**ICANN**

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer**
**April 8, 2015**
**1:00 pm CT**

Grace Abuhamad: All right, while we're waiting for confirmation on that end I'm going to go ahead and go full screen in the Adobe Room and...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Grace Abuhamad: And let me know if this is better. I mean I think most of you are in the document anyway right?

Avri Doria: I am.

Grace Abuhamad: Okay. So I'll just follow along with you in case anyone doesn't want...

Avri Doria: Okay.

Grace Abuhamad: ...to be in the document.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks.

I don't know if we have everybody that just dialed in.

Grace Abuhamad: We don't have anyone just on dial. Greg's the only one who's on the phone connection.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible).

Grace Abuhamad: And the recordings are started so you're all set.

Avri Doria: Thanks.

So here we are DTN. It's the last week. This is our first meeting. But, you know, there has been work ongoing.

I really want to thank Stephanie who has done, you know, the lion's share of the writing and has contributed quite a bit of text that hopefully we could go through.

What I did Stephanie was accept all of the text that she put in so that it was all visible. And I haven't made any changes to it that I know of.

What I did do also though is start going through it and started put in some tentative answers in a table. So maybe we want to go to the table just to see where we're at and then go back.

I haven't found also any extra reviews that we had to add based on the what was it, is my TE, the SSAC 69 document.

So now the table shows up I guess it's on 3, no Page 4. And what I tried to do today and I just tried to start by taking stabs at it and we could just look at

partially based on what you wrote Stephanie and partly just jumping to conclusions so the things that are in green.

And even though I'm the editor I've been trying to put my own stuff in as a suggest as opposed to, you know, a full-fledged change.

So those are the two things. So just quickly going through there and good I see (SAR). So in the program review so just (unintelligible). And I guess at the end of this we'll have to produce something in the template that has been prescribed which is a short bit of intro text.

And then we can include the text that you started Stephanie and then the table if we wish. I think the table is useful in that it gives people a snapshot and see how many things we're talking about needing to be reviewed and on what cycle.

So how do we want to go through this?

Woman:           Yes, and the other...

Avri Doria:       Any suggestions?

Woman:           ...thing we might want to check quickly, so I think Stephanie's the anonymous panda. Avri you're signed in. Greg I don't know which one you are.

                 But in case because I know Stephanie's been putting comments in.

Stephanie Duchesneau:       I think I'm signed in as myself.

Grace Abuhamad: Oh, you might be signed in now.

Avri Doria:        Yes.

Grace Abuhamad: Okay.

Avri Doria:        I know the - yes, I think you're signed in as yourself. And then we've had a number of critters watching for quite a while. I haven't seen them make any suggestions or comments.

(Matt) has made some comments in terms of I guess he was marking the term community function but I guess is a term used for (unintelligible) Stephanie because we haven't defined what that is.

There's a bunch of things that remain sort of undefined in doing this. So one question that is here...

Stephanie Duchesneau:        Yes, and this is a change of something that you've had in Avri. I don't know if it was from the MRT. I don't think it's inclusive within the working group that we're retaining that or if it's going to be some sort of a periodic team.

Avri Doria:        Right.

Stephanie Duchesneau:        So I just use community as like a generic reference for something that would be carried out by a multi-stakeholder group.

Avri Doria:        Yes. That's what I assumed you meant and that's why I picked out practice all the way through.

Now for example in the legal documents that we've seen there's yet another new way of referring to it which at the moment slips my mind in terms of the review function.

So, yes. And that brings up another issues. So for example in this - there's also the one question that we had all the way through. And I think that's been also one of your questions Greg is the program review and the statement of work review something that happened at the same time.

So it's PRT now is that it? Okay.

Stephanie Duchesneau:     That's what (unintelligible) used.

Avri Doria:     Okay that was - I knew there was a new one. I just lost it. Okay. So that's the program review team or the - and indeed we don't know whether there is a standing MRT or there's a fundamental bylaw that kicks off the Review Team that's ICG like or, you know, cross community working group like. And I don't know that it's for us to figure that out but somebody has yet to figure that one out.

And that shows up both in DT and where we say well what's the last step, who does it go to. That shows in the escalation processes. And that shows up here in terms of at the end of the day who's doing the multi-stakeholder review? And at the end of the day if there is a decision to initiate RFPs A, I don't think we do it.

But is that an output that could come out of review? That's something we may have to give an indication on or not.

The other thing I did - and then I like get Stephanie to get you to talk through the stuff you've written is that I borrowed your initially after two years and then moved to every - okay you put it to five years, cool.

I thought the review of the Monthly Performance Report kind of had to be monthly. The site visit actually talked about it being needed. And I guess DTC has that so we can probably remove that one or at least leave it crossed out to show we thought about it and didn't forget it but that we're not taking it.

