

IANA CWG Meeting #9 (27 November)

Attendees:

Members: Jaap Akkerhuis, Robert Guerra, Graeme Bunton, Greg Shatan, Jonathan Robinson, Paul Kane, Erick Iriarte, Lise Fuhr, Seun Ojedeji, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Fatima Cambronero, Eduardo Diaz, Elise Lindeberg, Avri Doria, Stephanie Duschesneau

Participants: Brendan Kuerbis, Matthew Shears, Chuck Gomes, Amr Elsadr, Martin Boyle, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Wale Bakare, Milton Mueller, Tony Holmes, Phil Corwin, Plamena Popova, Alan MacGillivray, Keith Davidson, Alan Greenberg, Mark Carvell, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Yasuichi Kitamura, Peter Van Roste, Maarten Simon, Camino Manjon, Lars Erik Forsberg, Guru Acharya, Mary Uduma, Alyssa Cooper, Gary Hunt

Staff: Bart Boswinkel; Marika Konings; Nathalie Peregrine; Bernard Turcotte

Apologies: Tomohiro Fujisaki; Desiree Miloshevic; Carolina Aguerre (staff: Grace Abuhamad; Berry Cobb)

Please let Grace know if your name has been left off the list (attendees or apologies).

Proposed Agenda

1. Welcome & Roll Call
2. Review of F2F meeting & Project Plan
3. Update from RFP4 Call
4. Review Draft Proposal
 - Review draft proposal (which includes RFP1, 2, 3)
 - Identify Key Issues for Public Comment

1. Webinar Planning (3-4 December)
2. Review of Action Items
3. AOB

Notes & Action items:

Welcome & roll call

- Roll call will be taken from Adobe Connect

Review of F2F meeting

- Good representation and participation both from members as well as participants (over 40 participants)
- Substantial progress made, including framework for responding to RFP3
- Chairs statement published after the meeting to communicate outcome of meeting more broadly

Update from RFP4

- First call earlier this week on RFP4 - awaiting outcome of RFP3
- Considering how to move forward on items 1 and 2 which may be less dependent on RFP3
- Next call scheduled for Friday 28 November at 13.00 UTC.
- What is expected from RFP4 as part of the publication of the draft proposal on 1 December?

Review Draft Proposal

Section 3 Comments

- ALAC to provide written comments - concerns regarding jurisdiction of contracting entity (problematic to find one); capture of whole process; costs - how is this entity going to be funded, especially if ICANN shouldn't be part of the picture; integration problems with other proposals; who convenes PRT, prevent capture; likelihood of acceptance by NTIA. Basically some of the components have questions that do not have obvious answers - several of these together may question the overall proposal.
- Consider calling out some of these questions out as part of the public comment forum. For example, jurisdiction of contracting authority; formation of PRT; stress test idea - are there any items in the structures that leave it open for capture;
- Not useful to raise acceptability to the NTIA unless it relates to the criteria set by the NTIA.
- Focus on acceptance by naming community - ICG will worry about how it fits together with other proposals.
- How will contracting entity take action if it has no staff? Actions could be delegated to PRT or administrator / secretariat function for contracting entity? Principle is that PRT provides oversight and direction to Contracting Entity.
- Paper is a starting point - there are issues that will need to be addressed, but having a document will allow for soliciting input.
- Focus should be on finding solutions for issues identified, not just calling issues out. Work from within the group, not from the outside. Need to be part of the dialogue.
- Contracting entity questions: jurisdiction, staffing to carry out its responsibilities, who will be paying for it, is it a viable plan? PRT would be responsible for taking actions. Regarding funding, various models could be explored.
- Contracting entity - formal legal authority. Created with very limited mandate. In articles and bylaws it would have prohibition against changing bylaws unless certain steps are taken that involve the PRT/multistakeholder community.
- Consider opening different email threads on questions identified
- Need some independent legal contracting expertise to provide input - should be started now. How can independent legal advice be obtained and funded?
- Accountability - chairs will meet with co-chairs of the accountability CWG to discuss linkage and commence co-ordination between two groups.

- Approval function - may no longer be necessary. Has the proposal thought the issue through, also per the discussions on the mailing list. May be another issue to be called out as part of the public comment forum.
- Proposed modifications to the document as well as questions that need to be called out as part of the public comment forum - objective of today's conversation.
- Need to agree on sign-off moment for chairs to publish document
- Flag open issues / questions - either in document or as part of public comment forum.
- Transition implications could be an other area to solicit input on.
- Is it possible to flesh out composition of PDT and relationship to customer standing committee as part of draft proposal? See also comments from Avri on the mailing list. Could be convened on short notice if issue arises, but probably formally convenes once a year? Would need to define number of seats, not necessarily which individuals would occupy those seats, but will need to be multistakeholder. Term 'periodic' may be misleading as PRT is expected to be reactive between formal review moments.
- CSC focused on direct customers, possibly with a couple of additional experts /liaisons (non-registry per se, but experts in technical / operational issues that may occur in the execution of the IANA functions). Scope and deliniation between CSC and PRT should be further defined.
- Guide public comments on preferred way these should come back to facilitate review by CWG.
- Need to define who has standing to appeal to independents appeals panel.
- Monitoring of how policy is implemented - how is that done?
- Agreement to keep on moving on the current timetable, although consideration will need to be given with regards to the linkage with the accountability work.

Action item: contribute to questions that would need to be called out as part of the public comment forum. Deadline for all input on the questions & document - no later than Saturday 12.00 UTC. Co-chairs will have the authority to take that input and formulate the questions and issues that CWG wants input on.

