

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
April 10, 2015
8:00 am CT**

Donna Austin: Welcome everybody. This is Donna Austin for the record. I think what we should do today is - actually I'll just ask. Stephanie and Staffan have you had a chance to go through the - and Kurt - the clean version of the charter, or the revised version of the charter?

Staffan Jonson: Staffan here. Not in the extent I would have liked to, but I've seen it very briefly, yes.

Donna Austin: I see Martin's trying to - welcome, Martin. And Stephanie you probably haven't had a chance either, given the time that I sent it out which would have been like evening to you. So we've got the clean version on your screen now. Would you prefer to go through the clean or the - there was also a compare document that I sent out. Okay.

Okay so let's go through the clean version. So the - I've tidied up the mission a bit. And I've also opened the mission with a - just a statement as to why the customer standing committee has been established. You know one of the things - we did have the language in a post-NTIA transition or something like that.

But at some point in time people aren't going to understand what that meant. So I'll try to explain that. So if you just want to have a look at the first sentence and see if you're okay with that. Stephanie do you have voice? Or, okay Staffan's good.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes I'm on.

Donna Austin: Okay good. Given there's only a few of us it might be just as easy to just say yes or no.

Man: All of you are in the Adobe room just check the boxes. Say green if you are in agreement.

Man: Okay.

Donna Austin: Okay thanks. So the - I've taken out - I found the last paragraph that we had in the mission. I was getting confused by it. Kurt's got some wording there. Bart can you capture that please?

Bart Boswikel: Yes I think you're right Kurt as it relates to the monitoring of performance of the IANA functions. Just adds that word in -- monitoring.

Donna Austin: Yes okay thanks. So the middle, the second sentence is the same as what we had yesterday with Stephanie's language. And I think really that's the primary mission, right? So it's about performance and it's about - and that's how we will - oh sorry, not the second one but the third one. And that's how we'll do it.

But we had quite a bit of detail in there and I started to get confused by it. So I just took it out. And then I thought it was important that we keep that reference that the CSC is not mandated to initiate a change in the IANA function (unintelligible). So does that all look reasonable to people?

Man: Mm-hm.

Donna Austin: Okay good. Scope of responsibility - so I've added in here the second point is new. The CSC will analyze (unintelligible) provided by IANA on a monthly basis and publish their findings. Does anyone have any problems with that? Okay.

Man: Fine by me.

Donna Austin: Okay good. And probably the other new piece in these is - so based on Staffan's question about the DTM - is it the DTM? I don't know, the escalation design team, I've changed the - one, two, three, four - the fifth point there.

So the CSC may receive complaints from individual registry operators regarding the performance of the IANA naming function. However the CSC will not become involved in a dispute between the registry operator and IANA.

So I think - and please correct me if I'm wrong, but I think we will come to the understanding that we don't want the CSC to be a dispute resolution mechanism in any way.

I think it's still valid that the CSC can receive complaints from registry operators. And that can go to (stats) or you know just evidence that there

might be a problem in some areas if there are a number - if (CSC) receives a number of complaints within a certain period.

And that would be an issue that the CSC could take up with the IANA functions operator as a job lot rather than an individual issue. So it looks like people agree with that.

Staffan Jonson: Staffan here. Yes I sent this message to the design team and not being involved in disputes, etcetera. You may have seen the exact wording on the list but - and this was maybe not received with so happy faces.

Not sure how to handle that. It is an ongoing call. We're in DTM right now in parallel with this one so I can't be in both. But except for that I think it's a reasonable text. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Thanks Staffan. Martin?

Martin Boyle: Thanks Donna. Staffan it would be useful to know if you've got any feelings about this as to why DTM seems to think that the role of the customer service committee should be to involve in the business of other people.

Staffan Jonson: Staffan here. I don't want to go into that too deeply but I think that the (unintelligible) explanation is that DTM was ahead of DTC in designing things. So they made it - or we made it or from a blank paper. And I was late into the process as well.

So - and I think there are some advantages with their approach taking in DTM since they have a process approach as was also demanded from Kurt.

So there is a point in their process even though I don't think all aspects of it are very - are maybe is valid. But that's what we have to just continue working on and do it in a constructive way. So I hope we'll be able to do that. Thank you.

Martin Boyle: Back on that, I see some of this overlapping rather with the discussion in Design Team B as well, which is looking to see whether there is need for some sort of appeals function. And I think it was Donna at the last call flagged that particular concern that I share, that we ended up with people forum shopping, you know, as they come to the CSC to try and get the CSC involved.

Whereas I certainly would see a role for the CSC, very largely as Donna has just outlined it that you monitor where the disputes are and if you're getting an undue number of disputes then you have got a reason for going and asking the IANA function operator why that is the case and what they can do about trying to reduce the number of disputes. Thanks.

Staffan Jonson: Okay Staffan here. Well I agree. I also fear forum shopping as it's called. And that is not the idea for me either, what the CSC should be all about. So - oh I had - I lost my train here. Well I agree. Please let's avoid forum shopping.