There's the review CSC report on (Sal) report on. And that sort of implies that the CSC is going to be doing some sort of SOW report every year. So, and I'm not sure that we've got that necessarily in there.

The program review, is this the same program review as we've got in the top one? Is the review the performance metrics? I put these down as quarterly. I don't know if that was too frequent or too rare but that seemed like a good guess. I did that also for review.

Customer Survey Report, but that might actually be yearly because I think that's only done yearly.

Greg Shatan:     It's not clear to me what program review means especially when we're using it twice at the top and in this cell.

Avri Doria:      Right. I think that's something that's Stephanie started to cover in what she wrote below. So perhaps Stephanie if you could talk to that and sort of get into that issue might be good.

Stephanie Duchesneau:      I don't think I introduced this to the table. I'm not sure what the program review refers to either. I think what I referenced in the text that I

provided below was that in addition to reviewing the actual contents of the statement of work you should determine whether there are kind of performance related aspects that are not explicitly covers there and how those would be incorporated.

But I don't know what the program reviewers do on the chart. So if we're all in agreement we can maybe just kill this line...

Greg Shatan: Yes.

Stephanie Duchesneau: ...with the table.

Greg Shatan: Yes, I think it's - there's operational or performance review or an SOW review. But program review is nebulous.

Avri Doria: Okay, I was understanding the program review to be the statement of work review plus all the up things that needed to be viewed like performance, operational, et cetera, and that that was that.

But certainly I think we could remove the standalone one. Oh, somebody already got to it, Fantastic. It was the panda.

Whoever just did that you're the panda.

Woman: Yes Stephanie looks like the panda I think and if you're - until she comments and then...

Avri Doria: Okay, but anyway.

Woman: Yes.

Stephanie Duchesneau:      My insertions are coming in as me. No, it comes up as myself to me.

Avri Doria:      That's interesting. Anyway...

Stephanie Duchesneau:      Interesting.

Avri Doria:      Yes. Still trying to understand how this completely works. Okay. So then this program review perhaps needs to be called something else other than program review.

It's not just the statement of work as you indicated (unintelligible) thing yes. And it's the periodically perhaps that's what it should be called. I don't know because every review is periodic so that becomes sort of silly.

Greg Shatan:      I think we should talk about what the - what it's a review of. If it's a performance review or an operational review or a technical review or an SOW review it should use utilitarian names.

Avri Doria:      Okay. This review was kind of an omnibus review. This is the every two eyras, every five years, every seven years review.

So I would assume that this would be a review of not only the SOW but of all the other aspects. And that's what I was understanding this one to be, you know? And I...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan:      I think that's...

Avri Doria:        ...(unintelligible) sort of the omnibus review.

Greg Shatan:       I think that's a good concept. I think we should just reference it in the - in that
                   upper left-hand cell and say that it includes SOW performance operations.

                   Okay, you know, all...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria:        Yes, I think that...

Greg Shatan:       ...reviews and all more frequent reviews. It's like the Godfather. It's the...

Avri Doria:        (Unintelligible).

Greg Shatan:       ...review of all reviews, the (capo del to decappi).

Avri Doria:        Right. Right. I think the program review is what comes out of the NTIA
                   writing. That's what I believe. And I think that's where the terminology of
                   program review actually started. I may be wrong but I think that's it, certainly
                   didn't make it up on my own.

                   Okay. So it's periodic...

Greg Shatan:       Definitely I think if you join group chat -- it's in the upper right-hand corner -
                   you'll no longer be an anonymous panda unless you prefer to be one.

Avri Doria:     I don't know. But, anyway so, okay we can come up with a name. And I think that - I think Stephanie covered a lot of that in what she wrote about this review is that correct?

Greg Shatan:    I think so.

Avri Doria:     Because it includes at minimum the following inputs should be considered as part of the review.

Greg Shatan:    Yes.

Avri Doria:     The current IANA statement of work, the regular reports, the inputs by. So I think that that one's pretty well covered.

Greg Shatan:    Right or we could just say that...

Avri Doria:     And I've never...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan:    ...as the low. We just need to kind of tie the chart to what Stephanie wrote...

Avri Doria:     Right.

Greg Shatan:    ...in some way by, you know, defining or pointing to a number, you know, if this just gets numbered.

Avri Doria:     Yes, we can certainly do that, you know, in that ref column once we get that far. Okay.

Now the questions that were still sort of outstanding in my mind in reading that is is this a review that can initiate the RFP because that's one of the pending things?

And if not then how, you know? If so, then how? If not then who? And I don't know the answer to that but, it's a question I've actually been asked several times in various conversations. So, I don't know where, you know, is that one of the things that this review can trigger?

Stephanie Duchesneau:     So, I kind of feel like we are moving to a point in the conversation where a decision to separate the IANA functions would be based only on a performance deficiency and that it's not kind of a regular rebidding or re-contracting process.

