

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
March 20, 2015
11:00 am CT**

Coordinator: The recordings are started, you may proceed. Thank you.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. Okay so welcome all to the second meeting and roll call according to Adobe we have Bernie, Donna, Kim Davis, Kurt, Martin Boyle, Sarah Falvey, me, Staffan Jonson and Stephanie Duchesneau. If I understand correct we have no one on the phone only, right?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, so complete.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. So today we have a couple of things to cover. And as I believe we had two hours, especially welcome to Kim that hasn't been here before if I understand - remember correct.

Kim Davis: Thank you.

Staffan Jonson: Yeah, you're welcome. So the idea is to start with the short term preparations before Monday 6:00 pm UTC and what we need to deliver at that time. And that is covered under Agenda Points 2 and 3. And then it's the Agenda Point 4 talking about preparation before Istanbul if we should prepare something and

how we should do it in that case before first thing Friday next week and then the next meeting.

So if I have no other comments I'd like to start with continuing work of fulfilling the Google doc or filling in the Google doc. And address partly my contributions yesterday, Donna's overview and the template per se. So if no one minds I will start by talking about contributions by me yesterday. Is that okay with all?

Okay I see no hands at least. And I'll start by just explaining what has happened. I've been at a meeting where I met several CCs and I almost think we managed to get some kind of list of consenting views, at least that is what I hope I scabbled down yesterday evening in green in the Google document.

And it might be a little - it might not be so consistent to what I added before. But my point of pasting this into the document is actually to showing what the CC expectations are. And this is maybe one of the better times for understanding what CCs actually want and what there is a consensus on and what there isn't.

So I'm very happy with outcome of this even if it could have been formulated in a better way or edited. So - and, yeah, I see we have the green on the screen right now. So what I did just before this meeting, I took Donna's table as was also sent yesterday - or Donna's overview of what is consenting within this group.

And I numbered every sentence from A to H or something and then - in red letters and then I took the same letters and try to paste them into the Google doc to see where the correspondence where we actually mean the same thing but it's just formulated in different ways.

And there are - this is of course a way to identify conflicting issues as well in this group. But since our main goal must be to put down what is consensus in the group Donna's list seemed to be quite good as a starting point. Do you have any remarks or considerations about this idea to work in the first place? How do you think we should take work further (unintelligible). Donna, please.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Staffan. So to some extent I would like to go through your next text because I think in large part when I read it I think we had already covered it.

Staffan Jonson: Yes.

Donna Austin: So while it wasn't - to some extent I think I've pulled it out in some of the overview points that I've done. But I would like to go through particularly the stuff that's taken from SSAC 069 I think and just understand - I think, you know, the change to the point about a registry - I think that's picked up in the contract already so I think that's okay.

I'm not sure what changes of who is appointed the registry for already existing TLD means; I think that's delegation and redelegation. And the Number 3 is the one that I'm not sure about that I'm really unclear about. So I think if - a first step if you can walk us through that because this is new information to all of us and we have a discussion around it.

Staffan Jonson: Yeah, so I had - had I had more time yesterday I would have edited this better to a more understandable way than is today so I'm sorry about that but I just didn't have time to do it.

So my idea is to compare with Donna's overview and this document side by side to understand what are similarities and what are not. So I'll just take out

the documents here to start with. So do you have the two documents side by side or how do you manage to do that?

Bart Boswinkel: Now you ask me something I don't know whether that's possible.

Staffan Jonson: I don't expect you to do it, Bart. I hope people can manage to do it without your help. So if not I'll start anyway but might be a little bumpy here.

Bart Boswinkel: Staffan, may I ask you what do you want to achieve by having these documents at the same time? Is it easier to first discuss what you - because if I understand it correctly Donna's document or the overview is more a kind of summary of - of the...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, already. And the agreement, say, what she understood are consensus points and where further discussion debate is needed. And your insertions in, say, the Google doc is, say, is at a more detailed level first. And then say it's reflected in the overview. So I don't know which - I think either - but that's up to you, you have a discussion on the details. And that's the Google doc.

Or we go to the overview and where needed we go back, say, if there is agreement on the changes you made then it's fine; if there is none then we go back to the details and have a detailed explanation. So there are two ways of doing this.

Staffan Jonson: Yeah, exactly. That is actually my question: "How do you want to do this?" So my general idea is to prepare the document per se. But if that is not a feasible way to do we - I'm open to any suggestion here so please let me know

what's the best idea. My initial idea was to just go through the document, strike out what is not supposed to be there so we could make this text ready.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, at which level? At the overview level or the Google doc level?

Staffan Jonson: I think at the Google doc level but maybe this will take too long time.

Bart Boswinkel: Martin.

Martin Boyle: Thanks, Bart. Martin Boyle here. Yeah, I think the material that Staffan's put before us for - and Donna put it quite clearly for a number of people on the group, this will be new stuff. So I think without referring specifically to Donna's overnight document it would be helpful if Staffan were to talk us through his...

Staffan Jonson: Okay. Okay.

Martin Boyle: ...his contribution. And as he did it because he has already done the cross comparison, he specifically refers us to Items A-J in the document that Donna sent overnight that he amended just before this call.

And I think that will probably allow us to make a fairly rapid progress because it is - well it might be controversial for some it's hardly a page of text.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, and, Martin, if I understand you correctly but frame it a little bit differently, say, if you look at the overall or the broader document the sections in there are already, say, H to - A-H and so they are summarizing the overview so it's easier to go to the detailed ones in the original document.

Staffan Jonson: And the original document you mean Google document, right?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, yeah.

Staffan Jonson: So we go through Google docs with the risk of keeping Kim hostage here. But maybe we need to do that. If you'll bear with us, Kim, we'll hopefully get your input and please speak up if you find something that is too detailed, too unclear that could have any kind of improvements.

So with that I'll start on the role and responsibilities of the CSC in relation to the administration and oversight of the statement of work. So the sentence A from Donna's list is that the CSC should take over the NTIA responsibilities and from the IANA functions operator. So this is not very controversial or difficult sentence in that case.

Second meaning is it should be as unpolitical as possible. And I think we have a consensus on what that means. And I think there is the consensus on that and what it means so I'll just continue in the text. It is essential that there is no risk of service disruption following the IANA stewardship transition. I don't think that is controversial either.

If we - the CSC would take on certain duties currently performed by the contracting officer. This is also just information, I guess, this is not controversial in any way. Please interrupt me if you disagree.

And there we have the new text confirming that there is a need for a CSC. And post - CSC post transition and that the CSC will be responsible for overseeing the following functions. And then the following functions are three of them, they are from the document, SSAC 069 I think it is or if it's RSAC 069.

And probably these points are better covered in Donna's table after the overview but I'm not sure, I haven't cross checked that yet so please let me know if that is not the case.

This is one way of putting it and the table is another way. Kim, please go ahead.

Kim Davis: Thanks. Just for your awareness, the way that the different types of changes are split up here is not - is kind of an artifact of the way the IANA contract is written right now. But for example 1.2 Whois changes are affected every kind of root change that we do so any technical change results in a Whois database change. So often - so 1.2 is a super set of 1.1 I guess I would say.

I'm not sure it's particularly important in this context but I just wanted you to be aware that the way - and this has been a source of confusion with NTIA over the recent years that people tend to refer to Whois changes as being the ones that don't impact the root but in fact root zone changes do change the Whois itself.

Typically if we're discerning between the two we talk about, you know, technical changes and non-technical changes, let's say, but all of them impact the Whois database. And then I guess...

((Crosstalk))

Kim Davis: ...Point Number 2 I think that's trying to be conveyed there is whenever there's a substantial change of control for a TLD that can be the initial delegation, that can be a redelegation/transfer of an existing TLD, and obviously that can be a revocation where a TLD is removed from the town operator. So that's just - just my 2 cents on those bullet points.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you very much. So is it okay to just strike out 1.2 and let 1.1 stay in the text?

Kim Davis: I think there's value to 1.2 in acknowledging changes that don't impact the root zone. I perhaps wouldn't use those examples, perhaps alter them a little bit.

Staffan Jonson: Okay. So I'll put this in brackets then at least.

Kim Davis: I can provide text on Adobe Connect if that's useful.

Staffan Jonson: Oh, it would be helpful.

Kim Davis: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Staffan Jonson: ...Bart as well for that? Okay so we continue.

