process control monitoring that detects whether there are issues occurring on a real time basis and providing the CSC with some ability to contact ICANN there.

So, you know, that really - I think it goes more to Martin's but it would necessitate an additional sort of real time reporting that IANA will do.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes. I think that's either Martin's or if we're defining an escalation path and it's still not totally clear to me if that fits in this group or in the SLA group or potentially if there's a third group being formed to address that.
Martin?

Martin Boyle: And thanks very much - Martin Boyle here. If I've understood her right this seems a little bit like the dashboard process or so the dashboard's reporting system that they are and a functions operator got in place. (Unintelligible) to me though what I got is a bit of a problem is within the set up the committee that is primarily going to be involved - be made up of volunteers. Now the volunteers the idea is that - well once a month, you know, the last Thursday of the month or whatever we expect to receive the reports and therefore we will commit to the last Friday of the month doing all - doing a review of it.

It seems to me that anything that starts to put the CSC into a position where it proactively has to keep on going and keep monitor that which is happening is a risk of overloading the committee and, therefore, finding that a large number of the committee members are not doing what I would consider to be their basic work. So it's just so (unintelligible) masses being a, you know, lets try and also think of the dynamics of the committee and overloaded committees to find that there's anyone or two people actually doing any work on the overloaded committee - thanks.

Kurt Pritz: Donna can I respond to that?

Donna Austin: Yes you can - thanks.

Kurt Pritz: Okay thanks. Thanks Martin - so I think that we should - how do I want to put this - so I think we should define the roll of a competent monitor of IANA performance and what it needs to do rather than start with, you know, a volunteer committee and how that limits what we might do. So I understand your point exactly and a discussion and my, you know, I want to have later, but this group can decide whether it wants to discuss it or not - is whether or not, you know, this function should be outsourced by the CSC so I can't (unintelligible) in the CSC decides who should do it.

So I think we should discuss the value of, you know, and the benefits of being able to monitor full time and if we think that's worth it then we should figure out a way to do it in a way that doesn't, you know, doesn't result in all the negative things that Martin's rightfully talking about.

Donna Austin: Bernie?

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you. Just a comment here - I'm getting a little lost. I appreciate what Kurt is saying and at the end of some point that maybe exactly where we need to be. But in some of the other sections of this there's been a real focus on let's duplicate what's there now - let's not try and reinvent something unless it's really broken and set up a process where once we've got a transition done that process can be followed to modify things. And the reason I'm bringing this up is just in the concept of timeliness.

We are working under the gun and every time you bring in something that's going to change you're going to initiate a discussion not only that is significant in this group, but I think you're going to initiate a discussion that's significant across the whole CWG. And some of these things when they touch on this kind of stuff are very close to some of the TLD Operators and that discussion - I'm just concerned could end up being long.

So I'm not trying to influence the discussion either way - I'm just trying to put a note down saying that let's be aware of the ramifications time wise trying to bring in really new stuff at this point - thank you.

Donna Austin: Bernie it's Donna if I can just respond to that. So I don't think the idea of and Kurt didn't say this explicitly, but I think the idea of a third party auditor isn't necessarily beyond on the realms of what's potentially been discussed before. And I think going to the point that NTIA actually has, you know, half an FTA on this kind of monitoring performance (realm) at the moment.

So I think it potentially would be useful to have the discussion of how you replace that FTA given that you're going to have a standing committee that, you know, potentially you want to make every month. But you need something to back that up to monitor the space in that intervening period as

well so I don't know that it's a particularly new - I certainly - I think we have had some discussions about it within the J Registries.

So my concern is if we don't discuss it here and put it on the table then potentially we lost an opportunity. So I understand what you're saying that we're pushing up against some, you know, some how timelines here, but I don't think this is actually a new discussion.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay I'm not arguing that - I'm just trying to bring another understanding of this because on our end we're getting (unintelligible).

Donna Austin: Can you just hang on a sec? I think - I can hear you, but I think nobody else can.

