ICANN

Moderator: Brenda Brewer
April 8, 2015
9:00 am CT

Coordinator: Recordings have been started. You may go ahead.

Donna Austin: Okay, thank you. Donna Austin for the record. Thank you everyone for joining. We only have an hour for this call, so what I would like to do is go through the Customer Standing Committee charter. I think I've included most comments that were received on it, and some input or some feedback from Bart about some additional stuff that I should be providing.

The version that we have up on the screen includes Stephanie's most recent comments, but it actually has everybody's input as well. So we'll just go through it as best we can, and see if we can just kind of - I guess just as a general comment, has everybody had a - I doubt that everybody's had a chance to read Stephanie's comments.

But did everybody get a chance to read the version prior to that? Okay, Martin says yes. All righty, so let's just work through this. Does anybody have any overarching comments about the document itself? Are people happy with the direction we're going? Is there anything that seems to be obviously missed? Staffan, go ahead.

Staffan Jonson: Well I just want to - I promised the Design Team to get back with some rather central issues as well before Friday, and I hope we might conclude that in this meeting as well today if possible. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Okay, thanks, Staffan. We'll make sure there's some time for that. Stephanie, do you want to go ahead?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Likewise, a couple of my additions come from language that's inserted into the current draft for Design Team N, but that's under a lot of flux. We have a call today, so I might be updating specifically my sections, my additions, and that's on the basis of that conversation.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Stephanie. I guess one of the concerns I have about it what design team is the overriding design team? Because if we may not agree with something that's in Design Team M or Design Team O, can we counter that in some way? I guess it's just a question to be put on the side for now.

So David Conrad is also on the call. So David and I had some back and forth yesterday about - David has raised this issue before, and we've covered it in the scope of responsibilities, and also in the other recommendations.

So we've got that the CSC is also expected, on an annual basis, to undertake a consultation with the IANA functions operator, ccTLD and gTLD registry operators, the ICANN community, about performance of IANA. The consultation is also expected to include any changes to the IANA services that are underway or anticipated in the future.

So David's undertaking a project at the moment which will change the key signing process that is undertaken by IANA at the moment, and he wondered whether that was something we could include in our documentation. So...

Man: Donna, you're breaking up.

Donna Austin: That we would like to keep the remit of the CSC reasonably narrow. But there might be the ability to provide for the CSC to create committees to do further work that comes out of those annual reviews. So I'll get David to talk to that once we've been through the full document. So I just wanted to give you all a heads up. Can you hear me now?

Man: Yes, we can hear you now, Donna.

Donna Austin: Okay. Sorry about that. I am on the phone, so it's not the Internet which is (unintelligible). So I guess let's just work through the mission. Stephanie, I have - the qualifier that you've put in the third paragraph, I do have concerns about, because we don't - we haven't defined what a serious or persistent performance deficiency is.

So I think I'd like to discuss how others feel about that. I can't remember what the previous language was, but it wasn't as prescriptive, I suppose. So do others have a view on - so Stephanie's new changes, I think, are the purple, are in purple. Martin?

Martin Boyle: Thanks, Donna. I think - correct me if I'm getting the wrong bit, but it's the bit that says the CSC is not mandated to initiate a change in the IANA functions operator.

Donna Austin: Correct.

Martin Boyle: Is that right? (Unintelligible).

Donna Austin: That's the correct piece I'm talking about, Martin.

Martin Boyle: Good, okay. I'm not clear about the CSC initiating a community process. And I picked this up in a comment I put in under the scope of responsibilities where we were looking at how do we deal with something where the IANA functions operator is just refusing to put things right.

And it seemed to me, when I thought through that, that what we've got to look for is the CSC working with the IANA functions operator to address issues and try to remedy those issues. But it seems to me that the group itself, a very small group, shouldn't be the group to unilaterally decide that it is going to escalate issues.

So the CSC, I don't think should initiate a community process, but rather should refer issues up to the ccNSO and the GNSO for those councils then to decide whether further action is warranted; and if so, what action that should be.

That in part, in my mind, is triggered by work of the CCWG where they're looking at processes that then would be - accountability processes that would be initiated by two SOs working together. And it seems to me that, you know, this would then be the case that the two SOs working together would then raise one of the processes, whether it be sacking the board, or whether it be turning down the budget or whatever, at that stage. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Martin. So Staffan, I'll go to you and then I'll come back to what Martin just said. Thanks.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. Well I have two reflections on this, taking up after where Martin stopped. So if I didn't write, I perceive that the CSC would be a trigger, but just triggering things that get decided by others. That's how I perceive this process.