Donna Austin: Staffan, before we move, it's Donna...

Staffan Jonson: Sorry. Sorry, Donna.

Donna Austin: That's okay. So I think part of our task here is to, you know, we need to identify what's currently in the NTIA contract and post-transition how that will be managed. So what I tried to capture in the table, and I don't know if I've got this correct, is that - and it was based initially on Sarah's table, so the reference in the - and I just want to cover off Number 1 of your text at the moment, Staffan, so in my thinking that relates to the reference to 2.9(a) and

(b) which is root zone and Whois change requests. So I think that maps across to that quality in the contract. So I just want to confirm that that is actually the case.

Staffan Jonson: Okay, excellent. Sorry, what point you say, 2.9 and what was the other one?

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: ...2.9(a) and (b). So it's the first in the table that I've got. It's the first...

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Staffan Jonson: Okay. Thank you, this helps, table 2.9(a) and (b) because then we have a more overview text explaining what this is about for the ones that hasn't gone to the table yet. Then we might actually have both. Okay so Point 2, redelegation of an already existing TLD, for example, initial delegation, redelegation or revocation I guess it should say.

And this is of course - has been a lot of discussion with the naming community with the delegation and redelegation should be in this at all. But if this is relevant at all. But for now I don't know if you have a view on this, Martin, but is it should be - stay in this proposal or not. Please, Martin, go ahead.

Martin Boyle: Thanks, Staffan. Yes, certainly I do have quite a strong view on this one. And I think we - certainly over the last couple of days in the European ccTLD group in our discussion on this, were expressing quite a strong degree of

caution about the involvement of others, and essentially third parties, in the very, very sensitive issues of ccTLD delegations and redelegation's.

And I think there is also a similar concern if I go to Donna's summary paper for the gTLDs. And for both the entries on Page 2(c), 2.9.2.c and d, Donna, I think very wisely has just written the CSC will have no role in defining or reviewing the content of the delegation and redelegation reports for ccTLDs. And the CSC will have no role regarding the merits of delegation or redelegation.

And therefore it limits that role to things that it can monitor; essentially performance as it relates to timeliness and accuracy.

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Martin Boyle: So as far as I can, you know, that is probably, you know, as safe as we can be without suddenly throwing in quite a lot of value judgment on the decisions that have been made.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. Thank you, Martin. Just a follow up question, will this, according to you (unintelligible) challenged during the meeting by anyone.

Martin Boyle: If it's challenged I think the answer is that this is not where it belongs, gTLD the decisions are made in ICANN as part of the contracting process. And in ccTLDs this is primarily, and most usually, related to quite a delicate negotiation between existing operator and the local Internet community.

So I think (unintelligible) on this but could we actually just try and make sure that we maintain that local authority issue. That at great length was covered in the Framework of Interpretation Working Group reports...

((Crosstalk))

Martin Boyle: Those are just going to the board now.

Staffan Jonson: As you might see I'm also trying to identify will there be an issue and will this be contested. So because I guess in Istanbul we have to in some way take lead in this formulations however they are made so we need to understand where the hardship will be and if we do that already now we can prepare a little bit better for Istanbul. That's why I'm asking you of course. I do have a view on my own as well but it is hardly relevant right now so thank you.

Bart, you want something.

Bart Boswinkel: Just as a question, and say looking from, say, I'm just off a call, as we as Donna is, where we had a prep meeting for Istanbul and on potential - or dependency - interdependencies between the different design teams. Do you foresee a role with regard to authorization as well for the CSC and/or - because that's almost similar - and/or say is this core principle as you just suggested is that relevant for the authorization? Because the same argument could apply in that (unintelligible).

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. Martin, please.

Martin Boyle: Thanks, Staffan. Thanks, Bart. No, I certainly do not see - well I'd start off by saying I do not see a role for authorization. It's an unnecessary level of gatekeeper in the process. I think it can be responded to by introducing some sort of verification check internally. But I would not want to see it in and certainly not in a CSC where it will just - it's almost certainly going to introduce delays in process. So 100% zero, no from me.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Staffan. So originally we did have the question of authorization within our scoping document but it was taken out. I think - and depending on what the design team on authorization comes up with, I think it's still possible that the CSC has a role in monitoring any performance as it relates to that authorization piece. And I'm not sure how that's going to work but potentially that's the role there for the CSC.

It might be - it might be interesting to hear from Kim at this point on, you know, the current process at the moment. Kim, I don't want to put you on the spot in terms of offering opinions but if there's any kind of context you can give us as to how that process works at the moment and whether you actually have SLAs that are related to that function now would be useful.

Kim Davis: Sure. So we have multifaceted reporting. It's probably a whole subject of itself. I'm not sure if you wanted me to focus on a specific aspect of it or just give you a general overview.

Donna Austin: Maybe just a general overview. Thanks.

Kim Davis: So firstly we privately report to NTIA a number of reports on a monthly basis. We provide detailed disclosure of a number of requests pertaining to the root zone. Requests that are pending for more than a certain period of time we provide them with a detailed explanation of why the request is taking that long.

We also provide detailed reporting to them with respect to DNS SEC. We describe key ceremonies, issues in key ceremonies, we describe

documentation changes, we describe any emergency events. We break down download statistics of how often DNS SEC is used and so on and so on. So that's one key area of reporting where we produce monthly reports but it's just seen by NTIA.

Second key area of reporting is to the IETF.

Donna Austin: Kim, can I just stop you there?

Kim Davis: Yeah, sure. Go ahead.

Donna Austin: Sorry, I put myself on mute. I think that's an important point that this group needs to understand is that those reports that go to NTIA that are confidential how would the CSC manage that and where would - because in my mind there has to be some kind of repository for that information. So probably something that we need to put in parking lot at this point is how would we deal with those confidential reports - not we - how would the CSC deal with those confidential reports? Sorry, Kim, go ahead.

Kim Davis: Yeah, no it's a good point to make. I mean, I think just my personal observation is much of - much of the reporting is benign and it's more historical reasons rather than a compelling public interest reason not to make some of that information public. That being said, particularly in the cases of delegation, redelegation and perhaps of ccTLDs.

We're disclosing to NTIA, you know, issues inside a country that are perhaps politically sensitive. And, you know, the appropriateness of that being disclosed to a wider audience I think needs to be considered.

Yeah, so they're the two key reports that are private. The remainder of the reports are published on our Website, the first of which is the IETF reporting which, you know, the IETF has it's own MOU with ICANN that we've produced that.

In terms of the root zone we have a monthly performance standard metrics report. This is measuring against a number of SLAs that were agreed with the community about two or three years ago. We have an audit data report which is essentially a retelling of all the root zone changes that were made in the previous month.

And then we have - we call it the dashboard. I think on our website it's referred to at root processing times. Under the contract we're required to produce a dashboard for root zone changes so we produced the mechanism of live reporting on average wait times, average processing times and so on. And there is three or four graphs in that report.

In the end NTIA agreed for us to produce sort of a single monthly snapshot of average wait times for the previous month. So it sort of moved - in the discussion with NTIA it moved from being a live dashboard to being sort of a monthly snapshot. But the original intention there was that there would be some kind of ongoing live measurement of what the current wait times are and so on.

I think the last kind of reporting that we do is on a one on one basis with the customers themselves. Any of our original management customers are able to log into their account via our system and have a real time reporting on the status of their requests. So it's a bit like package tracking with FedEx and what have you, you can log in, you can see requests that you've submitted, you can see each time the state changed in a given request.

You know, if it's in a particular state for you as a customer that felt that that was an exceptional period you can always, you know, open a ticket with us and ask us what's going on. So I think that's an important piece of reporting that we do insofar as I think customers have indicated to us that they don't necessarily want the status of their individual requests being public but they want the ability to see their own requests in detail.

So I think I've captured the different facets of where we sort of report performance that I think are relevant to this workgroup.

Staffan Jonson: Okay, thank you. Just to let you know, I'm doing some very editorial changes here proposed by Stephanie especially - Stephanie and Donna mostly who are better at writing English than I am so those are very uncontroversial editorials I'm changing so you might see the text is changing a bit but it's nothing essential is being changed without talking about it first.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yeah, most of mine were just either little editorial changes or cutting things out where I felt like stuff was addressed elsewhere. I don't think there was much that was in contention from my perspective but just a few areas where I thought stuff was repetitive.