Kurt Pritz: Right so I think we're talking about a couple of different things here. One is whether we should out source part of this monitoring process and I think we should table that for later and decide as a group whether we want to talk about it or not and then if we decide to talk about it then we'll debate the merit. But the other was and I think what Bernie was talking about was sort of the real time monitoring and I'm happy to leave that alone.

But I think that occurs now that, you know, if gTLD or ccTLD is not getting IANA service they sometimes go to the NTIA and say, this isn't going well for me - can you go yell at the ICANN board or something. So I'm not sure that that doesn't occur now and I'm not sure that from a TLD standpoint they wouldn't want a real time resource to be able to go to escalate their problem. So I'm not sure it's a change Bernie, but I agree for simplicity sake let's march ahead with what we have now.

Donna Austin: Thanks Bernie - thanks guys. Martin did you have something?

Martin Boyle: Yes thanks Donna - yes actually on the same point - you see I'm actually sort of a little bit suspicious about any failure that is so catastrophic, but it really does merit continual monitoring of progress. Monthly I would of thought is really going to be enough and what Kurt just said, I think perhaps gave me the sort of - yes, okay I can understand where he's coming from and perhaps as part of the process something needs to be put into the CSC that's, you know, it would be possible for registries to - themselves to put their hands up and identify that a problem has occurred.

That though in this model is going to be a pretty serious event so I'm not sure that this is something that we build into the regular reporting cycle, but rather there is something associated with the fact that registries themselves - we all recognize and likely to try and resolve issues directly themselves and the CSC certainly finding itself between an angry registry and a frustrated IANA functions operator because the registry is not providing information that it needs to and not listening to etcetera - etcetera - etcetera.

You know the idea of getting in between to angry parties after the CSC seems to me perhaps to be a little bit of a dangerous route for us to follow particularly on the sort of day to day battle ground. I think I'd still prefer that to appear at the end of the month rather than somewhere in the middle - thanks.

Donna Austin: Thanks Martin so I think that falls into the category of escalation which I think was identified. We need to get some guidance or some understanding from NTIA and IANA about what they do now. Stephanie have you completed your section?

Stephanie Duchesneau: So there was one more which was just the (reassigned) management audit data which is just some monthly report of all of the (unintelligible) that have occurred. I basically (claused) it as that their requirements for this report should only be changed if their services are introduced such that new metrics which have to be tracked for it. I don't know if anyone else takes a different position. And this would also be affected potentially by the question that Sarah raised earlier about whether we would want this to be potentially uploaded instantaneously rather than on a monthly basis. I'm happy to have that discussion now or people can just provide input on the document itself.

Donna Austin: There's no answer so I'll just assume that if people have any comments they'll provide those on the documents. Okay so I think we're up to (A) which is...

Kurt Pritz: Of course ignore that little (belt) at the beginning - I thought I'd be able to delete it, but I couldn't and (unintelligible). So I think that - where I was with this - when I first read E - I thought it was literally clear to me, but then it became less clear as to what the task was, but what I took it as - as describing what the remedial action plans were in event of poor performance and I extended that through escalation which might have been somebody else's area.

And again, I ran up - in my thinking I ran up against, you know, whether it was for us to create the message or for us to inform the CSC what they have to do. So I made this table and - that described, you know, triggers which is the occurs row that, you know, if this occurs then that would trigger a - going back to the title, you know, an instruction at the CSC would send to ICANN so poor performance in different areas is a trigger so.

You know the first notice that the CSC would send to IANA would be a notification so that something's gone wrong so either that, you know, some control emit was exceeded or one of the reports that we received indicated that an SLA was not met or, you know, so I have some of these real time things in here, but we can forget about them if we want.

Got an IANA - a customer presented evidence that a SLA was not met so it's sort of a first occurrence and then, you know, it would be sent to the IANA Manger which is (Elise). And then, you know, then I specified in bullet form, you know, what the message content would be and what the response from IANA would be required to say. So I laid it out that way and then, you know, having done that I said, well, you know, but I took it through a couple of escalation steps so if corrective action wasn't taken or there's no corrective action plan, you know, what would we do.

