ICANN

Moderator: Brenda Brewer
April 10, 2015
2:00 pm CT

Coordinator: Your recording has started. Speakers, you may begin.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Hello. Do we have everybody on the phone that's not on Adobe chat? I don't hear anybody saying yes so probably the answer is no. Okay Greg are you in?

Greg Shatan: I am all the way in.

Avri Doria: You're on the phone. Okay fantastic. What I was suggesting doing - and it was okay with everybody else so hopefully it'll work for you too - that we work through the document but that we work through it all in our own drive image as opposed to trying to share it here on the screen which is hard to see anyhow. Is that okay with you?

Greg Shatan: Sure. Wouldn't it be OneDrive image though? We'll all be in the (same drive).

Avri Doria: Well we all have an image of the same drive document.

Greg Shatan: Right.

Avri Doria: Right okay. It's the - sorry. Getting in the language. Okay there have been various contributions to it for last time. Before we start I just wanted to say what I did. I took the table and I moved it to the back of the document as an appendix or whatever we're calling them as opposed to being in the main text. I hope that was okay.

I left a blank for the short form that we have to produce as part of the template. I'm not terribly concerned about it but I did leave it. And then had the edits. I've accepted a lot of the stuff but I basically wanted to go through the document accepting what's there if we can and then talking about, you know, what we need to add if anything. I don't know that sounds as an approach.

Okay so I'm going to assume that we're going to keep the titles short form and long form. You know, basically it was changed in several places to IANA naming functions. And please just jump in if you want to speak. As I'm reading this I'm not necessarily looking at hands.

So that naming convention's the word important replaced the word critical there. I think that one's probably fine. Yell if you have an objection to anything being changed.

A period following transition of the NTA stewardship over the IANA function as opposed to the IANA function. Any objections? (Unintelligible) created pursuant to IANA stewardship transition. That seems...And to address...

Stephanie Duchesneau: Some of these I just did to make sure we're saying stewardship transition versus transition and also referring to the naming functions versus the IANA functions.

Avri Doria: Yes.

Stephanie Duchesneau: When I drew this up I just had mixed it up in a couple of places, so...

Avri Doria: Yes no I figured they're mostly fine but some of them will probably be that or my changing to my own and some of them may not. So I just wanted to walk through them since this is kind of like our last chance. But yes.

Greg Shatan: ...these changes throughout then so that there's consistency?

Avri Doria: Probably.

Alain Durand   So Avri this is Alain.

Woman: Hi.

Alain Durand   Could you please just which line you are writing?

Avri Doria: Right now we're in the first paragraph of long form on Page 4. Sorry. That's what we lose by not having the picture displayed.

Okay so the two years have been - now what was it - as a result we recommend that the initial - no it would have been two years. Is that okay with everyone? Okay where was that one? And I appreciate Stephanie the way you added your own stuff in and suggest kind of the way I was even, you know, just so someone else could say yes, that goes in. I think that's great.

So for the two years of the IANA stewardship transition. The next paragraph there was a correction there. And then there was, "We recommend

subsequently be initiated on a calendar basis once every five years." Now this one puts up a question that's come up elsewhere is, is there any way to initiate this in an emergency situation?

I made a note of that in the table. I haven't put any text in on it. But it's a question that came up in a discussion in one of the other sittings this week is I think maybe it was an (M) in escalation.

If, you know, the CSC is reporting all kinds of problems and they report them and then at what point after these reports does something happen? And is this the group that would, you know, be called into effect if things weren't going well or does it only get called on a calendar?

Greg Shatan: I think this should be the group that gets called. But that's - then again there's the question there. I mean I think it's probably a question for the larger group as to whether it's the PRT that gets kind of non-periodic review or whether that's something that's instituted by the community group or mechanism that still seems somewhat elusive to me.

I think the problem is the periodic group is called together periodically. If it's not a standing group then, you know, would it be called together on an emergency basis? If there is another standing group would that group call this group together or would that group just act by itself? I think we kind of need to see the org chart before deciding where that goes.

I mean if this group has been well constituted to review IANA functions it seems to me that this group should at least do their review, even if it's initiated on an emergency basis. The question is whether they should have the right to initiate it.

Avri Doria: Right, and if they were called up - sorry.