This has to be in (unintelligible) (TM) as well, what exactly are the triggers. And I'm not sure we have gotten that far yet, but at least we're starting in describing processes for going ahead, initiating change, so it's the same.

Another idea would - in correlation with Stephanie's proposal is that once we started with - and this is a general problem actually. In her text it says, in the event of serious and persistent performance deficiencies, the CSC may et cetera.

And then we start the discussion. Okay, so what is a persistent performance deficiency? What is the actual definition of it? So if we could avoid to insert new complicated terms, I think we all gain from it. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Staffan. So that was some of my concern with introduction of serious and persistent performance deficiencies, because we haven't defined what that is. So I'm reluctant to put anything in the charter that would kind of raise the question, well what is it? And until such time as we define it, it's going to be hard to answer.

Just going back to Martin's point, so Martin, rather than initiate a community process, perhaps what I had started to do throughout the rest of the document was you had suggested that things be referred up to the ccNSO and GNSO.

So perhaps the step is to send it up to the ccNSO and GNSO, and we could get around it that way. That's notwithstanding anything that comes out of the CCWG work. So there may be another body that could possibly be referred to, but for the time being we don't know what that is.

(Kurt), did you have - I saw your hand up and now it's gone down. Did you have a comment? (Kurt), we can't hear you. (Kurt), if you're talking, we can't hear you.

Man: He said let it go in the chat.

Donna Austin: Okay. Sorry, (Kurt). Martin?

Martin Boyle: Thanks, Donna. Yeah, your proposal, I think, suits me. And to some extent, the referencing up, by the CSC, might be a way of overcoming the issues of the CSC having to decide what is a serious and persistent performance deficiency. It now becomes for the ccNSO and the GNSO and wider consultations to decide whether things have gone that far.

Frankly I think that by the time the CSC refers anything up to the ccNSO or GNSO to resolve, we've already got to quite a serious part. There is something going wrong in this case beyond - a dialogue of the depth between the CSC and the IANA functions operator is probably counter-productive. But it would allow us to modify the wording accordingly here. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Okay. Thanks, Martin. Stephanie, we haven't heard from you. Do you have real concerns if we take out the...

Stephanie Duchesneau: No. I think when I inserted this it was in advance of having reviewed the later part about reference up to the ccNSO and GNSO. My

inclination in putting it in was just to make sure that there was - we see the CSC in this mission statement doing the day-to-day monitoring.

But in the case that there was something more serious or something that couldn't be resolved through those processes that it is clear that there is some sort of - it can act as (unintelligible) to - even if it's not handling these bigger issues on its own, to at least be refereeing them and handling them through some mechanism.

Donna Austin: Thanks. So I think the language that was in there was that however in the event that service level targets are not being met to the satisfaction of the CSC, that the CSC has the authority to engage with the IANA functions operator to remedy the errors of performance. Oh, that's wrong. I don't know. I will have to go back and review what the language was before. I'm a little bit confused right now.

Okay, so I think we've agreed that we need to fix a couple of things in the mission statement. Is there anything else that needs to go in the mission - I am conscious of what I discussed with David Conrad yesterday. We might want to introduce that into the mission statement as well. But I'm just not sure yet because we don't have language.

Okay, so I think we'll move through the scope of responsibilities. Now the newest stuff in here is in purple from Stephanie. Stephanie, do you want to speak to - I know you mentioned the periodic review stuff, but do you want to speak to the one, two, three, fourth paragraph?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes, so my initial inclination was to just make clear that even though the CSC can serve as a body for addressing performance issues, that it isn't going to prevent the ability of registry operators to do so themselves.

But then I was wondering whether if we have all of these issues being addressed on a one-on-one basis between registries and the IANA functions operator, whether there might be a value to the CSC getting some - even if it's just a statistical measurement of how these complaints are being handled in the one-on-one interactions, because it does seem like some - like a critical component of performance, and being able to track how IANA is performing, and ensure that when stuff is being handled directly by registry operators that that, too, is being resolved, and being resolved on a timely basis.

Donna Austin: Staffan?

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. Well I don't think I have a problem with the added text, but the more general terms I'm considering if we make the text too long, if we put in too much. So the general criticism was that this proposal was too complicated and, between the line, too long. So maybe remarks like this might be in an annex. I'm not sure.

But considering the format of the text per se, we might put - in general terms, I mean, put text in annex as well -- make it more precise, what we actually mean by principle sentences. Thank you.

Donna Austin: I have a tendency to agree with that, Staffan. And in my mind, the reporting on individual cases should be picked up in service level targets. So in my mind that kind of reporting is already covered in the first (unintelligible) scope of responsibilities.

