ICANN

Moderator: Brenda Brewer
May 28, 2015
2:00 pm CT

Coordinator: The recording has started. You may now proceed.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you. Everyone this is our last call for day one. It is 1900, well 1903 UTC and the 28th of May. We will take attendance in the Adobe Connect Room as always. And we have Olivier on audio-only for the next 27 minutes. Lise, turn it over to you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Grace. It's Lise Fuhr and I'm one of the two co-chairs of the CWG and together with my co-chair Jonathan Robinson we will continue to go through the comments that we started during the last meeting.

We need to speed up in order to go through those and have it finalized by this call. But having said that I would like to repeat what Jonathan stated during the last call and the first call regarding the objectives and the necessary outcomes of these high intensive working calls.

And well the objective is that we need to have a document that is as close to finalization as possible and it's very important that whatever we do is supporting staff in the preparation of the final document. It's important that

we all recognize what's been prior agreed among us and we only do the modification of such by the public comment.

So we want to close all open issues and recognize which one can be left for the actual implementation. And by doing this we need to decide on the necessary level of details and to cover all the public comments and sufficient closure the key items and not as I said reopen previously closed items.

We're going through the summary of action items that's coming out from the public comment. This summary that's being shown in the Adobe room is actually building on the public comment tool that staff prepared for us. And as previously noted this is - the original document is color coded by design teams and so every design team has their color and can easily recognize what comments are related to their network.

So we will go through the comments and focus on necessary additions or changes to the proposal and find out what we - the group will respond to these and of course we'll have some of the design team's work on this too.

So where we left was we were partly through the DTO - or not the DTO - we were partly through the IANA budget. And we had Chuck asking us to put in the comments that the DTO already prepared. And Chuck...

Chuck Gomes: Okay, thanks Lise.

Lise Fuhr: Will you go through the...

Chuck Gomes: Sure.

Lise Fuhr: ...comments that you have and let's discuss it in the group?

Chuck Gomes: I will. The first one is the comments from the CRISP team. And basically what they said was that they didn't see any conflicts and we don't either so you can see the proposed response there is that the DTO appreciates the input provided and suggests that those steps be - I'm sorry, I'm one too low. It moved up on me.

The DTO appreciates the feedback provided and notes there is no conflict between the two approaches. And we think as Design Team O that that response is sufficient. But I'll stop there to see if there are any comments or questions.

Okay going on to the next one which is from the Internet in that folks. And they actually provided the steps that they use for budget approval. And those of us on Design Team O thought that their steps are actually pretty good and could be used as a basis for customizing them for PTI and developing the budget for PTI each year and as a best practice.

Now we did not have the time or try to do the customization of that. But our response right now is that the CWG suggests that those steps be customized for how PTI is expected to develop its budget as a best practice. And then the one decision then that the CWG needs to make if that approach is supported is to decide should those steps be customized before we submit our proposal for SO/AC approval or sometime after that.

Certainly they need to be in place before the transition. And I'll stop there and see what comments or questions there are. And that's - by the way that is in the review tool, that's Item 317 in that where you can actually see the steps that they propose if anybody wants to look at that.

Lise Fuhr: Chuck I see Alan Greenburg has his hand up.

Chuck Gomes: Good. I didn't know whether you wanted me to manage the queue or not.

Lise Fuhr: Okay I'll take this line. Okay Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you. Chuck I cannot really see us designing the details of their budget planning process for IANA post-transition. That's a level of micromanaging and presumption of the incompetence of the skills of the people who will be there and overseeing the operation that I don't think is warranted.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Alan. That's certainly one perspective. I think one of the problems we're dealing with is that a budget's going to have to be developed very quickly and we don't necessarily have to prescribe the process but maybe it's an approach where we put these steps out to them as a suggested process for them to review and consider.

                   I'm not necessarily at - nor is Design Team O - advocating that we are prescriptive in terms of how they develop their budget. I think there are some things though that we do need to recommend and those have to do with the timing of it.

                   And that's what some of the important issues that came out in the Design Team O meeting yesterday because for stability purposes we don't think it's going to work for the IANA budget to be approved for the next fiscal year as late as the overall ICANN budget is approved.

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: That's way too late for stability purposes.

Alan Greenberg: Chuck if I may follow on, I support specifying a level of granularity and timing. And I'll point out PTI's budget year doesn't have to overlap with - doesn't have to be the same as ours necessarily. But so yes specificity with what we want to accomplish, but details of how to do it I think is going too far. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Alan. And I see James Gannon is next in line. James go ahead.

James Gannon: Hi. James. I think we could do this similar to the way that Design Team L worked insofar as Design Team L can come back with a series of I suppose best practices and recommendations from the CWG as to how the PTI should structure its budgets and here are the points that we feel are incredibly important and really should be not laid down as the law but here is what we feel the community, the CWG being the community vehicle for the - feel are things that really should be at the top of the process when it comes to formulating the budgetary process for PTI.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you James. I'd like to add that the (unintelligible) and budget recommendations regarding process and budget development too. So it might be worthwhile to have a look at those too. Any other comments to Chuck and this part of the public comments? Doesn't look like it. Chuck go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so then the last one there - I'm looking on the screen - looks like it's a need for a budget to support. R&D should be included and you can see - well I don't see our response to that. Let me look here. In fact I'm not sure - that's not one that DTO dealt with I don't think. So we may have to take another look at that.

Marika Konings: Chuck this is Marika.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Chuck this is Marika. It's actually the one above that that BTO provided the response to. And I think actually the one you just referred to, I don't know if we overlooked it on the (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Oh I'm sorry. I was - I had moved one, two down. Thanks Marika. This is Chuck. With regard to the IANA specific budget review you can see our proposed response and we agree with the CCWG Accountability chairs in their comments on that and note that the process should be developed possibly as part of the implementation of the proposal. And the CWG would consider whether there are any elements that should be developed as part of the final proposal.

So basically we're in agreement with the CCWG Accountability Chairs on that. And we should decide whether or not - as we say there - whether or not there are any elements that we should develop together. And I think that's all of the ones that Design Team O dealt with.

Lise Fuhr: Okay any questions or comments to Chuck regarding this part?

Chuck Gomes: And I'll - Lise...

Lise Fuhr: Yes go ahead Chuck, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Regarding the next one there, the need for a budget to support R&D, we did not discuss that one I don't - but we definitely think that a budget needs to be

worked on quickly. And some of our recommendations in Annex Q deal with that - less so from a budget point of view as an overall funding point of view.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Alan Greenberg, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes just a quick point. Part of the issue on the R&D budget is that it's not just we need to allow an R&D budget. Based on what we're doing that may vary heavily from year to year. So we need to put in place the kind of process which will allow that to happen. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Lise and thanks Alan. And as Alan knows, I'm aware of the issue because I'm also part of Design Team F. So yes that does need to be dealt with.

And we need to make sure as Design Team F recommends -- and this may be as much of a Design Team F issue as a Design Team O issue - we need to make sure that there is flexibility so that when major R&D issues or other changes to the infrastructure and so forth are considered, that there is the ability to include those kind of things in the budget.

And hopefully that would be done by PTI submitting a budget to ICANN early enough in the process so that there's time to adequately consider those in the budget.

And we really think that Design Team O thinks that, you know, by submitting - PTI submitting a budget at least nine months in advance of the applicable fiscal year that -- and this was part of our previous design Team O response for Item 125 in the review tool - that would allow six months for approval of

the IANA budget for the next fiscal year and still allow a three-month time frame.