Yes, and I've said this before. Sooner or later we have to assume if there is a continuation (via) the CSC or not, sooner or later we have to say - assuming that there is a (unintelligible) or whatever. It will be called this and this should be the case because we need to - because otherwise we'll just - they'll lock each other and that won't be constructive either. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Thanks Staffan. Thanks Martin. I think some of this might have come from the paper that was circulated by (Chris Despame) that appears as registry

signed off on because he - that document actually had a full escalation discussion in there. And I think the CSC - although he called it something different - the DUG, the direct user group - they had an escalation point in there where the CSC would appoint a mediator.

But I think you know in our discussions we've come to the conclusion that the CSC should be very narrow in scope. And once you get into dispute resolution that becomes very (unintelligible) what we've decided the CSC should be doing. So the...

Bart Boswikel: Donna this is Bart.

Donna Austin: Yes.

Bart Boswikel: It might be useful - I tried to capture it in the note but at least say later today there is the co-chairs DT leads call. Already to flag this because probably this will be one of the more say of the topics to discuss either on Monday or Tuesday, so how this will relate and the potential divergence between DTM and DTC in their views.

Donna Austin: Okay I'll (unintelligible) that. Stephanie did you - what was your conversation with (Chuck) like? Can you (unintelligible)?

Stephanie Duchesneau: Well we mostly just noted the discrepancy between it. He had asked me about whether in our charter and our scoping docs we had accounted for this kind of role as a first escalation point. And I mentioned kind of where we stood now that we had stepped back, designed a more narrow scope for the CSC.

And partly just because of the composition of the group and the fact that it's going to be entirely volunteer we didn't think that it made sense for it to have much of a dispute resolution function. And he seemed to understand the justification behind that and just said that he would take the feedback back to the group.

Donna Austin: Okay thanks Stephanie. So the paragraph under that is there's some new language on here from David Conrad. And the sentence underneath is directly related to what David discussed on the call on Wednesday.

So the changes to CSC will on an annual basis or on an as-needs basis conduct consultation with the IANA functions operator. The primary customers of the naming services - we had ccTLD registries, so primary customers is probably better and all-encompassing in the ICANN community about the performance of IANA.

These consultation is expected to include any changes to the IANA services that are underway or are anticipated in the future. In the event a change of IANA services is anticipated, the CSC is authorized to establish an ad hoc committee of technical and other experts to oversee the changes in accordance with a defined process. Anyone have any - yes Martin. Thanks.

Martin Boyle: That seems generally fine to me with the sort of feeling though that that wording, they're looking for a rubber stamp on a decision that's already been made. And so I wonder that the (unintelligible) wherever it is that you talk about proposed changes rather than actual changes themselves.

It's only a minor point but I think it might just be a little bit more realistic, that's what we're actually saying is -- what I would like to see at the CSC - is that is in general good discussion mode with the IANA functions operator and

that when something is originally flagged up, that actually enables the dialogue with the supporting organizations. So just a minor edit I think.

Bart Boswikel: Martin could you suggest it in the chat because then I can take it into the notes as well? So like Kurt did.

Martin Boyle: I look for wherever I thought I was going to put it and then you can find when I was talking.

Bart Boswikel: Yes. I'll copy and paste it and put it in the notes so it's recorded.

Donna Austin: Thanks Martin. Kurt?

Kurt Pritz: I have two points. One is - and just to be clear - you read language to us, right? It's not in the document that's appearing before us. You just read the (unintelligible) from David?

Donna Austin: It's in the document that's on the screen. So it's - on Page 1 it's the last two paragraphs.

Kurt Pritz: Oh I see, it's the last two paragraphs yes. So I think it's changes to IANA operations or services. So you know it's not just the service that's provided but, you know, it might be a significant change in operations. And, you know, I remember that language from earlier somewhere when IANA was working with the Department of Commerce. So, you know, we might want to consider casting it that way.

And my second point is, you know, I don't think the CSC should be constrained to forming an ad hoc committee. But I think the CSC should be

empowered to retain the expertise necessary to evaluate whether the change is being done in a competent way.

So, you know, it might be a set of experts but I might be - you know, that are volunteers - but it might be, you know, that you go hire a firm that looks at, you know, evaluates the service and says it's okay, you know. It might behoove us to have somebody independent from the customer group or the ICANN community look at it.

So I think we should create that freedom for us to just retain the expertise necessary to verify that the change is made in accordance with the defined process or whatever it is.

Donna Austin: Thanks Kurt. Do you have language that you could propose? Are you suggesting changing the - that would be the last paragraph.

Kurt Pritz: Yes.

Donna Austin: Okay if you could propose some language and then we can see how that fits in with what Martin's done and then sign off on it by the others. Thanks. Okay so we'll wait for Kurt's language but we'll move through to the...

Staffan Jonson: Staffan here. I'll try not to expand this issue, this question more. But just (unintelligible) if the CSC has expanded mandates we also need to consider where to finance that from. So let's not make it too big or right for them because then they need funding for it. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Right. So I think what Kurt is saying is that if there is - you know, if a change is required to the IANA services or the operations of the IANA service, then it may require more than just an ad hoc committee or it might require something

different. So I don't want to kind of guess what Kurt's getting to but I think that's what it is.

It's just to expand the options but it's not just, you know, an ad hoc committee is the only way to respond to (unintelligible) service.

Kurt Pritz: Right so if IANA decides to automate their processes more, you know, we might want an independent firm to do the casting of the automation to ensure its reliability before it's launched. So similar to what, you know, the NTIA checks on, you know, had IANA do verifications on automation services.