And I know you want to have somewhat of a summary in the first section; I'm not sure if it's confusing to just touch on some topics like the composition and then move away from it but that's certainly something we can discuss here.

Staffan Jonson: Okay good. So let's push on. Bullet - Number 3, it changes administration not triggered by registry. And this is 3.1 was what I would call innovation dimension where you actually can develop (unintelligible) and after the transition.

And this is also, if I remember, a correct match to Donna's document by the key point in the overview. In Donna's document it says, "The CSC will engage with IANA and the direct customers of the IANA function on an annual basis to discuss emerging technologies and issues that might impact the provisional of the IANA services."

So to me I'm quite happy with both those formulations. Just let me know and I'll transfer them. If not I'll push on if you don't have any ideas about this.

3.2, certification of IANA and its processes, for example, related to sanctions so that all registries can communicate with IANA. This point I had certainly - I couldn't wrap my head around it so I wrote (unintelligible) group but this is not really the case. Should this sentence stay or should it go? Please, Donna.

Donna Austin: So, Staffan, I'd like to understand what it means. And if I understand correctly these passages come from the SSAC report, is that correct?

Staffan Jonson: Yes. This is almost direct from the report so...

Donna Austin: So, Kim, do you have any idea what this is? I don't.

Kim Davis: Without having the SSAC report fresh in my mind, I mean, I'm familiar with the sanctions and their impact on IANA. I'm not sure what the word "certifications" specifically is referring to. We, you know, in the course of doing our regular business, and this isn't just for root zone, it's for any kind of IANA request, if we need to deal with parties that are subject to sanctions globally we need to obtain the correct permissions in order to do that.

This is, you know, this is something that our legal team inside ICANN facilitates. We approach the appropriate governmental parties required to get those licenses. We obtain them and then that allows us to conduct our work particularly for the root zone for the countries that we know that this might be an issue we try to be proactive and have those in place in advance so that, you know, it doesn't stall or delay root zone related requests.

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Kim Davis: I'm not sure that certification, to my mind, implies there's a need for some kind of third party, you know, apart from ICANN and its relationship to the relevant government, needing a customer committee to take any steps there in my mind just at first reading. So I'm a bit puzzled as to what "certification" might imply but I'll need to reread the SSAC report as well and perhaps we can talk it out.

Staffan Jonson: Okay, thank you. So let's push on if there are no - sorry, Sarah, please.

Sarah Falvey: I just have a quick question for the group on whether or not we would want - because sanctions are typically a very government-focused kind of process. And it seems to me like it's similar to the delegation and redelegation in the sense that it could be very political. Is this something that we would want the CSC to do? I personally don't think that it - we should.

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Martin has his hand up.

Staffan Jonson: Yes, please Martin. Please.

Martin Boyle: Thanks, Staffan. I must admit I agree with Sarah that the concepts of the CSC having to run around and obtain essentially what are sort of export control waivers would fill my heart with dread. I think this is the wrong place to do it.

That having been said, there would be a real issue if change that were needed in a registry that was serving a country that was under sanctions were then being denied. And that is perhaps something that we ought to raise with NTIA as to how that process might be managed bearing in mind that it's a US government process. Thanks.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. Bart, do you want to...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, maybe if you look at maybe included as a note if this is relevant and it is relevant but - so it doesn't fall in the (quicks) is there is a DT on (OFEC) licensing but it has priority too but that - this issue is not so much considered a CSC issue as that it needs to be addressed.

Staffan Jonson: Okay, thank you. So we'll leave it now with maybe striking it but look into it further on. Thank you. So let's push on. And then we come to the even looser formulated sentences like "CSC should only look at operational performance of the IANA functions operator." I think that was quite covered above at the second sentence, also mentioned (B), so I suggest we strike that altogether if no one opposes. Going one, going two. Thank you.

"It should be provided with tool and now we're talking about - let's see it should be provided with tools and escalation abilities to keep the IANA performance at high level." Reading it like this it's not really a controversial sentence. However, I don't find very much content to it. Do you remember, Martin?

Martin Boyle: As the discussion - I don't - I can't remember the use of the word "tools" and I'm not quite sure a CSC will tools is the most useful of organizations. But I think there were the two issues that were associated with it, the one being to try and identify with the IANA functions operator what the problem might be because in some cases it's a one-off. And then the other one, as you say, is a process by which you seek to address the problems or rather you seek to encourage the IANA functions operator to address the problems and improve the performance.

So I wonder whether that could be just slightly reworded with the deletion of tools and to rewrite it in the work with the IANA function operator, the keep performance to encourage the IANA operator to keep performance at a high level.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. So I already went on to next point, "CSC should review the IANA function operator's reports." That is an obvious statement. I just - I just keep it for - so there is actually expressed somewhere I guess it is. But that's just in case.

So let's push on. "It should not be limited to customers - direct customers of the IANA."

Stephanie Duchesneau: I think we should not say the thesis here and just tackle this in the composition section.

Staffan Jonson: Sorry, could you please repeat?

Stephanie Duchesneau: I think we should just take this out of this section and actually - instead of just saying whether it's direct customers or not direct customers

deal with it by actually scoping out the CSC which is drafted out in Section (I), I think.

Staffan Jonson: Okay. No opposition so we just track this one. Going first, (unintelligible) thank you. Customers should have majority vote. I noted as well, Stephanie, as you mentioned we already discussed this about voting and there shouldn't have to be any voting in CSC. So what is actually expressed here is that customers should have majority.

And if you directly - from your head know that this is expressed somewhere else I prefer to strike this as well.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yeah, I think that works.

Staffan Jonson: Martin please.

Martin Boyle: Yeah, I think the same thing applies to the three bullets, those two plus also the issue being possible to overrule the effective community. This is all about the methods of working which I think when we know what it is doing then it becomes clearer as to whether we need to address these issues or not. So whether it's striking out or whether it's parking I don't care. But I don't really think it belongs in this particular slot. Thanks.

Staffan Jonson: Okay, thank you. So striking, one, two, three, thank you. "CSC composition should mainly be limited to direct customers of the IANA naming functions. Liaisons from other parts of the naming community could be invited to participate to ensure seamless coordination among impacted parties."

Stephanie, you're right, I would recommend deleting this; membership are addressed below. Anyone opposing to this? I see no then we strike it.

"Service level expectations on contract at the service level agreements should be in place before the transition."

Donna Austin: So, Staffan, this is - I've captured that in the table that the CSC will need to monitor the SLEs, SLAs, but we don't know what they are yet. And my question is, you know, to what extent do they actually relate to some of the text that we already have in the table. So I think this is a - yes, the CSC will have to monitor performance against the SLEs and the SLAs but we don't know what they are yet.

Staffan Jonson: To me we can strike them at this level, not talking about them at all.

Donna Austin: I don't think we have to go into any discussion about, you know, developing them or whatever -just a placeholder I suppose. It's dependent on the work of the first design team.

Staffan Jonson: Stephanie, please.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Maybe just as placeholder language something like the CSC may be responsible for reviewing SLAs or SLEs on an ongoing basis.

Staffan Jonson: So as a placeholder then. Okay. "A review mechanism should be an integral part of the SLE. And this is a question, "What does this refer to?" And this is addressed later on I guess, the review mechanisms, right? Excellent. Thank you, Stephanie.

Kim Davis: May I intervene, please?

Staffan Jonson: Yes, please.

Kim Davis: So I'm sorry, I don't seem to be able to raise my hand for reasons that seem to be completely beyond me. Technical incompetence. I think one of the slight concerns I have here is when you start reviewing service level commitments is that while I could see the CSC being an organization that organizes the discussion, I wouldn't want this discussion just to disappear into the CSC and I believe that the CSC has a significant and perhaps primary role of being the - being the root for getting the information out from the IANA functions operator, commenting on it but getting it out to the wider community.

And if you go through to the statements of work as it as at the moment, that was something that was defined by the NTIA following two rounds of consultation with the wider - with the wide community. If we are going to try and change service level commitments I would like to see us being able to do that in a wide framework rather than it just being two ccTLD managers and two gTLD managers sort of dominating - dominating the discussion. Thanks.

Staffan Jonson: Okay, thank you. I see Stephanie and then Sarah.

Donna Austin: I'm not sure Stephanie is actually with us at the moment so maybe go to Sarah.