But hopefully the kind of things that Alan is talking about here with regard to R&D that may need to be done and so forth, hopefully those would have been identified in that draft budget that would be presented to ICANN nine months before the fiscal year. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Chuck. And I note in the chat that James Gannon is saying that R&D would come under continuous improvement, operational excellence. And I agree, being such a technical organization it makes sense that we have an R&D budget to ensure that you continue to improve.

Okay the next is that PTI should be adequately funded and need to ensure that expenses are appropriate. This should be clarified. And this has been dealt with in a prior comment so we're going to refer to that response. Is there any other questions regarding the budget comments? Yes, Martin Boyle, go ahead.

Martin Boyle: Thanks Lise. It's Martin Boyle here. And listen I'm really struggling a little bit with this in that it really feels to me like we're beginning to try and micromanage. And it would actually seem to me to be very much more important that part of the process should be that the accessing of the budget goes on between ICANN and the PTI.

That process is transparent. We know what is happening. But I'm not sure necessarily it's up to us to have more say over the budget or in fact the budget process unless it is because some analysis indicates that the budget is not going to be sufficient for the job or is rather gold plating the job.

Bearing in mind we have two mechanisms about the mechanisms in the budget that goes through. And then we've also got the accountability afterwards as to what was done with the budget. So it just seems to me that this whole section we're putting in rather too much time on it for which my apology is (unintelligible) extend the amount of time.

But we're starting to drill down into a level of detail that is very much more importantly done by the management - the management of PTI and their requests for budgets and the oversight of ICANN in ensuring that they get an appropriate budget to do the job. And the test is are they actually doing the job? Are they resourced to do the job? Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Martin. And you have a very valid point that we shouldn't micromanage but at the same time we've been asked for some further clarification and further details. So some of the comments want more details and some are in the opposite direction.

And I think as a recommendation it's not going to be a complete list of mandatory things, but it's going to be a recommendation of what should be included. Any other comments? Don't see any and having said that we need to go through this faster. I will try and do so.

The next is Section 3, implications for the interface between the IANA functions and existing policy arrangements. And there's a lack of detail, need to emphasize the absolute imperative of ensuring separation between the policy development and processes and the IANA functions.

And well it's a good point. We need to emphasize that we're ensuring the separation. It's been one of the objectives all the way through this. But is there any comments or questions for this?

Well seeing none I will move on to the transition implications. Grace your hand is up. Grace go ahead.

Grace Abuhamad: Hi Lise. This is Grace. So I just wanted to address Section 4 and Section 5. As you know those two sections are currently in the drafting status on - staff is getting some drafts ready for the group. So we're going to make sure to incorporate the comments from Sections 4 and Section 5 in the drafts.

But I don't know if it's worth at this point delving too much into them because they're looking for more detail which is what we're doing in sort of fleshing out the drafts of those sections.

Lise Fuhr: That's a good point. So unless anyone else has some comments or questions we'll move forward because this is something we're aware of and are working on.

Okay seeing none we will move on. And the next one is oversight mechanisms in the NTIA IANA functions contract. There's one comment and that's a CWG to replicate these oversight mechanisms. Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I'm hoping that Greg or someone else from the IBC's on the call because what wasn't clear at least from a staff perspective when looking at this comment whether it was implied that the proposal currently does not replicate these oversight mechanisms or was a confirmation that the proposal is replicating these oversight mechanisms and as such that is satisfactory.

So it would be helpful if Greg or someone else from the IBC could maybe clarify what was behind this comment.

Lise Fuhr: Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan. Actually I have to look back at the comment myself. I think the point we made that we shouldn't be replicating or oversight mechanisms, in essence duplicating oversight mechanisms that are being created by the CCWG.

Lise Fuhr: Okay so the point was that we shouldn't replicate them.

Greg Shatan: Right. Then we'll just end up with overlaps and potential contradictions.

Lise Fuhr: I think that was included in the proposal but yes, good. Okay. Let's see. Well are there any other questions or comments for this? No, seeing none we'll move on to principles and criteria.

And there's one comment and that's a suggestion to add .7 - the appeal by significantly interested parties. Furthermore they must give adequate guarantees of independence through uncostly procedures.

And having said - well having looked at this, this is a document that's actually been decided on and closed quite some time ago. So my first take on it would be not to reopen it but - and I would like a very good reason to do so. But any questions or remarks to this?

Greg Shatan: I'm seeing this as...

Lise Fuhr: Oh Greg?

Greg Shatan: Sorry, this is Greg Shatan.

Lise Fuhr: Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Sorry. I'm looking at - I don't think we ever use the term uncostly procedures. That just sounds like not native English speaking, which also doesn't like native English speaking. I'm just wondering where this came from. Is this really us?

Lise Fuhr: Well Greg, Marika's just checking. I see (unintelligible) hand's up and I would like to say for me it's not the actual wording. It's the principle of reopening of this again.

Marika Konings: And this is Marika. I apologize there. I think I probably put the (IPC) from previous comments. It's actually Italy that provided that input. So Greg you're off the hook for now.

Greg Shatan: Thank God. I thought that the...

Marika Konings: Sorry for that, yes.

Greg Shatan: I'm glad that the dementia is not setting in yet. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Good to have that sorted out. Holly, go ahead.

Holly Gregory: That was just he point I was going to make - of where it came - it was proposed language from Italy.

Lise Fuhr: Okay thank you and sorry for the confusion. But anyone in a position to not following this? Okay thank you. We'll move on and we have other comments.

We have four comments that were (unintelligible) from the board. I'm going to hand this over to my co-chair Jonathan Robinson.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks Lise. So of these four - the first is asked - the comment asks is it (in visits) that the PTI will operate the IANA functions as required by the numbers and protocols community as well as root zone management function? If so how can some of this complexity be moderated to allow adequate space for other operational communities to participate if they wish while still keeping in line with the narrow technical scope of the IANA functions?

Well I would - I'm open to any thoughts on this but I would suggest that while it's not up to us to envisage that the PTI will operate those IANA functions it doesn't preclude - our proposal doesn't preclude the PTI doing so. So I would say that CWG responses should be that they - the CWG proposal does not preclude PTI operating IANA functions as required by numbers and protocol communities.

I'm not sure I see that that's - creates additional complexity. And I stimulated a couple of hands so I'll pause at that point and see what the response is. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan. I agree with you. I don't think it adds a lot of complexity. But I do look at it maybe a little bit differently than the way you expressed. Doesn't our proposal assume that PTI would be performing the numbering and protocol work as well because we're moving the whole team over to PTI is what we're proposing? So I think we're assuming that.

Now I don't think that that's complicated. I think maybe the one question that the board is asking is okay how do they participate? And that's kind of up to them. For example do they want to have a liaison on the PTI board - a subject

that we're going to cover later? And they may, considering that if I'm right that PTI is performing the numbering and protocol IANA functions as well.

And that may be more to what the board's getting at with regard the opportunity for them to participate. But it's really their call. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so that's really interesting input. And there's obviously two parts to this point. I mean - and clearly your view Chuck is stronger than mine. While I said it doesn't preclude it, I didn't necessarily assume it. And I'll be interested to see where others are at on this. So let me just go straight to Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri speaking. Yes, in the first part there is actually an assumption that PTI will be forming those functions because they remain ICANN's customers.

They have indicated as far as we can tell across the operational boundaries that they intend to remain ICANN's customers. ICANN will be using the services of the PTI, very similar to what Chuck said.

The other piece of it is all the other options that they might have if they were to request them to participate more closely, to participate as liaisons in the various committees are all extras and would have a little bit of extra complexity in that in the original assumption we're not assuming that they'll do that.

