

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
April 2, 2015
9:00 am CT**

Donna Austin: Thanks everyone for joining. So I wasn't able to make the call this morning and so I was wondering if there's anything available that I should know about before we kick this off? Bernie? Staffan?

Staffan Jonson: Yes. So should I start? Staffan here.

Bernie Turcotte: Yes please do. I thought no one else was coming up.

Staffan Jonson: Okay. Well yes we have the presentation of what is currently on the way in the different design teams and I mentioned the close connection between us about DTM Escalation Group. I also send you a draft escalation group or design team a couple of hours ago with the current proposal in that group for escalation mechanism or rather three mechanisms actually on the way. So that might be a very good paper to look at to see what is proposed in. A template for writing text and define a proposal was presented as well. This happens to be the same paper so the paper showed escalation mechanism and DTM is both a template for help how all DTM's should send their text. And it also the proposed escalation mechanism so it's this document for at least two reasons. Did I forget anything?

Donna Austin: Bernie did you have something to add?

Bernie Turcotte: Yeah. Not really except that people are mentioned that you were looking at developing your own charter I believe and that the deadline of the 10th April is still there and it will be an intensive work section Monday and Tuesday on the 13th and 14th to try and wrap up everything into one coherent piece which then we will work into turning into a public consultation document which should go out on the 20th.

Donna Austin: Okay. So Bernie from your perspective the current format that we are using for our document, how much change will we have to do to that to make it fit the template or do we have to do that?

Bernie Turcotte: Personally, I would say in your case we will try to do so and staff will help you with that. But yours is probably one of the larger volume outputs for design team and understandably so. As such I wouldn't drive myself crazy. We're trying to fit into the template. I think the best thing that can be done is coming to decisions and recommendations and if worst comes to worst the staff will take care of that plowing this into reasonable format.

Donna Austin: Okay. Thanks Bernie. So I send around an agenda and I think what we need to cover - I'd like to offer so (unintelligible) SLA team. How are we going to fit that into what we're doing if we need to at all? The escalation team -- so that's Chuck's team and also the work that I've read is doing which I understand. Stephanie is part of. I still don't see Stephanie online. So Kim are you aware of the Paul Caine's SLA document? I guess you're aware of it.

Kim Davies: Yes I am. I read a draft a few days ago.

Donna Austin: I guess I don't know whether you're comfortable saying anything but do you have an indication of how realistic that is or...

Bernie Turcotte: ...if I can save Kim some heartache here maybe I can take that question.

Donna Austin: Sure Bernie. Thanks.

Bernie Turcotte: So I think IANA may have provided internally some comments that were obviously some issues with the recommendations from DTA as they stand. It was discussed on the call this morning for the CWG call. Paul Caine said he would like to do understand those issues and see if he could work through those. And I believe that the end result of that discussion was that the co-chairs thought that was the best way forward. After the call I had a chat with Paul and I think he's looking forward to working with IANA to try and develop something within the required timeframe and that where staff is working with IANA to try and iron out some of the details to get that going. So relative to your DT here I think what that means is technically there is nothing for you from DTA at this very moment.

Donna Austin: Thanks Bernie. So in your mind do you think and I'm thinking of this from a drafting perspective more than anything. If you think that DTA would work as they stand alone that we could just refer to or is it something that we need to include in our staff. I think our work suggests that they has to be a conversation with IANA to agree to any SLA. So should we okay their predetermined and make reference to that.

Man: I believe that sounds like a sound plan.

Donna Austin: Okay. Thanks. So Staffan did you want to speak to the escalation work that Chuck's team is doing and how fits into what we're doing. I mean my kind of

personal sense you said. I would like to keep what we have in the escalation as kind of illustrative about how we would see that back and forth between the CSC and IANA working and, you know, we need some kind of mediation. But I'm just not sure whether it's consistent or not with what Chuck's team has done. So could you speak to that, please, Staffan.

