

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
March 23, 2015
10:00 am CT**

Staffan Jonson: Hello. I can hear you. Staffan here.

Bart Boswinkel: Hi, Staffan.

Bart Boswinkel: Hi, Staffan.

Staffan Jonson: Hello.

Bart Boswinkel: And I see Donna say - my suggestion is I'm in the room, so that's why you hear this wide sound, with Martin and Grace. We're already assembled. We haven't agreed on the agenda, but I think there was only one agenda item effectively; that's run through the latest version of the document with all its edits, and then run through it and see if we can find consensus of the group on the latest version. What do you think?

Staffan Jonson: Yep.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes? Sounds like a plan? Donna, can you hear us?

Donna Austin: Yes, I can, yeah.

((Crosstalk))

WoBart Boswinkel: Do you want it to be shared?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

WoBart Boswinkel: Okay, I'll switch back.

Bart Boswinkel: So I'll upload the latest version of the document.

WoBart Boswinkel: We can work in the shared part, and remove the...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, and move it in there so I can take notes as well.

WoBart Boswinkel: Great.

Bart Boswinkel: It's coming.

Kim Davies: Hello, this is Kim.

Bart Boswinkel: Hi, Kim.

Bart Boswinkel: Hi, Kim.

Bart Boswinkel: Hello.

Bart Boswinkel: Uploading.

Bart Boswinkel: He's in a noisy hotel...

WoBart Boswinkel: (Unintelligible).

WoBart Boswinkel: Probably; right?

Bart Boswinkel: Oh, now we just see the - this doesn't work.

Grace Abuhamad: Oh, it's the other PDF. It gives you two PDFs when you download with comments.

Bart Boswinkel: Hopefully this is the one. We'll see in a minute. Converting came first. Yes, that's the one. So in front of you, you've got a version with all the changes since our last call, starting with the ones from Stephanie, and then running to, say, Martin, and then Kim's additional changes. So I guess, Donna (unintelligible), do you want to run through it? Or..

Kim Davies: Sorry, I was a little upheld. Could you repeat this?

Bart Boswinkel: In front of you, so in the Adobe room, you see the latest version of the document. So that was sent this morning by Kim. And it includes - that's why you see all the different colors. It includes all the changes made since our last call on - when was it? Friday afternoon.

So starting with the changes from Stephanie, then I think your comment, Kim, then Martin's comments again, and then your comments again, Kim. Several comments from Kim.

So I think the best way is that we run through, say, the overview, because that's the core of it, and then look at the minor changes. Once you agree on the - yes, Staffan, go ahead.

Staffan Jonson: I just sent five minutes ago, ten minutes ago, I just sent yet another iteration from me with two points. But I might as well raise my hand during this call and put them in in lower left; right?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, otherwise we'd lose another five minutes probably, trying to upload it. And so and I think once we've reached, say, agreement on the text, then this is going to be the submission of (DTC) today. And I think, Staffan, Donna, it's up to you. I can send it to the whole list as the final version, and copy, say, on your behalf, or you can do it yourself. That's up to you.

But maybe at the end - I think the deadline was 1800 UTC. If this document can be sent to the full CWG, I think we've done a fabulous job. Okay, shall we run through it? And, Donna, Staffan, you want to run through the document, one of you? Or you want me to do it?

Donna Austin: Staffan, I'm happy to do it if you that's okay with you.

Staffan Jonson: Okay, go ahead. That's fine.

Donna Austin: Okay. So who have we got on the call? So Stephanie, Staffan, Martin, Kurt, Kim. So we're missing (Sarah).

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Donna Austin: That's all?

Bart Boswinkel: Yep.

Donna Austin: Sorry, I know it's a small group. I just can't remember how many. Okay, so I think Number 1 we're okay with.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I think so.

Donna Austin: Okay. Number 2, so this is something new that I introduced because I thought we're going to get some questions about, you know, who should do this and who should do that. And I just think that if we state up front that a working group direct customers - and what I mean by that is maybe the CCNSO and registry stakeholder groups should be established to develop a charter for the CSC.

It might, you know, take a little bit away from people saying well, you know, you've missed this, you've missed that. I think we have an understanding that there's still some work to be done. We might get away with that. So does that sound reasonable?

Bart Boswinkel: It certainly does to me.

Donna Austin: Okay, great. So Number 3, this is also new as well. The CSC will be responsible for developing its own working methods. So while we've covered this off in some detail in the body of the report, I thought it was worthwhile just putting it in here as well. Everybody okay with that?

Bart Boswinkel: Staffan raised his hands.

Donna Austin: Yes, Staffan?

Bart Boswinkel: Or hand.

Staffan Jonson: Sorry, I was trying to make it a green agree card. So, yes, fine. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Okay, thanks. For...

Bart Boswinkel: Donna? Donna?

Donna Austin: Yes?

Bart Boswinkel: Donna? Sorry I should have raised - do you want to refer this back to the charter as part of its charter? Or the CSC itself?

Donna Austin: What do you mean by that?

Bart Boswinkel: It's developing its own work methods - should that be enshrined in the charter?

Donna Austin: Yeah, I guess it could be.

Kurt Pritz: Right, right. But there's two different tasks. This is Kurt. There's two different tasks here; right? One is creating a charter, and then the second is the ability to change how you do things afterwards. So I think you're right, include it in the charter. But they're two separate items, so I didn't - if that's what you're getting at.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, no, but as (Lee) said - and this should be ensured, and maybe add some line like which should be ensured in the charter. No?

Martin Boyle: Can I intervene here, please? It's Martin. It seems to me that there are two separate stages. The one is to develop the charter. And then once you've got the charter sorted, one of the things that the committee itself should do would be to develop its own working methods based on the charter.

So I would prefer, just on a procedural basis, to keep them separate. And one of the things in the charter would be the CSC will be responsible for developing its own working...

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, that's what I meant.

Martin Boyle: Oh, okay.

Bart Boswinkel: So that should be enshrined in the charter.

((Crosstalk))

Martin Boyle: Yeah, okay, fine.

Bart Boswinkel: But the mandate of the CSC to develop its own working methods (unintelligible) in the charter...

Donna Austin: Okay, thanks, Bart. And so 4, that's something that was in there that we discussed on Friday, so I'm assuming it's still okay with everybody. Okay, I'll take that as a yes.

5, so, Martin, I know you mentioned that you weren't sure what this meant. So a handover of responsibilities from the NTIA to the CSC would be required, initially it also involves the IANA function (unintelligible).

So I guess what I was getting to here is that I think this is not - setting up the CSC is not an insignificant task. And I think there would be some value in whoever the representatives of the CSC end up being, to actually sit down and have a conversation with NTIA and IANA before they actually kick off, and understand exactly how that relationship used to work, and how NTIA kind of ticked the box on that report, and things like that.

So I just thought there might be value in mentioning that, but happy to have a discussion. Kurt?

Kurt Pritz: Thanks, Donna. So I think - yeah, I think that's really important. And often in situations like this where a significant change in - you know, this is occurring, sometimes the systems are run in parallel. So, you know, I don't think you need to change the sentence. I think it's fine. But in what's behind it, we might think about, you know, running the NTIA and the CSC running in parallel for a short bit of time as part of that handover.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Kurt. So I guess I'd be interested to hear what others think as kind of running in parallel for a little while. Martin?