And, you know, I think again, it's for the CSC to specify the timeframes for corrective action - for the plan to be published and for the corrective action to be done - probably on a case by case basis. So then I created these escalations paths where, you know, they would be triggered if the plan was late or, you know, if violations continued to happen even though corrective action was suppose to being taken.

And then, you know, included some additional requirements in the ICANN response or the IANA response as you went through the escalation paths. And then, you know, when I finished those - disappointed so, you know, then I added on top and I don't think you're seeing the addition in the - well it's in the live document that, you know, this is to create sort of a template - (cost) to build those typo's. And, you know, it's really for the CSC to make these exact determinations because they're the ones that are going to be monitoring

this so they need to create a process that is very usable by them. That's all I have.

Donna Austin: Thanks Kurt. So Staffan you have your hand up?

Staffan Jonson: Okay thank you - yes. Thank you Kurt. I think this makes - it's a good idea and a good start to clearly outline that there are steps of escalation and it clearly defines what bullet point will lead to what event so that's a good idea even though I guess - for example; the addressee - the second row in the column might be quite controversial. But none the less I like the (mess) and I think it's a good start.

This is tricky and I know in SLA - SLE group that there's assigned teams for SLA - SLE group - they're talking about this as well. What should the final punishment be for - and here I see quite distinct difference between contracted and un-contracted TLD's rather than (unintelligible). But there are a huge difference - they're talking about they find for example; if a etcetera, but this might just be a (circular) way of punishing people so. But I think this matrix is a good starting point in a way to be very specific - thank you.

Donna Austin: Thanks Staffan. Martin?

Martin Boyle: Yes thanks Donna. Yes I really welcome this sort of (curve) - I think it's a good idea because each shows a process and a process that is directly related to engaging with the customers on a failure to meet the requirements of those customers. There are only two little comments I had - the one was I wondered whether there was essentially a level zero which is yes, you failed an SLA requirement. But that could well be exceptional circumstances so I think probably there is a new column to the left of notification which is probably an initial discussion on the reasons for the - for the particular failure.

And the other thing I, you know, (process) more difficult to show this in this sort of tabular form, but always seems to me to be important as policies start to go through a dispute phase then to ensure that there are plenty of opportunities for discussions for dialogue between the parties. And so certainly I would like to see that as a concept that comes in to moving from a sort of level zero of identifying that it was not an exceptional circumstance through its notification - through into the three escalation steps. But that doesn't diminish the - I think good quality and good basis of this work so thanks so much Kurt.

Donna Austin: Staffan it's been a long time.

Staffan Jonson: Yes it is so I'll take it away.

Donna Austin: Thank you. Does anybody else have any other comments (occurred) or we could go on with this one? It looks like we're good to go. Staffan I think you're on F.

Staffan Jonson: Yes I am and I noticed now while looking at it that there is actually three things that CSC may do and one that it doesn't - is not allowed to do so since the heading is specifying instructions of what is not mandated or out of scope for the CSC I answered maybe (erroneous) on the three first ones.

But none the less I only could think at least within this same timeframe for one and that is what has already been discussed actually the idea of that CSC is limited to a technical function basically and not (inter metaling) into public policy issues - etcetera - etcetera. It's not my (theory) phrase this (technique) text might be rephrased, of course, but it's just - that is the only point could I

come up with in this time. Maybe I'll fill this in with more eventually - are there any questions or remarks?

Donna: Okay doesn't look like it - thanks Staffan. Sarah I think we're back to you.

Woman: Last I heard from Sarah she was still locked out of the building. I don't know if she's on line via cell, but I think she's still out of her office.

Donna Austin: Okay we might skip over (G) and that and if we can do (H) that will be great.