So we might decide that, you know, where the register operators have the time to do those checks or we might decide that ICANN should just pay an independent firm to do the checks.

Donna Austin: Thanks Kurt. So I see Martin has a question for you in chat. So can we wait for Kurt's language? We'll move on past this and then we'll come back to it?

I think the membership composition, that is pretty much the same with the exception of the fifth paragraph under ALAC. So the chairman of CSC will be elected on an annual basis by the CSC. We did have ideally the chair will be a registry operator I think. That's been changed to will be a direct customer of the IANA naming function but cannot be the IANA liaison. So that's the only change here. Very good.

The selection process, we included the language provided by Stephanie that while the ccTLD and just to flag that (CC&G) operators can be from outside the ccNSO or the registry stakeholder group.

I'm scrolling through the document. I don't know whether people are doing that as well. So I'm now moving on to Page 3. The terms I've updated to the language that Stephanie had provided and we agreed on on Wednesday. The new part here is recall of members. And this is something that was suggested by (Bernie).

So any CSC appointee can be recalled at the discretion of their appointing community. In the event that a ccTLD or GTLD register representative is recalled, a replacement must be provided in order to participate in the next meeting of the CSC.

And the CSC may also request a recall of a member of the CSC in the event they have not met the minimum attendance requirements. The appointing community will be responsible for finding a suitable replacement.

We are okay with this? Okay Stephanie is - I see everybody else is still discussing the previous sentence, the previous issue. Okay let's get through the rest of the document and then we'll come back to the issue that's causing some consternation on the chat.

So recall of members, we agree - do we agree with the language that's on the screen? I saw Staffan agreed that (unintelligible).

Bart Boswikel: Sorry Donna. Just to be clear, so the recall of members, that language has been agreed, and then we move (unintelligible)?

Donna Austin: Staffan and Martin have agreed. Stephanie hasn't indicated agreement yet. Yes, she's good. So are you okay with the recall of members? Yes go ahead Kurt. It's (unintelligible) to take the box. So recall of members is good Bart. Thank you.

The meetings are the same. The recording of proceedings is the same. Secretariat is the same. So with the review pace we agreed during the call to separate out the charter and the performance and separate the review of the charter and the effectiveness of the CSC or review of the CSC.

So this is changed a little bit. And Martin raised some concerns that we would be reviewing ad nauseum, so I've tried to break it down into reasonable time frames as well.

So the charter will initially be reviewed by a committee of representatives to the ccNSO and registry stakeholder group. That should be one year after the first meeting of the CSC. The review is to include the opportunity for input from other ICANN stakeholders. Any recommended changes are to be ratified by the ccNSO and GNSO.

Thereafter the charter will be reviewed every two years or at the request of the CSC. The effectiveness of the CSC will initially be reviewed two years after the first meeting of the CSC and then every three years thereafter. The method of the review will be determined by the ccNSO and GNSO.

Service level targets must be formally reviewed no less than every 18 months by the CSC and the IANA functions operator. Any proposed changes to the service level targets as a result of the review must be agreed by the ccNSO and GNSO. Do we have any concerns with any of that? Bart, can you just note that on the second line that has to be (RYST) one year, not (unintelligible). Martin and then Stephanie, thanks.

Martin Boyle: Thanks Donna. Yes by and large I think that wording is very helpful. I have a little bit of doubt about reviewing the charter every two years. You know, that

just seems to me to be, you know, sort of excessive. And I wonder whether that could just be put round the other way and say the charter will be reviewed at the request of the ccNSO, the GNSO or the CSC and leave it open to how often it is reviewed.

To some extent I have the feeling that if things are going wrong in the CSC that really is going to require some fairly serious debate within the ccNSO and the GNSO because they're not getting out of it what they want and therefore, you know, let's make it proactive for them.

As I said before, the sort of - the ICANN process of reviewing everything, if it's in place for more than 30 seconds just seems to me to be a little bit excessive. But I think I can just live with that language.

But the last paragraph about service level targets, expectations, commitments - call them what you will - and reviewing them no less than every 18 months - I've not got any general feel for how often they're done, they are reviewed now.

And, you know, it would seem to me that if you're going to do a review of the service level targets, then perhaps that's something that is initiated in one of the general discussions - in other words, one of the annual meetings as something where there is pressure for updating rather than getting this poor committee to sit round and scratch their heads and think, "Well how do we modify them now?" which again seems to me to be not driven by need - you know, by requirements but driven by need of a committee to do something.
Thanks.

Donna Austin: Okay. Thanks, Martin. Stephanie.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Yes, I generally agree with (Martin's) point that the source of reviews that are initiated or carried out by the CSC should be more ones that are done as needed. And I also just wanted to flag that the review of the service level targets, because in Design Team M we are looking at the IANA statement of work as a whole, there is a potential for overlap there.

And I think in looking at the service level targets, the input from the CSC and from the registry community that is filtered through the CSC would definitely be the most important piece of data and piece of analysis. But I kind of think that having it structured every 18 months in a very formalized review could be out of sync with that process as well.