And that was the position that I was doing the drafting. But I don't know if either of you disagree with that.

Avri Doria:     No. I think I completely agree with that, that that is an exceptional thing. And I was sort of reading it and thinking. And I just wondered if we needed to be explicit about it is that this review after two years and then after five years is one that could decide that performance has been such that they want to trigger whatever RFP mechanisms have been created but that there wouldn't be a natural automatic RFP process.

Greg Shatan:     Right.

Avri Doria:     So that's why I kept talking about the triggering and whether this was the review that did that triggering?

Greg Shatan:      I think it could trigger it as well as an acute problem that occurs outside of any, you know, review process that's just a performance backup of massive proportions. So I think there should be no...

Avri Doria:       That wouldn't be our (unintelligible).

Greg Shatan:      Right. So, I think there should be no presumption that an RFP would issue or anything else but it's a possibility.

Stephanie Duchesneau:      I agree with no presumption of it. I'm inclined to think that the performance issues that we would be looking at as a grounds for transferring it would be ones that were persistent and serious enough that they might have to be addressed outside of a very regularly scheduled restructured review process and that there would have to be some emergency mechanism that is different than the, you know, regularly scheduled review every year.

If IANA is broken to the point that you have to move it then I feel like you're going to watch a mechanism that you can leverage unfairly or trigger unfairly short notice rather than something that is kind of scheduled every few calendar years.

Greg Shatan:      I don't think the two were mutually exclusive. I think both powers need to be in place, both the ability to react to a fire and also the ability after doing a detailed review to decide the whole thing is fucked up beyond all redemption.

Avri Doria:       There basically could be a situation where there was, you know, many years of small nagging issues never enough to participate the catastrophic.

But at the periodic five yearly review, you know, there could be a review of this persistent effect that a decision could be made.

So really all I'm looking for is do we want to say that this periodic review could trigger.

Greg Shatan: Right, or may trigger.

Avri Doria: And not say that this is - may, you know, whichever, yeah.

Greg Shatan: In the real world this is often what happens in relationships. You know, I've had clients who have said we need to find the material breach with this guy because, you know, we're sick and tired of dealing with him.

It's like, well he hasn't done anything really material yet. Well how much longer do we have on the contract? So we want both.

Stephanie Duchesneau: I don't want both. So this is a point of disagreement but I don't know how we mark that in the text and take it to the wider group.

Avri Doria: I think that we just say there's two opinions, you know, basically. You know, basically it's something like regarding whether this review.

Greg Shatan: Stephanie why don't you think that this periodic review should be able to have negative consequences up to and including an RFP?

Stephanie Duchesneau: I think the consequences associated with moving IANA would be - I mean they're pretty big. So we would want it to be limited to a set of circumstances that were very, very serious and likely to be pretty immediate.

I think there's kind of an incongruity (unintelligible) key issues and the statement of work and the different documentation that we would be looking at as part.

I feel like if things got to that point we would need a more immediate trigger mechanism than something that is based on a calendar period.

And we've discussed at that length for the community and that position or at least on the gTLD side we've discussed whether or not we think that there should be kind of a regular rebid period associated with it or should be these short contracting cycles and people generally feel this way.

There was a lot of debate but, I think this position that it should only be brave performance deficiencies and that this would have to be direct addressed or some sort of an emergency process is supportive within that community.

Greg Shatan:     Well and I think that...

Avri Doria:     So nothing...

Stephanie Duchesneau:     I'm happy to - I think it makes sense to do what Avri denotes and say that, you now, this is still a difference of opinion and to work through that potentially with the wider group but stand on that right now.

Greg Shatan:     Yes, I think that's right. we're obviously not going to resolve it amongst the three of us.

Avri Doria:     Right. And I think I occupancy sort of a middle position. I certainly don't see this as, you know, doing an RFP. I just see it as being one more cause.

So and there's obviously the CSC cause that sort of says the CSC decides that things are bad enough. And that precipitates the yet to be defined RFP process.

I guess I also believe that there needs to be a multi-stakeholder process that can also do that. And that's what falls out in that.

And that's going to be more of a general failure, a general long-lasting low level of failure that comes out through analysis.

And then also realizing that the RFP process is not always a replacement process, it can also be a reparative process as obviously the last one with NTIA was that it was, you know, also...

Stephanie Duchesneau:    To...

Avri Doria:    ...it (unintelligible) to prove things. So yes?

Stephanie Duchesneau:    To provide a little more context I don't think anyone on the CSC side or on the registry side is thinking that the decision to move IANA outside of ICANN would be a CSC decision nor that the CSC itself would even be the trigger mechanism there.