Staffan Johnson: Sara please.

Sarah Falvey: So I guess I just have a question for Martin. I just want to make sure I understand kind of how you're envisioning the CSC from your point of view. I think that the idea would be - and maybe we're not capturing it correctly sort of in clear language here that, you know, service level expectations or agreements would sort of be set and then someone needs to review to make sure that IANA is performing against those expectations.

So it'd be sort of a technical review - I envision it as a technical review process where we have the criteria set out and we need to just make sure that it's being reviewed against that criteria. I think the second point that you make which is if we want to change that criteria that should be not just up to the CSC but sort of a broader discussion which I would agree with.

But my understanding of what we were trying to say here is once that criteria is set through whatever process we want to take that the CSC would then sort of review the functioning of the - and the technical operation of the functions against that criteria. Are we missing each other or is that sort of that you were saying and I just misunderstood?

Martin Boyle: Thanks, Sarah. No, I don't think we're missing one another although one of the things that I would see important for the monitoring process is that the CSC members are talking to their community about performance levels because I think one of the things that actually happens is that nobody else is bothering to look at this and therefore for the CSC to turn around and say yeah, you know, at the moment, you know, at a regular meeting of their community that the performance is fine, all is being met or the only things that haven't been met are exceptional circumstances, that sort of thing.

And I think we - we too often forget the role of communication to the wider community when we start looking at the entities that the CWG came up with so I wouldn't like us to drop that. But otherwise, yeah, I think we're entirely in line.

Staffan Jonson: Okay, Kurt please. We don't hear you, Kurt. No. No sound from you, Kurt, yet. Okay, in the meantime may I ask Kim - I have a creeping feeling that we're misusing your time are we or rather do you have any general remarks

this far? Is this a way forward? Can you give some general comments or did you have anything on your mind yet?

Kim Davis: Yeah, thanks for asking. I guess without having seen this document until just now my first I guess question or thought is whether the group has a good sense of what the scope of the domain related activity would fall under the CSC.

In the sense that, you know, obviously the primary thing IANA operates is the root zone but we also operate the dotInzone, the dotArpa zone, there's a number of other domain names that we operate even going so far as example.com, for example, although that's not a registry.

And then we also have other auxiliary functions that we've stood up over time. We have this IDN table repository. In the past we had this interim trust anchor repository and so on. So there's - obviously the functions continue to evolve but they're not purely focused on the root zone.

And I was - I guess my question is does the group have a sense of whether all those things I just mentioned would fall in or out of scope for the CSC?

Staffan Jonson: And I would say I'm not really there. Would anyone else dare to take a stab on that? Bernie please.

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you, Staffan. I guess the question would be, Kim, if the CSC being the main replacement on the name side doesn't take it on, who would take care of it?

Kim Davis: Yeah, I think that's...

((Crosstalk))

Kim Davis: ...my point and what - back in my mind concern is is will this fall through the gaps?

Staffan Jonson: Okay, thank you. It's a good remark though, Kim.

Bernard Turcotte: Staffan.

Staffan Jonson: Please go ahead.

Bernard Turcotte: Just to be clear, in current version 2 of the proposal we've certainly got Int and the IDN repository identified and I think David is taking a read at it and hasn't brought out anything else except that we've stopped being specific about what things apply to - relative to registries and (unintelligible) TLDs in general to cover most of the (sins).

So it would be interesting to have Kim - if we do actually spread the net wide enough in the proposal and a second part of this is making sure that somewhere in the proposal it's addressed. But right now it looks like it would be in the CSC. Thank you.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. So if I understand you correctly we're asking Kim to help out then?

Stephanie Duchesneau: My comment was mostly the same as Bernie's but we do have two other design teams that are doing - discussing work for the IDN tables and for dotInt. But it's definitely true that if it turns out that this is the right home for those we might have to build out our scope a little further. ARPA I think is addressed in the IETF proposal.

Staffan Jonson: Okay. Thank you. Bernie, is that an old hand? And, Stephanie, is that an old hand? Let's try Kurt again. Please go ahead. Typing. The CC would be the vehicle for changing SLAs, getting input for the TLDs and maybe (unintelligible) IANA. Your mic is broke. Okay.

So, Kurt, may I please ask you to - in the Google doc could you just put a marker here? I started already but what is the open case here and then we'll just push on the list instead. Thank you.

So it's three minutes to the hour and I believe we have one more hour. So maybe we quite decent on time, right? We'll also push through Donna's overview and we'll consider preparation before Istanbul. Yes, I - if no one opposes I'll push on like this and see what else can be taken from this text.

So next heading is called CSC on review. And this is maybe also just a placeholder saying that there should be a review. Stephanie points out that there's another DT for this and the general idea was actually just to remind the reader that this is also considered this framework but I don't mind striking this sentence. Stephanie, please.

Stephanie Duchesneau: And I actually think that this should fit in the CSC so I volunteered for the other design team to kind of sync up and coordinate that and make sure it doesn't fall through the cracks.

Staffan Jonson: Okay, thank you. Then I'm happy. So may we just strike your remark here then I guess. I guess that's an old hand, Stephanie. And then we have old formulation. Input from the CC would feed into and inform the work of the MRT. And while we doesn't know what will happen with the MRT but some

kind of review might be considered at least. So I won't go into this old text unless you stop me.

And I'll push on to the next text, CSC and appeals mechanism. This heading is also just a placeholder. There is a need for general appeals mechanism, that's the first segment to start talking about it. And then we might push it further onto some other DT if you don't mind. Just for symmetry it's good to have those functions collected since I guess that CSC will be one of the first groups discussed in Istanbul as well.

Donna Austin: I think, Staffan, just to add to this is that Sarah kind of covered this off in some of the work that she did. I can't remember the letter it was attached to. But, you know, there is a first escalation point for a TLD registry...

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Donna Austin: ...to come to the CSC so I think we've covered that elsewhere.

Staffan Jonson: So we'll strike this, is that what you're saying?

Donna Austin: Yeah.

Staffan Jonson: Yeah. There we are. (Unintelligible) operator functions, yeah, and this is the escalation plan again actually. So escalation mechanism - and it's - first of all should it be in this text, should the heading be at all?

Donna Austin: It's Donna again, Staffan. So I think in my mind what we need to do is map this against the work that Kurt did on the escalation process and see whether there's anything missing in terms of what you've provided with the next text

and understand, you know, the differences and then decide what text goes forward.

I did notice that you did change some of - or you questioned some of the escalation process that Kurt suggested so we probably should address that in the context of this discussion as well.

Staffan Jonson: Okay. So let's see, how do we do this? Okay. Should we continue with this text first?

Donna Austin: Maybe if we can get Kurt's microphone to work we can get him to kind of do a check against your text here and just see if we can do a quick gap analysis.

Staffan Jonson: Okay, Bart...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Again, maybe again what is probably useful is put some text around this one. There is DTM, which is dealing with escalation mechanism. So this one - so what you're discussing right now needs in one way or the other be coordinated and consolidated with that design team.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you, you're right. So let's go back to Kurt's - and where are those. I forgot actually. It's not under B. Martin please, go ahead.

Martin Boyle: Thanks, Staffan. I think one of the important bits about Kurt's input, which was under E, was that he looked in his work about an internal escalation process which would, if - at the end of that process fail to have achieved anything then that would be escalated -I actually think it would be escalated to the new and shiny IANA - ICANN enhanced accountability process.

But I do think that these escalation processes, the internal escalation processes, do actually quite clearly belong to the CSC. And I would categorize that very much as being a looking to resolve the problems rather than to punish the - punish the crime.

For a way forward though, I wonder whether now would be the appropriate time for us to start looking at Donna's document because on Page 5 and 6 of her summary, she does pick up Kurt's document. And so then as we start going through the document, because I think Donna's document is a useful document to have on the table in Istanbul, that as we go through it we see whether we need to add anything from your section on breach of IFO functions.

So that's just a proposal bearing in mind we've now got less than an hour to go.

Staffan Jonson: Yeah, exactly. That's my concern. And my main goal today is to have something to - as soon as possible put before the Istanbul meeting, that's what I hope most of all to have here.

So how should we do this? If we take breach of IANA function - Kurt, please go ahead.