Martin Boyle: Thanks, Donna. Yes, in that light, that seems to me to be fine. Essentially it's a handover of that sort of operational outside role, and yeah, now I know what it means. I'm quite happy to say that's fine.

Donna Austin: Okay, thanks, Martin. So do we have - I don't have an objection to the running parallel for a while, you know? It might make some sense to do that for maybe two months; no more than three, I would think. Looks like Staffan agrees with that. I'm not sure how we capture that in the body of the text, but I'll have a look at that if there's no...

Bart Boswinkel: Can I suggest that is probably part of the discussion between the CSC and NTIA? So if we just say handover responsibilities, and then it's up to the CSC to work out how long it needs with the NTIA, or for that matter, how long the NTIA's prepared to carry on holding their hand.

Donna Austin: Okay, yep. Sounds good. Okay, Kim, I know you had your hand up, but it's gone back down, so I assume you're typing now.

Kim Davies: I am, but I can speak to it. I was just going to make the observation, if it's some kind of parallel reporting structure for a period, and the reporting deliverable will be significantly different, which might be the outcome of this work, that it might be quite burdensome enough to produce two sets of different reports under different structure.

I don't think we need to solve that now. Just flagging that that might be a consideration.

Donna Austin: Okay, it's a valid point. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: Kim, I would hope that handover responsibilities would be looking at and trying to ensure that you get a phased approach in. So in other words, you don't, from one month to the next, certainly have to produce a completely different set of reports.

Kim Davies: That would be great.

Donna Austin: Okay. What are we up to? Six. So I think we discussed this on Friday. And, Martin, you provided some qualifying language in there. So if you want to speak to that, and then Staffan.

Martin Boyle: Yeah. So, Donna, I think Staffan had his hand up regarding the previous point.

Donna Austin: Okay, Staffan?

Staffan Jonson: No, that's on the 6. So please go ahead, Martin, and I'll just pop in something.

Martin Boyle: Okay. The only thing that there, as I said in my response to Kim, was I've not got any particularly strong feelings about it. But issuing something that is will engage, I have a certain question as to whether that is being unduly prescriptive.

But as I said in my note in response to Kim, it seems that let's assume that the CSC will be intelligent enough not to engage in unnecessary cooperative communications if everything's going well. Thanks.

Staffan Jonson: Okay, Staffan here. Oh, sorry. Kim, please go ahead.

Kim Davies: No, please. You first.

Staffan Jonson: Okay, Staffan here. So just considering Sentence 6, 7, 8, and maybe even 9, do correspond quite close to Sentence 1. Maybe we should regroup them in a cluster, because Sentence 2, for example, talks about how to take the (unintelligible), whereas 1, 6, 7, 8 talks about the specific features of the CSC. Just a thought. Thank you.

Donna Austin: It's a good thought, Staffan. I think, you know, to the extent that we can cluster these together, that would be really useful. Kim and then Kurt?

Kim Davies: Thanks, Donna. I think my (unintelligible) reaction to usually, the use of the word usually, is usually doesn't really define which circumstances you would

and would not. Maybe just simply changing usually to endeavor, the CSC should endeavor to engage in (unintelligible) - I mean not to imply that the accepted standard affects them.

Donna Austin: I have no objection to that. Martin, does that sit okay with you?

Martin Boyle: Yeah, I'm fine with that. As I say, you know, I wouldn't object to leaving the word will in. Kim's suggestion, I think, is...

Donna Austin: We lost Martin? Okay, Martin's pulling off the...

Martin Boyle: No, no. Sorry. Did you say something?

Donna Austin: Yeah, no, there was a click and it sounded like you were gone. So we just assumed we'd lost you.

Martin Boyle: That was probably my head hitting the table as I fell asleep.

Bart Boswinkel: He's still in the room. I can assure you.

Woman: He's more awake than ever.

Donna Austin: Okay. Kim, you had something to respond? Or Kurt?

Kurt Pritz: Kim, did you have anything else?

Kim Davies: That was it. I put my hand down.

Kurt Pritz: Okay, thanks. Well before I make the comment I was going to make, I agree that grouping these together as several forms of engagement or cooperative communication is a great idea by Staffan.

And I think we should just take, based on what Kim said, we should just take the word usually out. I mean the CSC should engage in cooperative communication, and I even think it should be shall. I think it should be stronger than that. So those are the two responses.

My comment really went to taking the word escalation out. And I don't know if we can do without it. I agree wholeheartedly with Martin's sentiment in how we go about that. And I think, you know, other groups are going to be talking about - just pragmatically speaking, other groups are going to be talking about escalation.

And I think, you know, in order to ensure the kind of cooperative communication that Martin's talking about, you know, I think we still need to say the word, because it's an important cog in the whole discussion about ensuring IANA performance and, you know, keeping the contract with IANA, and all those discussions. It's really sort of a lynchpin.

And so, you know, I'd like to find a way to put the word escalation back in here. But I - because I think it's necessary for us. But that's in no way to disagree with Martin's theme that, you know, we're working together to succeed. We're not working at odds to find fault.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Kurt. So I don't recall if we had the word escalation in Number 6. I think we had it originally in what's now Number 10. But I guess we'll take that on hold, and we can - Martin, you obviously want to respond to that, so go ahead, please.

Martin Boyle: Yes, I would, please. And yes, you're right. Escalation was in 10. And it wasn't even me who removed it. It was you, Donna. I think there are two separate concepts here. And I think both need to be addressed. The one is the resolution process, which is the four-stage process that - the multi-stage process that Kurt provided and is later in the document.

And at the end of the attempts to make sure that things do work properly, then I think there is an escalation process. And that escalation process is then to hand up to whichever, whatever, process then is responsible for, quote, moving strong carrot to stick, and punishing ICANN for its failure.

And if we can separate those two in different headings, and say that the CSC has got the responsibility for pressing the punishment button at the end of that process, then I'm fine with that. What I don't want to do is for the CSC to appear to be going through its - to have responsibility for that escalation process which comes in early. So that really is my only concern, and I'm happy to see if we can just separate it.

Donna Austin: Staffan, did you want to comment?

Staffan Jonson: Yeah. Just want to let you know that sign team and (Maxim Martin), they've written a proposal. So I just spoke to them and there is quite a detailed idea how the process should be. So maybe the picture will get clearer once we see that proposal beside this one. However, we need to put something in writing now before that happens.

So I'm just getting (unintelligible). I just want to let you know that there is a quite detailed escalation process - well not detailed, but there is an escalation process described from the (TM), in your inbox.

Donna Austin: Okay. Thanks, Staffan. So what - okay. What we might do is just put aside this conversation. We'll just work through the rest of the document and then come back to it. I think I understand where both are coming from, so we just need to find some middle ground, I think.

So let's keep working through this. So I think we're up to 7. I don't think anyone has a problem with that one, so we'll move on. 8, I think we agreed to this language on Friday, so I'm assuming it's still good.

9, so this is new language that Stephanie introduced as a result of our conversation on Friday. So does anyone have any comments on this one?
Staffan?