They're going to be ICANN's customers and ICANN will act on their benefit in all things. If they want more participation after seeing the proposal, after something like that, that would involve some complexity to figure out how to fit it all in.

We have allowed for it in many places but that's only rudimentary because we're not allowed to think about including them. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Avri. That's useful additional information. And all right I see Staffan is next.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. Yes I'd like to comment on the second half of this paragraph because other operational communities to participate in IANA did not - participating in operations and numbering issues. I'm not sure they would expect any operations from the PTI at least. I would be very surprised if that's the case. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry Staffan. Lise and I both missed that last bit. Could you just repeat the last part of that please?

Staffan Jonson: Yes. I was saying I would be quite surprised if other operational communities would expect to participate - for example having, being part of PTI operations. Okay they could participate as liaisons of course but I'm not sure if that's what's intended in this text. Yes. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks Staffan. James?

James Gannon: I think number one this question is almost an artifact of our method of work. But because we have all the way through the CWG's work, tried to stay so narrowly within our remit of only looking at names we've kind of created little artifacts like this. So operationally, yes it would obviously make a huge amount more sense.

And there has been some operational assumptions that the group have had to make in order to have a viable proposal. But ultimately I feel that that

question is almost more suited to go to the ICG because they're the ones that need to bring these three proposals together from the other operational communities.

So while we can attempt an answer here, really we can't make an educated assumption on this until we know what the outcome of the ICG's pulling together of all the three proposals and how they're going to affect that is going to work.

Jonathan Robinson: That's a good point and probably a helpful addition with the ICG part of that James. Thanks. Let me just see. I thought I had Greg in the queue next but I - yes, go ahead Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan just making sure everyone knows I'm still awake. The second sentence - in fact it implicitly assumes ICANN will use the services of PTI. Doesn't make sense to me. I mean maybe it means ICANN will use the services of PTI to serve the number and protocol communities. Maybe it needs to say that because if nobody is using PTI then we really have a problem. I think that works.

And is it the number community or is it the numbers community? I'm never quite sure about that. But I'll let somebody from numbers answer that question.

We may also want to say more explicitly or expressly what James is saying which is that, you know, we've - we're constrained to, you know, dealing with the needs of the names community only due to our remit. And, you know, we're not - it's outside our remit to make plans for the numbers and protocol community.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes thanks Greg. That's a good incremental addition. Thank you, that's helpful. Andrew?

Andrew Sullivan: Thank you. So the way that I have been understanding this proposal - and I'm not going to speak for anybody in the protocol community - but the way that I've been understanding this is because the protocol community - and I assume it's the same thing for the numbers - by the way it's numbers with an S Greg because they have different kinds of numbers, right - IP number, AS numbers and so on.

They way I've been understanding it is that we've got consensus on the existing arrangements and agreement with ICANN. And if ICANN does an internal rearrangement of things so that it moves the IANA department that currently exists into an affiliate then it can do that and that's within its internal organizational structures.

So we as (unintelligible) of a service from ICANN would not then try to dictate the ways in which that service is operated. Now it might be in the future that it would become, you know, more rational for the protocol community to move to PTI and I don't think anybody is ruling that out.

I think the idea is just that for the purposes of the transition in order to follow this process that we've got set up we want to make as few changes as possible. You may have heard me say that before. And so the idea here is that, you know, we maintain the existing arrangements as far as possible and then ICANN can do a subcontracting thing.

And I think what this question is asking - I confess I don't fully understand it - but I think what this is asking is is there a way to hook up those other

operational communities directly to PTI? And I think the answer is, you know, that's going to take more time and we don't have it.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Andrew. I mean I thought that - I mean I think I see the first part the same as you. It's a technical change. And it's interesting. I think we had some advice from Sibley at some point that - I don't remember it exactly so I'll paraphrase it - that they saw no reason why such an arrangement couldn't be made or something along those lines.

In other words, I think to some extent I suppose it depends on the nature of the subsidiary. But provided it's a wholly owned subsidiary controlled by ICANN there's no fundamental difference whether ICANN delivers that service via ICANN or via its wholly owned subsidiary.

And you described it well, that ICANN could make some sort of internal arrangement. And this is the delicate walk we've had to make in this group. As the last sentence on this says - since the CWG is technically constrained the question may need to be further addressed by the ICG and in the future, which is why I started off by saying it doesn't preclude PTI operating IANA functions.

And then others have pushed that a little harder to say arguably it assumes ICANN will use the services of PTI to service the needs of the numbers and protocols community.

So I think we should be perhaps careful of getting into much more detail than this but, you know, challenge that if you think the answer is inadequate. And I note that Holly from Sibley confirms - thank you Holly - my layman's understanding of the position. Andrew go ahead.

Andrew Sullivan: So I agree with you that, you know, we don't want to be dictating how other communities do things. But I will note that the IANA program of the IAD and the CRISP Group both came back with a remark that they didn't see a fundamental incompatibility with their proposals. And their proposals both assume that the agreement is going to be with ICANN.

So if that's the case then - and I know that in the case of the IANA program at the (IT) because I had a little bit of a hand in working on that text - that, you know, we made the point that the - it wasn't entirely clear to us exactly how things would work out because the details of the PTI of course were not fully fleshed.

But we didn't think it was a - there was a basic incompatibility. And as far as we understand the legal arrangements particularly under California law, you know, that kind of subcontracting would be permitted anyway. So I think that, you know, we can say, you know, that ICG needs to say something about this but if you want to respond to this, you can point out that the other communities actually said that they're comfortable with the consistency here.

Jonathan Robinson: Now that's a really helpful final additional point I think. Well I won't presume it's final but it certainly seems to be a really - that we could add as a final sentence: "Further we note that in their contributions to the public comment on the draft proposal, the numbers and protocols communities did not see any fundamental..." - or we use the accurate words whatever the words were - but I think it was along those lines - "...do not see any fundamental conflict with this proposal on that. So I think that's fundamentally in compatibility. Thank you James.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Jonathan it's Olivier. Can I be in the queue please?

Jonathan Robinson: Olivier go ahead.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you very much. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking. This is something I've actually discussed with a few people here today and yesterday, with regards to the contract that the other communities will sign with ICANN.

It's none of our business but since a number of people are on the call that might be taking part in the other communities, they would wish to perhaps check their contract with ICANN, that it doesn't preclude ICANN from subcontracting to PTI.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Olivier. Yes. That's great. All right, good, so that's - and then the next question asks perhaps what might seem simple at first, what is the expected timeline for implementation? Well I think we touched on this earlier. I mean we certainly talked about the fact that we're going to have to respond in respect of the NTIA requests by the ICG to understand the timelines, I think...

Yes maybe the point to answer here is that the CWG is obliged to respond to the implications of the proposal in responding to the RFP. And in assessing those implications we'll make best efforts to assess the time scales but not all of this is within our control.

And I think that's really all we - so we could probably just say we'll make best efforts to assess the timelines - time scales. And additions to that feel free to...James go ahead.

James Gannon: I don't want to disagree with that but I would suggest that where we have it within our power anything that we can create a timeline for we should. So I

wouldn't like the idea of just putting it all off and saying oh we'll (unintelligible) stage when we're done.

I think anything that we have locked down now to the point that we can put a time scale on that section of it we should do so because again I'll go back to what I said earlier on previous calls. You know, (Elissa) sent us an e-mail last week asking for some form of timeline by June 9. So if we could get something, even if it had gaps, together by then I think we should be as opposed to saying okay we'll deal with it some stage.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks James. That's a good point, and I just draw your attention to the fact that there's an intention to use our Meeting 55, the last of these high intensity calls, to deal with remaining open issues including implementation. And we could put including implementation and time scales. We could add to that so that's a good point.