Stephanie Duchesneau: I don't think this is a standing body. My sense is that this is
                     something that's convened periodically for the purpose under scheduled
                     review and not that it's something that is constantly sitting there as part of the
                     process.

Greg Shatan: Right. So I guess the question is whether it can be convened on an emergency
                     basis as well by some other convening action or body.

Avri Doria: Or mechanism. Yes that's what I was thinking - somewhere in between the -
                     it's only on a calendar basis; it's not standing. Can it be convened somehow?
                     And if so, by whom? Should I just put a footnote on that question?

Greg Shatan: I think the answer to...

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes I think that's still an issue for Design Team M to decide what
                     that escalation process is going to look like. But it might be something that
                     when we have all of our design team inputs and we take it to the fuller group
                     we can see where they think up and if it makes sense that what we're creating
                     as part of the process can be leveraged for an escalatory function as well.

Greg Shatan: I think that's a good angle to take and maybe even take it a step further, which
                     is that if Design Team M, the escalation recommends a review of the
                     functions, that the PRT model should be used for convening the reviewing
                     body.

Avri Doria: I put in a footnote -- I don't know if it corresponds - just so the issue's not
                     lost, but it's also not one we're trying to answer. Just thought it was a question

as to whether this could be convened in an emergency. If so how and whom? Please feel free to edit it on the fly. Okay should I keep moving on? Okay.

Greg Shatan: I added that although I actually (unintelligible) be a statement rather than a question, but...

Avri Doria: Yes. Okay so then we had the once every five years. Then there's an (oops) in brackets which is you should be focused on identifying necessary changes or amendments to the existing statement of work and not upon reconsideration of the statement of work. I'm not sure I understand what that means.

Stephanie Duchesneau: So this was my language from a bit back. And this is one of the things. I probably need to reframe it a little bit but what I was saying was that it was focused on kind of tweaking and changing the statement of work and not whether or not it was going to be re-awarded or the period was going to be extended.

My sense is that this review process is not looking at potentially whether or not this statement of work with ICANN is going to be extended but rather looking at changes that are internal for that statement.

Avri Doria: Okay so that's sort of an answer to the question that I've been asking is whether this review not is the one that would do an RFP but whether this review can recommend and be in some sense the trigger for that other step. And that's one thing that I don't think we've answered either is can the review recommend an RFP.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes and that's why I had bracket text because it didn't seem completely agreed that it shouldn't be based on whether or not the (SOW) had sent it. That's why I put that in brackets.

Avri Doria: So okay. And that's that next sentence that we've already got there. So do we need both of these? Because we've already got that question statement highlighted that we couldn't come to agreement on.

So if this is saying the same thing, do we need that? Or should we just phrase it differently? Okay that looks good. And then we just have the other sentence there.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes. I think no matter we want the review process to be able to identify potential amendments. It's the second half of it that we're still in some debate about.

Avri Doria: Okay so I can take off the brackets too, okay, good.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay then the next sentence - opinion of the (DT) regarding whether this review could precipitate. Yes that remains as a highlighted question.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Okay.

Avri Doria: And the footnote, we'll accept the footnote. Okay then I guess going to Page 5. There's nothing else on this page. I'm having a problem getting this footnote accepted. Oh I'll deal with it later.

Okay so on Page 5 then there's the - what should be the process for reviewing or amending SOWs.

Stephanie Duchesneau: So this was new by me just because the language hadn't been filled in yet.

Avri Doria: Okay. Anyone have any issue with accepting that - the block of red? And then there was another later thought which was I guess on the timeline for implementing any amendments would be agreed to between periodic review team and the IANA functions operator. Any issue with that?

Okay going down. Okay in the next place there's things that you have edits on. I know you - for the first place is we edit on handling issues, which is (Slide)...

Stephanie Duchesneau: Comes out of a slight change in the work of (DTC). It's kind of been rephrased that the CSC isn't really going to be as a mediation or dispute resolution body but rather it's going to be handling higher level performance issues that are identified. So I changed this language to be more consistent with what the CSC as an oversight structure was currently supposed to be doing.

Avri Doria: Okay. So that's interesting. I have to catch up on what CSC is these days. So in other words - that's never mind. That's (DTMM) and I'm not going to think about that right now. Okay so I'll mark those as okay.