And I would say that in developing a charter, this is something that I haven't done before. And my initial thinking is that the intent is to keep it lean, and not provide too much detail. That way you don't have to - if you have minor

changes, you don't have to go back and forth to keep going through a process to change it. Martin?

Martin Boyle: Thanks, Donna. Martin here. Yeah, I certainly take the point about trying to keep the document short. But I would actually also flag up that I'm getting increasingly concerned about the way, in particular, some of the other teams expect us to be writing something for the CSC that is almost exclusively based on resolving problems and complaints from registry operators.

And I really do not think that that is the role of the CSC, and I certainly wouldn't want to see that as being the principal role of the CSC. You know, it should be something that has to be addressed somehow, obviously.

But I don't want the CSC having to judge on particular cases, and certainly not as the (unintelligible) proposal seems to be suggesting, that we start taking serious action against the IANA functions operator on the basis of a half-hearted assessment of the issues concerned. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Martin. I tend to agree. Staffan?

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. Yes, I agree as well, Martin. And this is maybe one of the main reasons why we sooner or later have to assume there is a second level of appeal or other forms of multi-stakeholder representation; that sooner or later you have to decide, if we assume (MRT) or not. And that makes a difference. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Okay, thanks. I'm sorry, I just need to ask a question. I see we've got an Alain Durand in participants, but I'm not sure who that is.

David Conrad: Donna, (unintelligible). He reports to me, works for me. Yeah.

Donna Austin: Okay. Thanks, David. Sorry. Okay, so I think what we've agreed here is that perhaps we take out the text that Stephanie's provided or reduce it somewhat, but potentially keep it for the recommendations document that we have.

So Stephanie, to the text about the periodic reviews, I know you mentioned this at the start of the call. But could you just provide us a little bit more context to that? I'm kind of interested that there might be another group saying the CSC should initiate periodic reviews. Thanks.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yeah. I mean honestly I did move to the baseline for what I've seen in Design Team N, so I'm not sure where other people stand on how the interviews should be initiated.

My thought wasn't that the CSC would be carrying out the interviews, but just kind of triggering the process to then be carried out whether it's kind of community working group or a different review team. But (unintelligible) disagree. I think that's something that is going to be up for discussion in the call later today.

Donna Austin: Yeah. I mean I haven't given a lot of thought to this, but I'm not sure that I agree that in terms of the periodic review that that should be under the remit of the CSC. Does anybody else have any thoughts on that? I know it's something that we haven't discussed. Martin?

Martin Boyle: Thanks, Donna. Martin here. Yeah, I agree with you that we've got a small team of volunteers. Initiating a periodic review seems to me to be overloading the team that is supposed to be very much operations focused.

And therefore if we can kick back on the periodic reviews - which I think probably really ought to be community initiated anyway -- so ccNSO, GNSO

initiating, using an affirmation of commitment sort of review process -- would be the best way of dealing with it. But yes, the more we can do to avoid it coming here, the better, as far as I'm concerned. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Martin. Staffan?

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. Yeah, as I said before, it depends on if any other organization can pick up this function or not. So it is a hypothetical question. I think we need to keep it as a placeholder since (unintelligible) group discussing it, but maybe in brackets or something. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Okay. I agree, Staffan, that keeping it in brackets is a good idea, because it is something that somebody has to pick up. I agree with Martin that perhaps it's the ccNSO and GNSO. But let's keep it there as a placeholder.

                  David, I wanted to come back to you. Have you had any additional thought about that text that you were considering including with regard to the annual consultation?

David Conrad: Hi, Donna. Can people hear me?

Donna Austin: Hi, David. Yep.

David Conrad: Okay, good. Yeah, so I actually did, with the 0.4 charter, I have made a couple of edits. I haven't sent them in yet, because I wanted to actually think about them a little bit more.

                  But basically in the mission, I had suggested to add a clause where - in the current document, so the CSC is not mandated to initiate a change in the IANA functions operator. However, in the event that service level targets are

not being met to the satisfaction of the CSC, or changes are necessary to meet technological or environmental changes in the Internet, the CSC has the authority (unintelligible).

And then in the scope of responsibilities, in the last paragraph, I added the CSC is also expected to, on an annual demand or as needs - upon an annual basis or its needs demand, essentially at the bottom in that section I added in the event a change in IANA services are anticipated, the CSC is empowered to establish an ad hoc committee of technical and/or other experts to oversee the changes.

And the intent of all of that is to cover the cases where the Internet technology or a situation has evolved, and there needs to be some change in the IANA services.