Martin Boyle: Okay thanks Donna. I had a bit of a problem with this one because the question is considered the extents of which the CSC could engage the - or emerging issues. And so I - at times because the best I could come up with was trying to think of what sort of mechanism might be put in place to identify emerging issues. And this is, obviously, something because issues are, you know, do they really emerge that quickly, you know, they've been twinkles in peoples' eyes for awhile.

And so it seemed to me that we could perhaps do something that was very much more based on an annual meeting between the registries and the IANA Functions Operator that would then consider the annual reports that we heard about from Stephanie and you (unintelligible) that to have discussions on things like enhancing and improving service level commitments and any security stability issues that might be coming up in the longer term and then that would then provide the framework for doing Horizon scanning and stuff that might actually be done.

If I put it wrong I'd be grateful to know because as I say I really - really did struggle to try and think exactly how I was suppose to respond to this particular question - thanks.

Donna Austin: Thanks Martin - I don't think it's particularly off base. I think what this is trying to address was situations that (David Comrad) had addressed on the last - the broader CWD (unintelligible). I'm not sure that everyone has actually seen that, but it was, you know, things like (unintelligible) so in order for that to be viable the MTIA actually had to approve it so there's an issue taken here taken out of the equation who replaces that. So I think that was certainly in my mind this point was partly about, but I don't think what you suggested about, you know, doing an annual review is, you know, what's coming down the pipe or whether they try to improve relationship or having to be managed is necessarily out of the scope either. So that was my thinking of it - if anybody else has any other comments?

Kurt Pritz: Yes this is Kurt - it looks like I can raise my hand (unintelligible). So I was going to say exactly that and then maybe we could just make that part of the monthly report for IANA to identify any emerging issues and that would be, you know, we could write a definition for it.

You know changes for their operation or their duties that would be material or have a material effect on its customers, you know, some simple definition and just have them raise the issue in their monthly report if one of those like (automationer) or signing the route (zone). And like Martin said, you know these - you can time these issues with a calendar not with a stop watch so that would be plenty of time to have - consider the issue.

Donna Austin: Thanks Kurt. Do we have Sarah back in the building yet?

Woman: I don't think she's going to make it back. She told me to send her apologies.

Donna Austin: Okay - Stephanie do you want to continue with the composition of the CSC?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes sure thing. So I've already gotten some input since we discussed a bit earlier on the call that my position was - again, it's dependent on what actual functions we described to the CSC that that's going to have be revisited at earlier point, but was that we should be keeping the CSC kind of small on the insurance focus on (progression) of the relevant skills and relevant knowledge to the IM and (unintelligible) functions so.

And (Donna) I believe was the person who had recommended the (unintelligible) in one of the earlier calls that we were talking about the CSC that I applied on the body the minimum requirement of two representatives from DCL the registry operators a minimum of two representatives from ccTLD registry operators.

And I had done probably included also (unintelligible) from the (unintelligible) so upon this session I think it was a good suggestion that we should also be including the (RSI) on this body. I welcome any input here and now if people have a sense of what the (RSI) role should be in this body. And then my suggestion was that as long as we have this minimum structure set that additional members with relevant skills - relevant knowledge could also be added as long as they were approved by these five official members of the CSC.

And that could - I didn't want to require a liaison from the RAR or from the ATIF because I don't think its necessary for the entire duration of the group's work, but (unintelligible) a point it was deemed to be necessary or appropriate (from that) official then the CSC would be - the members of the CSC would be empowered to appoint these additional bodies.

I don't really think it's going to be a voting focus group so I was more concerned about how do we get - A - the minimum level of participation and - B - make sure that people have relevant criteria and relevant knowledge to participating and that the right priorities in mind then about - I know the - or really dicing the participation and focusing on different geographic consideration - focusing on (unintelligible) I was just focused on ensuring that we have the minimum, but if people think if different approaches is necessary I'm happy to hear it.