Donna Austin: Okay. Thanks, Stephanie. So we changed the second paragraph that basically any review of the charter can be done at the request of the CSC, the GNSO of the ccNSO. And I think what I'm hearing is that we get rid of the last paragraph here about service level targets and that can be captured, or it's intimated that that would be picked up as part of the consultation that is undertaken on an annual basis that is referred to its scope of responsibilities or through the periodic review that Stephanie is referring to of the statement of work. Is that what I'm hearing?

Kurt Pritz: I'm not sure you don't want to reserve for yourself some way to raise your hand and say we think the SLA should be reviewed. So I don't know - let's talk about it for just a minute. I understand what everybody is saying that, that (unintelligible) somewhere. But if the CSC gets together after a while of monitoring and decides that SLA should be reviewed, there should be some mechanism for raising your hand and making sure you're listened to.

So I don't know if you want to reserve for yourself some -- I don't know if you call it a (right) -- that if the CSC decides that SLA should be reviewed that will trigger a review. I see others have comments.

Staffan Jonson: Staffan here. Yes. This was discussed a lot in the DTM. The outcome was who was standing to raise an issue. When you say someone has to have the chance to raise their hand, who is the someone? Is it the CSC members or is it all of the Internet community? And that makes a difference and that is all of the difference.

What you think, Kurt, when you say one should, who is that exactly?

Donna Austin: Kurt, did you want to respond to Staffan before we move to Martin?

Kurt Pritz: No, I think we should hear what Martin has to say.

Donna Austin: Okay. Martin.

Martin Boyle: Thanks, Donna. I think Kurt has got a good point in that it is obvious that a service level commitment is no longer appropriate or is woefully out of date. The CSC has an opportunity to raise it as being an issue to discuss. But the current service levels were evolved, developed in discussion between the wider community and the IANA functions operator.

It would seem to me probably quite appropriate for the CSC to put its hand up and say we think we need to look at this, which it could do at the regular meeting. You could do it as an ICANN meeting, general discussion. But the next stage is to go through that sort of consultation to make sure that the ccNSO and the registry stakeholder group - their views are being taken into account.

And I would not want the CSC either to have to review something formally every 18 months, which is out of cycle with the annual meeting or for the CSC to see it as being its decision. It is rather sort of the interface with the ccNSO and the registry stakeholder group and the other ccTLD who are not members of the ccNSO.

I felt inherently comfort with (Donna's) suggested wording. Thanks.

Donna Austin: So what if we -- that last paragraph that we have in the review -- what if we said service level targets or the CSC or the IANA functions operator can request changes to the service level targets at any time, any proposed changes would have to be agreed by the ccNSO and GNSO. It may not - under review anymore we may have to move it up to scope of responsibilities.

Martin?

Martin Boyle: Could we find a happy in-between because this is an unhappy of the CSC certainly unilaterally starting to say what the service level agreement should be. And say that the request changes to request review and that then allows it to take into account what the ccNSO and the registry stakeholder group are saying and initiate with them - initiate a process. Thanks.

Donna Austin: My kind of gut feel on this is that if a service level target is off, then there has to be - the CSC and the IANA functions operator must be in a position to be able to say, look, this is just stupid and it's not workable. And they need a reasonably quick method to change it. I guess the other way around it is if it becomes obvious in the monitoring of the performance that it's often - that's part of the review as well.

But Kurt suggested the CSC can raise for review service level agreements by the ccNSO and (unintelligible) initiated process.

Staffan?

Staffan Jonson: Yes, I'm not sure if it's constructive. But the service level targets must be reviewed regularly, not mentioning the months if that's the issue, and then adding on (Kurt's) formulation in the charts. The CSC can raise full review of service level agreements by the ccNSO as indicated in the process. Maybe that is middle ground or something.

Donna Austin: Okay. So the CSC or the IANA functions operator may request a review of the service level targets at any time and any proposed changes to the service level targets as a result of the review must be agreed by the ccNSO and GNSO and add in the word "regularly." Okay. So Kurt is saying can. Okay.

Staffan, go ahead.

Staffan Jonson: Nothing from me. Okay, if no one is talking, I'll try to expand a bit more. So we're talking about service level targets and we want them to be reviewed, right? If we say a specific number of months or regularly, I don't know if that makes a very huge difference as long as we have a mechanism that will take me further. And I thought we had a mechanism taken further, right? Martin Boyle, you say no here. I'm not sure what happened.

Donna Austin: There are types and language into the chat. I don't really want to spend much more time on this. If we can kind of come to some vague agreement that would be useful. I mean there has to be the ability to review or change the service level targets. My suggested language is mute on when that can be done, so I haven't included "regularly."

Staffan Jonson: Staffan here. I'm happy with your formulation. What it also says is who cannot initiate a change. That's important as well. Thank you.

Donna Austin: It's confined to the CSC. We may get some pushback on this part of the comments. But you've got that language, so we'll just swap that out.

So let's go back to the...

Bart Boswikel: Donna, this is Bart. Maybe - just one small addition because that will take out some of the heat in this one as well in accordance with a predefined or in accordance with a defined process again because it allows you to define that process later on.

Donna Austin: Sure, I don't have any opposition to that.

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: Thanks, Bart.