Currently NTIA performs an oversight function to ensure that those changes do not have negative impact on architecture of the root system as a whole. And the intent here is to have some analog of that in the post-NTIA future. And I'll send those changes to you as soon as possible.

Donna Austin: Thanks, David. Does anybody have any questions to David on that? Or does it seem reasonable? I see Staffan and then Martin. Well maybe just Martin, because Staffan's hand's just gone down.

Martin Boyle: Thanks, Donna. Martin Boyle here. I wasn't sure I properly followed David's second comment. It sounded a bit to me like he was suggesting retaining the authorization function on the basis of something that I never properly appreciated the NTIA doing as part of its authorization function.

So I don't know whether that's something that David could sort of perhaps enlarge on. It's just I'm not feeling very happy with the idea of introducing an authorization function, certainly not introducing it here, and in particular not putting it through as a role for the CSC. Thank you.

Donna Austin: David, do you want to respond?

David Conrad: Sure, sure. For clarification, usually when - at least in the context of DT - Design Team (B), the authorization function was the role performed by NTIA to authorize changes to its own content.

What I'm talking about here is a separate role that NTIA performs that provides oversight to ensure that technological changes that are being proposed to the root system -- for example, the deployment of DNSSEC -- are done in a way that will not negatively impact the operation of the Internet as a whole.

So, you know, for example, right now we're in the process of figuring out how to roll the root key to change - update the root DNS (unintelligible) the Internet as a whole.

And the process by which we do that -- the root management partners, Verisign, ICANN and (unintelligible) - the way we do that is to propose a change to NTIA, and NTIA maps that change to an internal process that we happen to know includes the involvement of (unintelligible) technology to verify the technological changes being done, in a way that, you know, meets the US government's view of the (unintelligible) standards.

So the idea here is that, you know, with NTIA no longer participating in that role, there would need to be somebody that would ensure that that same level

of oversight of changes that are being proposed by, you know, say the (IETF) or other entities, is being implemented in a prudent and responsible way.

And the idea that I'm proposing within the context of the charter document is that while the CSC is not empowered to provide oversight of those changes itself, it's empowered to create an ad hoc committee of technical experts - technical and other experts, who would be able to provide the necessary oversight to ensure that those changes that are being proposed are done in a prudent and responsible way. Hope that clarifies that.

Donna Austin: Thanks, David. Staffan?

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. Yeah, this is a really tricky one, because on the one hand we do want the functions to be upgradable. And of course key rollovers is an important process in itself. On the other hand, is this essential for the development of the CSC?

I understand that it would be a good idea to have someone to lean against, saying you're the one deciding to go ahead or not with this. But is it a path of the overview process? I'm not sure really. The question is maybe, who should otherwise do it if not the CSC? And that is a more difficult question.

But if - it may be good to have drawn, then absolutely necessary for the process. I'm not sure. But I tend to walk away and think, do we absolutely need this within the CSC or not? It's an open question. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Staffan. I think, you know, part of what you said there is, you know, if it's not within the CSC, then where? I'm not sure there's any other place to put it right now. But certainly we - perhaps it might be best to wait and see what David's text is, and then we can discuss it some. Martin?

Martin Boyle: Thanks, Donna. Yeah. Thanks, David. That was actually helpful. But if I understand what you're saying correctly, you're saying it wouldn't necessarily be possible to use the regular, the annual, meeting, but rather that you look towards developing an ad hoc meeting process that would then look at this particular activity, and just building - and we were looking at including in the regular meetings reference to technical developments and changed.

But it would seem to me that for something like this, it's not necessary to do through the CSC, but rather that is something that the IANA functions operator could initiate the process that leads to the modification development of or the introduction of new technical developments in the process, in which case, you know, perhaps it's a very simple reference to the role of the IANA functions operator to consult widely when it's doing something that changes, rather than that being something else that comes into the CSC for action. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Martin. So I think in the interest of time, you know, we still have some indecision amongst us about whether this should sit within the CSC. And I agree. But I think that if you look at that paragraph that we have in the charter already, I think there's an element there that's missing. And that's the question of, well as a result of the consultation that you have, what happens next?

And to me what David is talking about, that is if there is a consultation that discusses new things like DNSSEC, or the changeover to key signing, then there has to be a logical next step. And in my mind, that would be that the CSC has the ability to create a committee, technical committee, that will go off and do the work, and then, you know, that could come back and be run

through the CSC, and perhaps through the ccNSO and GNSO as kind of the end stop.

So let's move on from this, because - and we'll wait until we see David's language on this. So thank you, David, for that.