I think where we stand right now or where we stand right now on that issue is that if there were these serious and persistent performance issues or ones that couldn't be resolved in the interactions between the CSC and the IANA functions operator that the issues would then be referred to the ccNSO and the GNSO would have to act jointly on it.

So I don't think anyone is thinking that this decision sits squarely within the CSC.

Avri Doria:         Okay.

Stephanie Duchesneau:         I hope that that helped.

Greg Shatan:       Yes. I think this is still one that we definitely need to flag for the big group. And this may be one where the registries and the non-registries have a difference of view.

Avri Doria:         Okay I even put it in color so it would stay away. And I will check that to keep it at this point.

                   Okay so do we want to go through the details of this at all or do we just want to jump -- we've now used 26 of our minutes -- to some of the questions.

                   So and I guess I still have a question. All these other reviews that were taken from NTIA or whatever are - do we agree that they're all needed in other words an annual?

                   I really - this review of CSC report in SOW report I'm not clear where I got that one to be honest.

Stephanie Duchesneau:         I don't know what the CSC report or the SOW report is either.

Avri Doria:         Exactly, so that one might just be my being brain dead at the time. So we have taken out site visit. Let me put a line through that.

Greg Shatan:       Is there any...

Avri Doria:        And I'll put a line - whoops.

Greg Shatan:       A crazy thought, should the site visit be part of the periodic review? I realize annual site visits are kind of overkill for something like this.

                   I suppose the Periodic Review Team could always decide to do a site visit whether we put it in this chart or not.

Stephanie Duchesneau:      Yes. I don't know that it has to be a necessity but I think what you say makes sense that it could be a part of, a component of the periodic review versus an annual thing.

                   My suggestion would be that we start to go through some of the questions. And I kind of - I tried to regroup the questions from the original charter below so that ones that are pretty closely related fit together.

                   And I think once we have some sense of where people stand on the questions it will make it easier to go back and update the text versus trying to look.

                   Because I was really writing up a straw man that I meant for people to take a look at and edit and fill out. But I think the hour would be better spent running through the questions or the remaining bits of the hour.

Avri Doria:        Okay.

Greg Shatan:       I agree. I think questions is the biggest problem we have here is we have more questions then we have answers or we have a lot of questions and the periodic - and the final report didn't have questions.

Avri Doria:          Okay, well the questions show up at the bottom of Page 7 and continue into 8. And now when you say this spoke of periodic reviews you mean the other periodic reviews correct?

Stephanie Duchesneau:          (Unintelligible) to me. I don't understand the question.

Avri Doria:          While we seem to have this one major two year, five year review. And that seems to be a lot of what's expressed in this and what's written. And in terms of the inputs to that review and so on.

                          And I think that text holds really well for this omnibus review for the want of a better term.

                          Then there's all the other periodic reviews all those things that I've tagged as annual, quarterly, et cetera, and...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan:          And well to be fairly (unintelligible) in and of themselves.

Avri Doria:          Exactly. Now mostly they were defined previously by NTIA and by the SSAC, you know, and DPNE but that would need to be moved into here.

Greg Shatan:          Right. So it's either going to be an SOW or a contractor in a document? And I guess - and the definitions themselves could either be moved into this document or into an annex.

                          I think if we're trying to have a reviewable two tier document we may want to move the details into an annex.

Avri Doria:        I'm not sure I understand.

Greg Shatan:      I would suggest...

Avri Doria:        In fact I'm sure I don't understand.

Greg Shatan:      I was just guessing if we have something like review RZM audit report in the chart if we wanted to bring into this document or into the final document for the CWG what the RCM audit report consists of how it's defined currently in the NTIA group agreement we should do it in an annex or an exhibit or some sort and not work it into the narrative of the document or put it into the chart.

Avri Doria:        Okay. So...

Greg Shatan:      But that's style not...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria:        Yes so it takes us yes, I thought that the whole document except for the two paragraphs that were at the top was essentially annexed and that there was some short stuff at the top but anyway or the short report.

                   I haven't quite understood what we're doing with the whole report but since I'm not writing it I haven't worried about that too much.

Greg Shatan:      I think that's one of the things we're going to need to do with this is to turn it into narrative, declarative narrative. And maybe that's just taking it out of the table format and putting it on a paper.

Stephanie Duchesneau:      I think...

Avri Doria:        Well I think that's...

((Crosstalk))

Stephanie Duchesneau:        ...as we talk through the questions and work - yes what I've done in the narrative I think Greg is right that we can make it once we're done and once we has an agreement we can post like an executive summary that makes it even simpler and choose whether we want to move kind of an annex.

But let's like try and tackle the questions right now to see if we can get to agreement on what we could actually be writing about before we try what is going to be in a short form versus a long form proposal.

Greg Shatan:        Yes agree.

Avri Doria:        Sounds good.

So...

Stephanie Duchesneau:        So as a baseline for - go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria:        No you please, please take it.