Staffan Jonson: Maybe do we really need to decide that it should be annual meeting? Is it a specific thought in that? Or it's just being too narrow in our regulating this corporation?

Donna Austin: It's a good thought. My thinking on this is that it's probably one of those things that it would be useful to have on a regular basis, and annual seems to fit. Kurt's suggesting regular instead of annual. So we could certainly put regular meeting in. Stephanie's, I think, typing something as well.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes, I had said annual partly just to differentiate between the bullet for 4, which is like addressing - meeting to address issues as they come up versus having a regular meeting to address general topics than performance, something that is calendared on a more regular basis.

I don't mind if it's like regular instead of annual, though I think it's a good baseline to have it be at least once a year. But partly it was just to draw the distinction between what we're talking about in eight.

Donna Austin: Okay. So Kurt's got some language there. So the CSC shall hold a formal, regular, at least annual, meeting. Does that work for everyone? Martin?

Martin Boyle: Yeah, that would work for me. My feeling is that saying at least annual meeting, typically annually, to allow there to be some leeway, otherwise one year and one day could be seen as a failure.

Donna Austin: So let's go with Kurt's language for the time being, rather than spend too much time on this, if there's no objection to that. Okay, I think we're good to go.

10, so we have discussed this in some part, and it's where the - excuse me, to bring back the sort of escalation. So I think in my mind the reason - and I think this goes to Martin's point. The reason that we moved away from escalation is it has a - I don't know whether the word pejorative is the right word here. But it has kind of a highly sensitive meaning, I suppose, and I think that's why we were trying to move away from it.

But it does - in a practical sense, escalation is actually the right phrase, because it is - the way that Kurt's process is outlined, it gradually does - it does escalate over time, because you're actually going to a higher level within the ICANN organization to try to get resolution. So I guess we still need to think about this some more and come back to it.

Yeah, Bart, that's exactly - escalation comes with baggage. That's exactly what I was trying to say. So do we agree that we can just move past this, and we can come back to it at the end once we've gone back through the process?

Martin Boyle: I'm trying some wording that could either go in as immediately after 10 or immediately after 11, that will try and make the difference between resolution of problems -- in other words, a friendly process -- through to escalation. So I'll be with you by the time you finish 11.

Donna Austin: Okay.

Martin Boyle: Just speak slowly.

Donna Austin: I think Kurt raises a good point. Sorry, Martin. Kurt actually raises a good point in chat, and that's, you know, whether we're talking remedial action, or whether it's a friendly or a non-friendly, the term that has been used throughout work of the CWG is escalation.

So to try to avoid getting into arguments or nitpicking about what we mean, it might just be political of us to stick with the word escalation. But anyway, we'll see what Martin comes up with when we come back to it.

Martin Boyle: Yeah, I actually don't think they are the same thing. Escalation is something that goes out of the CSC into a different organization, and that is the bit that gives me concern -- that people will (unintelligible) and say well, you know, your four-stage escalation process shouldn't be beamed up by the CSC. I think it should, because that's the cooperation bit.

Donna Austin: Okay. I mean, Martin, I completely understand what you're saying, and I agree that I believe that, you know, the remedial action should stay within the CSC. But I don't think, even if we use the term escalation, we can say that, you know, for - it is the role of the CSC to perform escalation up to a certain point.

Martin Boyle: Anyway, I've posted some wording now in the chat.

Donna Austin: So should resolution processes not remedy filing from the provision of the IANA function, CSC can escalate the issue in a process identified, too, by the (DTN).

Martin Boyle: Yeah, identified by (DTN) or whatever the other (DT)...

Bart Boswinkel: ...or Martin.

Donna Austin: Staffan, do you have a comment on that?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, if we are talking about escalation anyhow, so what happened to the sentence saying that the CSC is the initial point for escalation? That was quite elegant, and then just leaving it from there.

Donna Austin: So I think - so in my mind there's two things here. So one is for a direct customer. So a registry operator can actually come to the CSC and say we have a problem with IANA that we'd like you to help us try to resolve. So that's one.

But the second part of it, which is that overall management of the IANA performance by the CSC, and if, as a result of the reports that are coming in on a regular basis, the CSC is concerned that IANA is not meeting those performance targets, then the CSC has to go through that remedial process to get IANA back on track.

So in my mind there's two very different escalation or remedial processes here, and I don't want to confuse them. I think 10 and 11 is actually - in my

mind, was pretty good at making them distinct from one another. But perhaps not.

Bart Boswinkel: So you mean that 10 and 11, correspondents with contracted and non-contracted TLDs, that is...

Donna Austin: No, so 11 is about the individual TLD registry having a, for want of a better word, dispute with IANA, that they can't resolve with IANA themselves, so they come to the CSC for some help. And I think we've got some language underneath which says, you know, the CSC can try to mediate on behalf of the TLD registry operator. So that's one thing.

But the second thing is that ongoing management of the IANA performance that is the primary role of the CSC. So there's two distinct things here.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay.

Donna Austin: And I'm not sure to what extent that's picked up in the work of (DTN). Okay, so I think let's just park 10 and 11 for now, because I think we need to perhaps look at the work of (DTN) before we kind of sign off on that.

So let's go to composition. This is our - up until now has been our most contentious discussion, I think. Staffan, did you have something to say on composition?

Staffan Jonson: Yes. I was a bit concerned about the expansion of the group, even though the last ones are called liaisons from other ICANN groups, because that is an invitation and hidden financing as well of all these people. And always I want to minimize the groups only to full people, and preferably make the other ones seek invitations themselves as liaisons, and they will be invited of course.

So I don't see it as a problem. It's maybe a financing thing, having to pay for four extra functions here. And they're specifically pointing to (unintelligible), and that is also a financial thing. Thank you.

Donna Austin: I guess my concern is that, you know, in all the discussions we've had about the composition of the CSC, it was ALAC that said they wanted to sit at the table. So we're trying to accommodate that. And I think the GAC as well.

Stephanie, did you want to speak to this? Because it was originally your language, and I've played with it. What I'm trying to do with this is just find a middle ground that we can go forward on, because I think this will be one of the most contentious issues when we take this to the voter groups. So, Stephanie, did you - I don't know whether you've had a chance to look at what the revised suggestion is. But if you have any comments...

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yeah. I mean I don't think we've found a singular way to reconcile this question as having broader participation. I mean I would like the group to be narrower as well. But there's also a trade-off that I think if we keep it so small, it's going to be hard to, in the wider CWG, push back against creating a separate (MRT). So I don't have a decision here on the language, but I agree that it's going to be one of the more contentious points going into Istanbul.

Staffan Jonson: May I give myself the floor again?

Donna Austin: Yes, Staffan.

Staffan Jonson: So in order to push this issue forward, I agree we want to solve this today. But maybe today's goal will be to formulate two alternative decisions, two sentences in competition with each other, taking away the potential 15 other

ways of addressing. So maybe we should focus on that instead. Is that a good way forward?

Donna Austin: Staffan, just so I understand, what would you suggest is - so you're suggesting two potential compositions of the...