Down to composition. So I think - okay, I don't want to speak for everybody. But I think we're reasonably comfortable where this is. I know Martin had some concerns about the GNSO. And it looks like that, you know, gTLD registries will get a bigger chunk of the pie potentially than ccTLD registries. But there's a reverse argument to that Martin in that the GNSO is not just gTLD registries. It's a much larger body.

And what we're trying to capture here is the ability to appoint a liaison from that broader GNSO group.

Martin?

Martin Boyle: Yes. I think my concern here is that just because the GNSO has got that wide remit the idea is that you then appoint people from the GNSO when exactly the points that you referred to are all dealt with by ccTLDs as well.

So, you know, ccTLDs have relations with their local IT constituencies, their local business users and so on and so forth.

And I guess part of my concern is that you start to open up what is a technical function related to the managements of root zone file and you risk then having additional criteria being put onto registries because of the vested interest of this little group of people.

Now I'm not going to die in the ditch over this one but I do - did notice in one of my comments that you could have four people from the GNSO side of the ICANN communities compared with just two ccTLDs one of whom not might well be a member of the ccNSO.

And it just concerns me ending up with a bit of a lack of balance just because the community is in place in ICANN. Yes but it's in place for different reasons. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Thanks Martin. Staffan?

Staffan Jonson: Okay, thank you. Again it isn't the liaison is a substitute actually for a multi-stakeholder representation? And again maybe this is the place for a placeholder as long as we don't know if there will be an MRT involved.

I think this is the third time I say it today and I think there are actually three things to that are dependent on the existence of an MRT or not. So and by formally appointing liaisons I'm not sure that that will help actually in the formal way either. I again prefer a very small organization. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Thanks Staffan. Stephanie ?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes. I just wanted to put on the record that I support Donna argument on this particular point.

And with respect to what the mandate for the CSC is I feel pretty strongly that non-registry GNSO representatives it's not the same as having a gTLD registry operator representative.

I think that the balance between the ccNSO and the - or the ccTLD operators and the gTLD operators refers to where you have actual registry operators sitting on the body.

Donna Austin: Yes. I agree. And Martin I would say that we should take the GAC liaison out if we take the GNSO liaison out because genuinely the ccs are aligned with their governments. That's right isn't it? Just kidding. Yes Staffan I was just kidding. Staffan did you have something?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Okay...

Staffan Jonson: Sorry no.

Donna Austin: Okay thanks. So I think Martin if you're not going to die in a ditch, you know, over it we'll leave the GNSO in there. I take Staffan's point that perhaps there's a placeholder around this liaison piece because we don't know whether there's going to be an MRT.

But my feeling is is that composition as we have it now is probably good for the CSC. I've added some text in here around the selection process. And I did kind of do a bit of cut and paste from the SSAC document that they have. Because I think what I have there is probably reasonable but I would be interested in the thoughts of others.

Okay. Because nobody's saying anything I'll take it all as brilliant.

The other thing I would say is that I'm not sure whether the selection process actually fits within the charter or whether that fits in somewhere else. So perhaps that's another placeholder as well.

Stephanie did you I see - you've got some - is that new text in there? Did you want to speak to that?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes. So all I wanted to emphasize because I know it's come up at a lot of different points in the conversation is that even if it is the ccNSO and the Registry Stakeholder Group that are selecting the representatives that you're not required to participate in these groups to be a member or be a liaison of the CSC.

I know are trying to cut down on detail for this but I actually think it's a pretty important point and it's kind of different points in the wider CWG discussions that they shouldn't just be ccNSO and Registry Stakeholder Group representatives across the board.

Donna Austin: Yes agreed. And I know that language was in here previously so I might have inadvertently taken it out.

So I think we'll move on to terms and Staffan I see that, you know, perhaps the selection process could be described in an annex and that's possible.

The only thing I worry about is that any changes to the charter has to go through a formal process. So that's why I had that question about, what's in and what's out so often.

So I suggested that CSC appointments before I don't really know because Stephanie said something over the top of it.

But I think the idea was that the initial CSC would be in place for two years. Half of that would disappear after a year in order to stagger but it looks like

Stephanie has suggested for a two-year purple. So Stephanie did you just want to comment on that?

Stephanie Duchesneau:	I changed up the numbers a little bit probably just because I think if we're setting a pretty high bar for who is eligible or encouraged to participate that and at least on the gTLD Registry operator side a lot of this expertise is going to come from a pretty small number of backend providers that if we introduce a requirement that representatives are turning over every year and there's only one possible term renewal that we're actually going to get to the point of having a hard time filling these seats pretty quickly.