Now I added one here - now I'm not sure that it's necessarily appropriate with what the CSC is becoming. But it was basically that the periodic review would take recommendations from the CSC or community on improvements. Maybe you put that one in there, not me. I don't know. But...

Stephanie Duchesneau: You put it in but I think it is appropriate.

Avri Doria: Okay. I've lost track sometimes of who put what in.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Then with the CSC. I mean, what it's basically doing is very narrow in scope but we've said that, you know, every now and then the CSC should be taking a look at something like service levels and - they couldn't change it. They wouldn't be empowered to initiate any changes in and of themselves without going through the GNSO the ccNSO. But I mean if the CSC had a clear explanation that its charter should be changed for some reason or service levels should be changed, I think that makes sense.

And that's seeing this comment from you Avri was one of the reasons that the process structure section I included a consultation with the CSC to pull out those issues.

Avri Doria: Okay. Great. Thanks. I've accepted that. So nothing else on Page 5. Moving down to Page 6. Delete and (unintelligible). Okay then I added - here's one that I added was conflict of interest enforcement and compliance report.

That's one that is in the current contract so I've carried it through. We've never talked about it but I had it in the table and it seems like the kind of thing we wouldn't want to get rid of. So I just put it in there. I don't know what other people think.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes I think if there is not a problem to me. I wonder if that's something that is determined to be a bigger responsibility of this group or we need more language around that. Or I don't see it as a problem to review it as a part of this process.

Avri Doria: Right. As far as I could tell what (NTIA) did was there was an annual report on it that they - you know and obviously if you get a report then you have to

review it. And so that's kind of what I thought it was. Okay. It was a footnote. (Unintelligible)

Okay next one there was an annual evaluation of IANA function operator performance. And that was - and that's I guess an evaluation. I assume an evaluation includes them reporting it. I don't know whether the CSC accepts that notion of both evaluating and reporting on it annually.

But it seemed reasonable to put it in there since they're doing a whole lot of work and, you know, (unintelligible) a lot. There should be at least a periodic evaluation that they do, you know, for the general public.

Oh a comment from Greg. "Makes sense to me." Is that in reference to this one? Yes. Thank you. Okay so we can also add the dependency section for (DTC) okay. You mean in this document or in the table there or somewhere?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Just I have a little dependency section at the bottom of the document.

Avri Doria: Oh okay. Okay.

Stephanie Duchesneau: I'll type it in right now and we can look at it by the time we get to the end.

Avri Doria: Fantastic, thanks. And then next thing go down to the last bullet to evaluate the performance of any IANA oversight bodies with respect to responsibilities set forth in their charters as opposed to their charts. Yes that makes a whole lot of sense.

Okay now obviously - and no one's - and I haven't asked but you know if anyone feels that anything is missing from any of these, please, you know, speak up.

Okay then the first bullet on Page 7: "consider, assess any changes affected since..." Yes that seems...

This is really just all sentence clarification stuff and clean up on naming function. And then there was "what should be accounted for in the statement of work or elsewhere." Is that coverage somewhere else or just didn't belong there? Okay.

Okay then moving down to composition of review teams so then there was just basically a note then that all stakeholder groups represented at ICANN would be relevant for the reviews done by periodic review team. Okay. See it started replacing community function all the way through with that, okay. Additional...

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes and I had just done community function originally because we hadn't really decided what the team was going to look like.

Avri Doria: Yes. But PRT does seem to be something we're settling on, at least this week.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes. And we can update the language that (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Yes. Okay. I appreciate that. So it was additionally the minimum protocol. So okay then there was - and then Greg's going to put in the suggested composition from the appropriate MRT formulation. And I guess I included the - well I think it was me - the number and protocol liaison for this review group. I don't know if that was agreeable to others.

Greg Shatan: That makes sense.

Stephanie Duchesneau: That makes sense to me.

Greg Shatan: Yes. It'll happen eventually probably even if we don't put it in, so...

Avri Doria: Okay. So then this table needs to get inserted. Then the question of which body should coordinate reviews. And then as a periodic review team convened every five years, (unintelligible) years from the data transition. Okay that's there.