Stephanie Duchesneau:        So as a baseline for the period of the statement of work in the period of reviews I did one within two years of a transition date just because I thought that it might make sense to take a look at the over site structures and the post-transition performance sooner than we might want out of a regular period because we're initiating a change.

And then I had picked a fairly long period. I initially said five to seven. I think five is actually closer to what we want. So people generally agree with those periods or do they think they should be shorter or longer?

I think those are good periods. I think seven's long.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Which is why I updated to five when I was looking at it just today.

Greg Shatan: Yes, a five year plan.

Stephanie Duchesneau: So I had - and I can move some of the text around that I had come up with over the weekend.

But in defining I had put both a set of kind of functions and performance indicators that they would want to look at in addition to inputs in different reports that would be considered as a part of the review.

Did it seem like there was anything that was very significant missing from these lists?

Avri Doria: I didn't see anything.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Okay.

Avri Doria: That's pretty much what I accepted. I thought that this was pretty much already a close to one thing in terms of that particular review because I think it was great.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes, thank you. But if you all think of anything just feel free to add it into the list and we can take a look.

And I think I can probably just move the text around and then we've covered a lot of the scope of the reviews.

Avri Doria: And you covered the scope of that one review.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Of the larger...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: Right.

Stephanie Duchesneau: That's correct, the two to five year review or two year and then five year.

I think the goals may have to be clearly stated. But I don't think that this is particularly difficult or this is going to be a point that we have a lot of disagreement on.

I would expect that it would be very performance oriented. But also I think this is one of the key ways that we have the full multi-stakeholder, that we are going to have some multi-stakeholder representation on the CSC.

I think this is also one of the ways that we have the multi-stakeholder voice and participation in IANA overlay so I would also include that within the goals.

And do folks have other things that should be represented here? And I can take a stab at building out more text here. All right.

We'll let me just draft up a straw man for some of the goals. And then you and Greg can help fill it out.

I wanted to kind of take a second pass at this today but I've been behind on my to do list.

And then the - two of the biggest things that I wanted to talk about on this call because I wasn't really sure where we should be starting from is one the composition of the Review Team and two how these review processes are triggered.

And when I was trying take a look at it over the weekend I did a lot of review of the AOC reviews. But it's not completely visible to me how these processes are initiated.

I know you've participated in it Avri so any context from that you think could apply well here because I think it's going to be- it can very effective if it was carried out in a manner that was similar to the AOC reviews.

But I don't know if there's a good starting place that we can use for that both in terms of trigger and in terms of how those bodies are composed.

Avri Doria:     Well in terms of triggering the AOC is triggered by calendar. So I think that we're already doing the same sort of triggering is it's a periodic review and it's a periodic review that has a defined - a predefined purpose.

(Unintelligible) sitting - I mean especially since the CCWG is in the process of putting the affirmation of commitments reviews into the bylaws it becomes interesting.

In terms of how to pick the AOC we certainly don't want to do exactly what's happening now because at the moment it's basically all of the ACs, SOs, SGs what have you are suggesting people.

And then the chair or the board and a CEO or the GAC chair in different configurations are deciding who will sit on the panel.

And I definitely don't think we want to borrow that model. In fact I don't even believe we want to follow that model for when we put the AOC reviews in the bylaws in a CCWG but that's beside the point.

So it certainly has triggered this thing. I think therefore it could also use the same kind of multi-stakeholder selection process that those use though that has yet to be defined the sort of new way of defining (unintelligible) by - it's almost done as the ICG or done as the CC as the CWG was done by each named group, you know, contributing and members according to a predefined formula by some method of their own choosing seems to be what, you know, the basic formula for a CWG.

So we'd be back to our - the problem we never could solve at the beginning when we talked about MRT and which we're probably going to have problems with when we talk about the - is how many people from what grouping?

That formula is something that I think is still (unintelligible) us. We can certainly present a candidate formula. And at...

Greg Shatan:     I think there was some - a lot of work done on the MRT front in RFP3. I think that in the end smaller rather than larger was what was arrived at although that was for a standing body.

And perhaps for a less periodic for a body that is only brought together periodically that may not be as true.

But I think I still tend to think smaller is better than larger especially if you can have, you know, observers or nonmember participants.

Avri Doria: I definitely agree with you on the smaller is better. I mean I feel - I'm quite comfortable with taking whatever formula, you know, you or someone else thinks that we nearly reach closure on and sticking that in here as our trial balloon. I'm very comfortable with doing that.

And I definitely don't think it should be a standing review team. I definitely think it should be a, you know, assembled on demand...

Greg Shatan: Right.

Avri Doria: ...review team.

Greg Shatan: If I can go back to the last MRT kind of stopping point and see where we were at because I think we had managed to get convergence, a fairly reasonable convergence on a smaller rather than larger system where, you know, not everybody would necessarily get every representation that they're, you know, internal organizational structure might, you know, deem appropriate. But there would be sufficient representation.