Staffan Jonson: Yes this is a bit premature for me. But the escalation mechanism as an outline of DTM is more hands on and it's actually three parallel processes. In a couple of them there is pointing on the already established processes and in general terms saying, let's take both of those processes as already described. But they need to be there in the proposal. So what we wouldn't mind having issues with or not is one of the three. The second one called Customer Service Complaint Resolution Process and this is a mid- complex. The first process is very short termed emergency processes and the third one is about the escalation stage. But I understand our tasks as defining escalation within the CSC and that is mainly the triggers and the ladder up to where it's no longer a CSC issue. And this was all also questioned a bit in the last call in the CWG call that's we need to specify more in detail. What triggers actually are needed for triggering an escalation process? I'm not sure if that's the answer to your question but I would - this is an eight page description that is described here. So we should need to go through it step-by-step, or what do you say?

Donna Austin: So I think the work that Kurt did in terms of the remediation process does identify the triggers. I think it does. I think it's more detailed than I what Chuck's team has put in their proposal. So in my mind I think given that it's illustrative and it's something that would need to be negotiated with IANA at the end of the day how that process would work with the IANA functions operator. (Unintelligible) as a - and perhaps referencing all the other work that Chuck's team has done. Understanding that ALS will take it to a certain point but it's that next stage of the process that he's in to see if the CSC believes

necessary that the performance is poor to the extent that it should be a conversation around to whether we need another operator than that would move it somewhere else. So that's my kind of thinking on it. Martin?

Martin Boyle: Yeah thanks Donna. I do agree with you. These two processes seem to me to be sort of overlapping rather. So I think there's two things. The first one where something has gone wrong. And that is being internal IANA functions operators role to try and sort that one out. Where, obviously, we would need to keep an eye on it. Secondly, we've got these Service Complaint Resolution Process which comes in and it's step two to the CSC mediating and then if that fails to involve the mediator. And then in the step three which rather sort of startlingly jumps pretty quickly into an escalation but it doesn't say to whom.

And again brings in the role of the CSC as a mediator. Now, I've actually got problems with a committee of four worth people having to step up to the plate and mediate. Mediation is quite skilled job and I'm not really greatly sure who that CSC should be anything more than they step to mediation. In other words, to try and get the IANA functions operator and the person whose got an issue into the discussion and into (unintelligible) and mediator at some stage down the track. The other thing that obviously and clearly is missed out is our remedial action which appears, I think, is dynamics ZED. Point number one where the CSC reports significant failures to the IANA functions operation request response in the predetermined number of days and I think we just need to make sure that TM is aware of the fact that we don't see that as being CSC telling IANA function operators sorted out in two weeks. And all is right. But rather we see that as a process that should start whenever they are all courses to concern so we head off the issues as early as possible. And at various stages in the process as we have in our documents we might be giving an instruction that says, well, look we need to have a plan and that plan needs to be with us

within one week, two weeks, three weeks whatever. Anyway. Just a couple of concerns I have on the document. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Thanks Martin. Staffan? This will be the last.

Staffan Jonson: Okay. Thank you Donna, but I would like to agree with Martin. I may not put it as eloquently as he did but assuming a couple of things. Assume that the CSC is a minimal organization. It might handle those specific and easy things or as Paul Caine usually puts it, a very boring job in the way that is purely technical operations and worth in discussing. So still it might take away a huge deal of all problems arising of the organization. And this, of course, presupposed yet another organization. Then (unintelligible) something similar at the next level when you talk about more general policy issues. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Thanks Staffan. I think that's kind of the outstanding thing for in the back of my mind with all this is we still don't know whether there's an MRT or something else that will sit above and how that would actually work. So I know that Kurt wants to go back and ask a question about the IANA and I then I want to work through the document and just explain some of the changes that Stephanie and I have made. Bernie's informed me that we've only got an hour for these call so year 22 minutes here now. Kurt did you want to go ahead.

Kurt Pritz: Yeah. Thanks. I had to points. One about this one and escalation. So again let's be careful that you're not tailoring the tasks to fit the organization so if you're characterizing the CSC as a minimalist organization or minimal organization and so you don't want to do escalation, well then, where should it be. So I'm just concerned with saying the CSC won't undertake escalation and then leave it for some place and MRT that might exist or some other place where it's not going be picked up.