And then there's the individuals interested in participate in a periodic review team would submit EOIs and (clear their) response to the following questions. That's an interesting one. Why are they interesting? Okay that looks pretty good.

What do other people think about Stephanie's addition for how those bodies are created? It's very similar to what's happening now for AOCs except that it's their SOAC that picks them and not the chairs or whomever. Any issue with that?

Stephanie Duchesneau: And it's similar to what we used for appointing people to the CSC. And the language to question themselves are also similar to what's used for (FSAC).

Avri Doria: Oh fantastic. Always good to use agreed language.

Greg Shatan: I guess one question with that be is the PRT is intended to be multi-stakeholder and the CSC is not, it may be that not quite the same criteria

would be used. Obviously you don't want somebody wandering in off the streets so to speak who, you know, can't spell IANA.

But on the other hand you can't expect that a non-customer is necessarily going to have the same kind of operational understanding even if they have, you know, a hard-fought understanding, you know, through secondary means. Hopefully that's good enough.

Avri Doria: The way it looks here that's (unintelligible) to describe - like for example their knowledge. It would be up to the AC or SO to try and (unintelligible) the degree to which they cared.

Greg Shatan: Yes sorry. I guess I had thought that this was going to be, you know, given to some oracular group that would then decide who makes the cut. I agree that each SO and AC should sort people out and put people who are prepared into the PRT. A group like that can also move only as quickly as its slowest member so...

Stephanie Duchesneau: And I think the questions are pretty general. Like the threshold for what skills and what level of knowledge you need or what type of knowledge you need for the PRT and the CSC might be different, but the questions themselves (have value).

Greg Shatan: Right. I think that's fine. Obviously it's kind of a relative test, you know.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes.

Greg Shatan: Someone in the GAC or ALAC wouldn't necessarily have the same experience as somebody in the ccNSO but they should be somebody who rises to the top of their respective group.

Avri Doria: Okay so this is fine as it is for now?

Greg Shatan: Yes.

Avri Doria: The next section was how should it be composed. I think that's already been covered hasn't it? So can we just eliminate that section or is there some other information that this is asking for?

Stephanie Duchesneau: I'm sorry Avri. Can you repeat that question?

Avri Doria: Okay Page 8, right afterwards there's the - how should it be composed? And then there's - so we had one of those little subsections here answering one of those questions. But I think that question has already been answered, hasn't it? Or is there some other information? That's what I'm asking (unintelligible). Is this now redundant because it's already been answered?

Greg Shatan: Yes I think so.

Avri Doria: Yes?

Greg Shatan: I think so.

Avri Doria: Okay then there is - okay and I probably should at some point just for format either italicize or something these questions that are sort of section headers. But I'll worry about that later. I don't know how much I'm going to be doing on this tonight before I send it in.

               What is the scope of its responsibility for reading the review and then that's there. It's review (unintelligible) way and such. Then the IANA function

operator will provide secretariat support for that. Funny how that became such small font.

And then the next changes we have - what sort of process structure is warranted? And then there was subquestions. What is the timeline? What are the working methods? And I basically I think put in something that was saying we would use our well developed and constantly improved cross-community working group methodology for this. I don't know what others think.

I see there's already a couple edits to it, which is good. Replacing that. Yes and then I just put a note here. Here I'm saying they have been used successfully. Of course the jury is still out on that.

You know I just had trouble saying it has been already successful when we're still trying. But anyway, I think that's the right wording. But I just left the comment in because I couldn't not comment.

Stephanie Duchesneau: ...than saying are untested and unproven.

Avri Doria: Right. Have faith. We have faith. Okay so in the event a consensus could not be reached - and this is trying to basically get the same approach that we've got here, that there are - you know it's going to be open but there's going to be official members.

And if we get to something that needs an official member type of, you know, supermajority vote, it can happen, although we don't want it to be the case. Is that okay?

Stephanie Duchesneau: ...worried about it becoming too big? I know the AOC review teams are narrower. And I haven't participated in it directly so I don't know like what the value to having completely open participation versus having a smaller more manageable team would be in this context.

Avri Doria: Yes. It's certainly more manageable when it's smaller. But then there's the issues of, you know, only doing this once every five years is just such a big decision. Why are you keeping us out kind of question.