And I think there's other ways that we can address this. We could have more than one possible renewal of a term or extension of a term or we could make it, you know, a reselection process where the same person can come out of it.

But my language was introduced with out of concern about whether we were going to run out of people to fill these seats pretty quickly at the maximum time and an individual person could sit in the position was for two years.

Donna Austin:	Okay. I see Martin agrees and I tend to agree as well. So maybe after 12 months the CSC will decide that they're just going to outsource all of this because it's not worth the effort. But we can't decide that here.

So I think are we all okay that the terms so as we have them now is Stephanie update is good? I'll take that as a yes.

So I'm conscious that I want to get to the - give Staffan the opportunity to report about the escalation process.

So meetings I'm - any comments on meetings? I've not mentioned the travel funding issue. I think we just stay mute on that for this document? Okay.

Recording of proceedings, does that seem reasonable? If I don't see any hands go up I'll just assume that people are comfortable with the language.

Secretariat? Okay seems good. And review, I think that's the final piece, yes and what we've suggested for review.

Bart Boswinkel: Donna this is Bart. It's with regard to the secretariat is do you really want the IANA performance operated to do it assuming or do you want to make it more general as ICANN?

Because this if it's the IANA performance operator and if it's say currently IANA department it's you expand it and then you have the liaison it's becomes very how would I say it...

Donna Austin: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: ...unclear.

Donna Austin: I understand what you're saying. So in our minds I think the IANA functions operator is ICANN. But if we want to change that to ICANN I have no objection to that. Does anybody else?

(Greg) is typing. Martin?

Martin Boyle: Thanks Donna. I can see big advantages of the secretariat being somebody who is directly employed in the IANA functions operator's office.

And also provides the first point of contact between the IANA functions operator and the CSC.

When you go out to ICANN more generally then bearing in mind there's a certain degree of separation between ICANN and the IANA functions operator, it then looks to me like you'll have one person providing the secretariat function and somebody else who has to be the liaison point between the IANA functions operator and CSC.

But it's only marginal but it's something I would prefer to see the IANA function operator if possible.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes it's more about these say you put a lot of pressure on IANA liaison if he's going to be play both the secretariat role and act as a point of contact because one is administrative and the other one is acting as counterpart of almost of the CSC?

Donna Austin: So I think Martin's point is a good one. I also understand where Bart is coming from. But I think the way we have the language at the moment the IANA functions operator does mean ICANN at this point in time where we refer to the IANA function, where we are referring to the IANA department.

And I think that's been pretty clear throughout the CWG that where the IANA functions operator is stated that means ICANN.

Bart Boswinkel: Okay.

Donna Austin: So (Bernie) suggested that David might have a view on this. David do you? You've got 20 seconds because we need to get to Staffan's stuff.

David Conrad: Not at this point. I probably do but I would need to think about it a bit more. Okay thanks. Sorry I think, you know, at the end of the day this is this will go for public comment so if we don't think it's a really big issue for this group we'll just leave it as it is.

So the review, are people comfortable with the review items? I did have one question should - where we say ratified by the ccNSO and GNSO should that be the ccNSO and GNSO councils? Martin I see you have your hand up.

Martin Boyle: Thanks Donna. Yes I must admit the idea of giving the CSC an annual exam seems to be a little bit heavy. I think in the first case if the CSC is performing poorly then it would be up to the ccNSO and the Registry Stakeholder Group to take their reps aside and tell them to improve their performance.

I'm not got any great issues on it. It's just the fact that, you know, yes another bloody review process and we've got enough of these in ICANN already. And people are paying less and less attention to them.

Therefore that is to say, you know, perhaps every four years, five years but more importantly I guess would be that if we're doing a say five year review of the IANA functions operation that CSC would be reviewed as part of that as being part of sort of a total monitoring process. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Okay thanks Martin. Does anybody else have any comments on that? You don't hear anything because I was on mute. I'm really sorry. So what I suggested is perhaps we separate the review of the charter from the review of the performance of the CSC.

The review of the performance of the CSC can be done every three years, perhaps the charter on a as needs basis. Okay hearing no objections we'll go

with that. So I think Staffan I'm really sorry that we've got a short amount of time but did you want to speak to...

Staffan Jonson: Yes please.

Donna Austin: Thank you. Go ahead.

Staffan Jonson: So if we roll down in the document to the heading called Process for Remedial Actions in the CSC this is concentrated version of the design team and as an escalation. So this is actually the proposal being put forward by the Design Team M.