So be careful about first you've got to describe the task and then you've got to figure out how to do it rather than describe what the organization does and then figure out what the tasks are. So I hope that was clear in some way.

You know, I couldn't find my stupid window on my laptop when we were talking about SLE's. Are you making Design Team A the negotiator on behalf of the registries for SLA's. You know, it seems that there's a difference between Design Team A and IANA. I don't know how that should be handled and I think the way it has to be handled is you know the SLA's are really the result of any negotiation between the registry operators and IANA. That's how the current ones were essentially formed although in GIA was part of that. Mostly with CCTLV's and IANA and IANA's other customers. So think about, you know, you don't have to be considerate right now, but are we making Design Team A the de facto negotiating party on behalf of the registries and are you as registry operators satisfied with that.

Donna Austin: Thanks Kurt. It's good point. I mean in my mind I've always assumed that the CSC would negotiate with IANA and that the work of the Design Team A could be a starting point or a reference point but that's not particularly clear to me. Martin, if you want to go ahead.

Martin Boyle: Thanks Donna. Certainly on the surface levels, there probably is a need for us to think about how do we do it. But I thought the initial idea was where possible we go into the transition on the status quo so the service levels that are currently defines and in our program. And in our reports we do have a process for then re-examining and developing service level commitments expectations. As we go ahead. So we obviously do need to just get that one a little bit more thought.

But I put my hand up in response to Kurt's comment about the CSC for escalation and if it's not escalated within the CSC where do we go to do it. And again, I thought it was actually quite an important point because when there is a vacuum quite often it's a good idea to try and steal the vacuum with a process before somebody else does. Particularly, as I must admit, I had assumed the escalation mechanism would have been picked up by DTM. It looks now like they are not doing it. But I guess certainly in my mind that my thinking would be to CSC was essentially the sort of day-to-day monitoring processes and it would put it's hand up if it saw a problem having got to a stage where it did not think it did not believe it was any longer possible to resolve it. And that would I guess, in the first case, be to alert the CCNSO and the GNSO as the customer groups. And then to use them to trigger whatever processes is being put in by the cross community working group accountability proposals which have certain processes for triggering some of which could be quite practical. Like for example, the IANA function operator being staffed (unintelligible). And therefore, make sure the budget was properly committed. And other ones responding with some sort of sledgehammer on the board. Which I guess would probably mean the board would move the first and sack the CEO because he's failing to get it right. But that would seem to me to be perhaps something that we could put down. Something based on that sort of idea, down in our reports as showing you where do we go in. And very firmly steering it to the cross community working group on accountabilities ideas. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Thanks Martin. That's a good suggestion. Bernie did you have something?

Bernie Turcotte: Yes ma'am. Two things. First thing on staff support for DTA as it figures out how to go on. Being I thought Martin's points were quite eloquent and on deck with SLE's. And if, somehow, this group could agree that that is the general

thinking, I would like to be authorized to take that back to DTA to help them along.

Donna Austin: I don't have any objection. Does anybody else? If there is nothing I think that would be okay. Thanks Bernie. You've been helpful. Okay. So Stephanie can we move to you now? I don't know whether every team on the periodic review has actually started their work but if you have anything to provide in terms of how that coincides with the work that we're doing, could you let us know? Are you with us Stephanie? What's happening? No. Can't hear you.

Staffan Jonson: No Stephanie, we cannot hear you.

Donna Austin: Okay. So we'll wait for Stephanie to join in. Is there any - before we start working to the document. Is there anything thing else that we need to discuss. I think our document's in reasonably good shape. But I'm interested to know if there's anything that we're missing that we still need to do some work on. And that's notwithstanding that we still have to develop a charter and I've reached out to Marie and Steve Chan to see if they have a pro forma that I can use. The one that they use for (unintelligible) is particularly useful saw Steve was doing some more scouting around to see where they could find that might be able to help with that. But from anyone perspective is anything that we're missing here or Kim is anything that looks pie in the sky to you would be useful to guide. Martin, go ahead.

Martin Boyle: Thanks Donna. Just to remind you of what I said about the escalation process. It would seem to me that it would be worth our wild putting our dependent's worth into the debate by saying how we would see the escalation process going from those things.