And then the other thing that I had included was that it should be just on a volunteer basis and not be put - to keep cost low it should be done on a volunteer basis and be carried out remotely. And that the functions operator would be responsible for facilitated remote participation, but not be required to pay (spousal) support associated with this role. Oh and then (unintelligible) conversation I see Staffan has a hand.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you - yes. Just - well you partly answered my question while speaking so - but, on the one point three you talk about a voting liaison and in my world there wouldn't need to be any voting in the CSC at all and I'm just - but you mentioned this wouldn't be a voting so maybe from the (Security) (unintelligible) Advisory Committee - I'm not sure what kind of functions would be voted about in the CSC in my - in the Frankfurt mind at least that should be taken care of by someone else more (unintelligible) oriented. So that's why I'm (unintelligible), but yes - thank you.

Donna Austin: Thanks Staffan. So I have a - its Donna speaking - I just wanted to provide some context to my original thinking with a minimum of two reps from (unintelligible) registries and two from (unintelligible) registries so this is at the end of a long conversation on a (unintelligible) call and one of the challenges that we got into was everybody wanted to say to the table not

understanding what the role of the CSC would be and also there was an understanding that they would be a NRT as well.

So because everybody wanted a piece of the pie I tried to cut it back to what can we agree is a minimum so that's why the two and two were recommended. If going back to where we originally started this conversation and we agreed that this would be a stand alone committee and, you know, perhaps it would be in our contract (code) or NRT - I'm thinking around the composition of these they seem like they're a little bit different, but I just wanted to put that context out there. Did anyone else have any questions for Stephanie or any comments?

Kurt Pritz: I had - this is Kurt I had the one that I typed in. You know I'm not sure of the (F Fact) role except to make sure that the team has technical competence. And if it does I think that (F Fact) member should also be from a TLB.

Donna Austin: Thanks Kurt. Martin?

Martin Boyle: Thanks Donna. I kind of like the approach and certainly I understand your slight reservation Donna on if we're trying to ensure some multi stakeholder engagements and we don't have multi stakeholder review team then we do need to bring in liaisons here. But the other way of dealing with that is to make the (atavist) of the CSC transparence and with the CSC at least some sort of regular cycle engaging with the very much wider community essentially giving reports - giving report back of some sorts or allowing people to engage with it.

But certainly I think anything that goes on in this committee then appears to be (reductive) - lacking in any form of transparency is probably going to be a little bit dangerous. You know there might be currencies where high

confidentiality is needed, but in many cases I think the CSC should seeing its role as being a vector from what is happening at the IANA functional operator to the wider world.

The other point that occurred to me is it's - and I'm a member of the LACG so we're going to have to wrestle with this at some stage. I suppose I would feel a little bit nervous about just because the three separate IANA functions of having three entirely separate reporting procedures and that for perhaps we just need to put in something in our wording that would note this is a body that could be shared between the naming - numbering and protocol perimeters communities because that then sort of gives a platform for subsequent discussion on how do we do the monitoring - thanks.

Donna Austin: Martin could you just elaborate a little bit on what you mean by the trade groups and one reporting procedure. I'm not just sure I understood what you were getting to?

Martin Boyle: Yes - sorry about that. What I've sort of recognized is that the numbers - naming and protocol perimeters will have an interest in the IANA functions operator meeting it's service level requirements reporting on its deliverables and otherwise showing its behaving like a good service organization should do.

It would, therefore, seem to me to be not inappropriate for the CSC to be a shed (multi) - that is looking at all three after functions and have those functions performing and therefore I wonder whether if we just put our hands up and said, this is a body that could be expanded to cover all, hopefully, different IANA functions or three of the IANA functions should the other communities so desire. I'm not within sake of - so putting in IAB and (RIM)

and as observers, but actually is part of an overall committee if people then decide that this - the best solution for them - thank you.

Donna Austin: Okay thanks Martin. Stephanie I'd say you handled that but, now it's down to - you okay?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes I think I'm upset. My perspective would that this should be the kind of rational for having the liaisons - identify where - I mean if we were going to try and assert any kind of change to the reporting processes or recording requirement that affected how it was being done across the board rather than just, you know, throwing in a new metric that was only applicable to TLD's that this would be the exact sort of (instance) that at minimum having liaisons that potentially after having fuller participation across the three communities would be appropriate. Maybe there's a way to craft - I can take a stab at building that language into this section and see what you think.