If you see red the text don't matter them too much. That's actually my argument within the group. And I pasted it in here just to show that this is unresolved issue still or and the text that is presented for you, rather the processes that is the idea from the time team and on how escalation should take place.

And it is high time to bridge what is expected from different design teams also in this issue. So if you look at the document itself you will see just below there are three processes in this - envisioned in this. And it's a root zone emergency. It's a customer service complaint for solution process. It's a problem management escalation process.

And this is what is being put forward. And you may be if you had time - if you didn't have time to read it you might see that the first root zone emergency that is really short-term issues, really important ones.

The second one is medium time, medium inside or meantime urgency where the customers may complain about a process. And the third one is in systematic, you know, problems, et cetera.

So the question I want a specific answer to is the second one what that is called a customer service complaint resolution process. And the original one was had the wording a process for anyone with a complaint about the IANA services. And my question is who should be allowed, who should be standing to initiate complaints within this process?

I change it from anyone to direct customers of a IANA operator. And maybe I am too hard on who is being let into the process but this is a little difficult question for me to resolve by my own in that group.

This was not a taken very - this was not a very popular proposal but I gather we have - maybe have a difference here and I need to hear your view on it. So in the first process it is before it's initiated to the CSC. Second process it is defining the step one in a step to. And the CSC is engaged per step two of the second process.

And my argument was that since CSC is involved in second level then we need to again remind that not anyone has standing to initiate problems within the root zone but just the ones in the CSC or do you agree with this or not? Martin?

Martin Boyle: Thanks Staffan. As will be seen by the number of comments that's - I put in on this I have serious problems with this part of with the remedial action procedures in total.

Firstly, I don't think the CSC has got any role in root zone emergency except perhaps to look and check and ask why the emergency happened at the end of an event. The customer service complaint resolution process I think is between that particular customer and the IANA functions operator.

And any big issues of that would be the issues addressed by a separate design team, the one that is looking at whether there's a role for an independent appeals process.

There is one missing. The next one would be the monitoring of performance and the deterioration of the performance, the quality of the performance or the timeliness of the performance of changes.

And that - and it's only that last one that I would see that if the performance got completely out of hand you would then need to go to a problem management escalation process because it's only that one where you have critical persistent or systemic failures of the IANA service.

And so I think that there is a lot of crossing out to be done here. And I think that this should be a fairly robust offense as to why the CSC would not see its role as getting between the IANA functions operator and sorting out any problem that has come up or as sticking its nose into the business of another registry. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Staffan did you want to respond to Martin? And just...

Staffan Jonson: Sorry I wasn't - sorry I was on mute.

Donna Austin: Oh, okay.

Staffan Jonson: Just before asking you about this just to be clear the CSC wouldn't be engaged until the end of the second process called the customer complaint process, the customer service complaint resolution process.

So the CC would not being engaged at all in the first process as perceived by the proposal. And the CSC would be engaged and active engaged first in the third process called problem management escalation process just so you understand the idea. I see you have your hand up Martin. Please go ahead. And then if I could have some input from others as well? Thank you.

Martin Boyle: The customer service complaint resolution process I welcome what you just said. But that's not actually with written down here in that 2A CSC decides to take action or not, B CSC to mediate, C CSC to assign and D CSC to decide whether an issue is a problem.

So I think the CSCs are getting rather drawn into that as a process considering more than I would want to see it's drawn in. I say again that that is an issue between that registry and the IANA functions operator. And I think it is inappropriate for the customer service committee which is looking at service in general not to get involved in a customer dispute processes. Thanks.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. May I just ask you on this that should all in information society as a general be able to insert views in the second process or should it just be defined to the members of the CSC? Who should have the right the standing to initiate issues with the CSC? Thank you. Donna please?

Donna Austin: So I think Staffan if we go back to our charter and also our recommendations we do agree that the CSC may receive complaints from registry operators. And what we've said is can't act as an intermediary in attempt to resolve complaints.

So I don't think - I certainly don't support the idea of mediation because I don't think the CSCs will be qualified to do that. I do agree that it should be direct customers only that can raise a complaint with the CSC. But I'm - I think I share most of Martin's concerns.

So the CSC is not a mediator. I don't know whether it's valid that the CSC should assign a mediator because Martin's right, if the registry operator is - has already gone through a process with through the IANA complaints itself then it could just be form shopping somebody else to, you know, help them out I suppose in a dispute.

So we need to be careful that the CSC is not seen as a dispute resolution provider because that's not its role. It's about performance. So I think I share Martin's concerns.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. And I see no other hands so I guess we have some kind of consensus of not being too happy about what is proposed in the Design Team M. And then we have the issue of actually going back and signaling this.