Donna Austin: Okay. Thanks Martin. Okay. Bernie's put it in check and see (unintelligible) I have some useful information so I would have to look at that later today. So while we wait for Stephanie, I think I might just take you through the changes that I've made to the document if I can actually remember what they are. So in number one if there were concerns from NTIA about the language that we've used so - and I think this was actually noted during the discussion and the (unintelligible) as well. The number one relates to the operation or performance of IANA functions. I think recently we had something in there like of oversight, role of NTIA and that was considered to be incorrect. So change that.

And the other changes that I made related to where we had hand over. NTIA actually has some concerns about that because it inferred that there was something for NTIA to hand over. Something physical. And they had concerns that that would be misinterpreted so we've changed that to every transition of responsibility rather than to hand over responsibility.

And I think those were the two primary changes that I made to the document. The rest were made by Stephanie.

So Stephanie is on the breach (sic) now. So Stephanie, did you first want to talk to the Periodic Review stuff that's being done by Avri's team, and then perhaps you can take us through the other changes you've made to the document. Thanks.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Sure thing. So I haven't actually done too much work on the Periodic Review side, but I did volunteer to do two things. We're still kind of working on off of the same template that was circulated in advance at the meeting, and I said that I would both integrate it with the information that we've provided and the Registry statements on IANA as well as make sure

that the output that was coming of that was coordinated with what was produced as a result of the Design Team DTC.

One of the things that we have to take note of - and I know it's kind of come up in our work, whether we can assume that there is going to be an MRT, or we can kind of construct the CSC on the assumption that that's going to be the primary oversight body.

So Design Team M - or Design Team N, it poses it as a question, but there is a pretty strong assumption that it is going to be a multi-stakeholder body that's leading the review.

I had inclined if we have liaison participation, if people are satisfied with that, to try and have it be the CSC, the same entity including liaison participation that would be coordinating these reviews.

But I would want to see if other folks from this group agree with that before I push forward in advocating that within the document - agree with that assessment. Or if we think it should be something different like a kind of standing working group or an ATRT like chain that should be conducting these reviews.

Donna Austin: Stephanie, if I could respond to that question?

I guess my concern is that the CSC's primary role is the monitoring of the IANA performance. And in the event that - so the periodic reviews which really we haven't defined in any great detail, but that's another body of work which will be, in my mind, a significant body of work.

And I don't know that the CSC that we're setting up, which is primarily lightweight, will be well equipped to do that. So we need to think about, just from the resourcing perspective and a work output perspective, how big a piece of work that is. Because in my mind, you know, a periodic review, the like that has been discussed, you know, in other conversations, is going to be a significant body of work.

So I'm not sure the CSC that we're setting up will be well equipped to do that. And that's my primary concern. I don't necessarily disagree with the idea that the CSC could do it, but I don't know that that's what we're essentially setting the CSC up to do.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Martin, did you have a comment?

Martin Boyle: Yes, thanks Donna. I actually fully agree with you that the periodic review is not what I would see the CSC set up to do.

But I think I would sort of add to that and suggest that in the discussions in the ccWG in Istanbul, there was quite a strong feeling that the Affirmation of Commitment Review model needed to be developed, should I say, but in particular with requirement for fulfilling the recommendations.

And so I would see essentially the role of the CSC as providing information into an AOC type of review process which by definition would be multi-stakeholder. And the CSC themselves wouldn't replace registry membership on an AOC-type periodic review.

But it might be that the ccNSO and the GNSO would look in particular favor on some poor sap from the CSC having to step forward and having to take on what essentially is writing a year of their lives out.

But there is certainly, again it would seem to me, probably a sense - probably useful for us to flag the idea of an affirmation of commitment style review as being a way forward. And that would then get to the multi-stakeholder bit into place but in a very, very clearly defined, you know, a one-year mandate to do just that -- a review with consultations built in. Thanks.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Thanks Martin. Sarah?

Sarah Falvey: So as Martin went on, he actually just hit all of my points. So I thought he might miss one or two but I completely agree with him, particularly that multi-stakeholder component because in Istanbul that's what we heard, right, that the CSC isn't multi-stakeholder.