Avri Doria: I think that would be great. And, you know...

Stephanie Duchesneau: I definitely agree with keeping things smaller. I think taking what we had scoped out in terms of composition for the MRT and repurposing it as a periodic but not standing body to carry out these reviews is a turning point.

Greg Shatan: Yes. I think that can be our straw man. At least it gives us some place to start. And I think if we're not starting from a 27 man team or from a 47 man squad we'll be starting from a better spot.

And people will understand that the goal is not to, you know, try to get every demographic represented but rather to provide, you know, sufficient and appropriate representation from overall groups.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Greg Shatan: And I say that...

Avri Doria: And how many other questions...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: ...of being a part of a very small demographic and a sense of constituency within a stakeholder group within a stakeholder organization.

Avri Doria: Yes. So how would that answer the rest of these questions? What body should coordinate the reviews? What does that mean?

Greg Shatan: I guess how should this - who would put this ICG type that this PRD in existence? So would it be something that automatically came out of a bylaw I guess?

You know, does the body need to coordinate all of the reviews, the annual reviews?

Avri Doria: Yes. I like the idea of having a bylaw that's - one of those bylaws that kicks it off. Treating it like or treating the AOC reviews in the CCWG of actually defining it in a bylaw. I think that that's a good thing.

And if the call went out that on January 1, you know, et cetera, I mean I know we get into dates but that each of the assigned - each of the parties that was assigned a number of seats was responsible for designating its members by, you know, a certain time, et cetera, I think is a fine way of teeing it off.

Greg Shatan: Yes. But I think it was just put into the description that it would be initiated by pursuant to a bylaw be time calendar driven so it just happens essentially.

Stephanie Duchesneau: That seems to make things a lot simpler to me as well.

Greg Shatan: Simple is good.

Avri Doria: So that would take...

((Crosstalk))

Stephanie Duchesneau: And put it...

Avri Doria: And structured also kind of.

Greg Shatan: Yes.

Avri Doria:    I would be structured like a cross community working group. We could say that especially since that is something we are developing more and more rules and practices around and guidelines for how those are done. So perhaps that is, you know...

Greg Shatan:    Right that may be the straw man or maybe a second straw man if we want to to look at...

Avri Doria:    Okay.

Greg Shatan:    ...that, the MRT as a straw man. But we'll start with one or both of those.

Avri Doria:    Right. Well the MRT was a straw man for composition. It wasn't necessarily a straw man for how it runs.

Greg Shatan:    Correct, okay sorry my bad. Never mind.

Avri Doria:    And so I was dropping down. No. Oh, no problem. I was dropping down to the next question. And I was going to say okay that one solved. But how composed that solved and it was dropping down to the how structured.

You know, and then, you know, question is what is the scope of responsibility for leading the review? Who leads the review? You know, again I would almost say borrow from some of the things that we've developed.

We could go with the ICG model where they elected their own chairs. You know, so each one of these elects a chair. Or we could go with CCW G model where each of the participating, you know, organizations is defining a member of a chair's group.

I'm fine either way. Those are two methods that we are currently using. And again in the notion of borrowing from what we know as opposed to inventing something new I would think either of those two could do.

Greg Shatan: Yes. I think so.

Stephanie Duchesneau: What is the difference between the question with respect to structure and process structure?

Is it that the process structure more refer to working methods?

Avri Doria: It might be something like, you know, yes I think they're different. I think the structure is kind of the structure of the people in it and how it's composed this is what at least I was thinking.

And that the process structure as we start out on January 1 with a call to we put out a call for, you know, comments to the general public.

We reviewed those comments we put out a draft report we review the draft report we put a final report with those recommendations go to (unintelligible) kind of structure of the process. So that's how I view them as sort of different.

Stephanie Duchesneau: That helps. Thanks Avri.

Greg Shatan: I'm good with that.

Avri Doria: It is a good question how long is this? It's done fairly quickly over the course of four months. I don't know the answer to that one.

I know the AOC reviews are generally timed at a year. And that gives enough time for everybody to, you know, it first of all it gives you time to do three reviews -- an initial comment gathering.

The way the ATRT worked is we met for a while. We came up with the questions we wanted to ask the community in terms of the work we had to do.

We put those out. There was a community input period. And we took the community input, discussed it for at length, you know, including, you know, talking to people and what have you and then came up with our draft report and put that out for review.

And then afterwards we took that - the comments plus the review, came up with a final one and sent it to the board at which point the board put it out for yet another review.

Greg Shatan:     A year seems long for something that's more narrowly focused than like this.

Avri Doria:       Yes.

Greg Shatan:     I would say six months.

Avri Doria:       That's why as soon as they said a year (unintelligible).