Kurt Pritz: Well maybe we should look at Donna's document. The point I wanted to make to build on - what Martin said was that - an escalation process - so what I put up in my document was a strawman, a framework or a suggestion of how it might look. But an escalation process is somewhat complex to develop. And I think, you know, our group should say that the CSC is responsible for the escalation process so I agree with that.

But I also think that it's going to have to be worked out rather carefully because it's very important. And I think that no matter what we come up with it's not going to work the first time. When we try to escalate things we'll find cases we haven't anticipated or edge cases that need to be dealt with. And so the real escalation process at the end of the day will have to be worked out between the CSC and ICANN.

And, you know, with the CSC maybe consulting with all the rest of the TLD customers. And that even once we launch it we're going to find problems and we'll continue to refine the escalation process. So those are my comments, thanks.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. So in this document we'll just keep a placeholder, breach of IANA function operation functions and then saying something in the event of the IANA functions operator fail to deliver, etcetera. Sorry. At predefined civil actions or escalation mechanism should apply. And then we'll just take a - maybe strike - I'm not sure if you're still with me on the screen but we'll just strike - part of that text just to - and the hope that this will be taken up in DTM, for example.

I see no opposition at least. I guess, Kurt, you have an old hand? So I hear we're going to Donna's text. Let's - Bart, could we maybe shift - yes please. Kurt, do you want to say something or is that an old hand? Neither. I'm not sure what that means.

Okay this document is scrollable. And well if you haven't seen this document you'll see it now. It's Donna's text. It's her listing of consensus. And I just put the red letters in to map it towards the Google document. And this is what is agreed upon and then we have more specific highlight or table that presents in

more precision that the former text did. NTIA contract requirements, and CSC. So how do you want to do this? Do you want to go through this, Donna?

Donna Austin: Yeah, thanks, Staffan. So I think just to get - just to provide some background so I found that in trying to put a document together that we could use in Istanbul the current format that we had was not very useful because it didn't pull out the key points. There was a lot of duplication.

So essentially what I've tried to do at a high level is just gives a - key points of, you know, what we think the CSC would do. And then - and Staffan, thanks for doing the mapping, I think that's really useful.

And then in the table, which is the one that Sarah started, I think, you know, we make references to certain clauses in the NTIA contract. But we don't necessarily always, you know, there seems to be a shorthand that we use in all this work that I don't find very helpful.

So what I've tried to do is keep - expand on Sarah's table and try to add, you know, post transition what - how we would - how the CSC would work moving forward. What I would like to put into his table as well is, you know, perhaps some of the monitoring or the reevaluation that, you know, would be undertaken as well as it relates to these specific references. And, Kim, your expertise might come in handy with this.

The area that I didn't quite get to were C and D which I think Martin and Stephanie worked on. So any - I think if we can kind of collapse that work and frame it a little bit better than how it actually came out in the Google doc might be useful.

The escalation stuff we just - we just touched on. And then for the individuals to make complaints I've kind of wrapped that up based on Sarah's text. I haven't, you know, provided the detail or the composition; I just picked that up in the high level overview.

So I'm just - I'm conscious that when we get to Istanbul we need to be able to tell a story and the way that we were working on the Google doc wasn't going to achieve that. I really don't think the template that Marika provided is necessarily going to enable us to do that either.

So I appreciate that you might not have had much time to look at this but if you have any initial feedback of, you know, whether this is a useful way to go forward in Istanbul that would be helpful at this time I think. Stephanie.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Hi, Donna. I think this is really good and really useful. The one thing I might suggest adding in addition to the responsibilities that we have clearly given to the CSC is to have like a specific placeholder section. These are responsibilities that we think the CSC could perhaps carry out pending the work of future design teams or wherever they're being addressed just so that if we have these ones that we're still sort of iffy on it doesn't seem as if we're saying that the CSC shouldn't be carrying them out, just that we're waiting for further language and further input.

Donna Austin: That's a good point. Thanks, Stephanie. And just I think Bart referred to a meeting that the leads of the design teams attended earlier this morning. And what they're actually putting together at the moment is Kurt had developed a kind of org chart and where the crossover was on some of the design teams. And that's going to be built out so that the - in discussions in Istanbul those are the kind - those design teams that are interdependent in some way will be clumped together so that the conversation may be had in one place.

So in terms of the escalation that's a design team that Chuck is leading; that will feed into what we're doing and certainly Design Team A. So I think it's a good suggestion to pull that out, Stephanie. Thanks.

Staffan.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. This is an excellent document. And it's more substance than the few words we had so far. I found some points that might be - that might be challenged. And my main concern by highlighting them is actually to say this will be challenged. So I don't (unintelligible) my view this far as long as we have a good way of presenting this in Istanbul. That's all my remarks, actually, to this document.

So how do we take this further?

Donna Austin: Staffan, I think the areas we're using - this might be challenge - relates to the escalation. So it might be - and I understand your thinking might be based on recent conversations at the (CENTA) meeting. So did you just want to touch on that a little bit so we understand what they are?

Staffan Jonson: Well actually my idea was to strike out them instead and take them later on. So since - as I understood people is hoping that the Design Team M will take that instead and we'll leave it out of this discussion today so we can use Kim better and so we can go through everything else. Or am I wrong? Martin, please.

Martin Boyle: Thanks, Staffan. Yes, it's quite possible that these things will be challenged. But the fact that they might be challenged I don't think is a reason for us not to put them in. But in fact I wonder whether this particular table currently says,

"Process remedial action in the event of poor performance of IANA," is the key to what we're doing.

We're looking at an internal resolution process that is focused on making sure that the IANA functions operator works within its normal bounds. And then as I say I think the escalation process that we've got here which is very much an internal escalation process on behalf of the CSC is focused on trying to find solutions to the problem before.

And then I think if it's actually escalated and this is the real bit of escalation, it's escalated from the CSC into the existing or - no the newly to be introduced ICANN accountability mechanisms and the follow up action should there be entirely within the ICANN accountability formwork. Thanks.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: So I think, say, especially Martin's explanation is if you could include it in the document itself and maybe already flag not just the placeholder but also flag where there is potential overlap and why this group thinks it's necessary to be dealt with, I think then you have a more focused discussion or provide the opportunity to have a really focused discussion on - with other DTs and other members of the CWG itself.

Staffan Jonson: Okay it sounds like a very good idea. I'm not sure if I'll fix it on my own so how do we do this? Kurt, please go ahead.

Kurt Pritz: Yeah, so I think it's a great idea to have a document that tells a story. And given the start we should do a couple things. One is we should go through the overview and get - because these are our principles essentially and get, you

know, common understanding amongst us what they mean because words can mean different things.

And really harden them and then there might be a page or so for each one of these overview bullets behind this. And so this document to me is the start of that. And what we would do then is make this our working document and pull from the Google document, you know, all the stuff we've done earlier and decide, you know, what we're going to take. So it's a good way to transition our work from all the thoughts we put into the Google doc into this thing that will become our deliverable.

So I think it said a couple things. But first I think we should go through the overview and get agreement that those things are right.

Staffan Jonson: Makes sense. I'm with you 100% on this because I think we need to get participants started and get them thinking before - them straight into table because it might scare them a way to get agreement in a general sense and then drill down and go through the harder and harder things, I think that's a way forward.

And, Bart, do you have your hand up again or is it an old one?

Bart Boswinkel: Apologies, old hand.

Staffan Jonson: And Kurt's is the same for you maybe. So now I'm grasping for the method. And do you want to play this, Donna or should I try to push this forward? I see - I hear silence...

Donna Austin: Okay...

((Crosstalk))

Staffan Jonson: Sorry, there you are.

Donna Austin: Thank you. So to Kurt's suggestion I think we'll just work through this one by one and try to understand, you know, where we have - where we have agreement and where we diverge and then we can do the secondary part. We may not get through the secondary part on this call but certainly if we have an understanding that I can pull from the Google doc then I should be able to have something together perhaps - well hopefully before the Monday deadline that give you guys time to review it and hopefully agree with it.

So on the first point, the CSC should establish - should - that's bad language. The CSC should be established to perform those activities currently undertaken by NTIA in overseeing the performance of IANA functions as they relate to naming services. So do we agree? Sorry, I missed, where were you now? The first line, right?

Donna Austin: Very first, yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Page 1.

Staffan Jonson: Yeah. Yeah.