And I don't think we necessarily want it to be but I think it does make sense that some piece of it needs to be multi-stakeholder. And so I do think that this also provides a good sort of safety valve to sort of keep the CSC operator focused but then it provides for some sort of multi-stakeholder oversight that doesn't at the same time create an MRT-like standing body.

Donna Austin: Thanks Sarah.

Stephanie Duchesneau: That makes sense. This is all useful input, and again I haven't delved too much into that draft document. That's probably going to be over this weekend. But I'll take that input in into that working group, that design team.

So do we want to move on to (unintelligible)?

Donna Austin: I'm sorry, Stephanie?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes?

Donna Austin: Staffan's got his hand up so I think he wants to (unintelligible). Sorry.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Oh sorry. Jump in.

Staffan Jonson: Yes, thank you. Just to stand in line concerning Martin's view that an affirmation of commitment's starting review model in some kind is of course the best way to not invent the wheel the second time. And again, that has been said many times now; that isolating the CSC as a minimal organization, et cetera. So most points are taken and I agree with them. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Thanks Staffan. So Stephanie, go ahead.

Stephanie Duchesneau: So do we want to move now into looking at the changes to the document?

Donna Austin: Yes I think so, unless anybody else has anything else they want to discuss before we do that. Okay, so Stephanie I think you can go.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Okay, sure thing. So on the first change, I stressed that the piece that has a charter because part of the Istanbul meeting it seemed fairly evident that at least the draft charter (unintelligible) this design team. So I don't think it changes the outcome but it's just the group that we have designated to be developing that charter.

Donna Austin: Yes, I agree.

Stephanie Duchesneau: So I had tried to - the second assertion which was an attempt to address the NTIA's point or the point that was made that we have to have the CSC be operational at the point of transition, I know we got some objection from Ashley about having that kind of handoff period.

I still think - I think the problem is more one of framing than of the fact that there's not (unintelligible) for these sort of conversations. This is just language to say that those conversations and appointment of representatives to the CSC, at least the minimum (unintelligible) (unintelligible) before the transition so that the body can be convened immediately when the stewardship is transitioned over.

Donna Austin: Yes, I don't know that Ashley necessarily had a problem with being involved in any kind of handover, but they had a concern about the word handover or handoff.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Right.

Donna Austin: Because it seemed to suggest that there was something physical that was being handed over. So I think...

Stephanie Duchesneau: Right. I changed it to transition over responsibilities, but I was trying to deal with the language. If people have a better suggestion of how that should be framed, I welcome input on that.

Staffan Jonson: Stephanie?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes?

Staffan Jonson: Staffan here. May I just here - on your first point, the one you stroke out, a working group will directly on a functions customer should be established/developed in short before the CC.

Actually, I had to insert this in the last discussion in the CWG meeting today. So maybe we could put it out there as a placeholder just for information. I have no problems in striking it out later on, but since it was obviously needed, the information, it might be worth keeping just for now.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes, my goal in striking it wasn't to suggest that it wasn't necessary input. It was just that it presumably is going to be developed by us somehow in the next ten days, so I'm not sure it's in the scope of responsibility for CSC that's going to be formed before the transition proposal is finalized.

As long as we have it on our past list, I'm not sure that it's fallen off the radar.

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Stephanie Duchesneau: But do you want (unintelligible) input on that?

Donna Austin: I mean if we're concerned about the reference to direct IANA Function customers, you we can just say, you know, "A Charter for the CSC will be established," and just leave it like that.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes.

Donna Austin: And you know, once it's available, we can actually change that to, "A charter for the CSC is being developed and is provided at X."

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes. Or I guess we can just reframe it now and say, rather than making the reference to the working group, say, you know, “A charter will be developed by the CSC. The CSC will follow a charter developed by a group of (unintelligible) customers,” rather than putting off the establishment of a working group to some future point.

Donna Austin: Yes, I would just say, “A charter for the CSC is being developed as part of, you know, the Design Team (unintelligible).”