We've actually seen, you know, this time with this CWG how when there was a lot of work and too many people they split us up into drafting teams and then there was still only two or three or four people working on an item. So, you know, there are techniques that get used.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Mm-hm.

Avri Doria: So I would prefer at this point to think of it as open because I can't imagine us getting away with having it like a smaller team. But I might be wrong. And even on the ATRT while there's only a small group participating, everything is always done as open and people could actually come and participate in our meetings. Not many did but, you know, some did, on occasion.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Thank you.

Avri Doria: Okay. So but I did not answer the timeline question in that bit of writing. Now somewhere else we had had the idea that this takes six months or is that some other design team I'm remembering?

Stephanie Duchesneau: That was here.

Avri Doria: Okay thank you. So I'm not sure where we have that but (unintelligible). What do we have in six months? I do not recall.

Stephanie Duchesneau: I don't know if it was reflected in the document but it was something we discussed on the last call.

Avri Doria: Okay so should we add a sentence? "This process should take no longer than six months," or something like that?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Would it be six months from the appointment of members?

Avri Doria: Right, yes. Yes I would think so. Okay.

Stephanie Duchesneau: The publication of a draft report or a final report?

Avri Doria: It's a good question because later we did describe the notion of reaching out to the public three times. Now we haven't talked through that yet to make sure that that's the pattern we want to follow. But that seems a natural pattern. You know, you go out and you solicit broad viewpoints, what you would be dealing with, etcetera.

Then you have a draft report. Then you have a final. Now if you consider that each review - each comment period takes a month, you've used up two of the months. So the final one would perhaps be afterwards.

So that's two months leaving four months to do any work. One month before the first comment period. You know, one month between the first and the second. And we're at fourth. So I think it could happen to final in six. Does that seem overly optimistic? So yes - six months to publication of a final

report and it would have two comment periods in the middle if we go with what was suggested.

Six months seems like it should be long, but it's not. Okay. Oops I accepted the wrong thing, sorry. Anyway. Okay then this was - I just accepted it accidentally but yes I can always remove it. So patterning against, you know, recommend openness, meetings with open participants and transparent, recordings, transcripts made to the public. Yes, good.

At several stages in the process community comment will be requested. You know, near the beginning of the process I think community consider issues relevant to review, midway through when a draft report for the review is prepared. Once the final report is prepared - but that would be post-delivery of that final report. So is that okay? Anything to be added there? Okay.

Then what should trigger reports? And in this instance pertains to periodic review. Then, okay then there's (attendance at session).

Stephanie Duchesneau: The two that I added were things that I added during this call. One of them was about the annual IANA performance review which we're attributing to the CSC. And the second one was to address Greg's question of if there are escalation issues is this the appropriate body to be carrying it out?

Avri Doria: Okay. Anything? Greg? Are you okay with these dependencies?

Greg Shatan: (Unintelligible)

Avri Doria: Okay and at that point we've reached the end of that. Before going on to anything else, is there anything other than the short form description at the top

that we need to add to this at this point before being able to submit it? Or do we have...

Greg Shatan: My table.

Avri Doria: ...all the general content we need - other than your table, certainly? But anything that isn't tapped here as outstanding -- or are we pretty happy with what we've got here? I can't think of anything we're not covering that we should be but that may just be wishful thinking on my part.

Greg Shatan: I think we're covering at least what we should be and maybe even a little more in the sense I'm not sure whether we were expected to cover some of the things. But I think it's good that we have them.

Avri Doria: Okay great. So then the last thing here is the table which I actually added as comments just for reference, the pieces from the various SOWs, so actually the actual language of the NTIA stuff, should we want to refresh it at some point. Yes thank you for changing community functions to periodic review teams.

And as I said when I move this table I lost all of the marks of things I had changed. Now on some of these - and I think it's quite appropriate - there are still communities - yes please.

Stephanie Duchesneau: I had taken - what is the program review? I thought that we had decided that that was the same as the first one and we had taken it out.

Avri Doria: Possibly. And possibly that was one of the cross-outs that I missed when I moved it. Right I think we had. I think we had crossed it out. Now there was

the - oh phoo, what did I just do? Okay, my semi-language. So yes, no we definitely take that...