Bart Boswikel: And say on that is if you'll go through - because I wanted to raise it earlier in the conversation on that. And maybe that's something to take into account. In this charter, you refer to predefined processes, et cetera, to really say as part of the review is that when necessary these processes will be reviewed and need to be adopted by the GNSO and the ccNSO. Then you got it full circle. Send it in a separate e-mail. I'll put it in the chart later on.

Donna Austin: Okay. Thanks, Bart.

So can we go back to scope of responsibilities and the last paragraph on page 1 which created some discussion? Kurt?

Kurt Pritz: I think I understand (Martin's) concern. So in reading this it says "the CSC is authorized to establish an ad hoc committee to oversee the changes." And so my point was if the CSC is going to oversee the changes, then it should have flexibility in how it oversees the changes.

Martin, when I read your comment, I think your comment really goes to whether the CSC should be in the role of overseeing the changes or not. And then my comment was if we are going to oversee the changes, we should have flexibility. So I think the discussion is whether -- and tell me if I have the issue wrong -- but I think the issue is whether we include this or not, whether the CSC is charged with overseeing the changes in operational and service changes. Do you think that is right, Martin?

Martin Boyle: I'm actually struggling with the idea that the CSC starts taking on a very much wider role that it would necessarily have the skills to be able to, or the resources to be able to carry out. And I suppose to some extent this sort of goes back in my mind to the CSC being inserted in a sort of authorization role or other critical path where all it probably can do is to go back to the ccNSO, to go back to the registry stakeholder group and ask them.

Now I think the IANA functions operator when doing something -- and let's just think about automation is something that has sort of gone on for some time. And there was then a great confusion to where the delays were coming in in the introduction of automation. Some people said it was the NTIA. Some people said it was ICANN itself. Nobody really knew.

The idea of setting CSC up to fail in that sort of process seems to me to be silly. What I would like to see anyway is the IANA functions operator on something like the automation to say, okay, this is what we're proposing. Go

into a consultation with the registries. Take into account what is being said by the registries. Do a trial -- a limited trial -- to make sure that things are working. In other words, do good engineering diligence rather than just sticking another committee in the way.

Anyway, that's just my feelings, my concerns of not wanting to set the CSC up for a fall.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Martin.

Kurt?

Kurt Pritz: I agree with Martin. I think it's an authorization task, that whoever is doing the authorization should be authorizing the changes and service it. I think where I disagree with Martin is that there should be some sort of authorization or oversight and not just - make sure you use good engineering practices when you do that. So I think it's a necessary task.

And I agree with Martin that it should be with an authorization party and not with the CSC which is a monitoring party. And that's why I put in that if the CSC does do this, we get to hire somebody to do it competently if we want and leave it off to some independent body because I was thinking to protect the CSC in the same way that Martin is.

Donna Austin: Martin, did you want to respond?

Martin Boyle: Only very briefly in saying that where I'm sitting I have great reservations over authorizing parties and authorizing roles. It's been something that has given me a lot of concern that essentially we're putting something into the process that starts to have a gatekeeper function.

No, I think actually in this particular case, we've got to get the IANA functions operator very much more closely working as a service function, providing a service to the registries and working in conjunction with the registries on enhancements to that service. And putting somebody in who takes a checkbox and says this is ready to go is just downright dangerous. What happens if the CSC takes the checkbox and says this is ready to go and then the whole thing falls flat on its face. Is CSC to blame? I'm not sure.

Donna Austin: Okay. So I think part of what I'm hearing is that there is a concern here that we're broadening the scope or the remit of the CSC. It's primarily a performance monitoring body. We've deliberately tried to keep it that way in that we decided that it should not be a dispute resolution provider.

One of the problems here and that (David) has is that there is nowhere else to put this. And I'm not sure how to marry those two issues. Kurt is saying there should be an authorization function, but I think another team has decided that there is no authorization to be done anymore.

I'm really at a loss as to how to reconcile this. Did somebody say something?

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart. I think if you say -- and this is based on a discussion (Bernie) and I had around the role of the CSC -- say the (unintelligible) is one. Another way of looking at the CSC is it acts as -- it's not a gatekeeper -- but it acts as a counterpart of IANA to talk with the registries -- whether the CCT or the gTLDs of these -- and at the end with say the ccNSO and GNSO who will need to rectify stuff.

So it's more that under the umbrella of the CSCs, some processes can be triggered. I think what (David) was looking for and what you can see already here say with some of the ICANNs you agreed is that if frame it in terms of a process triggered under the umbrella of the CSC so there is no decision

making there with only there is under circumstances this process will kick in. And then it needs to be defined. Then I think it finds its place. So there is no decision making there.

It's only if certain thresholds are met, the process kicks in. And that is something what (David) was looking for as well -- to have a channel for at the end of the - like the example of automation to have a channel to discuss with the registries who have predefined process which is triggered through the CSC because they are constantly in touch as with the IANA functions operator.

Donna Austin: Martin, go ahead.

Martin Boyle: I generally like the interpretation that I'm hearing from Bart and that makes (Kurt's) intervention a lot easier to me to understand. But I guess I'm still at that point in saying why do you see it through a narrow filter of the CSC rather than the IANA functions operator going out for consultation, putting forward its proposals and discussing directly with the registry groups. Because there is a whole (raft) of things that are associated here including the sort of preparation of documentation and processes which really I don't see as being a role of the CSC, but rather that want to give the operational teams in the different businesses the opportunity to look, discuss, test and come back with their comments and also to look for a process of implementation that is phased and has all the necessary feedback.