Stephanie Duchesneau: So probably the most significant change is to the composition (unintelligible). And I was trying to account for comments out of the Istanbul meeting where it seemed unlikely that this group would be viable if there wasn't a liaison rule.

Are we comfortable with having liaisons in the CSC? It's difficult because there's so many divisions within the ICANN structure that - and assume that if we count the liaisons it's going to be a much bigger group than I think we had envisioned.

And then I also added the option of having an additional ccTLD and/or gTLD representative. And that goal was just to strike the balance because we wanted it to be a primarily customer group (sic) the second we introduced even just counting the GNSO as a singular body and not (unintelligible) stakeholder group.

The second we introduce liaisons, if we assume that liaisons have a full participation role, then it becomes outweighed and there's immediately more representatives than those other parts of the community than from the direct customers.

So I think that's something we should talk through a little bit now whether we're comfortable with having liaisons, what that role should look like, if it's complete participation or something more limited, and then how do we balance that out to that it's still a primarily customer body.

Donna Austin: Stephanie, it's Donna. So I just wanted to make the point that I changed your - you had one additional C and one additional gTLD representative. I changed that to one additional TLD representative.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Okay.

Donna Austin: CC or a G. That was take into account the comment that David Conrad made about somebody from IAB being there from Dot (Unintelligible)...

Stephanie Duchesneau: Mm-hm.

Donna Austin: ...and potentially, which would seem pretty silly, but someone from IANA potentially for (Dot Ink).

And also, you know, Dot Gov or (Dot Mil) or one of those as well.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Mm-hm.

Donna Austin: So I take that to me more neutral.

Another liaison thing, I don't - if we agree that the CSC is not going to vote in any way, then I don't have a concern about liaison. If we also agree that the CSC composition that you have to have necessary expertise to be a part of the CSC, then I don't have a problem with liaisons from other groups. But it's a balance to keep the numbers small enough to make the - to keep the CSC

effective and just doing that, you know, primarily monitoring role that they're going to be doing on a regular basis. So that would be my contribution.

Sarah and then Staffan.

Sarah Falvey: So this is Sarah, I just have two points or things to add.

One is I don't know if we want to mention this, but the other point that was brought up was whether or not the registry operators need to be from the ccNSO and the RySG. So we might just want to add a note saying, you know, that these can be any registry operators whether they participate in the ICANN process or not.

And I don't know how - I think there was some discussion on how the different groups would sort of select these representatives. But I think it's just a point of making that you don't need to have to participate through the formal internal ICANN process in order to sort of be nominated to this group.

And then Donna, I think you were hitting on it right as you were ending, but I just want to agree and maybe put a finer point on it. I think that the number of liaisons, as long as we keep it - the function is kept as we sort of have drafted here, I think that that's fine.

I do think we should put in a note that there is a criteria. So you know, we can have one liaison from all of these groups, but provided that the person that they put forward meets the qualifications. So we can have a GAC person but they have to be sort of technically focused or have an understanding of sort of the operations portion of this so that there's real value that's being added and not just more of like a monitoring sort of function.

And so I think as long as there is some sort of criteria for participating as a liaison, then I think, you know, as many liaisons - obviously you don't want hundreds - but I think hitting a bunch of these groups would be fine.

Donna Austin: Okay, thanks Sarah. I'm just going to mention we've got nine minutes. So Staffan and then Martin and then Bernie. Thanks.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you, yes. First of all, I want to echo the first point of it not necessary coming from within the ICANN sphere, so the registry agreements are of course much more than ICANN itself. But we might need to make a point of that in the text just remembering the different relations around.

When it comes to the other question, the first question about the role of liaisons, my take is that a liaison may be present in the room and that's about it. When we talk about finals for example, according to me at least, there should be no expectation of being paid for travel, et cetera, so liaisons are there for listening. And of course if there are good relations, they also can contribute with expertise, but a very defensive role. That's my take on it at least. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Thanks Staffan. Martin?

Martin Boyle: Thanks Donna. Well now I'm in a position of saying that everybody else has said everything I've wanted to say with one minor exception.