I promise to do that before Friday meeting and I'll do it today or tomorrow. And I'm not sure how to handle this in a constructive way though. But maybe we should draw from some comments to the DTM.

I'm not sure but I also share your concerns that it was expressed both by Martin and Donna. And I just couldn't put it down in printing and maybe not totally either at the time but in - by intuition itself wrong the proposal per se.

So in some way we need to communicate our concerns about this. And I'll - maybe I'll draft something it's - some kind of response for the DTM so we

take this further. And if we have diverging views that's okay as long as we can be precise about what diverging views are about.

So let me get back to you with a - some written comment on the DTM proposal and try - I'll try to be constructive. That's - it's the best forward maybe. Donna please?

Donna Austin: Yes. I was just going to suggest Staffan if you could, you know, provide a draft response, post it to the list and for others to provide input and that's probably the best way forward. So I'd like to wrap this up at ten after the hour if we can so we've got three minutes. Martin...

Staffan Jonson: Thank you.

Donna Austin: ...or Staffan sorry.

Staffan Jonson: No sorry, that was my most acute question can we accept this as a whole or do we challenge the main structure of it? And actually we do. So that's was my urgent question. So please go ahead Martin.

Martin Boyle: Thanks Staffan. Yes I think as I said earlier on this the main role that we see to the CSC in ensuring the IANA functions operator stays up to scratch IE, monitoring the performance and remediation - remedial action on performance that's the bit that's completely missing from this section.

So if you want to be positive then I think you could go back and make very clear to them that this is - has to be that clear and direct role of this committee.

I would also though because I've looked at the Sidley input and it seems to me that their views on the customer Standing Committee seem to be very much more in line with the views of the Design Team M then on mine.

And therefore I'd think it like to get this automatic kickback on that. You probably will wish to at least read if you haven't already the bottom of Page 6 of the Sidley input. Thanks.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. Okay Donna?

Donna Austin: Thanks Staffan. So I think from the sense of the call I think we're pretty comfortable with the charter. We have some changes that need to be made so I'll work with Bart's notes and try to get that out if not by the end of today at least by tomorrow morning.

So I'll do that. We still had the recommendations document which is the other document. And I think we still need a little bit of work to do on that. (Bernie) or Bart can you - I know there's a template that we're supposed to be providing information in and ours doesn't conform to that. Can either of you just kind of give us a blast on what the expectation is for what we should be providing by Friday?

Bart Boswinkel: (Bernie)?

Bernie Turcotte: All right I'll take the hot potato. I think as I said prior...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I was away for a week.

Bernie Turcotte: Yes that's it. There is this format for rather shorter recommendations. I think in the case of the CSC it doesn't necessarily fall into that. And I would not like this group to get stuck on format. So between myself and Bart we'll work out something. So Donna don't worry about it, our job to take care of this so it makes sense for everyone.

Donna Austin: Okay. Thanks everybody for your contributions. As I said I'll try to provide a clean of the charter by tomorrow morning at the latest. David if you could provide your input sometime today that would be great.

David Conrad: Will do.

Donna Austin: I think we've still got a couple of placeholders in this that we probably need to finalize discussion on the list on Thursday if we can by the end of the day Thursday and the recommendations document so I'll go back through that again.

And if - I don't know the last time anybody looked at that document but if you could take a look today and provide any input that you think is required that would be terrific as well. So thank you everybody and enjoy the rest of your day.

Bart Boswinkel: Donna, just one question. Do you want to have one more call or not before say submissions for example on Friday?

Donna Austin: What's the sense of a group?

Man: Yes.

Donna Austin: Yes? So I think tomorrow is going to be too early so it would have to be...

Bart Boswinkel: Friday.

Donna Austin: ...Friday. So (Brenda) can send around the Doodle poll or Grace for Friday? Grace you've got your hand up?

Grace Abuhamad: Yes. This is Grace. So I just want to check in about Friday. It looks like there that based on the overlaps between the groups it looks like there is only a few slots on Friday that will work for everyone. So we'll send a Doodle poll out but I can just let you know now that it's something it's either between 12 - or 12 to 14 UTC or after 14 UTC.

Donna Austin: Okay.

Grace Abuhamad: I think that's manageable. I think it still gives you a lot of different times that are possible but I just want to let you know in advance that it's a lot of groups are trying meet on Friday too.

Donna Austin: Okay things Grace. So if you can send around a doodle poll and we'll get onto that.

Grace Abuhamad: Sure, okay.

Donna Austin: Okay thanks everybody.

Man: Thank you. Bye-bye.

END