So I'd be happy with really essentially with what Bart was saying except with, you know, well, here is a role for the CSC. The fact that the CSC is being set up to carry out a role in my mind is yes, but a very, very clearly defined role that is looking very specifically at making sure that IANA carries on performing well.

If, for example, going back to the case of automation, the IANA functions operator introduces automation and the whole service falls flat on its face, then the CSC has got a role there because, of course, the IANA functions operator has properly missed a good (feel) of its service level commitments. And then it's how are you going to put that right? And again good engineering from the IANA functions operator is to have a roll back process ready just in case.

Thanks.

Donna Austin: I think I have a question here and that is why at the end of the consultation can it not be the responsibility of the IANA functions operator to establish the ad hoc committee to do more work and come back to the community to agree to it? And I think Martin mentioned that. I think that's where I'm coming down do.

Okay. The CSC can facilitate a consultation were some changes are discussed. But as a result of that consultation, if it is agreed that a new service is required, then the IANA functions operator should be the body that takes that consultation forward with the community, not the CSC. And that removes the CSC from the line of blame as well.

Staffan Jonson: Staffan here. I tried the verb "invite." So I took the current formulation and just changed it. In the event of changing the NSO - anticipate the CSC may invite and that whole committee will take (unintelligible). By saying this, there is no promises in either direction to actually use what is being done. Common sense says it will be anyhow. Maybe that is the way forward.

Donna Austin: Even if the CSC invites an ad hoc committee, it's still responsible for the output of that committee. And I think that's the concern. I think it's...

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Donna Austin: Sorry, Staffan. I don't mean to dismiss you, but I guess I'm kind of thinking out loud here.

Staffan Jonson: Please do. So I was trying to take away the responsibility from the CSC but just letting them have the initiative to (unintelligible) things, not necessarily conclude and maybe that's not constructive; I'm not sure. But not to take away and put responsibility where power is and not mixing up the responsibility and power in different organizations or functions.

Donna Austin: Yes. Kurt?

Kurt Pritz: Stéphane, my concern is that even if we say May and this is the only place in any of the documentation where such a review was mentioned, then it will, you know, it will be thought that, "Well, the CSG decided not to undertake this review or initiate and substantiate this ad hoc committee, therefore the review is not required."

And so, you know, it leaves the CSC open to the criticism, "Well the CSC decided not to review it, then things went south." So I think your spirit is exactly right, but I think it could be turned on its head somehow.

Staffan Jonson: Good point; definitely.

Donna Austin: Perhaps one way around this - my handset is about to die. So perhaps as a result of the consultation so if you say in the event a change in IANA services is - I don't like the word anticipated because the consultation is going to identify whether there should be changed or not. So in the event a change in

services is required or agreed, the IANA Function's operator is required to undertake a community consultation to (unintelligible) support the process or something.

So Benny, I think part of the confusion here is that we don't know what the IANA process is. So in my mind, the CSC doesn't have a role here until such as the new service is implemented and there's a performance requirement. So I think that's why the disconnect is here is that until the service is implemented, I think in our collected minds, there is no role for the CSC.

Staffan Jonson: So what fora would actually provide enough for development of the DNS? Because we can't take that out of the definition. We need - it's need to be somewhere. Maybe we should just leave it by that saying that we don't provide CSC (unintelligible) for development renovation in the DNS, but it needs to be somewhere else.

As I always say, let's put a placeholder there and say this is someone else's work but let's not forget it anyhow.

Donna Austin: Yes, I think I'm still on the call.

Bart Boswinkel Yes you are Donna.

Donna Austin: So I have a handset but I have no idea whether it's going to work or not.

I'm thinking. To Bernie, if there should be a process for how to bring in new services, yes that is correct but I'm not sure it's the CSC's role. And I think that's where we're all coming down too.

What if we highlight this text that we have? If anyone's got any good ideas about, you know, how we can change it to make some sense of it, but flag it that where the CSC is a little bit uncomfortable about being responsible for the process.

Martin?

Martin Boyle: Yes thanks Donna. Would it work, because as I said before, I think the role of the engineering due diligence is for the IANA Functions Operator. You're suggestion puts that into the IANA Functions Operator doing some sort of consultation and planning, which I must admit I think is right.

The CSC could be encouraged to work with the IANA Function Operator in consultations in introducing changes in process or in services.

Whether that is actually enough that would then allow the CSC to put up its hand if it was getting any direct concerns that were coming from the community that seemed to be being ignored by the IANA Functions Operator whether there's some sort of softening -- softened words -- in there that doesn't say it will actually have the role but - sorry, a direct role, but it will work in cooperation with the IANA Functions Operator.

And that then does allow this to be a channel that would be equivalent to the CSC putting his hand up and saying, "Stop, we don't think this is ready because of the feedback that we're getting from registries." Thanks.

Donna Austin: Thanks Martin. So Benny or Bart, is there actually a process for how this works at the moment? I don't believe there is, I don't (unintelligible) an ad hoc arrangement (unintelligible).

Bart Boswinkel Yes and I think that's the real concern is some of it - some of these changes as far as I know and because of they're part of the Statement of Work and the change of Statement of Work is almost on an ad hoc basis, and the evolution of it, and that's a bit of the concern.