Donna Austin: Sorry, this could become very painful. I think probably what we should note here is what Kim brought up previously and that is, you know, we've kind of done a mapping against the - what we think are the naming services

responsibility but perhaps this is where we should flag that other piece that Kim mentioned earlier.

So the - on the second dot point, the CSC is only responsible for the performance of IANA and will not engage in policy related topics or policy related disputes.

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: So I'd say that - Martin has these little tick box so I guess if others want to do that that might be useful.

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Kurt Pritz: So I think that the CSC is only responsible for monitoring the performance of IANA, not for the performance of IANA.

Donna Austin: Good point, Kurt. Stephanie.

Stephanie Duchesneau: I wonder if we say it's only responsible for monitoring if we're precluding have any sort of enforcement power. So maybe monitoring and ensuring the performance of IANA.

Donna Austin: I have no problem with that. Okay so I think we're good on that.

Staffan Jonson: So will you do amendments to the text, Donna, or should I?

Donna Austin: If somebody has the document open now that can kind of do a live edit that might be useful.

Stephanie Duchesneau: I can do that, Donna.

Donna Austin: Okay thanks, Stephanie, that'd be great.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: And I'll be capturing your notes and additions in the notes you can always fall back on the notes.

Donna Austin: Okay thanks, Bart.

((Crosstalk))

Stephanie Duchesneau: Fantastic.

Donna Austin: So the next dot point, the CSC will engage in cooperative communication with IANA on a regular basis. Okay that.

Kurt Pritz: I don't want to nit-pick this, so you could augment that be defining the goal of that so cooperative communication with - it's what Martin was saying before and he can say it more eloquent than I - more eloquently than I but, you know, it's cooperative communication in order to, you know, we're trying to succeed here by cooperation and communication rather than beating over the head which this whole discussion I've just made makes me think that this belongs in the document behind this one and not in the overview document so never mind, sorry.

Donna Austin: Okay. Sorry I thought Martin's hand went up but it was - it wasn't.

((Crosstalk))

Martin Boyle: I'm sorry, I'm not sure what happened to my hands. I put it up and it fell back down again. Obviously something wrong with me. Yeah, I think I would agree with Kurt except for this last thing. I think it actually does belong here. But, yeah, I do like his idea that we take the engage and cooperative communication and then say why in that what we're doing is to ensure the best service of the IANA functions operator.

And that then makes it very very clear that it does belong here and it doesn't go to somewhere where the only tool for dealing with it is a hammer.

Donna Austin: Okay. The CSC will meet once a month by teleconference to review performance reports and conduct other business as required. Staffan.

Staffan Jonson: Sorry.

Donna Austin: Hands are turning into little green ticks and (unintelligible). The CSC will engage with IANA and direct customers of the IANA function on an annual basis to discuss emerging technologies and issues that might impact the provision of IANA services.

Stephanie Duchesneau: I would want to change this to the IANA naming functions but otherwise I'm good.

Donna Austin: Okay so, Martin and then Ken.

Martin Boyle: Thanks, Donna. Yes, I just wonder whether it's not just going to be engaging with the IANA and the direct customers of the IANA naming functions but actually with that wider community bearing in mind, for example, that some of the new stuff coming along could come from the IETF.

And I think we just need to perhaps sort of show a willingness to be out there looking more widely. But, you know, apart from this that bullet is fine by me.

Donna Austin: Okay thanks. Kim.

Kim Davis: I guess my observation is this might be seen as in conflict with C. C states that we would engage regular communication between IANA and the CSC. And then E suggests on an annual basis you would engage with IANA on emerging technologies. I think that the pace of development means that the IANA would want to engage with the CSC more often than that on emerging technologies.

For example, just in the next few months we'll be implementing RDAP support. I don't think that could wait for an annual cycle to kick off in the new environment. I wonder if the intent here is to perhaps that the CSC and IANA together with engage the direct customers of the IANA function might be a more accurate or more appropriate way of putting it.

Donna Austin: That seems to make sense. So, Kim, because this is kind of a live example, I guess, so you're saying that RDAP will be introduced in the next, I don't know, few months. So what was the process that you - that you have undertake with regard to that to get that to this point?

Kim Davis: Essentially everything has been driven by the IETF. It's an emerging IETF standard, it's not quite an RFC yet but as part of the IANA process we get draft RFCs before they're finally published. And we implement the actions in there. And one of the actions is that IANA will augment it's original management processes to support RDAP. You know, I'm paraphrasing.

But so we've been working on it as an IETF action. That being said, we've informed the community via our updates and there are regular forums that this is happening. The precise details of how it will work for domain management some of them are still to be determined and that's a discussion we'll be having with NTIA moving forward. But the actually RDAP registries are expected to be published sometime in the next week.

So, yeah, at the moment, you know, we do use some judgment in terms of how that process works particularly when you have a mandate that crosses from the IETF over into the naming functions. I mean, this is a good example of where there are gaps in how the functions are sort of fenced off because I don't think we have a clear set of guidelines to operate right now and we just - we try to be as inclusive as possible just to try and remove all doubt.

Donna Austin: Okay. Thanks, Kim. Stephanie.

Stephanie Duchesneau: It strikes me that there might be two different things; one is to discuss emerging technologies, emerging issues as they come up. And then the other is more regular reviews of the IANA services and initiating a conversation around that.

Maybe we should just separate it out and create two different bullets for that, turn this into - I mean, maybe you don't even have to say as needed, just CSC will engage with IANA, direct customers of the IANA naming function and the ICANN community to discuss emerging technologies and issues that might impact the provision of IANA services. And then if we're also doing these periodic reviews whether it be annually or what comes out of that design team have that as a separate point or as a placeholder.

Donna Austin: Sounds sensible to me.

Kim Davis: Yeah.

Donna Austin: Any objections, Kurt?

Kurt Pritz: I agree with Stephanie, you know, we should use the monthly meetings to consider, you know, everything that's going on, not just performance. And you do have - conduct other business so I think that's emerging technologies and other items and the annual meeting is more of an annual meeting to discuss, you know, the available issues.

So you just want to provide both resources, the monthly meetings are more targeted at what's going on than the annual meetings are more global so I don't think that's anything different from any - what anyone else has said.

Donna Austin: Martin.

Martin Boyle: Yeah, I would certainly concur and in particular I think - and really we're not talking about anything major, we're talking about for an annual meeting we're talking about getting people together. And one of the things that you should be looking at there is what is coming down the tracks whereas what is being implemented or what is about to be implemented or what needs to be implemented is, as Kurt says, very much more a regular - a regular discussion.

So I certainly would support Stephanie's idea that you split this into two bullets and cover them separately. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Okay, thanks. So Bart and Stephanie you're good with that in terms of capturing the idea of that?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yeah, I'm going to just post something into the chat in like 30 seconds that tries to split that out.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Stephanie. So the next point, remedial action may be taken by the CSC to address issues of IANA poor performance identified through the reporting and monitoring process - full stage escalation process has been recommended. I say I think it's only a three stage escalation process. Martin, go ahead.

Martin Boyle: Yes, following on from my earlier points here about let's not call it an escalation process, but rather look at something that is very much more operational and looking at addressing problems for this. And I actually think it is four because Escalation Number 1 is on notification that you actually try to identify what the real problem is. And you then proceed from there. But I think we can drop the number if people have different interpretations of these things to me. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Okay thanks, Martin. Kurt.

Kurt Pritz: I think there are - I think this bullet is really two different bullets. One is identifying the fact that the CSC can, you know, might become involved between the monthly meetings so it provides an opportunity for the CSC involvement if there's a certain case where IANA performance degrades, you know, and it's important to get involved before we wait for the monthly meeting so I think that's one point this makes.

And then the second point is of course the escalation process has been recommended and I just want to reiterate that, you know, (unintelligible) a straw man that, you know, is likely to be, you know, 20% correct if that. So I would, you know, I would say it's a multistage escalation process. In fact it's

four stages because, you know, five and six stages on a, you know, a four sheet of paper didn't work very well. So I was kind of limited there and I stopped working.

But in fact at the end of the day, you know, it might be more stages than that that need to be worked out. So, you know, I would put a multistage escalation process is recommended. You know, and you can refer to it, you know, as a straw man's being constructed if you want but I would step back from making the - what's there a recommendation and instead, you know, providing some sort of model from which others can build on when they make a real escalation process or whatever we call it.