Donna Austin: That be great - thanks Stephanie. So we'll take section of G which is Sarah's - we've covered - well we intended to cover so Sarah's space was consider whether it would be appropriate for the CSC to be an initial point of escalation to TLD operators through our experience and a performance issue so I think Sarah's not on line so it makes sense it should be the first point escalation. Martin I see you've got your hand up.

Martin Boyle: Yes and I think from the earlier discussion on Kurt's (sheets) on and I'm trying to find the - yes on E that seems to me to be something that we all were very clearly agreeing on so I just put my hand up to check that I'm not missing something there and so that we are actually generally in agreement with (access) and approach.

Donna Austin: That was certainly by census on that one. So I think we've made a good start here. Perhaps next step is it pays for us to go back and have a look at their respective - sounds like they want to provide some updates to do that. The other thing that I'm not and I- we made clear - obviously we need to put time in around that. The other thing that's not particularly clear in my mind is, you know, what is it we've missed and perhaps that will become clearer once we put a clean version of this document in front of us or perhaps we'll never know.

But I think part of my task for this week was to go back over information that was or discussions that we had within the CSC prior to - sorry - conversations that had been going on within the (RSP3) discussion about the CSC. And I think there's some value in not having that conversation now, but with the benefit of what I got in front of me I can now go back and do that and then perhaps do some kind of analysis on where I think we're missing anything as a result of those early discussions and then perhaps try to plug those holes. Martin is that a new hand?

Martin Boyle: Yes I'm afraid it is Donna. Martin Boyle again - the one bit that's I felt was missing, but it might just be because it's not considered appropriate here is that we need some sort of process which allows the registries to discuss with the IANA functions operator about changing - amending - improving - or whatever about reporting procedures and more importantly updating service level commitments that might just be that I missed it on the twelve or thirteen (order base) document.

But that seems to me to be something that's how this committee of all the bits would be the most appropriate time to identify and upgrade - update the particular service level commitments - thanks.

Donna Austin: Okay and that escalate piece of work is probably one that's important to this group as well and we haven't seen that - come of that yet so it might be something that we need to just kind of pass for awhile until we've seen what that comes back with as well. The - so I might need some help here on next steps and how we move forward with these.

Do people think that they can get or kind of rehash what they've done in the next 24 hours? And then what I would try to do is and perhaps with Bernie's help if he's available try to plug this into a format that is going suit the expectation of the broader CWG. Does that make sense - do I have any opposition to that? Staffan?

Staffan Jonson: No it's an excellent idea. Maybe if we should have them - if Bernie could help - some kind of collection of what is new in relation to - in very general terms - what is new relating to the December 1st proposal or in some way to speed up the discussions on the - in Istanbul so that I'm taking - how could we refine this at the product so we - because - prepare something that is easier to say yes to if you see what I mean.

Then so as Bernie (role) was into before - let's not open every door because then we won't have time in Istanbul so I'm just thinking out loud - how can we improve that possibility.

Donna Austin: I think there's potentially another phase to that two step and I'm consciously - there's not just a December 1 proposal that's on the table at the moment. We actually have five - I think from memory. And one of the things that occurred to me was to (regards) to and where because I think they all have a CSC or something similar component across the board.

And there might be some value in actually having a local of those and seeing what was addressed - what we haven't so that might be a - kind of a analysis that we could do as well. Because I think it's not just the first December proposal that we need to take into account here it's the other ones that are on the table as well. So that being made the strongest suggestions on what our next steps are? Do you want me to try to wrap that up a little bit?

Man: Yes please do so at least with the Sarah.

Man: (Unintelligible)

Donna Austin: Bernie did you have something before I try to settle that?