Staffan Jonson: Two potential formulations. Two potential sentences written down saying this is Alternative A and this is Alternative B, just to give the CWG two alternatives to choose among, so to say, because if it's complicated now, it will be complicated then, and our goal is to get the process forward. So let's - if possible, could we formulate two alternatives for the group to take into consideration?

Donna Austin: Okay. I'm willing to consider that. I'm just considering the merits of doing so. Martin?

Martin Boyle: Yeah. Well firstly, if this group is doing its job well, then this is a pretty boring role for anybody who is not a big fan of IANA operations. I actually wonder whether - so coming in and saying well you have three liaisons, is unnecessary. Why don't we just say liaisons from other ICANN groups, and then not say which groups we're thinking about? And then we can listen to what people say.

I would have no particular problem about a liaison from ALAC or a liaison from GAC or a liaison from SSAC. I have a little bit more hesitation over increasing the number of GNSO participants, because that starts to unbalance the relationship in the committee. But well as it's only a liaison, I guess we could get away with it.

So what we're really talking about here is making sure that other communities are aware of what is going on, and they don't think things are being done behind their back. So I don't have problems with liaisons. I think the liaisons should be expected to keep their communities informed of what is happening, but for they're liaisons, so they wouldn't have a voice. So all we would say for this bullet is, liaisons from other ICANN groups, full stop. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Okay, that makes sense. The reason I put a number on this is because, you know, we don't want it to blow out. So I guess if we keep in mind the opening sentence that it should be kept small, and comprise representatives with direct experience, that's going to be an important qualifier as well.

Stephanie. Differentiating between members and liaisons gives us some flexibility to define the roles, as Martin is suggesting, when we have a sense of what kind of participation other groups are seeking. Okay, so maybe let's strike the three. So let's just have liaisons from other ICANN groups, and we'll get rid of the (AG), (ALAC), (SSAC), GNSO, and the number.

Martin, you also had a problem with the CSC will have the discretion to seek additional expertise as required.

Martin Boyle: Yes, I do, because I don't actually have any clear feeling of what, why, who those experts will be. And asking experts to join, you know, that's a crafty way of somebody expanding the group, or even seeking to capture a group. Now I guess we might get (unintelligible) again if we use that liaison word, so it's clear that this is expert advice to the committee.

But as it's written at the moment, it looks like somebody might just seek to stop it with their same experts, who would then have votes. So you get around my objection just by saying the CSC will have the discretion to seek

additional expert advisors, or something along those lines. (Unintelligible)
advisors, not actually decision-makers.

Donna Austin: Okay. Staffan, your hand's up?

Staffan Jonson: Yes, thank you. Let me revert back to Frankfurt again, because I think one of the elegant ideas in this construction is separating amongst stakeholder input away from the CSC, and thereby taking away the incentives to capture.

And that is, to my mind, the elegance of it, that in this construction there is some kind of multi-stakeholderism pouring into the CSC. And of course multi-stakeholderism, a wanted feature of this whole process, but maybe not in the day-to-day operations of oversight. And that is what I'm turning against, because then we do put in all the multi-stakeholderism into the very defined operational overview anyhow.

And I think the idea of separating the two, that's a very elegant construction from the beginning. That's what I'm trying to avoid here. So again, minimal organization in all aspects. And when there is supposed to be a governance of policy, it needs to be on a higher level, on a more systematic level, in operations. That's why I'm against crowing this group. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel: (Unintelligible).

Donna Austin: It's Donna, sorry. Can we have some discussion about Kim's suggestion about an IANA liaison for the CSC? Kim, you might just want to speak to that and give us some kind of context of what you were thinking. And then I'd like to have a discussion of that, whether we think there's some value in doing that. Thanks.

Kim Davies: Sure. Not really a suggestion. I just wanted to bring the issue to the table so you guys could decide. In my experience, all the other sort of reporting functions that we've had over the past, whether it's our relationship with the (ITS) and how we report to them in terms of (unintelligible) in the (unintelligible); whether it's the Board IANA committee, and so on.

There's always been some kind of IANA seat at the table. So we're in those discussions. We might not have any formal voting role, but we're on hand at the discussion. I raise that just in context. That might be appropriate in this instance as well.

Tentatively maybe you might expect with the CSC (unintelligible) to IANA's stock involvement, and then there's a bilateral discussion after the CSC has met. But I think historically generally IANA being involved (unintelligible).

Donna Austin: Thanks, Kim. Does anyone have any thinking on this? My - I think in my mind if there was a contact within IANA that the CSC could go to on a regular basis, there would be nothing to stop the CSC from requesting that person be on call to be available for discussion. But whether we want to formalize that is another issue. So I'd be interested to hear what other people think.

Staffan Jonson: Staffan here. I think it sounds like a very good idea. I would rather see two gTLDs, two ccTLDs and one liaison from IANA. Makes sense. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Very good. I'm not at my laptop, so I can't see if anyone's raised their hand.

Martin Boyle: (Unintelligible). Martin expresses his support. And no hands up...

Bart Boswinkel: I can say it's more than support. It would seem to me to be just plain good common sense to have an observer from IANA, because that really is going to

be the area where, if there are issues or questions about reports or about service level expectation, that's the person who would be able to explain what and why.

Staffan Jonson: Okay, Staffan again. So I see Kurt also agreeing in Adobe that there should be IANA liaisons. So I would - so there is, I guess, support for an IANA liaison at least.

And I separate that from my next sentence, is I would prefer two gTLDs, two ccTLDs and one IANA liaison in the CSC. And that's about it, if I would have my way.

Bart Boswinkel: Stephanie?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yeah, I'm not opposed to the concept of it. It's a little bit - I feel like the CSC is partly a body that is going to be interfacing with IANA. So it's a bit confusing to me to have someone from IANA internal to the body that's interfacing with IANA. But I mean in terms of having a designated contact for information, I think that's fine.

I had another question. Had we done away with the (RTEC) liaison or (RTEC) member?

Donna Austin: Stephanie, not in my mind. But I think the problem is - can people scroll down in this? I think they can. And just a point on the (RTEC), so during the conversations in the CWG, Steve Crocker was very much of the opinion that, you know, (RTEC) is a customer in the naming function. So I think that's, in my mind, why we kept it there. Staffan? I'm not sure whether you agree with keeping it, or whether you do agree.

Staffan Jonson: Well my talking point is always direct customers. If it could be argued that (RTEC) is a direct customer, I would welcome them of course. But I'm not sure how to define that. Maybe we won't resolve it either. So direct customer is, to me, the logical thing to do. And having discretion to seek additional expertise as required is also the very logical thing to do.

So and in my mind that is specifically on the liaison. It's not more than that. But I do feel having too many parties engaged in the group - that's my - thank you.

Donna Austin: Kim says they are direct customers. Might want to...

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Donna Austin: So, yeah, I don't know. If anyone else has any strong views about that, I'd, you know, welcome hearing them.

Martin Boyle: I think - Martin here. I think they've got a very particular function in the fact that they are the people that take the results of the IANA functions operators work and publish it.

So I would be inclined, and I felt convinced after our discussion last week on this, that it was worthwhile having them in the room. So, you know, I would certainly prefer to see them there as they are currently listed.