Donna Austin: Moving on to the next point, the CSC...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Donna, this is Bart. May I suggest you also mention that this will evolve or needs to evolve over time as you just discussed going in the - reference - or in reference to the sections in the Google document.

Donna Austin: Yes, agreed, Bart. Okay so to the next point, the CSC can be an initial point of escalation for a TLD registry who believes they have experienced poor performance from IANA but not for matters associated with policy implementation. The CSC will also be the entity responsible - I think I missed a dot point here. I don't know how that last sentence got in there.

So just to the initial point of escalation, are we okay with that wording?

Martin Boyle: Yeah.

Donna Austin: Martin, did you want to comment?

Martin Boyle: Yes, it's linked to my earlier thing about the word being perhaps a little bit dangerous and therefore CSC can be an initial point of contact for a TLD registry that believes that they have experienced poor service from IANA. And then we're not actually sort of - oh well we've got this hammer for dealing with these issues.

((Crosstalk))

Martin Boyle: ...dangerous terminology.

Donna Austin: Yeah. Where are we?

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Sorry, Donna, could you conclude because I was copying, say, the suggestion from Stephanie into the chat. Could you conclude what you or agreed on Section G so I can capture it?

Donna Austin: Yeah, so the CSC can be an initial point of contact for a TLD registry who believes they have experienced poor performance from IANA but not for matters associated with policy. So I think it's a - take the kind of kind of (unintelligible) language out by saying contact not escalation.

So Kim's put a note in chat here saying his experience is anyone can be an initial point of contact. We can't control that. Kim, did you just want to speak to that a little bit?

Kim Davis: Sure. Thank you. You know, the reality is this escalation process that IANA has today which I remember talking with Bernie almost 10 years ago, has almost never been used. The reality is customers which complain don't usually seek out an escalation process even though we acknowledge it in our automated templates and so on that this is a valuable term, that will go wherever they want to go to complain.

I think just carrying on that thought a little bit, I guess my question would be what's the expectation of the CSC when they're the first point of complaint versus if the customer has already tried to seek a remedy from the IANA staff itself and not been successful.

To me operationally my concern would be that we haven't had a chance to sort of address it. So I would be hopeful the CSC would come up with some kind of operational parameters that would allow to be referred back as appropriate for remediation in the early stages.

Donna Austin: So I think that's a valid point, Kim, and maybe it's something we need to pick up in the body of the document to say that, you know, there has to be some criteria or operational component around any complaints and also I think we need to be mindful of if a concern is being raised with IANA already and what the result of that dispute was. But I think we picked that up in the body of the document.

Stephanie and then Staffan.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Can I just remove initial? It strikes me that what is important is that the CSC is available to registry operators to address issues, not whether or not it's the first step. That it provides an escalation path, whether or not they've tried to resolve it with IANA first.

Donna Austin: Yeah, good point, Stephanie. I'm okay with taking it out.

Staffan Jonson: Okay, Staffan here. I just - I think we're getting ahead fine. Just want to be the annoying guy saying that we have some 18 minutes to the hour. How do you want to play this, Donna? Shall we finish this list and go as far as we have into the next table or should we start talking template and preparation for Istanbul? What do you say?

Donna Austin: I think we get through this list, Staffan and then - which shouldn't take much longer. And then we can kind of discuss how we move forward to prepare for Istanbul. I think if we can get agreement on these pieces and then identify any gaps and then we can try to work out the Istanbul meeting.

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Donna Austin: So I think we're okay with the point of contact. The CSC will also be the entity responsible for administrative changes not triggered by registries. That just should be struck; I don't - I've copied something from somewhere and inadvertently pasted it there I think.

Bernie.

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you, Donna. A few points as I'm going through this. A, the template I wouldn't worry about; it's really meant for changes that are more parallel to existing text which this is (unintelligible). I really like the way this is going. I think it explains things very well. And so I wouldn't get too wrapped up about the template.

The second thing is I don't know if this is relevant to the way we're thinking about this but I think we should try to capture, you know, as much as we did in A, that, you know, the CSC should establish and perform those activities currently undertaken by the NTIA.

There should be some sort of reference in there, at least to my mind and I know I've brought this up before, that if the CSC is undertaking anything significant - of significant impact for the community that it should go back to the ccNSO and the GNSO to get formal approval.

And I don't know if we're thinking of capturing that later in another fashion or not. But somehow I think that would probably make a whole bunch of people feel more comfortable with this if this is a statement at this level.

Secondly, it matches up some of the things that were brought up in the Disspain document. And I think that sort of makes sense. So anyway those are my suggestions. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Bernie. So we'll move to what will be the most contentious issue I think and that's the composition of the CSC. So at a high level the composition of the CSC should be kept small and comprise representatives with direct experience with IANA naming functions and knowledge of IANA procedures, services and reporting requirements. Suggested composition, 2 Gs, 2 Cs, one member of SSAC and one member of RSAC. Do we agree with that at a high level? Bernie.

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you. Again, just reiterating the guidance from auDA, they published some numbers, we've got these numbers. Somehow it probably be useful if we could line up on something common between those two.

Donna Austin: Fair point. Kurt, (unintelligible) an SSAC member and what is the role?
Perhaps, Stephanie, you could respond to that? And then I'll come to Staffan.

Stephanie Duchesneau: I think as it's currently scoped there is a responsibility to address like SSR related issues with IANA. So I saw in drafting that it would make sense to have a representative from the technical community provided that they were willing and able to participate.

One question that I have is whether we want to frame this - as I currently had it drafted in the longer doc this is the minimum composition. Is that what we want or is this just the composition? Is it the minimum that we're saying is needed to carry out the functions or is this a set size for the group?

Donna Austin: So in response to that we could have suggested minimum composition and that takes a little bit of the heat out. So, Staffan, I know you had your hand up, so did you want to speak and then we'll go to Kurt. Thanks.

Staffan Jonson: Yes, and one - so (unintelligible) issue. And I would argue for a minimal organization. And in other places there has been talk about direct affected customers as a general term. And maybe this Sentence H could include that formulation because it's a more general description on who is - why just these people are affected by it.

So and then we could get to composition. I might even suggest that instead of having six members there could be liaisons and maybe this could be reduced to four people or four representatives on an equal basis, Gs and CCs really signaling that this is nothing more than a technical function.

And I - because also I believe that the GAC will have issues about this and they might even (unintelligible) themselves so I think it's quite important to be - keep this as small as possible. Thank you.

I notice that Donna lost voice so I'll continue. Bernie, please, go ahead. Okay, Kurt, please go ahead.

Kurt Pritz: I have three points to make. One is the registry operators, the TLDs, are full of SSAC members and technical staff that can provide the advice we need. SSAC is a, you know, a highly politicized organization and having one member of SSAC at the table with their views necessarily won't get us to the technical advice that we want.

So I would recommend either having one member of SSAC that's also a TLD or I would recommend that, you know, the CSC go out to get technical advice whenever required from, you know, its - the constituencies that it represents. So that's one.

I see RSAC is having, you know, important role because they have to put the stuff in the root zone. But - well ICANN puts stuff, anyway you get what I mean. But SSAC, you know, one SSAC member representing SSAC I don't think is - could be - could be negative as well as positive. So I don't see making this permanent for all time in this document by including it here.

My second point is that I think we should go forward with this rather skinny configuration into Istanbul. And if we have to negotiate away from it we can. But I think this is our viewpoint and we should put this forward as our model. I don't think we should concede anything that we don't want to do at this stage.

And the third point is that we should have a statement in here that the CSC intends to correspond, collaborate or communicate with the TLD operators whenever necessary on issues in order to get input from the TLDs. So we don't feel like this small - the small group is just making decisions as a small group but really it's an avenue to the larger group so we can head off some of the concerns about it being small that way.

Bart Boswinkel: Sarah has her hand up as well, Staffan.

Staffan Jonson: Oh sorry (unintelligible). Sorry, Sarah please.

Sarah Falvey: So I'm going to just disagree with Kurt in I think it makes sense to have the SSAC on there because some of the things - I understand - I agree with the premise, SSAC is very political, they may not have the right expertise necessarily. But I think having that communication between the SSAC and the CSC is going to be useful particularly in situations where you have - things like DNS SEC where you had sort of a broad roll out of a security standard that impacts sort of the entire stack.