So is there anything that is a community function on an annual basis in terms of reviewing? There's the - oh I see you've taken all those community functions out. Who would review the CLI requirements and stuff?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes that's what I wasn't sure about. And that's why when you flagged it, it's not sitting within the CSC right now. But I don't think this is the right group to be carrying it out either if it's something that's only being convened periodically. So that was what I had meant, whether we wanted to address that in more depth within this. But I'm not convinced that it is the periodic review either.

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible) this annual program review is something that we meant to delete. So I deleted. That was one of the changes that got lost when I did the cut and paste. But I'll ask the question - is there nothing that - for example we talked about the CSC putting out an evaluation. Now one of the ways we could look at it is that CSC and IANA put out these reports, these audit reports and these what have you.

And if they are reviewed by the community, and then if the community feels that there's something that needs to be done about it, they need a way to act. And that's where we talked about having another way to activate some sort of action.

But is it enough to sort of say that for these that we call it community functions that aren't the five yearly review, that the periodic review team, that they are reviewed by community?

Stephanie Duchesneau:	So we do have in the current scoping for the CSC, liaisons from all of the different parts of the community. And I think a part of that role is going to be to facilitate that type of dialogue on an ongoing basis so it's not just coming to bear when you get to the five-year point.

There's a constant conversation back and forth to the extent - the liaisons aren't required -- but to the extent that a community wants to have that interaction and wants to have that participation whether it's in all of the CSC meetings or just when, you know, you're coming to the point where you're doing the audits, there is still that community role provided for within that.

Avri Doria:	But I'm wondering whether we want to go further with any of these and actually have them reviewed by at least - I mean by the community for the SOAC structure. For example, the customer survey report. I don't know. But certainly the annual audit report seems like something that the community could also review to see if there were concerns.

And I actually don't think the requirements - I think the requirements themselves can be included as part of the enforcement and compliance report. But is every five years enough for us? Or is this something that should be put out to the public and then the public gets to comment on it and then IANA deals with those comments?

I mean that's another way to deal with this is that there is community review even if it's not PRT review. Anybody? While you're thinking so I'll exclude the site visits. Should I just delete those rows - the site visit and the...?

Stephanie Duchesneau:	I would (unintelligible).

Greg Shatan: The question is should there ever be a site visit? Or I guess it could always be at the discretion of the periodic review team.

Avri Doria: Right. Or the CSC could decide that it wanted to do one too for whatever reason.

Greg Shatan: Right.

Avri Doria: So do we need to say somewhere that while a site visit is no longer included as a regular item, you know, it could actually be changed and leave site visit in and say, you know, either the CSC or the PRT could decide to hold a site visit and do it that way? And just not make it a periodic review but an on-demand review?

Greg Shatan: Yes I think...

Avri Doria: So would that - Stephanie would that work for you in the CSC if it was on-demand and if they wanted they could?

Stephanie Duchesneau: I mean I think I would leave out the CSC part of it but because that is - I guess like that would be covered within the CSC charter and we decided within that group that we don't think that's a site visit is necessary. But if we want to in this document leave it as an option for the PRT then I don't have a problem with that.

Avri Doria: Okay so on demand PRT. Right and I'll leave the notes as they are, saying that the CSC sees no reason to do it. Okay, does that work?

Greg Shatan: I think so.

Avri Doria: Okay then this other...

Greg Shatan: I'd dump the (unintelligible) table in at this point too as well.

Avri Doria: Oh okay, fantastic. As soon as we get through this one we can go back to that one.

Greg Shatan: Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay so I'll accept removing the program review and I'll remove the - where's the remove row? I don't see a - oh delete row, there it is. And then I accept that. Okay so then the review the annual audit report, is it acceptable to say community here? Would that be accepted as opposed to community function but just the community gets to review it too?

Stephanie Duchesneau: I would say CSC with community input.

Avri Doria: Okay that works.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Because I think then we're having - we have the community input. We're involving a wider group. But it's easier to have an existing body initially in that process.

Avri Doria: Okay. Then this next one, reviewed. I've eliminated that line. So let me delete row and accept the deletion of the row. Okay now these last - this last - the CLA enforcement - I think it's good to have them put out an annual audit. I don't know who should review it. But obviously if they're putting one out someone should review it.