Stephanie Duchesneau:      I think the process is themselves we can pull from.

((Crosstalk))

Stephanie Duchesneau:      And just condense the actual timeframe.

Avri Doria:      Being able to get this done in six months especially since many of the questions will be predictable. It's not like accountability and transparency where there was an incredible wide view of questions we could ask. Here there's - it's going to be fairly well set.

And there's going to be - a lot of it is going to be based on those shorter period reviews, those annual and whatever things that have been being done.

Greg Shatan:      Right.

Avri Doria:      On some of these things when you're putting a question do we just pick one or should we be taking the thing back with questions? I don't know.

Stephanie Duchesneau:      So I'm putting in questions partly just for my own thinking to guide it when I go back to the text. But I think we should, I actually think talking through this we have a pretty good sense of what we agree on what we can use as a starting point.

I think we should just divide up the different then have people draw up a straw man. And then I don't know if we'll have time for another call but just at least to do a round of edits via email.

Avri Doria:      Yes.

Stephanie Duchesneau:      Like I am happy to take on updating the kind of scope and goal section. I know Greg had volunteered to fill out the text for the composition of the review team and who should be coordinating the reviews on the basis of what had initially been scoped for the MRP in terms of a kind of narrower lean and mean group to be serving that purpose but to have it be a periodically convened body rather than a standing body.

Like I think we should just take questions. I think we actually agree on a lot of points on this call but we just need to draft up a text...

Greg Shatan: I think we need to...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: I think we need to play reverse jeopardy here by which I mean we need to phrase these. The ones that we do agree on should be phrased in the form of an answer rather than a question.

And I think the ones that should be questions are ones where our group here can't reach agreement such as the question of whether the periodic review or the omnibus review should be able to kick off an RFP.

That way we can at least kind of start from something that looks like a narrative that could go into a final report. And clearly if there's something that the three of us agree on but we know that there is a significant sector that doesn't agree we can put those in questions as well.

But I think we - we're heterogeneous enough that we could, you know, reasonably unless we really identify something where we know that we're going to get a lot of pushback from, you know, more than just a single person we might as well phrase it in the form of a report as opposed to a question.

And we'll leave the questions for those things that are really still where putting it in the form of an answer would be an accurate of the position we're in.

Avri Doria:        Okay at the moment in terms of writing pieces of text we have your name Greg. I don't know whether you wrote it there or Stephanie did or I know I wrote one of them.

Stephanie Duchesneau:        I was (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria:        Oh and me too. I was doing it too.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan:        I turned away from the document for five minutes and all of a sudden I have been assigned half of it. I'm happy to do it.

Avri Doria:        Exactly.

Stephanie Duchesneau:        Never look away Greg.

Avri Doria:        And I put my name - I put my own name next to how it should be structured. And I'll, you know, base that pretty much on a form of AOC review and incorporate these questions if that's okay?

                What is the scope of its responsibility for leading the review? I don't know that that question doesn't sort of fall away in a sense.

Greg Shatan:        Yes.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes. I guess it might be a question of how centralized it is whether it is entirely controlled by a narrow body or the body is more acting as a convener for a communitywide discussion.

Greg Shatan: Oh yes that's...

Stephanie Duchesneau: I think if we do it a decent job of (unintelligible). What?

Greg Shatan: I was just going to say I - there is that model, the idea that, you know, like the ICG is supposed to only be or, you know, there are groups within ICANN that aren't actually supposed to do anything but they're only supposed to coordinate other people doing things. I don't think that's the model here for this team.

Stephanie Duchesneau: I agree. I feel like it has to be a pretty active group.

Greg Shatan: Yes. This is a hands-on thing, you know. This is not a - clearly the group can go outside the group if it wants. It is supposed to be a customer survey. There could be other surveys.

You know, the larger community will have a voice but this is not an issue of just coordinating the entire community doing like a, you know, massive all hands plenary review of the IANA functions. It would actually be kind of absurd.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Really good at this. Okay.

Avri Doria: So I think what this does with us almost nearing the end of the hour we've got tasks to do we do have another meeting scheduled for Friday I believe. I'm

not positive but I think there has been another one stuck it in case we needed. So I think the three of us can do a lot.

The thing that we haven't covered yet that we need to pick up and I can pick up some of this is to start defining these other interim or the other periodic less more frequent reviews and getting something said about them. And I think that can mostly be taken out of existing (documents).

Stephanie Duchesneau: So the only one that I see that isn't also accounted for -- and I'll do a double checking case anything has been removed from the charter - isn't also accounted for within the CSC is the COI requirements doc.

Avri Doria: Right.

Greg Shatan: Right.

Avri Doria: Well there's the COI requirements doc and then there's also the review of its equipment and audit. I tended to think...

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes.