Donna Austin: Okay, Kurt and then Kim.

Kurt Pritz: So for the reasons Martin just said, I agree that they should be in the room. I think they should be liaisons also. It's really helpful for them to witness what's going on, but I don't know to the extent they'll be willing to participate or

appoint one member to represent them all. So I think that it's best to cast them in the role of liaison for the present time. They can always be elevated. Kim, do you want to go next?

Kim Davies: Yeah, sorry. My observation, you know, like I said in the chat, how rarely are - these direct involvement groups have operated, it's very rare circumstances that they need to change the IP address (unintelligible). I agree they have a very important place in the group's design. (Unintelligible) is one; and certain other patterns -- VeriSign, for example.

I guess my question would be, in the context of customer service, which is what this committee is designed to do, does their special role in terms of propagating, you know, the groups that have a nexus with IANA's customer service. And to my mind IANA's nexus there, with respect to the (unintelligible), just my two cents.

Bart Boswinkel: (Unintelligible).

Donna Austin: So let me try to recap on this. So we agree we should have two g and two cc registry operators. I'm starting to think that we're not so sure about (RTEC). So maybe we take (RTEC) out and just say that we have a minimum of three - maximum? Minimum? Of three liaisons, qualified by the fact that they have to have some technical experience with IANA or, you know, some criteria.

And that's pretty much it. We're going to get pushback on this either way, so it doesn't - I think we just accept that, and we'll have to have that discussion in Istanbul.

Anyone disagree with that?

Bart Boswinkel: Well, immediately oh you can't see it but can you check whether I captured it correctly. So it's a minimum of two CCWs and two gTLDs and three liaisons?

Donna Austin: So I think it's - well yes we could always expand the Cs and Gs as well if we wanted to I suppose.

But the minimum actually in my mind referred to is three liaisons so it's a minimum...

Bart Boswinkel: Okay.

Donna Austin: ...of three liaisons.

Martin Boyle: But I thought we agreed to remove the number and just said liaisons from other ICANN groups which would then...

Donna Austin: Yes. I just - yes we did Martin your correct. But I think I'm kind of moving towards getting rid of RSAC as a member and having them as a liaison. I don't know...

Martin Boyle: No I'm fine with that because they're a member of other ICANN groups. It was actually saying how many liaisons from other ICANN groups. You know, and I think that's the bit that we can easily have a discussion on which groups are relevant and appropriate for this.

But the only one where I think they need specific mention in the light of the conversation we've just had is for some sort of liaison status for the IANA functions operator.

Donna Austin: Okay. Kim did you have something to say?

Kim Davies: Yes. I put my hand down.

Donna Austin: Okay thanks. Okay so don't want to belabor this but it looks like we are anyway.

So we can - so Kurt has got two suggestions here. And one is the TLDs plus the SSAC liaison plus a IANA liaison.

And then the second option is the TLDs plus other liaison that we don't prescribe so if we go back to Staffan's idea of having, you know, two options.

Okay I'm reading Martin did you want to go ahead?

Martin Boyle: Yes just quickly. I - you know, I'm fairly agnostic about how options we present. It seems to me always to be easier if you got one proposal and then you can discuss the numbers and who should be involved.

But if we are going to however many options we put forward I do suggest that we specifically mention the liaison role for the IANA functions operator.
Thanks.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Donna Austin: Okay. So I think if we all agree let's put two options on the table that fundamental principles of this is the composition of the CSC should be small and comprised of representatives that have the expertise to participate.

But so I think that set two qualifies regardless of the option. Everyone okay with that?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Donna Austin: Okay great. Do you get that Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Donna Austin: Okay terrific. Thank you.

So 13, so I think this is language that Stephanie added at the end of the call on Friday. The CSC shall facilitate public comment periods and other community participation methods mechanisms in the event the changes are proposed that will affect oversight of the IANA naming functions.

So I think what we're talking about here is are we talking about separability here? Stephanie can you just can you remember?

Stephanie Duchesneau: I don't think it's necessarily about separability. It's more just like openness and transparency and if we're keeping the group narrower how can we ensure that there is still a wider participation mechanism within it?

I think I mean this would definitely apply in the case of a decision separator or process to separate but I don't think that it's particular to that.

Okay. So if the CSC is proposing any changes to the way they do their business or the way that IANA does their business I guess by way of example for the Staffan I think you wanted discussion at some point around the automation part so if I that was ever to be recommended that that kind of thing would go into public comment.

Is that what we were thinking for this one those kind of events?

Staffan Jonson: It sounds reasonable. Staffan here. Sorry I interrupted Martin. But well at least Frankfurt this was to (unintelligible) to have this role but I would call it the innovation role.

But yes now it's put back to the CSC and maybe that's okay. I'm not sure really.

Donna Austin: So we okay on this, this (unintelligible)? All right.

Bart Boswinkel: Kurt has his hand up Donna.

Donna Austin: Yes Kurt?

Kurt Pritz: So I think it's a little mushy. And, you know, my vision has been that there is this process that while we think it will never get there there is an endgame in the escalation process where it's apparent that, you know, IANA 7 cannot recover.

So it's necessary that a new IANA operator is found. And it's obvious because a number of objective triggers have been tripped.

And so I don't know if, you know, we want to get to where we're suggesting a community discussion about whether there should be another IANA operator.

I think it should be, you know, kind of black and white in a - some sort of escalation procedure so at the end it's just a, you know, sort of a foregone conclusion. It's because all these triggers have been triggered, you know, it's clear that IANA has failed and can't recover.

So I can't imagine a scenario where that happens but I don't - I just - I think we want to avoid especially if we have, you know, a liaison sitting with us from ALAC that we are suggesting that we might have a community discussion about finding a new IANA operator. I just think that's kind of dangerous ground so let's be careful about what - how we put that.

Donna Austin: Thanks Kurt. So I think that's the kind of distinction I was trying to make here is that this is 13 is more associated with a change to the way that ALAC does their business as opposed to a change to the IANA functions operator. That's how I kind of see 13.

You may have been discussing 14 as well. I'm not really sure. Martin?

Martin Boyle: Thanks Donna. Yes I think there's sort of two things here. There's the one where everything is now moving and the current IANA functions operator has lost all trust and is not putting itself right.

And that's I think is the process that comes in under DTM. However and I think this is perhaps partly built up on comments that I made that I would like the CSC to be very largely an outward facing organization.

So in other words it's keeping the wider community aware and understanding what is happening.

So for example when it does a discussion about the change of technology, when it does as a discussion perhaps about new requirements or changing metrics these are things that it goes out to the wider community.

Because the wording in here is about the - that would affect the oversight of the old IANA naming function, not the operation of the IANA function, the IANA naming functions.

So I think that is - it's useful to have in as a reminder of that this body shouldn't be going off and making wide-ranging decisions that might affect that supervision but would go out with proposals and the wider community could respond. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Thanks Martin. So Stephanie has suggested in the chat that in 13 we should include a change to how IANA does its business or how the CSC does its business.

So we might be - so Martin I might have a different take on the meaning of operational and oversight. But I think 13 really goes to the operational part of the CSC and IANA.