Stephanie Duchesneau: I would say the annual audit report - sorry I'm having an issue with the document.

Avri Doria: Do a reload.

Stephanie Duchesneau: I'm going to open a new browser. Hope that helps.

Avri Doria: Then we have a squirrel. I love the little critters. I really do. You have a chipmunk, a raccoon, and a camel.

Stephanie Duchesneau: I think like three of them are probably me in different...

Avri Doria: Okay so - and I have no problem with us leaving a question mark in there. But I also think we could just say, you know, a CSO community, you know, what have you.

Stephanie Duchesneau: So this is - sorry, we're at review the annual audit report or review (unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Yes the COI enforcement report. It was something that IANA was doing for NTIA as far as I could tell from the contract. It doesn't make sense to eliminate it I don't think, you know, because that would be a statement saying we don't care if there's conflict of interest. No, I think we should do that.

But as I say, any audit report that somebody puts out, somebody has to be responsible for reviewing. It can just be the community. You know, that's fine. But opinions? As I say I'm fine leaving it as a question mark, you know, going in, but it seems also easy enough to just put community review. Because I don't think...

Stephanie Duchesneau: And what does community review mean in this context?

Avri Doria: It would mean that it would be put out publicly. The (SOs) would be responsible for reviewing it. And any issues that they had, I guess sent back to IANA or something. Which I think is probably what happens with a lot of these things now. Several - you know, frequently IANA puts out a review for ICANN community review and then the answers go back to them and they either fix or they whatever.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes.

Avri Doria: And then the periodic review could take those into account and, you know, were those reviewed, were there comments? Were the comments satisfactorily dealt with over the following years, etcetera? So then the PRT would take overall review that looked at these things but...

So it could be community review with comments to IANA or comments to the root zone operator, sorry. But...

Stephanie Duchesneau: That's fine to me.

Avri Doria: Does that work for you Greg?

Greg Shatan: Yes.

Avri Doria: So it's community review with comments to - what are we saying? Are we saying - IANA. We're still calling it IANA, correct? Okay, just want to make sure I've got the right euphemism going. Okay and I should probably spell comments correctly. Thank you. I really love (unintelligible).

Okay now going back to - so this table's okay for now. Okay great. We're almost at the end of our hour. Now let's look at the table that Greg just dropped in. (Unintelligible) Oh there it is. It really is a cut and paste.

Greg Shatan: (Unintelligible) table up a little bit so it at least has separate rows, but...

Stephanie Duchesneau: So I think while wanting to keep this not too huge, I feel like we might get this back from the ccTLD side, with how...

Greg Shatan: How many...

Avri Doria: Well they have the same number as the registry stakeholder group. One...

Stephanie Duchesneau: Which I generally agree with. But there is consistently an argument that like other parts of the GNSO are - that it should be a balance between the GNSO and the ccNSO versus the registries in the ccNSO. I tend to for this purpose agree with the latter - that it's the equivalent comparison is more the ccNSO and the RYSG. But it's something we should at least think about.

Avri Doria: So we could put a range in there that said one to three and leave that as something to be discussed so that we have been safe about it, and leave that as one of those open issues that we did not solve. Because I can't see us solving it.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Well I think we have to solve it. We could like say the ccTLD community or the ccNSO has like up to three.

Avri Doria: Yes how do I edit this table? Is this...? When I tried to edit it, I ended up changing the wrong line.

Greg Shatan: Sorry, it's a two-cell table and it should be a 24-cell table. So...

Avri Doria: Oh okay. So should we break this out into bigger tables so it's easier to change?

Greg Shatan: Do whatever you'd like with it.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I probably will. I'll change it into a multi-cell table. And for the ccNSO just put in up to three and leave that as one of those marks (unintelligible) that we just didn't want to tackle - especially since there are no ccNSO people in this little grouping of...

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes do you guys have a strong opinion about that? I just know that this kind of balancing (unintelligible) has come out (unintelligible).

Greg Shatan: Well I think it's an issue, but I feel if we put in one to three then they're just going to automatically go for three. I don't think there's going to be any holding back. I think regardless what you put in they can fall back. I don't think we can - I think anything we propose is going to get developed further by the group if they don't like it.