I guess it's worth noting that Andrew Sullivan's point about there may be a jurisdiction issue there as well with respect to subcontracting, although that starts to creep well out of the scope of the work of this group. But it does highlight areas we need to be aware of.

So next item, what steps for escalation mechanisms and separation, ensure meeting the criteria is set out by NTIA and other ways to manage that within their respective operational communities. Well I would say that the CWG is committed to the best of its ability to meet the criteria set out by NTIA and to use that - use those to test the proposal against.

Any thoughts, any other thoughts on that? Apart from my slightly imperfect English, use those to - against which to test the proposal. All right the proposal - is there a hand up? I'm sorry, my...

Lise Fuhr:　　　　Yes, James.

Jonathan Robinson:　Thanks Lise. James, go ahead.

James Gannon:　　Sorry, just very quickly and a small wordsmithing. I would take out "to the best of its ability." You know meeting the NTIA criteria is one of the fundamental that we work to. You know that's the basis of the majority of our work. So it's beyond the best of our ability. That's what we've been working through.

Jonathan Robinson:　Thanks James. Helpful, that's good. All right, next item, the proposal should be clear on the impact of the impact on delegation transfer and revocation. And I see your hand is up, Bernie, so go ahead.

Bernie Turcotte:　Thank you sir. I think this comes back to part of the discussion we had earlier in that in our discussions with IANA there is a real serious consciousness to ensure there is no changes from the customer perspective as to what is being offered and what is being done. So I don't think we can do more than that.

The objective is to have zero impact on those things - zero negative impact. Removing the NTIA authorization step should actually improve the performance in several categories. So that's my answer.

Jonathan Robinson:　Thanks Bernie. Any further comment on that, any points? Okay Lise did you want me to go on or will you pick up at this point?

Lise Fuhr:　　　　I'm going to pick up on this and the next and then I'll hand it back to you. The next one is proposed post-transition oversight and accountability on SLE. We

have five comments. I don't know if we have Paul Kane on the call who's the lead on DTA. But anyway, we're going to go through those.

The first is development of redefined SLEs essential prior to transition, maintain status quo, will continuous improvement post-transition. And that is from (Auda). I'm not sure if there's a comment that's saying that we don't need to have SLEs before the transition. Marika?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Just to clarify I think their suggestion is there is no need to change the existing SLEs prior to transition. The question they're asking is is that essential? But they do recognize that there needs to be a process for continuous improvement post-transition.

Lise Fuhr: Okay any - a lot of (unintelligible) - is there any comments or questions to this? Actually we've set down a specific design team for dealing with this. And so our aim was to have some SLEs defined. If it's maintaining status quo or not I think the design team are trying to improve the existing SLEs and...

Actually one of the criticisms we got in Singapore was that we were not into the operational issues deeply enough. And SLEs were mentioned at that time. So Bernie your hand is up. Go ahead.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you ma'am. As to continuous improvement post-transition relative to SLEs we definitely have a few things in the proposal. There's definitely the concept that the CSC can review that on an annual basis if it feels the need to do so, given it will be monitoring how IANA or PTI at that point is performing against those SLEs. So there's definitely that annual mechanism there.

Then let's not forget that the IFRT has no limits on what it can look at. And we discussed earlier today that it will review - it could review the CSC also. And I'm quite sure that part of what it would be looking at is exactly those service level engagements that are brought forward.

So our proposals definitely cover the going forward status. The DTA group is working very hard to see how far we can advance updating this prior to the transition. But unfortunately we don't have anything to publish as of the moment. But there is ongoing meetings and there's even one immediately after the last meeting tomorrow.

Lise Fuhr: Good to hear. Any questions or remarks to this from the group? Chuck go ahead. Are you on mute Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: I was, thanks. I wasn't watching. It appears to me that it's fairly likely that we won't have Design Team A's input in the proposed SLEs for the transition itself, even if they're the same, until very close to distribution time to the SOs and ACs. So how are we going to deal with that if that comes in after our last meeting before December 8, assuming that we send those out on December 8?

Lise Fuhr: Bernie?

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you ma'am. Good question Chuck. I think one of the approaches - and I guess we are talking about June 8. You scared me there for a second with the December 8 part.

                  One of the approaches we've begun using in the DTA sub-working group as we're trying to advance this as a minimum to get a set of guiding principles and expectations down so that this would be a contribution from DTA that has spent a lot of time and effort looking at the details.

So on top of looking how we can implement what's been done by the DTA group, we're ensuring that we can get some core principles and requirements that could be transferred at the transition to guide the first review of the SLEs if we cannot complete the work for this transition document that we have to get approval for. Thank you ma'am.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Bernie. I think it's also relevant to see how far you get and decide then on behalf of...

Bernie Turcotte: Yes.

Lise Fuhr: ...where you are on the meeting next Tuesday. So hopefully you will progress on the DTA. Any other questions or remarks for this one? Okay we have the next one saying transition plans should target further refinement of IANA productivity and efficiency. And...

Jonathan Robinson: It's the continuous improvement?

Lise Fuhr: Yes. Yes it is and I think all are supportive of that. Any questions or remarks to this one? And it could be put in in DTA but it's also as Jonathan said, it is part of the actual proposal too. We discuss it under the budget too so it's going to be present in...

Okay moving on, restrict work to what is currently necessary. It might be wise to (unintelligible) finalization of this work until later. And that's DTA. That's quite in line with the first one. And I think we can copy what the response is there.

Well we might -- as Bernie mentioned -- there might be some guidelines that will be the only outcome of this and then we'll need to further progress after the transition - not we but I guess it will be up to the - after the implementation.

Any questions or remarks to this one? Seeing none, going on to the next - while it might be nice to increase commitments this should be resisted unless there are clear operational reasons for change. There needs to be a clearer statement on process to amend and update this lead post-transition and in response to customer requirements. I see Andrew Sullivan has his hand up. Andrew go ahead.

Andrew Sullivan: So I know that we're saying here, you know, that we're aiming to improve the existing SLEs and so on. And I know that there are a number of people who really want to complete that as part of the transition work.

But I want to point out to people that the people who are saying in this they don't fool with that right now are all operators. They're people who are themselves frequently the target of SLAs and they're saying change one thing at a time. And I think we should take that very, very seriously.

I think that that's good feedback. I agree that it's important to improve these but I think that these are - that this is an important point, you know, that when operators tell you this is how we would do it, we should take that very seriously.

Lise Fuhr: Okay thank you for that comment. Bernie your hand is up.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you ma'am. Just as a counterpoint to that the - looking at the stats for the public comment responses the responses as we noted were split 13/10 and most - that kind of split was maintained across the operators and not.

So it's - yes there are operators who are against it but there are also some big operators or a grouping of operators like (Center) that are very much in favor for it. So yes it's an issue.'

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Bernie. And I see in the chat that Kurt Pritz is mentioning that (nominate) and other questions are the same. And I agree. While I think the (SRD) and (nominate) and other responses are very much on the same issues." Alan your hand is up. Go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes just as a follow-on to that, I think as you weigh changes versus not changing, the ultimate goal is to maintain or better the quality of the service. And that's not always - if you look up a little bit for instance, there's an issue on - let me make sure I get the words right. I can't find it right now - maybe it scrolled up - but productivity and efficiency.

I think from a global point of view productivity and efficiency are probably way at the bottom of the list of things you want to make sure are done right.

That productivity and efficiency say let's get it done for a lower price. And, you know, since we're not charging for this, you know, at a global and a (pert) interchange basis the real targets we're looking for are quality.