The oversight to me is actually that kind of take it away from function but that might just be a different understanding of the two terms.

So I'm - I apologize. I'm starting to get a little bit confused here about what 13 is.

I think 14 is clearly about the escalation process and potential separability. But I think 13 is definitely not. So...

Martin Boyle: Yes. I think I would agree with you there Donna.

Bart Boswinkel: Hello?

Donna Austin: Likes so I think we need to just review the language in 13 to make it clear that it's really about - that it's not about, you know, certainly to meet obligations or part of an escalation process. It's more changes in the day to day way the business is done by either the CSC or IANA.

And then 14 is Kurt I think that goes more to your point.

So what we're saying is the CSC is not mandated to initiate a change in the IANA functions operator.

However the CSC may recommend the community discussion in the event that in their opinion the IANA functions operator has not met its obligations and it has not been possible to adjust the performance issues through the remediation or escalation process.

So I think in 14 do we have any objection to having performance issues through the remediation/escalation process?

Okay I am not hearing any. So Bart maybe in 14 can we just add performance issues through the remediation/escalation process?

Bart Boswinkel: Add performance issues through remediation or escalation process?

Donna Austin: No, I want remediation/escalation process.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Donna Austin: Because in - I think in our minds they're the same thing that they have different connotations so...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Donna Austin: ...the text is already there. So it's just adding a slash next to remediation.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Yes.

Donna Austin: Okay. So are we all comfortable with where we are on those 14. points?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Donna Austin: Okay, terrific, so the dependencies. Staffan did you have something to say?

Staffan Jonson: Yes in dependencies I miss placeholder for design team M as in Martin talking about escalation. I don't find it here. And I guess that is also a dependency; right?

Donna Austin: Yes there is management of periodic reviews of the IANA function and IANA statement of work. There's is a bracket there that says pending there that's Design Team N for Nelly not M for Mary.

Okay. So maybe we need a dependency in there for Design Team M?

Staffan Jonson: Yes since they are leaning quite hard on CSC function so...

Donna Austin: So I noticed that Paul Kane has sent around the SLAs, SLEs. I haven't had chance to look at them. I don't know that we're going to have a chance to incorporate anything into this document.

But I will note that Kim when we get to the table Kim has actually pulled out the relevant section in the IANA in the contract so we might - it might be simple enough to cover it off there.

Does anyone have any other inclusions or deletions from the dependencies?

All right, Kim you had a couple of comments. One was about the IDN repository and somebody had a comment about .nth. Would you speak to those please?

Kim Davies: Yes. I made the comment or explanation the IDM repository has never been (unintelligible). It's one of the functions that we have which is not (unintelligible) but it performs like the IANA department but it's not contracted function.

I don't feel strongly either way about whether that should be co-opted into the IANA functions in the new environment or not but it's really something that sort of stems from this is the teams that ICANN has (unintelligible) to this (unintelligible).

You know, we maintain for example another example I gave is the registrar ID that are used for gTLD registrars. That's not something that has ever been kind of (unintelligible).

So there's two examples of them, not many probably just free to discuss whether we think it's appropriate to explicitly call them out or (unintelligible) them a particular way licenses.

Donna Austin: Does anyone...

Bart Boswinkel: Can you repeat...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Sorry...

Donna Austin: Martin has his hand up. Go ahead.

Bart Boswinkel: No, Kim could you repeat the second example? You mentioned so you've got - say the IDN repository and the - what was the second example you used?

Kim Davies: The list of accredited gTLD registrars.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay. Yes thank you.

Donna Austin: Martin go ahead.

Martin Boyle: Thanks Donna. Yes I - it was my fault that somebody challenged .int because I really don't see the management of .int being of the same sort as managing the root zone file and the root zone Whois.

And I think I would actually ask a question who are the customers of .int?
Because if we do consider that this is something that we should be covering in the CSC we would presumably need to make sure we have representatives of the customers of .int on the CSC.

Donna Austin: Fair point. Kim did you say that that .int is actually covered under the IETF? Did you - do I recall that or did I get that wrong?

Kim Davies: I didn't say that.

Donna Austin: Okay.

Kim Davies: Yes...

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: (Unintelligible) not, right okay.

Kim Davies: Just in response to Martin's comment firstly from an operational perspective the INT is more like the root zone would imagine. They have the same processing staff doing similar jobs in terms of receiving requests, dealing with customers, discussion and so on. So internally we actually treat them quite similar.

I would say that it's a lot simpler because we don't have a lot of the, you know, let's say the (unintelligible) in the root zone.

We can just implement the changes more or less directly rather than going through third parties.

I think in terms of the observation those who are the (unintelligible) about 188 (unintelligible) registrations today. The majority but not all are intergovernmental treaty organizations.

I would say in the context of customer service there's also, you know, potentially people feel that they should be eligible that are not but who seem ineligible but believe that they should be eligible for government domains.

You know, again from an internal perspective I - we're wasting into a - sort of potential proving ground for us to do things that we might then roll out now for the root zone at large.

So for us it's not a particularly complex (unintelligible). It's proven useful for us (unintelligible) ineffective (unintelligible) context, you know. But, I think, you know, in some we consider it a naming function in something that is actively, you know, our responsibility today notwithstanding, you know, the ongoing debate that has been going on for a decade or more whether .int as a whole should belong somewhere (unintelligible) finalized through (unintelligible) part of our operation.

Donna Austin: Okay so I think - I don't think there's any harm in leaving that in there at the moment. But essentially IANA is the registry for .int.

So if somebody wants to register again they have to come to IANA?

Kim Davies: Correct.

Donna Austin: Right, okay. So let's leave it in. I don't think there's any harm in doing that.

Management of IDN repositories I'm just not sure about because it's not really part of the contact today. So and this is - I know there's some work that's going on at the moment in relation to this so I'm not sure about this one either. My kind of initial reaction is to take it out of here. Staffan?

Staffan Jonson: Well I'm not sure either if it's a main issue but maybe we'll just leave it in the text as placeholders.

So I was actually direction just why not keep it just as space holders and then leave it out if it's not deemed relevant?

Donna Austin: Yes. That I mean at least people know we've thought about it so there's no harm in that respect in keeping it in. So let's leave it as it is.

So are there any other - so design team and we have to add in but are there any other dependencies people can think of?

Okay it doesn't appear so. So it's 9:21 so we've got about 40 minutes left. So I guess we'll just chat through the rest of this stuff.

So Kim's changed the language at the top there for the table. I don't have any concerns about those changes.

I think the column in the table that says CSC perform with a question mark we can probably take that out if people agree.

Staffan?

Staffan Jonson: I was actually under that idea that we would end in eight minutes but you want to push on right? I would...

Donna Austin: Okay, sorry I...

Staffan Jonson: ...really need...

Donna Austin: Sorry. I was working under the assumption this was a two hour call not a 90 minute call. But if others are under the assumption it was a 90 minute call then we can try to get through this in eight minutes. So I'll talk really quickly.

Staffan Jonson: Let's try at least yes.

Donna Austin: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: Sorry my apologies. Okay so does anyone object to having that column CSC perform come out? It looks like not.