For example - and Kurt, maybe you know say the bit around DNS sec (sic) that say - I know this is a major concern for David and others is there is no place right now, and there wasn't for future changes. And there are some coming down the pipeline. So I...

Kurt Pritz: So when IANA wanted to make a change, you know, they did the operational stuff to put the change in place but then NTIA would be the one to say, "Okay, start now." And that was usually down in a collaboration, you know, among VeriSign, NTIA and IANA.

Bart Boswinkel Yes.

Kurt Pritz: And I had more experience when IANA introduced it to automation and how that worked. But there had to be testing between VeriSign and IANA and the NTIA monitored that. And kind of when VeriSign and IANA said, "Okay, we think it's working okay."

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswinkel And I think - yes. And I really understand; you don't want the CSC to be involved in (unintelligible) stuff. That's pure operation - that's the responsibility for the party who carries out say who is performing the service at the end of the day. It's in their remit of risk or however you want to call it.

On the other hand - and that's what I do appreciate. And then say because it's been done in an ad hoc fashion in the past, is you need - and say the ultimate process again to engage with the registries or others, went through the NTIA like for example with the latest update of the Statement of Work or the previous one when (Ultimation) came in.

So you want to, in a way, a mechanism that channels changes. And if you look at, say for example, (unintelligible) that was a major concern for I know from some, who some CC's say, "When according to the current NTIA or current agreement, IANA had to do some consultations," which they did.

But they were organized in such a fashion that people - and they used a public forum and everything else. But people were not aware that this was happening.

And I think having a CSC or something in that capacity, people will pay attention to what it does as just as being a facilitator. And I think that's what I meant with under the umbrella of the CSC as being a facilitator to facilitate the communication or the dialogue between the registries and IANA.

But then you need a process in place. And that's something - that's why I said one way or the other, you need something in here in the Charter that moving forward, assuming this will be the role of the CSC, as part of its work plan, it needs to define some processes which need to be adopted by the GNSO and ccNSO anyway.

Sorry, I was rambling on.

Donna Austin: Stéphane?

Staffan Jonson: Stéphane here. Yes, maybe we're all complicating things a little. Let's step back and see what we're talking about.

The CSC is overview something. So an overview function is very problem oriented when something doesn't work, right. So we're talking about how the CSC should, in its overview function, should relate to innovation or new things.

So see, for example, for the development of key rollover or (audionesecc) or whatever function is new to the game. Where does it actually take place? Well maybe not in naming communities at all; maybe in the ITF.

So maybe this is not a big problem. Maybe this is something for the ISG to knit together how the innovation or the development of all the services, not just names but numbers, standards. And standards in general terms for both (unintelligible).

So maybe you should just leave this as a placeholder on unresolved issue, and maybe out of the narrative (unintelligible) of CSC's scope for the definition of CSC as we intend to go at least in this addition. Thank you.

Bart Boswinkel This is Bart. Just for my understanding, but maybe I'm losing track, is say going back to your question Donna, who is currently - say you could view this also as part of the evolution of the Statement of Work in which whatever entity is reviewing the Statement of Work should also be the counterpart around the evolution of the Statement of Work. Because that, if you think about it, that's the role that you're looking for.

Because the Statement of Work is nothing else than what services do you provide and that will change over time. So somebody or one way or the other

is that - either as a request from the community or based on the developments in the outside world is the Statement of Work needs to evolve.

Donna Austin: So I think, you know, going back to where Stéphane was, if we just flag this I think that it needs to be dealt with somewhere. We've got a placeholder within our scope of responsibilities, but we're not necessarily comfortable with having it there and we need to find a home for it.

So I think, you know, understanding that, you know, David needs somewhere to put this, but we'll put it here for the time being but we really would like to flag that it should be somewhere else.

Is that?

Staffan Jonson: Stéphane here. I'd just pasted something into the Chat to have (unintelligible). Thanks.

Donna Austin: Yes, I agree Stéphane.

So we agree that that's the way to handle this? I mean it's 6:20 now, or it's 20 past the hour wherever people are. So I think in the interest of trying to wrap this up, we'll just have to agree on that.

So Martin is okay with that approach. Stephanie, are you not happy with that approach?

Staffan Jonson: Stephanie has had that red one all call, so I'd think of something else.

Donna Austin: A do not disturb button or something. Okay, let's...

Staffan Jonson: (Unintelligible) maybe.

Donna Austin: Let's just go with that. And Bart, I'll raise this again on the call that's with the Design Team leads.

Bart Boswinkel And I'll put these two things, I'll put them in as action items for you to raise the two points we just discussed. This one and the previous one.

Donna Austin: Okay, thanks Bart. Bernie has just said that his headset has died. So I think that's a wrap on the Charter. Oh, Bernie's back.

Bernie, could you speak to the - I haven't done any - I haven't progressed really on the other document, the Recommendations Document that we pulled together before Istanbul, but I am conscious that we need to do that. But I wanted to get the Charter out of the way before we do that.

Stéphane, did you have something?

Staffan Jonson: Oh sorry, no. I was just going to raise how to take this further, but you already started; sorry.

Donna Austin: Okay, Bernie's got a headset but no mic. Okay.