I just feel a little bit nervous about us turning around and saying the role of liaisons is such that they need to meet qualifications and technical focus. The last thing I want is -- and I can say this as the next GAC person -- somebody from the GAC who believes that are well-attuned with the technical functions and starting to tell everybody how it should be run. I could go down, you

know, through the different constituencies of the GNSO as well and ALAC to show that I'm not just getting at the GAC.

I actually see the role of liaisons as being our primary communications channel between the CSC and the other constituencies. As such, and you know, I'm not in the GNSO and I don't particularly follow the GNSO, but I would actually expect the Registry Stakeholder Group as a constituency at the GNSO to provide regular reports to the GNSO in the way that ccNSO and other CC gTLD members of the committee would also be expected to share information around their much wider communities.

You know, as it is at the moment, it would be possible that we have three registries from gTLD as full members and two as liaisons. I think that's actually, you know, sort of a bit too much of a risk. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Thanks Martin. So I think maybe we need to flush out what the liaison role might be. I just - make sure within the group we have a common understanding of what that is.

Stephanie, I'm going to go to Bernie and then I'll hand it back to you to kind of wrap up. Then we've only got five minutes left. Thanks Bernie.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you. Just a few comments.

I think it's wise to think very carefully about not providing mechanisms for hard and fast mechanisms for choosing ccTLDs. I fully agree and I think the CC will fully agree also that, you know, they don't need to be members of the ccNSO, and I think we've shown that with the CWG. But coming up with rules that will affect the ccNSO might be difficult.

The other thing on liaisons, I understand both sides of the equation. I will simply note that when we were having this discussion in RFP-3 everyone ended up thinking it was really a good idea or that there would be independent validation of the acceptability of candidates versus the requirements. I think for all of those of us who have been around ICANN long enough, we know that people get posted to these things sometimes for odd reasons.

Now I understand if they're just liaisons and they don't say anything it's less of an issue, but in this kind of a small group, especially if it doesn't vote, I would be careful about their being a significant split between the types of participants.

Anyway, just some thoughts for you. I don't want to take up the rest of the time.

Donna Austin: Thanks Bernie. Stephanie, did you want to go ahead?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes. No, I just wanted to suggest that so take a look at the language, and I put some other relevant blurb that addressed the points that people were bringing up in the Chat. But again, this is just like a first stab of taking into account the feedback that was received in Istanbul, so getting at it and I'll try and take a look.

And I think it has been a bit of a trip (unintelligible) liaison (unintelligible) partly because in our initial discussion we weren't sure whether we were going to have liaisons stay at all, and where, you know, (unintelligible) derived from.

But just to encourage folks to take a look at the language, and if there is things we feel are discussed to actually put it into the document.

Donna Austin: Okay, thanks Stephanie. I put it out in Chat, is there anyone that could take a stab at identifying what the expertise should be for somebody on the CSC? If we can just try to scope, you know, half a dozen bullet points and what criteria we would be looking for, I think that might be useful and would maybe provide some clarify when we start to talk about what expertise would be required. Sadly I don't think I have the expertise to scope that.

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

So I think moving forward, we need to - if you could all have a look at the document and provide any comments. As I said, I'm sorry that the changes that were made didn't come up as obvious in the document; I don't know why that is. So all have a look at the document.

I'll try to get started on a charter for the CSC and get that circulated. I think if we're working to a 10 April deadline, we're going to have to have this document wrapped up by Wednesday of next week. And I appreciate that some people are actually on holiday with Easter over the weekend.

Perhaps if we can have final drafts ready by Monday, so close out any comments on the current document that we have by Monday, and then we'll maybe do a call on Tuesday just to sign off and hand it over to the broader group.

Does that make sense to everybody?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Sounds ambitious, but.

Donna Austin: Yes I know, well this whole thing (unintelligible).

Stephanie Duchesneau: It's going to be a fun weekend for all of us.

Donna Austin: Yes, sorry about that guys.

Okay, so thanks for the call, I think it was useful. It's good that we're, you know, still mainly on the same page. We just have to fix up that liaison issue and also the periodic review.

So thanks for the call everybody and I guess we'll see you on the line. Thanks guys.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Thanks everyone.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you, very useful call.

END