I'm okay with 2.8 the Kim's added in there which he says is largely the SLEs, SLAs. Kim just out of curiosity were you involved with the work that Paul Kane has done with a group to develop those SLAs?

Kim Davies: Not really. I think to be simple about it no, I haven't.

Donna Austin: Okay. All right, so I guess there's not too many other changes in this. If anyone has any objections just let me know.

On this so 3.4 in the security plan I think somebody else had a comment on this but I can't remember. Is this something we want to keep in here or is this something we get rid of?

Kim Davies: Kim here. Martin made the observation that the community wants some kind of assurance that the credit is (unintelligible).

I've made the comment that, you know, (IT top) security plan probably wouldn't be appropriate to be released publicly.

And I also made the suggestion that either we could find a mechanism to distribute on a limited basis. I mean right now we have the evidence as to (unintelligible).

Alternatively, you know, we have these third-party audits where, you know, (unintelligible) today comes in make sure we have certain controls in place.

You know, imagine some model could be envisaged where the evidence of the third-party auditor and CSC can satisfy the, you know, specified (unintelligible) controls and the third-party auditor (unintelligible) ICANN certain (unintelligible). Controls so that there is sort of options that might be could be considered in this context.

Donna Austin: Thanks Kim. Martin?

Martin Boyle: Yes. I'm quite happy with Kim's suggestion. And in fact I did respond that really it's the fact that there is something in place. I think it would be inappropriate for CSC to be crawling all over security plan.

And I certainly like the concepts of the third party auditor report as being a way of showing that this has been gone through.

So, you know, I'm quite happy with the wording along the lines that Kim's just outlined. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Okay. So we can - and that was actually in a comment that we can't see on the screen at the moment. So I think we can draw from Kim's suggestion and Martin's agreement.

Bart Boswinkel: Donna I've moved it and the document is scrollable for everybody now. It was already.

Donna Austin: (Unintelligible) okay terrific. Thanks Bart.

What else is new in here? Okay so if 3.4.6 I think we can take that out we can actually take that out given that the final report Kim is saying this is a deliverable at the end the contract that they have within TIA.

So I think we can take that out unless anybody objects to it. Or if we don't take it out we can, you know, provide a comment of what it is.

Staffan Jonson: I think it would be beneficial to leave it in just to acknowledge you recognize that deliverable but then explain why, you know, (unintelligible) is necessary.

Donna Austin: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Which one you talking about Donna? Could you repeat it again?

Bart Boswinkel: Four point six.

Bart Boswinkel: Four point six, okay.

Donna Austin: You had a comment in here on the root zone management audit data around 3.9.2 A to G?

Martin Boyle: Yes mainly because I was doing this on an airplane and I haven't got Wi-Fi and so I couldn't find the C.9.2 bracket A to G.

But I have look subsequently and I still can't find C.9 .2 brackets A to G. I'm quite happy with their being in reference to it. It's just I would like to know exactly where in the contract it was.

Staffan Jonson: I think that's a (unintelligible). It's (3.9.2) A through G.

Donna Austin: Yes.

Martin Boyle: Right, okay. I will look under 2.9.2. Thanks for the steer. I was beginning to think I was completely stupid rather than just partially stupid.

Donna Austin: Okay, we can fix that up. So 5.3 the compliance audit will continue and the report will be provided to the CSC. 7.2 and 7.3, so I suggested that they not be under the purview of the CSC but Martin and Kim have suggested otherwise.

So maybe we can just put some language in there that says, you know, while strictly not under the purview of the CSC would need to be assured that this has been done.

Does that work for everybody?

Martin Boyle: It works for me.

Donna Austin: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Donna Austin: All right guys. I'm not rushing this.

I'm not sure what to do about the remedial action. I think maybe taking into account what Kim, you know, what Kim and Martin have said and not necessarily worry too much about the work of the other team at the moment.

Staffan you seem to be the one that's paid some attention to the work coming out of the other groups. So if you wanted to speak to that and Kurt I saw you put your hand up so if you'd like to say something, Kurt or Staffan?

Kurt Pritz: Staffan did you want to say something?

Staffan Jonson: Sorry. No did I...

Kurt Pritz: Okay.

Staffan Jonson: ...what?

Donna Austin: No Staffan I asked you directly because some of the work coming out of the other teams dealing with escalation.

What I'm proposing here is...

Staffan Jonson: Sorry.

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: ...we just (unintelligible) because we don't have time to consider the other work of the Design Team.

Staffan Jonson: Yes. I - yes. I did send you the proposal so far but just five minutes before this meeting so that it is - there is a proposal that I think we should think this is better to keep actually because this is more specific.

It's another way of doing it but that so there are actually two proposals. And I'm not sure if we should put both of them for the CWG.

I haven't had time to have a view on this yet but yes. There are two parallel proposals here so...

Donna Austin: Okay so Kurt?

Kurt Pritz: Just to reiterate what I - the comment I made last time is that I think at this stage it's whatever specific proposal comes out for an escalation process it will be wrong and really has to be worked out.

I think it has to be - so I think we should stand for certain principles and maybe augment what we've said here with some principles.

And one of them I think should be that the escalation process should be worked out between the CSC and IANA. And then, you know, with the idea that it's going to be modified over time because as soon as you put it into practice you're going to find problems with it.

So the principles I think we should stand for is that that the - the - this transition plan should have, you know, examples and principles but at the end of the day the CSC and IANA will negotiate the escalation process and, you know, in a transparent way. And then we'll, you know, work and modify it over time.

Donna Austin: Okay thanks. So I think we can add some language...

Bart Boswinkel: Okay.

Donna Austin: ...in there to cover that off. Thanks Kurt. Martin?

Martin Boyle: Yes. I put my hand up because of the concept that DTM and the possible remedial action will parallel processes. I don't think they are. I think they are separate processes.

Process number one is the process that belongs to the CSC's remedial action. And this is the bit where I have problems with the word escalation.

I think it's remedial action. I think it's working together to try and resolve problems. And then if that fails to lead to relevant to improvements service then the escalation process the DTM are working on kicks in.

So I think that, you know, we can put the two one after the other. Whether we need this sort of level of detail helpful though that is in this particular document I don't know.

But and certainly I agree with Kurt that, you know, no matter how carefully and how painstakingly we work on the - on that table for all the processes we're going to go through we're going to get it wrong. And therefore that is probably something that has to be discussed and followed-up.

But I like the idea that remedial action if you're not getting satisfaction then you move up the chain to try and work out what the barrier is to resolving the issue.

And hence you go from the IANA manager to the GDD precedents of the CEO and then on last to the ICANN board to say they need additional resources or whatever. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Okay. So I think what I'm hearing is let's leave this in as it is understanding that, you know, being, providing at this level of detail could be I don't know, it could be a challenge.

But I think it's actually really useful to have (unintelligible). Are we okay with that?

Martin Boyle: Yes fine.

Donna Austin: Okay great. So is the process to individual TLD operators is to make complaints? I don't know that there's too much - Kim's got a comment in here with regard to, to (unintelligible) for future reference to clarify this (intends) that the particular should be published.

So I guess that's a good point. I think the individual cases it's probably best that the information is kept confidential.