Avri Doria: ...that was more at the community function then at the CSC but I - none of this...

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes, no...

Avri Doria: ...(unintelligible) I'm willing to fight for.

Stephanie Duchesneau: That one is not covered in a CSC.

Avri Doria:      Okay. And I would think that the review of the annual report, annual audit would also be both CSC and...

Stephanie Duchesneau:      Should that one is currently covered by the CSC including let's put a placeholder in that one maybe.

Avri Doria:      And okay. Because what I'm thinking there is possibly CSC alone every comment perhaps would be okay. But I was thinking that an annual audit might go beyond just the CSC issue so I'm not sure. So okay.

Woman:      So before we end the call I'm chatting with (Brenda) right now just to see we don't have a DTM call scheduled for Friday but you guys...

Avri Doria:      Oh we don't? Okay.

Woman:      ...are really easy to work with because you pretty much operate on your own.

So we can always pop one in. But I know that Stephanie is going to be on a call from you guys are all Eastern Time so from 8:00 to 10:00 Eastern Stephanie will be on a call. The DTBs have a call from 10:00 to 11:00.

So we could do something afterwards, something at 12:00 at 11:00. We could do 11:00 to whatever so we don't...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria:      Of course the BT leads call isn't that when we're supposed to be reporting where we're at?

Woman:      Yes the deadline's Friday.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria:        This was supposed to be done to the BT leads call right?

Woman:           Well...

Avri Doria:        Right.

Grace Abuhamad:  ...the deadline is Friday so I think the call - the chair's only had 1400 UTC as a time to talk to all the leads. But I think, you know, we would accept anything that came in close of business US time on Friday just because staff can compile that.

Avri Doria:        I think between the three of us we could just find a time if we needed to talk. You know, but should we schedule a meeting? Should we get a slot?

Stephanie Duchesneau:      Let's set something on the calendar.

Avri Doria:        Okay.

Greg Shatan:      I agree.

Avri Doria:        So perhaps after the WP1 there's a CCWG Work Party 1 that I'll be participating in 13 to - from 17 to 19 UTC.

Grace Abuhamad: Right so from 1:00 PM to 3:00 PM so anything...

Avri Doria:        Thirteen to 1830 I guess.

Woman:            So at 3:00 PM do you want to try that?

Avri Doria:       So something after that. After 3:00 PM is the only time I've got free that day
                  left.

Woman:            Okay.

Stephanie Duchesneau:       Yes 3:00 pm is good for me. Let's just plan to like all have done
                  our sections and also do a review of everyone else's section and do kind of a
                  round for comments.

                  So then we can really just considering that the deadline is Friday we can really
                  just a quick scan of items where there are still issues and just run through
                  those.

Avri Doria:       It sounds really good.

Stephanie Duchesneau:       Thanks. I think we have a lot of agreement on this call even though
                  there's still work to do.

Avri Doria:       I think so. So far we've only found one issue where there's a fundamental
                  difference of viewpoint. Everything else has been sort of easy so yes, I think
                  that's great.

Grace Abuhamad:   Excellent. So from our end we'll send out an invitation for the call on
                  Friday at 19 UTC which is 3:00 PM Eastern.

                  And then I might - I'm out of the office on Friday afternoon but I'll someone
                  will support. And if not (Brenda) might just be on the line in case you need
                  any help.

Avri Doria:       Yes. And if somebody initiates it because I can - I've - I mean I know all the tools and stuff and I am sure Greg probably does too so sure.

Grace Abuhamad: Right. So we'll have someone don't worry. And if not I'll...

Avri Doria:       Okay thanks.

Grace Abuhamad: ...(unintelligible) so don't worry about it. But...

Avri Doria:       But you're going to be off.

Grace Abuhamad: ...Friday at 3:00 PM. Yes I'm off...

Avri Doria:       Okay thanks.

Grace Abuhamad: But I'm always at ICANN.

Avri Doria:       You've got to be off. You've got to be really off sometimes but anyway.

Grace Abuhamad: All right.

Avri Doria:       Okay.

Woman:            Okay.

Avri Doria:       So thank you. And thank you Stephanie. I mean I may be listed as the provisional lead on this but you've have taken so much of the work and very appreciative.

Stephanie Duchesneau:      No problem. Thank you for coordinating. It's pretty easy to fill in the pieces.

Avri Doria:      Okay great. Thanks. So...

Stephanie Duchesneau:      We'll talk soon.

Avri Doria:      Yes, no. Thanks bye-bye.

Greg Shatan:      Thanks folks.

Stephanie Duchesneau:      Yes.

Greg Shatan:      Right.

Avri Doria:      Next meeting.

Stephanie Duchesneau:      Bye guys.

Avri Doria:      Yes, bye.

Greg Shatan:      On to the next one.

Grace Abuhamad: Bye.

END