The other things are background issues that management have to worry about. And I think as we look at what to change and what not to change I really think we have to focus on what the end product is not necessarily go into the details, thank you.

Lisa Fuhr: Thank you Alan. I don't think anyone will disagree with the quality issue so because that's the core of this it's high quality. Greg...

Alan Greenberg: Lisa you're right but we do see things like productivity and efficiency being focused on and those I think are the lesser of the things we want to make sure that if balances have to be made quality is where we're going, thank you.

Lisa Fuhr: Thank you Alan. Greg you're next in line.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Greg Shatan for the record. I think pragmatically given the message that we got in Singapore in a variety of different ways, different people we need to, you know, focus on and review the SLE's and operational standards.

And the way I interpret what design team A came up with was that they found that the service levels and the performance were so, there was such a delta between the two of them such a gap between the two of them in a positive way that maintaining the current service levels would be arbitrary and archaic.

And, you know, given the actual performance defining service levels that, you know, have a closer relationship to actual performance, you know, would be just good business practice.

I don't think the idea was somehow to tighten the service levels to the point where they were, you know, would create failures by making them so close but rather just that, you know, we identified, you know, it was essentially a little bit of a, you know, obsolescence in the service levels.

I think that that shows, you know, just some good, you know, clear thinking. And I think, you know, that the question that (ALDA) asks is it essential well that's their question and I think that's designed to get a certain answer in terms of, you know, essential will the boat sink if we don't do that?

I don't think that's absolutely the case but, you know, are we doing our job if we let service levels that bear no rational relationship to the current performance of the service just leaving them be then we're not doing our job. So that's my thought.

Lisa Fuhr: Thank you Greg. And actually we did as we write aim to improve the existing SLE's. So this is just to follow this path that we have this group. Mindful of time Martin Boyle and I'll go quickly through the others, thank you. Martin go ahead.

Martin Boyle: Thanks Lisa, Martin Boyle here. I do actually have quite a serious problem with this. The service levels, the service level expectation is what the organization has to deliver.

If we increase the expectations to the current performance level I actually do think we need to justify why we're doing it because one of the consequences is that we have now got a whole lot of things that are not really important that the organization is then having to focus on.

And could then find that it is having to put a lot of resource into coping with something that actually doesn't really matter. Now the actual performance level which is where we are at the moment is something that can and should be monitored by the CSC as it goes along because that will be the first indicator that the PTI's performance is beginning to drop.

But it just seems to me to be just because you are delivering it to a certain level do you now write that in as the you must achieve this level in a contract is entirely the wrong way to do it unless you can actually say we need it at this level.

And I don't think anybody has done that analysis yet and therefore, you know, it seems to me just turning around and saying we must have a Rolls Royce or whatever an American equivalent car might be when actually we really need a rather more lightweight performance car, you know, it's just the wrong way around.

Much more important is to make sure that we have other processes in place to ratchet up the service levels that do need to be addressed and that can be done after the transition through both the process within the CSC or through the first IFR, thank you.

Lisa Fuhr: Martin just to be clear. Does that mean you're opposed to the comments that we have written in the document now?

Martin Boyle: It means that the arguments that are coming forward this is saying we need to improve the existing SLE's to the level of the current performance I don't agree with.

I'm off (Andrew's) line that we don't need to change them at the moment therefore we shouldn't. I'm sympathetic to somebody coming up and saying this one we do need to increase because it's fundamental to the delivery chain, thanks.

Lisa Fuhr: Thank you Martin, Bernie.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you ma'am. Just a few comments. I don't think we're, DTA was looking at simply lowering the threshold or increasing it depending on your point of view on the SLE's.

If you go through the document they're actually changing the way we look into things. And a simple example of that if you will is that certain processes are measured end-to-end and that therefore it's very hard to extract the parts that were just IANA and the parts where you were waiting on clients.

Also as stated on some of the calls there is a mixture of automated systems and manual systems which we discussed earlier today. So part of the discussion that's going on is they're not, we're not simply changing the numbers on an SLE and using the same systems to measure them.

Technically there was some expectation that this would require no change and that the data was there. We're being told by IANA that this may actually not be the case and that there may be, you know, programming efforts and changes required to actually get this done.

So we're trying to approach this from both sides if you will. We're trying to gather up the best objective of the work that the DTA group has done into what they're really looking at versus what is being collected now.

And one should state that a lot of those objectives are really good basic sound business stuff which by the way IANA tried to get something very similar done when this new contract came on but was not able to get that through NTIA.

So that's why we're taking the approach we're doing now at getting the top level done and working to see what basic element we can get done from a practical point of view so that we can actually get real measurements in.

So the situation is slightly more complex than simply saying we're going to adjust the SLE's versus the current performance, thank you.

Lisa Fuhr: Thank you Bernie. Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes I'll try and make some attempt to wrap this up because it feels to me like there's three options here. We either do what was understood to be doing, to being done a while ago which is really ratcheting up the SLE's to current performance levels which I don't think we're doing anymore within the DTA.

And it appears there's a reasonably clear view that that's not the right approach. An alternative at the other extreme is to do more or less nothing which some are arguing with creditability about and there's some kind of middle road.

Now I think that's the work that the group is currently doing and I'm not sure we can do much else at this stage other than let them go down that middle road and see whether they as customer supply get somewhere satisfactory.

If they do we then have a decision to make whether to cement that middle road outcome or go back to status quo as it were. And that seems to be a decision that we don't need to take right this minute but we've got this - the discussion has been useful to clarify where we're at and to articulate those two alternatives.

So I think we can probably draw a line under it at that point knowing that those are the two alternatives.

Lisa Fuhr: Thank you Jonathan and let's quickly the last one is saying metrics should be clearly specified as soon as possible and I also - well that's what I guess what the DTA are trying to do at the moment. So that's being worked on.

Okay any questions or remarks to this? If not I'll move on to the proposed post transition oversight and accountability CSC. We have nine comments. Where the first is the IRR's would be willing to provide a number of - numbers community liaison to CSC and that's great.

The response - well the response to us is that we welcome that they are positive about it and appreciate the feedback and yes. So and welcomes the effort to provide (unintelligible) yes that's good.

I think we should move onto the next one and that is the composition of CSC must be sufficient multi-stakeholders so the CSC is not run by registries. Work needs to be transparent, should be open to participants as well as members.

Okay I guess what we have discussed in this group was that the CSC would not be multi-stakeholder but would be transparent and would be open. I see Donna your hand it up, Donna go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks Lisa. So - Donna Austin for the record. To some extent I object to the supposition that the CSC is not petitioning multi-stakeholder. We did open up for the liaisons from other parts of the ICANN community and that is a voluntary mechanism that communities can aspire to.

And I think, you know, it should be open to participants as well as members. This seems to be and Greg can - I'm sure he will rebut this if I'm wrong but it

seems to be based on the premise that CCWG's or cross community working groups that are being developed now have kind of moved away from the designation of whether it's a participant or a member.

So I'm not sure whether I agree with that premise. I mean we have reasons why we want to keep the agreement of the CSC very narrow and we do want a reasonably nimble organization.

So my concern is that it should be open to participants as well as members tends to run us into that problem that we might be having a very large CSC rather than keeping one that's, you know, small and relatively easy to function, thanks.

Lisa Fuhr: Thank you Donna. Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you. One of the things I'm not really, don't even remember if the ALAC mentioned it or not but the document and Donna right now used the terms member and liaison without ever defining exactly what the differences are, what rights does one have and not the other.

And it's really hard to judge whether it is sufficiently multi-stakeholder given that that is completely unspecified.

Lisa Fuhr: Donna do you want to respond to that?