Okay we've got three - actually we're over seven minutes. So if people have to drop off - sorry about the helicopter going over.

So if people have to drop that's fine. And I'm really sorry that I screwed up the timing on this.

Bart Boswinkel: So yes it's say Donna let me explain the 90 minutes. The reason was so we would have time to finish any edits before the deadline of 6 PM UTC.

Donna Austin: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: And that's in one and a half hour.

Donna Austin: Okay all right. Well I'm happy to push that deadline out. I didn't really care too much about that.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes nor do I. We're rebels.

Donna Austin: But I think it's good to have, you know, something more comfortable with something we're not.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Donna Austin: Does anybody - this is the overview of the CSC council work plan.

Does - I know there's some comments in here somewhere so do we have a guess as a general rule does anybody have any problems with the way that this is laid out or - okay, take that as a no.

So on the establishing mailing list and about whether that's public so Kim raises a good point that there are certain things that should remain confidential so I'm not sure how to manage that.

But perhaps that's just a line in there that, you know, there's a question mark over to what extent it will be made public because of confidentiality.

So on publishing meeting teleconference schedule based on the work plan so Martin has a comment on that about need clarification about who defines...

Martin Boyle: Who defines the work plan which I think is the CSC so that needs to be in place on that list.

Donna Austin: Yes. I guess in my mind working methods and work plan is a similar thing but...

Martin Boyle: Yes. I'm fine with that.

Donna Austin: And the last one is the on-site visit of the IANA function. So Kim doesn't seem to think that this is - I think I read the Kim doesn't seem to think it's necessary. Martin's saying why is it needed?

So do we have any views on this? I'm happy to leave it out but I know that it was something that was discussed during the RFP 3 discussions around the CSC.

Bart Boswinkel: And they wanted travel funding. And especially if you got the external auditor as well so why - I mean is there any - probably they're more into this than anybody else?

Martin Boyle: Yes. Is Kim still on the line?

Kim Davies: Yes I'm still here.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Martin Boyle: How often do NTIA go along to the IANA offices just to examine the location of the IANA functions operator?

Kim Davies: I think it's been done of some have three times. But the most recent time actually we went to them and said that we showed them our service abilities in Western Virginia (unintelligible).

So what happened was that we met my name in the morning at our COLO facility. We showed them racks of servers. The meeting lasted about 30 minutes. That was our annual on-site visit for (WCL).

Martin Boyle: I think we should just recommend that this is no longer - this is not needed.

Donna Austin: Okay, thanks Staffan. I'm really sorry about screwing up the timing. So, you're not in chat Staffan. That's why I'm saying thank you.

Okay so is it generally okay with how this looks? That's only going to get picked apart next week anyway this week.

The review of the reporting requirements post-transition, so I think I've kind of reduced this quite a bit to what Stephanie had. And the reason being that I don't know that there's value being prescriptive around this at this point in time.

So the middle paragraph, the design team should - the design - sorry I can't talk, the design team does consider that they would be considerable value in hand over private transition so would discuss what we mean by that.

So I think if everyone's okay with that then I think that's okay. And the composition of the CSC I just need to tidy this up so that it matches what we agreed to in the overview.

And I think we need to maintain Stephanie's distinctions here about members and liaisons. I think that's important to keep those distinctions.

Martin Boyle: Yes. There was one thing Donna about the appointing of additional liaisons which I assumed was probably the reference to experts, adding experts.

Donna Austin: Yes.

Martin Boyle: And therefore the language probably needs to be addressed. So CSC may choose to appoint expert advisors or something along those lines to avoid confusion on the number of different source of liaisons we have.

Donna Austin: Yes. So I think the CSC discretion to a point, you know, experts or liaisons I think we'll just take that out so or period as you say in America.

And the other thing we can take the travel funding out for the annual site visit.

Martin Boyle: Yes. Yes.

Donna Austin: And no other travel support is recommended for the CSC but it doesn't mean that if you find stuff on the CSC that you can't seek funding through the respective ICANN communities.

Martin Boyle: Yes it's not no other travels. Of course if you're removing the travel funding for the annual IANA site visit so you're simply saying no travel support is recommended for the CSC?

Donna Austin: Correct.

And we can have that discussion about ALAC about why it should be provided once they have...

Martin Boyle: Yes.

Donna Austin: Yes. So...

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: So I think we're done. Is there anything we had to come back to at the top?

Bart Boswinkel: I yes I think there's 13, 14 discussion around 13, 14.

Okay. So I think we've agreed that 13 is about - is more about the day to day operations of IANA and all the CSC.

So I think this is about if there's a change in the way that either decide to do something then there will be, you know, a public comment period or something.

So that relates more to - so I guess the cleanest way to say it it doesn't refer to starting a process for changing the IANA functions operator. It's more about the day to day work of either team.

Bart Boswinkel: Maybe the confusion is in affect oversight of the IANA naming function?

Donna Austin: Yes. So I think we just need time...

Bart Boswinkel: That if you replace this with business, et cetera, then it is clearly either in say the working methods of the CSC or the what's the business yes, business of IANA or the working methods of the CSC?

Donna Austin: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: I'm not - and replace that so yes. Okay. I'll include that slightly.

Martin Boyle: Yes. Although it could well be in 13 also the CSC running a consultation about the report is being produced so that people feel that where the CSC is actually reaching out to a wider community.

Bart Boswinkel: Isn't that included in the business of the CSC?

Martin Boyle: Definitely, yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Donna Austin: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: So replace it with and it's effectively replacing it with Stephanie's suggestion?

Donna Austin: Yes. I think so Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

So that's one. Let me scroll back up. So let me fix this line (unintelligible).

The bit about just to be on the safe side Section 9 is on say replacing the word annually by Kurt's suggestion.

The CSC shall hold a formal regular at least annual meeting because then I'll mark it as such. And then so you agree to that one. And so and Section 10 and

11, heck, 10 and 11 around escalation, et cetera, is that you agree to after a conversation with DTN.

Donna Austin: I...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes?

Donna Austin: I think the language in 10 and 11 still holds despite of the discussion.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Donna Austin: Unless Kurt has a running desire to have the word escalation put into 10 somewhere? We've had a, you know, a possible multistage escalation process for addressing performance issues has been provided as a strawman.

Martin Boyle: Yes. Although note that I have strong aversion to...

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Martin Boyle: ...the word escalation because it means something very, very specific in my mind.

Donna Austin: Okay. Let's just leave it as it is.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Okay. No I think then we - everything is covered.

What I'll do is I'll say I'll send out the notes as soon as possible mark agreements and changes.

And just one question, who is going to do the update of the document, the final update?

Donna Austin: I guess I'll try to do that.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes? And if - and you will send it out say whenever convenient for you to the CWG later today?

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Yes okay. I think then we're done.

Donna Austin: Thank you very much everyone. I'm really sorry I screwed up on the 90 minutes...

Bart Boswinkel: That's all right. Excellent everyone. I'm very happy about the progress here. So thank you very much.

Donna Austin: Thank you.

Martin Boyle: Thanks. Bye-bye Ms. Donna. Thanks all. Bye.

Donna Austin: Thanks Bart. Bye-bye.

Bart Boswinkel: Bye.

END