And I think communication between the groups then is incredibly important. I think being a liaison doesn't mean we have to listen to them, it doesn't mean that they get a vote or anything like that, but I think, you know, maintaining that open channel of communication and providing input in terms of what the two groups are doing I think would be really useful particularly, you know, in certain situations where you do have issues that sort of are beyond just one group's purview.

Staffan Jonson: Okay, thank you. I see no one else. I note that this is a tricky one so - and note to self, in Istanbul, let's get half the sentence through if not all of it so it is

better to have the first sentence agreed upon and then put the other one in brackets and say we'll take that another day.

Bart please.

Bart Boswinkel: If you go back to the Google document, say, another approach is - say starting with defining and setting some parameters around the composition and I think if you go back to the Google document this is where you started, and this is what you use I think in the guidance document as well. And this will result in a certain composition.

So a parameter is keep it lean and small at the same time recognizing a liaison role, recognizing it has no real powers, etcetera. And that drives you into the direction of a certain - so you reach agreement on these parameters or principles and once you reach that say the composition plus or minus some will fall out.

Staffan Jonson: Okay, good idea.

Bart Boswinkel: And you have them already in say, the other document.

Staffan Jonson: Okay...

((Crosstalk))

Staffan Jonson: Okay. Yeah. Thank you. So - and since there's five minutes to the hour and I'll ask if we could let this one slide for now. Donna, we notice that the Sentence H is a difficult one. I see you're on the chat. So since it's five minutes to the hour I suggest we try to conclude Sentence I and J and then we'll be very fast in closing up shop today. So if that's okay with all.

So I'll continue reading. I, additional representatives can be added at the discretion of the CSC as well as liaison. That's a continuation of H. Martin please.

Martin Boyle: Thanks, Staffan. I actually do have serious problems with this.

Staffan Jonson: With what?

Martin Boyle: By all means get in liaisons as additional representatives because you need certain skills and you haven't got them with the four plus SSAC and RSAC liaisons. But I would really like to see and be fairly clear what the purpose of getting additional representatives is. And I wouldn't want to leave it to a selected CSC for then those people that are on that committee to try and bring in all their allies and friends.

On the other hand I do like the idea of getting in liaisons from the other communities as a particular - as perhaps a bargaining chip to keep the size of the actual committee down while being open to the wider communities. So, you know, well that's all I've got to say on that, thanks.

Staffan Jonson: Okay, thank you. We're noting this. J, I'm pushing forward to the next sentence. Sorry, Stephanie.

Staffan Jonson: Martin, in the longer document we define liaisons as being like a temporary role to facilitate whether it's a periodic review or some specific need. Would you be more comfortable if we're defining liaisons in that way and we take out additional members?

Martin Boyle: I'm seeing liaisons almost certainly having more than a temporary role if you're open to liaisons, I think the wider community will probably quite rightly expect to have a more permanent liaison role. I think sort of the issue really is a matter of how can you ensure transparency of what the CSC is doing so ah the CSC retains the sort of wider competence that it is managing its role to the benefits of the wider community. Thanks.

Staffan Jonson: Okay, thank you. So, Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Staffan. So I think the path of least resistance here might be to have attached liaisons to the CSC perhaps from the GAC, the ALAC. And I don't know that we're missing anybody else. It might be another representative from the GNSO because we haven't (unintelligible) the gTLDs out. So that might be the path of least resistance so I just wonder if we can just put that aside for the purpose of this - while we're dealing with the (unintelligible) two hours.

So that's a suggestion. I think it might be just, you know, time to suck it up so to speak.

Staffan Jonson: Okay. Thank you. So now it's one minute to the hour. And, yeah, if you all agree we could push a few minutes over time, right? Okay, so let's finish off with Sentence J. The CSC is not mandated to initiate a change in the IANA functions operator. However, the escalation process provides for an independent review to be triggered of ICANN operations to recommend organizational change and determine with the IANA operator can continue in the event of continued poor performance results in (unintelligible) escalation.

Stephanie, is that an old or a new hand? Martin please.

Martin Boyle: Thanks. I wondered whether here rather than - but bearing in mind there's a separate team that's going to be looking at escalation processes, that we put down a marker that does refer more clearly to using the processes identified in the Cross Community Working Group on ICANN Accountability rather than establishing any dependent review.

There might be other ways of doing it but my concern is that if we end up with independent reviews, you know, who is going to be independent and will they properly understand the issues at stake. So that's just my sort of general feeling and concern. I'm prepared to be told I'm wrong but it is a concern I have.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. So I say we're out of time. So how do we take this further? We need some drafting for - before Monday. Stephanie, please.

Stephanie Duchesneau: So I have been updating the draft. I suggest adding one additional bullet which is to address the point that Kurt raised about how we're going to have to have some public participation modalities and requirements. And I think we're going to be better off in defending a lean composition if we put that in this. So I don't know if - I posted the text into the chat but we can also just discuss that on the list.

In terms of the areas - the issues where I thought there had to be placeholder text, do we agree that those are in IDN repository and periodic reviews? Is there anything else? So I'm going to add that section before I recirculate my notes from this call. And then if people have concerns of how that has been drafted then let's try to do it today on the list if that's possible so that we can get a document ready before whenever it is, the Monday deadline or whether we want to submit it this Friday.

Donna, you can probably give me some more direction on when we want to close out this doc.

Staffan Jonson: Okay, so Donna, do you want to head your doc and I'll continue with the Google docs and we'll merge them very soon or...

Donna Austin: So I have a - I guess I have a fundamental question about the value of the Google doc moving forward. I think it has value to this point in time but I'm just not sure to what extent there is value in having the two documents...

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Donna Austin: ...being developed at this point in time. So I think if we can get agreement to the overview that Stephanie is going to send around based on the discussion we've just had and then I'll - I really would like to fill out the table that's below the overview and what I'd like to capture in there is the performance and monitoring a little bit more kind of definition within that. Now that's the piece that Stephanie and Martin had contributed to previously but I haven't worked out how to fill it in.

So I think I need to scratch my head a little bit to work out, you know, what's the best way to move forward. But if others agree, Staffan, I don't know that I'm seeing much value in continuing with the Google docs. I think what we try to do is pull out what we need from that into the other document.

Staffan Jonson: I'm happy if all initiatives have been taken here so if you want to strike Google docs please go ahead as long as we don't miss content so yeah.

Donna Austin: So I think let's - let's review the document - the overview changes that Stephanie will post and then we'll try to make sense of having this all with the

rest of it put something. Stephanie, did you have something you wanted to say?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Old hand.

Donna Austin: Okay. Thanks. So I know that's not really clear on how we're moving forward but I think we have made some pretty good progress today. Probably what would be useful is in going back through the overview of the high level points if you think there's anything we haven't addressed then please flag that and then we can try to address that. And I think that's probably as far as we can get today. Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Just one question, so I don't know when, say, who will be attending the Istanbul meeting and when you will be traveling but say the CWG part of the meeting is at the end of the meeting. Would it be worse to try to schedule a call on Monday afternoon before closure so before 6:00 so around 4-ish UTC to finalize it?

Staffan Jonson: I'm happy doing that.

Stephanie Duchesneau: That works for me.

Donna Austin: I'm not sure that that timing actually works for me but I'll have to check that.

Bart Boswinkel: So could I ask Grace or Brenda to send out a Doodle poll for Monday for 4:00 or 3:00 pm - yeah depends on whether you'll be traveling, etcetera. So I'll send out a Doodle poll ask Brenda or Grace to send out a Doodle poll for Monday at least one hour closing at the latest one hour before the deadline. So you have a chance if feasible to discuss it again in a call because I think that's most useful to make real progress.

Staffan Jonson: Excellent. So any other business? Are we ready? As ready as be. So let's conclude. A Doodle poll for Monday afternoon. Maybe even some more and we'll send around on the list conclusions. What else? Kim, very much thank you for joining us on this list. I would have liked to ask you more things but we weren't ready to do that. Please chip in any comments also afterwards if you are - come to think of things.

Kim Davis: Of course, thank you.

Staffan Jonson: So if we have nothing else an agenda, let's close up for today.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Thanks, guys.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you very much, all.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Staffan, thanks everybody.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you.

Kurt Pritz: Yeah, thanks a lot. Bye.

Bart Boswinkel: Bye bye and have a nice weekend.

END