Donna Austin: Sure, (unintelligible) comment and we did in the early discussion we did have a better explanation of what was a member and what is a liaison. I think probably the way that we ended is that members are required and liaisons are optional.

I don't know at the end of the day that there would be significant difference in their contribution to the CSC but if specificity is required then that's something we could, you know, think about and provide that.

Alan Greenberg: Just as a return if you actually said that you may have a lot of a lot less pushback.

Lisa Fuhr: Okay, Greg you're next.

Greg Shatan: Thanks this is Greg Shatan for the record. I think if we look, you know, back at what was in the proposal and I've got it printed out on my desk maybe things have changed.

It's two gTLD registry operators, two ccTLD registry operators and another TLD representative from a non-cc or gTLD of which there are very few and then an IANA liaison.

So aside from the IANA liaison which is basically kind of a, you know, staff seat of some sort it's all registries. And then there liaisons and as Alan has pointed out, you know, much earlier liaisons can be more or less powerful depending upon what their role is and the role of voting in an organization and the like.

So liaisons can be kind of, you know, they can cover a variety of things. So there's, you know, one seat for GNSO non-registry. So that's the registrar is the non-commercial and the commercial, the non-commercial and the commercial all kind of vying or aspiring to use (Donna's) word to that one seat.

So that doesn't strike me as being all that multi-stakeholder. I do appreciate the need to be nimble and not wade down and perhaps it might have been another top potential way to deal with it would be to use observers rather than participants or to have roles be more sharply defined between members and participants.

And again maybe it's better to use the word observers if we're going to talk about sharp definition since as Donna notes the line between members and participants has been blurred by most people and that's, you know, generally actually I think a good thing.

Doctor (Liska) may disagree but I think he may be alone in that. But we need to find a way I think to have a little more sunshine in this group and at least a little bit more of a view if not, you know, actual participation from stakeholders other than registry.

So I think just a monopsony cartel doesn't really, you know, look good. So I think the more that there can be, you know, some balance while maintaining the need to be nimble and consistent with its mission is really, you know, what we're looking for, thanks.

Lisa Fuhr: Thank you for the comment Greg. I'd like to remind you all that we agreed not to reopen discussion that we'd agreed upon and I find this is one of the discussions where we've had this and we actually agreed on the customer standing committee as being for the customers and having liaisons as a part of opening for more.

But I don't want to get into a deep discussion regarding this at this time. We have a lot to cover and I think this is getting back to issues that we have discussed before. Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. With all respect issues that revolved around whether we end up with a multi-stakeholder organization or not are from minimal ones.

We were commenting on what the comment said and I think it is relevant to discuss issues surrounding that. As I said in my previous dimension if it said that liaisons and members have the same overall status but liaisons cannot show up if they want to that's fine.

I think the world would be okay. Maybe we also need other observers but to be quite candid we're talking about we're going to worry but what happens if this group grows to large and it won't be nimble about it.

This - we're going to have a hard time getting people, convincing people to attend this regularly and to do it. It's not going to be the most riveting thing in the world unless we're really having disasters and let's hope we're not.

So I really don't think we're going to have to worry about getting a larger room to fit all the people in if we had, you know, assuming we actually met in a room. I think we're worried about the wrong things, thank you.

Lisa Fuhr: Okay thank you Alan. Staffan you're next in line.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. I seem to repeat myself so I'll keep it very short. CSC is not run by registries. That I think that's a fundamental misconception from the start. So since it's supposed to govern purely technical functions.

We tend to return to this issue time and time again. So I'll keep it short. It is just very narrow functions that are supposed to be within the CSC or the

multi-stakeholder aspects are supposed to be taken care of somewhere else, thank you.

Lisa Fuhr: Okay thank you Staffan. Greg your hand is up, make it...

Greg Shatan: Thanks, just briefly I wanted to say that, you know, this was a strongly held belief in the IPC and that's why it's in our comment whether or not the CWG or any members think it was closed, you know, that was one that needed to be raised as it was a continuing concern.

                And as someone else said, you know, once it's in the comment then it needs to be discussed. So I'm not going to shush the IPC in that way, thanks.

Lisa Fuhr: Well thank you Greg. It was not to shush anything it's more to not go too deep into reopening issues that's been concluded on before and find an answer to the comment.

                So Donna your hand is up.

Donna Austin: Thanks Lisa, Donna Austin. So I just wanted to make the following observation as well Lisa. In addition to the composition of the SCS as was outlined we also have identified in the charter a selection process.

                So anyone that's interested can submit an expression of interest to the related supporting organization. I take Greg's comment about the GNSO is, you know, restricted to one.

                But I guess if people meet the criteria through the AOI as approved by their respective organization then that then goes to the GNSO, ccNSO and they

sign off on the composition of the CSC looking to diversity, you know, in terms of geography and potentially skill set.

So I think we both are, you know, not just being really specific about the composition but also provided additional information there about what the expectation is for the quality or what we want to see in the CSC.
So I think that should be taken into account as well when we look at the composition. So it was just a comment I wanted to make Lisa, thanks.

Lisa Fuhr: Thank you Donna. Anymore questions or remarks to this or I'll move on? No, we have the next from Internet and that saying constitutional document for the CSC must make clear how appropriate ICANN influence on the CSC or its function can be assured.

The GAC liaison should not be from the same entity as government operated TLD and well there seems to be two issues here and I don't know if that's been dealt with.

The first one is about the constitutional document. How to ensure inappropriate ICANN influence. And the next one is for me personally easier to deal with.

I find it difficult to say what liaison GAC can appoint. It seems to be a matter for the GAC to find out who to appoint. I don't know if there's any thoughts or questions or comments on this. There's a typo.

No comments. Okay, I think if the last part of it the GAC liaison should not be from the same entity. We could write that that should be it's up to every group to appoint their own liaison.

Regarding the constitutional document actually I don't know if Donna do you have any ideas, respond to this one? Is it ensured?

Jonathan Robinson: Lisa it's Jonathan isn't this a reference to the charter? And it's really that the charter is the constitutional document and it's reasonable to take account of that when preparing a final version of the charter.

Lisa Fuhr: Yes. So it's okay Staffan do you have a comment?

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. Well the first - thank you Lisa. Well the first sentence talking about constitutional documents include the term inappropriate ICANN influence and of course you can't answer that without knowing what they're pointing at.

So it's a statement you can't answer really. So thank you.

Lisa Fuhr: Thank you Staffan. Okay, seeing no further hands we will move on to the next one and we'll - the next one is concern about creation of new structure to perform these tasks. Scope should be strictly technical, composition should be limited to direct customers or and relevant experts or liaisons as the groups sees fit.

Roles of members and liaisons should be clearly defined, overall membership should remain small. I guess that a part of it is what we've discussed under the first regarding that we actually allow liaisons from other groups.

And but the scope is strictly technical and we have customers, direct customers as members and so I think most of this is covered under the first issue. So any further remarks to this or - and I think the role of members and liaisons should be clearly defined. That is up to the DTC to respond to that.

Okay we move on. Numbers communities have separate mechanisms for service level review. Note the possibility of communications between two groups as needed, that's the (Crisp).

And I think this is very - well its fair the remark to have that all fair requirement that there should be possible communications between the two groups.

And that's also been offered and welcomed by the numbers is to have a liaison. Those can be ensuring that communication. Staffan I see your hand is up, Staffan go ahead.

Staffan Jonson: Yes thank you. Yes so (Crisp) as I understand this they are highlighting that we are developing to a parallel process of review and of course that might lead to some conflict in a later stage.