Bart Boswinkel Donna, I've just shared with - and I'll make it scrollable, and that's just a layout. Say this is using the template that was prepared and say the submission of DTC for the time being. It needs to be updated anyway to reflect the latest discussion around the Charter.

But in principle, it is say it's the DTC recommendation and then Bernie suggests that we copy the Mission Statement of the CSC, and then as an annex

include the Charter. So that's what we're reporting into the Charis and for the discussion on Monday and Tuesday. And if necessary, as Annex B, you could also include the document itself say with all the deliberations of the DTC over the last couple of weeks.

Donna Austin: Do what you're suggesting Bart is the Recommendations Document that we had worked on prior to Istanbul, we don't necessarily need that at this time?

Bart Boswinkel No because if you look at it, say the way it has evolved especially in the discussion around the Charter, it's really focusing on the monitoring role of the CSC. And it became more succinct and clearer.

And I think, say that's very clear from the mission in the Charter itself, and then you've got all kinds of say some of the considerations in the other document are also reflected in the Charter itself. So it is an x-ray of that document, the preassemble one.

Donna Austin: Okay, well that makes life easier for me. Does anybody else have any comments on that or about that approach?

Bart Boswinkel And I think - Donna, if you really want, because I think the document that this group produced Istanbul and taking onboard is a very rich one, say you could include it as Annex B but making clear that that's up to Istanbul, and then the group has taken it a step further.

Donna Austin: Okay. Stéphane here.

Staffan Jonson: Well does this document then answer all the requirements from the templates? I can't answer to that myself but we started the pre-Istanbul documents just to make sure we answered all the requests from there. So maybe we need to look

through that. It actually does that because otherwise we didn't answer the question.

Another issue is...

((Crosstalk))

Bart Boswikel Yes but say in preparation, say Bernie and I could do that analysis genuinely. But say if them you put it in the report either as an introductory note or say as a background note. Say it defines some elements of the chart of the template chart of this group because there is a lot of overlap.

Some have been overstepping the boundaries and some have been within, so that's an analysis that needs to be done anyway in the ground picture of things. Like what you noted between the overlap between DTM and DTC around the escalation and the role of the CSC and the escalation.

Staffan Jonson: Yes because that's my other question or concern rather that how do we take on (unintelligible) between DTC and ETM; I'm not sure how to handle it. I hope we - well we need to be constructive in some way.

And I think the DTM had some points actually being quite specific and process oriented of what to expect, and this is also what Kurt wanted in his tables.

So how do we include that in our proposal? I'm not sure. Do you have an idea?

Bart Boswikel Well I think just raise it as an issue at this stage. Say that's the advantage/disadvantage of working in smaller working group, and that's

maybe one of the purposes, and that's something to raise at a later call, say how to reconcile all these different DTs and Design Teams and what they've done into a bigger picture.

Staffan Jonson: Sure, yes.

Bart Boswikel And that's something - sorry?

Staffan Jonson: Yes, you were right Bart. I just want to push things here so we get forward. But maybe you're right; there will probably be (unintelligible) problems or diverging views between DTs so maybe that's the next step.

Bart Boswikel Yes, you need to have a full discussion but that was the idea of having the Design Teams and then having a full discussion by the full CWG.

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Bart Boswikel That was the original intent.

Staffan Jonson: Good, then I'm happy.

Donna Austin: Okay, so are we all good?

Staffan Jonson: I am.

Donna Austin: Okay.

Bart Boswikel Sorry Donna. I just saw the note from you and Stephanie. I think say including the pre-Istanbul, say we can raise there is a document. Maybe it's easier to do it this way.

The Charter needs to be updated anyway as a result of this call. What you see now in the screen is what Bernie has prepared was a document which the recommendation is more or less the Mission Statement of the CSC, and then the Annex is the full Charter.

And we had one or two lines that needs to be approved by this group as well is one of two lines around what is included and say what has been done between post-Istanbul. And then flag say maybe one or two of these discrepancies.

And then we do not need to include the pre-Istanbul document anyway because that's available on the Wiki space and we can post it there. You can refer to it, but then you make a very clear distinction between the Charter and the pre-Istanbul document to avoid confusion around the two.

Donna Austin: Yes, I understand Bart. I think our intention when we started the Charter exercise was that we would do a Charter which would form part of the Recommendations Document that we have. But it seems now that the Charter has overtaken that document.

Bart Boswikel Yes.

Donna Austin: And it was my intention to update the Recommendations Document to be consistent with the Charter. But you know, I still think there are some things we might want to add in to support the Charter but let's get through the Charter first.

Bart Boswikel Yes, and we can raise it in this document. Say, "This group will refine the pre-Istanbul document." And then you have - then it's available for the group

because then it needs to be included in the proposal one way or the other as well. But that's another question.

Donna Austin: Okay, thanks Bart.

So I think it's 6:31. So let's call the meeting to a close. I will make changes to the Charter that we discussed. I will recirculate that to the list and then Stéphane and I have a Chairs' call in half an hour's time, so we'll raise those two issues that we spoke about as well.

Thank you everybody.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you very much.

Bart Boswinkel Thank you. Bye-bye.

Martin Boyle: Thanks Donna; helpful.

Donna Austin: Thanks Martin, bye.

END