Bernie Turcotte: Yes, I do have bit of time to work on this, but just to be clear if we're looking at how to deliver stuff that would be most useful and stuff that could be integrated into the - and in case you missed it the - while we've been having this call (Marie) could have distributed Version 2.2 which has a bunch of update and I guess a bit of a template for how we address each subsection where there was text. It's slightly less applicable here because we're not working from existing text, but definitely I'll have time and we can talk about that offline - thank you.

Donna Austin: Perfect - thanks Bernie. So within the next - about - I think the action points - within the next 24 hours could pay for review. They're contributions to this document in light of the discussion that we've had here today and make any updates and then I will go through and do an analysis of what we have in our document against not just what the previous RP3 discussions have been, but also try to take into account, you know, every proposal and the ones that came through from (Adler) as well and see if we can at least identify where the commonalities are and draw those out.

And I would hope that I can get something back to the group by Wednesday so that gives me - it would be close of business Wednesday so by Thursday morning. We've got sixteen minutes left - if there's some suggestions that we have a conversation that we - the automation of (roots) and updates - Staffan do you want to -- sorry Bernie just give me a second -- did you still want to go ahead with that discussion or is it something that potentially have off on a list?

Staffan Jonson: I might have done a list - I just want to clear - pick your brains of where its suppose to - if its suppose to be alliterated somewhere and if that is in our group so its - so I can send a - some words about it to the list as well and just ask for your comments if we should bring it in this group so that's the most efficient way - thank you.

Donna Austin: Okay - thanks Staffan. Bernie did you have something? Okay - all right so I think I'm going to bring this call to a close. I think on the action item we have really here related to IANA or NTIA at this point is what escalation processes they currently have so in the event of why IANA - what escalation processes or things that they're having in place so I think that's the only that we have.

Does anybody else have anything else that they want to add - is there anything that you're confused about? Okay, looks like we're all good - hopefully. So we'll call this to a close - sorry - forgot to mention - do we have a call scheduled for next Friday?

Bart Boswinkel: I believe we have - now let me check. No I don't have it on my list, but I can have it organized - no problem. Do you want to do it on Thursday?

Donna Austin: Let's (sign) for Thursday if that suits everybody. And the reason I say that is because it gives us an extra day if we need to do some additional work on a Friday.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Donna Austin: Very conscious of the following week people got traveling so.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. The only issue is this might be for some - the Center Meeting, but then again its close.

((Crosstalk))

(Matt): And also we're talking - talking first day of - four or three (UTC) - it will work because my plane leaves from Copenhagen at six so maybe - sorry - five.

Donna Austin: (Matt) is saying he can't do Thursday so I think we're going to go with Friday (Paul).

Bart Boswinkel: It's okay.

(Man): Friday - is it Friday after - Friday for UTC that I'm asked before or...

Donna Austin: Perhaps can we - is it possible to doodle poll (Paul) just to...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes it is. Yes please.

Donna Austin: Yes - okay terrific.

Bart Boswinkel: And then pull Friday.

Donna Austin: Yes so Friday.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes and then say would the alternative - I would say - what I see - say that with Staffan we do have a coordination call with CC so that includes Martin as well at 2:00 pm UTC or 3:00 pm...

Staffan Jonson: Thursday right?

Bart Boswinkel: No that's Friday.

Staffan Jonson: Oh that's - yes - that's Friday.

Bart Boswinkel: So it has to be 15 hundred UTC or 16 hundred UTC.

Donna Austin: Okay if you send around the doodle poll that be great.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes I will do.

Donna Austin: All right.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Donna Austin: Thanks everybody - I think we've made progress - I hope we've made progress.

Bart Boswinkel: I do.

Donna Austin: So we'll pull all the inputs in the next 24 hours and then I'll try to turn something back around for - you can see direction on Thursday.

Bart Boswinkel: Friday. Oh yes that's Thursday.

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Yes - yes - yes - sorry. I shouldn't interfere.

Donna Austin: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: My apologies Donna.

Donna Austin: That's okay Bart. All right thanks everybody.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay bye bye.

Man: Bye.

END