But maybe we should just add in CWG response that notifying and know the same level that this might be something for the ICG to consider once they put all the three proposals together.

Just as a heads up for the ICG (unintelligible) to a part of our processes. And then hand this over to the ICG thank you.

Lisa Fuhr: Thank you Staffan. Yes well but I think we rode in some linkage to this already by writing in the liaisons so anyway but it's fine we can also pass on to the ICG.

Any other questions or remarks regarding this? No okay we go on, the CCWG proposal acknowledged intention to create a CSC but it might be more

appropriate for the CSC to develop specific bylaws changes that might be needed.

So this has been sent to us from the accountability group. A proposal that we have a special bylaws for the CSC. What are the thoughts from the group regarding this because this has not been a requirement from us earlier on?

Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: Hi, so if I understand the point is that the CSC should be defined in a bylaw. If so I would agree with that, you know, and we have not been clear yet on who defines the bylaws between the two groups.

But it does seem reasonable that the CSC which is going to be such a fundamental part of ICANN in dealing with APPI, you know, would need to be a bylaws defined entity, thanks.

Lisa Fuhr: Thank you Avri. Hold on bylaw and what organization? That and it's an ICANN bylaw Staffan, Staffan asked bylaw in what organization and it's actual ICANN bylaw since it's the accountability team. James go ahead.

James Gannon: I was going to ask a similar question to Staffan. Did (Donna's) group actually decide under which organization would the CSC exist because that would depend upon the response to this question because if we created the CSC under the PTI bylaws then they would be part of that?

Whereas if we're going to create the CSC under ICANN bylaws then yes we'd need to go back to the CCWG and ask them for what specific bylaws they can put in on behalf of the CWG.

But if it's to be, if it's to exist under the PTI governance model then it can be as part of our design of the PTI governance.

Lisa Fuhr: Thank you James. Donna go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks Lisa, Donna just for the record. So James we never had that discussion and I think that probably goes back to the fact that there was no PTI board discussion at that time.

My personal thinking is the CSC will have to have a good working relationship with the PTI not necessarily the PTI board but the PTI itself. So IANA department as we know it now and if the CSC was to be recognized in any bylaw it should be recognized in the ICANN bylaw.

How the CSC would be formed or structured I'm not really sure. In my mind it's a little bit like an SO or IC but it's more operational. So I'm just not sure how that works in practice. Maybe Sidley has some ideas on that, thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes Donna it's Jonathan it's a good point. I mean I must say I was curious as to see I mean this isn't a PTI board issue this is a question of the institutionalization of the CSC and where it is relevant to institutionalize it.

The CCWG comment which is the one we're addressing has come to us and said, you know, do you want this institutionalized in a bylaw. There's clearly been a couple of comments to say that this does seem relevant.

I wouldn't mind input from Holly to as to the appropriateness of institutionalizing the CSC in the ICANN bylaws. So Alan if you'll bear with us it would be good to hear from Holly and then come back in after that.

Alan Greenberg: Certainly.

Holly Gregory: Hi there. So, you know, I have to confess that I assumed that this was an ICANN sort of structure and would be addressed in ICANN bylaws at some point.

You know, you could go another way but I think the point is that we can consider it as part of those ICANN accountability mechanisms and it seems to me that it sort of adds to the separation if you will in a positive way as between PTI and ICANN to think of CSC as being an entity or a structure committee if you will that's formed under ICANN.

From a legal perspective, you know, I think you have flexibility but I don't think this is something that we've discussed before and really drilled down on. I think my preference, you know, immediate reaction is that this is sort of ICANN Corporation.

Lisa Fuhr: Thank you Holly. As we talked about here CCWG wouldn't raise this if it wasn't the ICANN bylaws. So it's not the PTI board and actually while the cc is well as we haven't you said we haven't discussed it Donna but the place of cc is as envisioned to be within ICANN I think. Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you. Some comments just written were about what I was going to say. Whether the CSC is mentioned in ICANN's bylaws or not and I'm guessing that there will be some bylaws related to IANA and if so the CSC will probably be part of it.

Currently we run IANA and IANA is not mentioned there so it's conceivable, you know, it might not be there but that's a separate decision. The relationship with PTI management or operational people or the PTI board I presume will

be covered in the contract between ICANN and PTI to say yes the CSC will be able to, you know, talk to senior management.

And if they don't get a good answer from senior management they will be able to escalate to the PTI board for resolution of the issue before going and screaming to, you know, mama and papa in the ICANN board they should be able to try to resolve it within PTI.

So I assume that's going to be in the contract that's not in our bylaws. It might be in PTI's bylaws but that's a different issue.

Lisa Fuhr: Thank you Alan. I see Holly your hand is up, Holly go ahead.

Holly Gregory: I'm sorry that's an old hand I'll take it down.

Lisa Fuhr: Martin, Martin Boyle go ahead.

Martin Boyle: Thanks Lisa, Martin Boyle. We actually did have a discussion about some of the difficulties of escalation from the CSC and in particular if we needed to escalate via the ccNSO and the GNSO given the fact that neither of those organizations has got an operational role at the moment.

Now that would in its own right probably require bylaw of changes, ICANN bylaw changes and part of that I assume would need to link in with the CSC being created under the bylaws of ICANN.

The other advantage of doing it at that level is that it does put the CSC very firmly into the solar system of ICANN in other words it makes it very much closer to the rest of the community in ICANN.

So an important sign to everybody the CSC is serving the wider community as well as just itself, thanks.

Lisa Fuhr: Thank you Martin and I think you make an important point saying that we will bring the cc into the solar system. I agree it's going to be more routed within ICANN if it has a bylaw.

So I don't hear any opposition to a bylaw. Okay Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Yes I'm not in opposition to bylaw but I think a bylaw that mentions the CSC has got to be part of an overall set bylaw or set of bylaws related to the how IANA is structured.

And I would guess if we're going to have a wholly owned subsidiary or a membership or membership in an affiliate or whatever that may well show up in the bylaws. It doesn't have to but it may well in which case there may well be a reference to the CSC but I think the two go together.

There's a reference in the bylaws to the CSC without anything else related to IANA is sort of surreal.

Lisa Fuhr: Well yes we actually have argued for having a bylaw covering the IANA functions review and I think this is much in line with this that we also cover CSC with a bylaw.

Of course you have to be careful not to put everything in the bylaws but okay.

Alan Greenberg: You can have a bylaw which simply points to an external document for the details.

Lisa Fuhr: Okay we will work on this and get back to it and I see some of it is partly
               DTC but I think we should also have a look at it as a whole group but we will
               discuss at the next call and not this one.
               Let's move on to further clarity on organizational structure including (Jerry)...

Man: (Dickle).

Lisa Fuhr: ...(Jerry Dickle) profile as well as funding mechanisms of the cc needed and
               that - my response to that, well I think the organizational structure seems to be
               pretty well defined and the charter is I guess it's also dealing with the profile.

               Defining mechanisms I don't know if that's been touched upon by the DTC
               Donna or Staffan anyone from the group? Donna go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks Lisa, Donna for the record. We didn't have a conversation around
               funding and that was largely based on where the travel funding was required
               for the CSC and we've left that question open because it outlines the minds of
               the DTC it wouldn't be required because we felt that most of this would be
               done online or via a teleconference.

               We have recommended that a secretary be provided by IANA or PTI whatever
               is moving forward to provide support that kind of administrative support for
               any meetings and taking notes and that kind of thing.

               So but we didn't have a discussion around the budget per se, thanks. And I'm
               not sure I understand what (Jerry Dickle) profile means either, sorry.