                 I feel like concessions have been made in other ways in this group and I'm kind of - I would kind of like the ccNSO people to make that proposal rather than have us kind of make it for them.

Stephanie Duchesneau: That's fine. Two other questions about whether we want to add - would we want to add a liaison potentially from the CSC?

Greg Shatan: I think that makes good sense. I think we had talked about that at some point.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Would we want to add a liaison from the IANA department?

Greg Shatan: That might be a little weird only because they're the ones being studied. I wouldn't quite see that as a liaison - not in the sense that the liaison...

Avri Doria: (Unintelligible)

Greg Shatan: The liaison sense we typically have is that the liaison essentially becomes embedded into the group that they are liaising with, rather than being a main point of contact. I'm not sure that you'd want somebody from IANA sitting in the periodic review team all the time.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes I mean more as like having a defined intermediary, a defined point of contact for the (unintelligible).

Greg Shatan: Yes. So what I think I'd do is like main point of contact as opposed to liaison. Probably shouldn't go in the table.

Avri Doria: So we could just add a line later, you know, additionally, you know. Yes, something like additionally. A main point of contact from IANA would be assigned to the PRT or something like that.

Greg Shatan: Or it just would be appointed period. Or would be designated rather. I don't want to make it sound like it's to the PRT.

Avri Doria: Got you. Okay so we're not going to change these values. We're going to take these. Somebody wants to write that line down there and I can - additionally an IANA staff member would be appoint (unintelligible). That work?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes.

Greg Shatan: Yes perfect.

Avri Doria: Okay so I'll continue to transfer this table. We have hit the hour but we have one other thing that somebody has to take on. And I could take it on later so I'm not forcing myself onto it, and that's to compose the short form of this. I'm not - is anyone here else clear on what we have to get into that short form?

Greg Shatan: Not really. I would have to go back and look. I think it's just kind of an executive summary of what we're doing, so probably just involves basically boiling it down like maple syrup.

Avri Doria: Okay. I could try to do one of those boil-downs - unless someone else wants to tackle that. But I do want to send this in at some point before I go to sleep tonight. But I would also like to make sure that if I type something there that it's something you all are comfortable with. So I suppose I could do it and then let you know it's been done so that you could check it.

Greg Shatan: I would greatly appreciate that. My to-do list is about to bite my head off.

Avri Doria: Right. Yes I understand that. Mine is too but I - you know, I'm the provisionary volunteer leader so, you know, it's my responsibility to make sure we get something submitted. So I could take that and see if it's okay.

Greg Shatan: Yes the less eloquent version of that is shit flows uphill.

Avri Doria: I don't consider this at all uphill. It's downhill. All downhill from here.

Greg Shatan: We're all at the same level on the hill.

Avri Doria: I know. We're all at the bottom of this hill.

Stephanie Duchesneau: We're all (unintelligible) the hill.

Avri Doria: So anyhow, I think you. I mean I think, you know, especially you, Stephanie, you've done so much of this. But, you know, I thank you. I think we've got - considering how late we started - I think we've got an adequate submission for the group.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes.

Greg Shatan: I agree 100%.

Avri Doria: Fantastic, okay. So I will continue transferring this table and writing that thing. You know, I'll sent out a quick e-mail but I'm going to do it over the next hour or two. So, you know, if you don't see the e-mail just check.

Stephanie Duchesneau: I think the short form I'm not too worried about because it can be like an exercise in collective cut and paste.

Greg Shatan: Yes. It shouldn't be (unintelligible).

Stephanie Duchesneau: Something like that.

Greg Shatan: It should really track back to the long form, just let (it flow).

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes.

Avri Doria: Yes it's an executive report. I've done those before. I'm sure you guys have

                   done them before. But I just want it to be sanity checked. That's all.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes, no problem.

Greg Shatan: Yes.

Avri Doria: In which case I thank you. It's been a pleasure. I don't know if this'll get

                   thrown back at us, but thanks.

Stephanie Duchesneau: We'll deal with it if it does.

Avri Doria: Yes. Okay then, good weekend, all.

Greg Shatan: You too.

Avri Doria: Talk to you...

Greg Shatan: Bye.

Avri Doria: Okay. Bye-bye.

                              END