Lisa Fuhr: I guess it's yes well the legal profile on the competencies of the group is how I
               read it. Actually what you just said about the secretary that's going to cover

the next one, budget allocation for independent secretary should be seen by (unintelligible). So you have partly touched upon that. Okay Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks Lisa. Just (unintelligible) an independent secretariat we have opted for a secretariat that is actually provided by IANA and that is on the basis that IANA staff would understand the nature of the discussion that was taking place.

So we felt that it was better to have a well-informed secretariat rather than potentially going elsewhere for that. So we haven't opted for an independent secretariat but rather one that is provided by IANA or PTI, thanks.

Lisa Fuhr: Thank you Donna, James.

James Gannon: I had myself and (unintelligible) basically the same point if we've said in the previous discussion that the CSC is essentially going to be an ICANN construct then surely adding something and other related things like secretariats will be divided by ICANN rather than PTI because otherwise we're getting in a loop here of okay well then one thing for the CSC which is an ICANN construct needs to go into the PTI budget, which will then be used to form an ICANN, you know, subgroup if you want to call it that.

Everything is very (unintelligible). I understand the concept of where Donna is coming from with the practicality of it (unintelligible) I think needs to be in my opinion would be ICANN from that even if it's ICANN paying - I don't know it just seems very circular in my mind.

Lisa Fuhr: Okay, well I guess I understand your point about the circularity but still we have the part of the groups that are chosen from the multi-stakeholder parties or from the customers so. Okay Alan Greenberg you're next.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Regardless of how we think, how much we think the budget is there's going to be a budget. If there's a secretariat it's on someone's books. I tend to agree that it should be on ICANN's books even if the work is subcontracted to IANA and to PTI.

Donna mentioned that she expects things to be done by teleconferences. Last time I saw anything regarding that ICANN pays an awful lot of money for teleconferences.

So there is going to be a budget for the CSC and presumably it will be part of ICANN's normal budgeting process. I don't think we need to highlight it specifically but we shouldn't pretend it won't exist, thank you.

Lisa Fuhr: Thank you Alan. Anymore questions or remarks regarding this? I'm conscious of time we have 10 minutes left. We need 5 minutes to wrap up the meeting so we have 5 minutes to the next one that's from ALAC saying all deliberations and output should be transparent.

I don't think there's any disagreement regarding that but this the (cc's) should not escalate to ccNSO or GNSO as these are policy parties. I guess this is partly under the escalation too so this is a DTC but also a DTM.

Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes we already discussed this at length this morning. I'm certainly willing to let it go back to the design team and see what comes out of it before pressing the point. I don't think we need to repeat the discussion right now just because it popped up in the comments.

Lisa Fuhr: Thank you Alan. And with that I'll conclude on this one and hand it over to Jonathan to go through the Annex X proposed charter for CSC and do the wrapping up of the meeting, thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks Lisa. Look I guess there's these couple of points here. I was thinking of focusing more on where we were going forward but let's tidy up these couple of points as well.

So this is the proposed charter for CSC. Conflict between appointments of liaisons in accordance with internal processes must be approved by (unintelligible) geographic diversity or skill sets will be taken into account to determine if it's (unintelligible) appointment supply just to members.

CSC's charter should be approved by community not just ccNSO or GNSO. We've touched on various elements of this already and I don't know if would anyone else like to comment on this?

I mean we've certainly touched on the geographic diversity, we've touched on some of the points on liaison. I don't think we've talked about approving, approval of the CSC charter. Go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you. We did talk about diversity but we left it without any change and the last comment I heard was I think Donna saying the various bodies would appoint someone and then it would have to be approved she said by the GNSO and ccNSO.

I think the document actually said by the CSC. You can't have a body appointing someone and then someone else saying no you can't appoint them. You can't, you know, you can make it one or the other or you can say they'll

have to negotiate but you can't - those two statements independently do not match.

Jonathan Robinson: Let me just hand it straight over to Donna and then I'll come in if necessary. Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks Jonathan. So Alan I just put (unintelligible) the chat. So the full membership of the CSC must be approved by the ccNSO and GNSO while it will not be the role of the ccNSO and GNSO question the validity of any recommended appointments through the CSC.

They will take into account the overall composition of the proposed CSC in terms of geographic diversity and skill sets. Sorry the CSC is not approving the membership but there is kind of a secondary step that we would put it through the ccNSO and GNSO to see whether there is a, you know, diversity that or because what we don't want we don't want all of the members coming from North America.

Certainly we don't want all the registries to come from North America. So and it's not possible given the cc's but I guess we were looking for another avenue just to put the composition back through a second look because I understand that ILAC would make an appointment.

The registry stakeholder group would make appointments, the ccNSO would make appointments but how do we look at that as a whole and see whether it's a good composition or not.

And the way that we decided to do that was to put it back to through the ccNSO and GNSO.

Alan Greenberg: Yes but if I may answer. I think you're swapping one problem for another. Yes you don't want everyone from North America. Does that mean then potentially you're going to say well the registries from North America are really important it's the ALAC member from North America we'll reject?

I don't see the mechanism by which you're going to make that decision and therefore I, you know, I can certainly see that you can require the registries if there's two of them to have different, you know, be from different regions.

I don't see how you can handle the individuals especially the liaisons who may or may not be there. So, you know, I can appoint a liaison from Africa who will never show up. Does that help your diversity?

But regardless I think you need to resolve the two statements I don't think they're resolved as they stand right now. What you end up with may be acceptable and may not be but right now I think there's a conflict.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so I think where we are, given where we are in time it's clear that an additional comment from the IPC noting the - which is something we touched on in some, well we covered in some detail talking about multi-stakeholder community participation in CSC.

So I would think we need to refer back to that. There's some work going to go on by the CSC. Alan and others points related to previous comments have been well made so I think we've probably given especially where we are in the time of the call.

Alan, okay charter approval line has not been addressed. Well that's also - I must say I don't recall how the charter has proposed to be approved at this

point. Is there any - does our work at this point deal in any case where the charter approval will take place?

Donna Austin: Jonathan I think it does I'm just looking for it.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks Donna. I'm going to - you can come back on that item by chat or email or in further dealing with these comments. I'm going to give a perspective of where we are.

I mean we've worked through this very systematically and possibly a little bit too laboriously but it's been very useful to go through it and we've taken account of a lot of discussion and points.

We've clearly got some meaty issues and Avri rightly pointed out one of them a moment ago which is when do we do the IFR and the related cross community working group separation cross community working group.

It feels to me like the likely time we will tackle that is in meeting 54. We have to deal with scope of PTI, PTI board composition and then following on from that and related accountability mechanisms as well as the issues in and around the IANA function review and the (unintelligible).

There are some meaty issues to cover in those next three meetings and we'll try and shake that out into an organized structure for doing that. I think one thing that would be really helpful Avri and (Stephanie) if you are able to do this is to come to us with any sort of structured list of what you believe that the key issues are.

If you can help us to shape those main issues especially bearing in mind the comments received I think that would be very helpful in forming that

discussion and we'll aim to work through those in over the course of meeting 53 and 54 which I know are not favorable times from a North American perspective at all.

So it's clear that there is PTI scope, PTI board and related accountability points that we haven't already covered including IANA function review and this separation review.

So there's some chunky work to get on with. We've had a productive three sessions today. We may be challenged a little bit harder tomorrow. I hope not I hope we can find a way through them and will look forward to working with you on those.

I think that brings us to the top of the hour and we should probably call it a day at this point and leave you to either get some rest, get on with the rest of your days or prepare for some light work as the case may be.

So thanks very much we'll look forward to picking up those key topics in the next few sessions.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you and goodbye.

<center>END</center>