Webinars

- Co-chairs leading / presenting, supported by RFP Leads
- Will be scheduled for:
- 3 December from 7:00 – 8:30 UTC
- 4 December from 12:30 – 14:00 UTC
- 4 December from 16:00 – 17:30 UTC
- All CWG members and participants encouraged to participate and promote webinars

Transcript

The transcript is available here: [Meeting9_27Nov.doc](#)

Recording

The Adobe Connect recording is available here: <https://icann.adobeconnect.com/p6eghfdidhm/>

The audio recording is available here: <https://icann.box.com/shared/static/7nqvqd4u66oxa95h7ypm.mp3>

Documents Presented

[Gantt Chart _ 24 Nov.pdf](#)

[CWG-Dec01PublicConsultV1 1 6.pdf](#)

Chat Transcript

Nathalie Peregrine:Dear all, welcome to the CWG Stewardship meeting on Thursday 27th November 2014

Yasuichi Kitamura:hi, all

Bart Boswinkel:Hi All

Philip Corwin:Hello. Happy Thanksgiving.

Keith cctld:Hi all

Erick iriarte:good morning

Erick iriarte:(well good morning here in sau paulo)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:hi Erik

Chuck Gomes (RySG):Greetings to all

Martin Boyle, ccNSO:Hi all

Wa:Hi

Eduardo Diaz - (ALAC):¡Hola a todos!

Robert Guerra:Good day all - happy thanksgiving to those in the US

Milton:What a happy thanksgiving indeed :-/

jaap akkerhuis SSAC:Gobble gobble

Milton:nobody here but us turkeys

Philip Corwin:Can't think of anything I'd rather be doing at 6 am on Thanksgiving morning

Marika Konings:Please remember to mute your lines when not speaking. Thank you.

Mark Carvell UK Government:Greetings from London where the sun has come out at last.

Allan MacGillivray:Hello and Happy Thanksgiving to Greg and Chuck, and other US friends.

Fatima Cambronero:hello everyone

matthew shears:Happy turkeys!

Greg Shatan:Good morning all, and Happy Thanksgiving!

Wolf-Ulrich Knohen:Happy Thanksgiving!

Chuck Gomes (RySG):Siva was on the RFP4 call

Jonathan Robinson:Thanks Chuck

Marika Konings:RFP4 call is at 13.00 UTC (Friday 28 November)

Seun Ojedeji: Apologies i am currently in a meeting...so i am just here in part in listening + text mode

Robert Guerra: notes & transcript of the RFP 4 call earlier this week are already on the wiki. BTW

Milton: Good idea, Jonathan to highlight specific questions

Elise Lindeberg GAC: +1 Milton

matthew shears: Suggest start with 3

Marika Konings: Section 3 starts on page 52

Philip Corwin: Who is speaking?

Amr Elsad: Alan G.

Philip Corwin: thx

Seun Ojedeji: +1 to Alan's point...the scene is going to be different so we need to look at the details of this new structure that is coming up

matthew shears: to Milton's point on the contracting company - how will the contracting company take action (per requests from the PRT) if it has no staff, etc.

Paul Kane: My microphone is not working - This paper is a STARTING point. I have small issues but welcome having the document just to ensure the plan is on track.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: wrt Contracting Company I also hear mixed messages about it: some say it will have no employees, others say it will - this is unclear at the moment

Alan Greenberg: Regarding NTI, Milton is correct that there is perhaps not anything that violates the NTIA proposal. But Milton has also pointed out that the Kelly Bill, while perhaps not something to worry about in its own right, DOES likely include many terms that WILL be considered by the NTIA and the gov't. So it puts in writing SOME of the issues we need to think about. Of course, we don't know which ones are the critical ones.

Eduardo Diaz - (ALAC): Another question is how the contracting company is going to defend itself if it gets sued? Will the PRT be liable?

Alan Greenberg: I am willing to go into further detail, but surely do not want to be seemed to dominate the conversation.

Erick Iriarte: I follow paul comment, this document will receive comments from the community and will be important listen the community and continues with that feed back.

Seun Ojedeji: And if it will have employee, where does the funding come from. Also the issue of how will this entity be established....as NOT-for-profit and where

Avri Doria: is it inappropriate that i started on the list before the call?

Jonathan Robinson: @Avri - of course not.

Seun Ojedeji: I know there may be requirement by some countries to have BOD in other setup an organisation, also some require having meetings annually et al

Chuck Gomes (RySG): @ Avri: I am not a co-chair but I think discussion on the list is very appropriate.

Robert Guerra: In terms of questions - do we want to directly ask what Board bylaw changes should be done to - 1. increase independence of the proposed review structures, and proposed changes to iana

Avri Doria: sorry i thought Greg was saying they had to be introduced on the call.

Chuck Gomes (RySG): @ Robert: Independence of ICANN and changes to the Bylaws seem to be at conflict.

Wa: I think there are compositions worth looking into and may be merged together as one. This would of course resolve aspect of funding. One of such, the Oversight committee/team could be doing the tasks of (1) Security (2) Authorization.

Chuck Gomes (RySG): I do agree that Bylaws changes will have to be made especially with regard to accountability.

Alan Greenberg: @avri, I asked in Frankfurt whether to wait for the draft to come out and the answers from Jonathan and Greg were (to summarize glibly) yes and no respectively). I chose to wait.

Lise Fuhr, ccTLD: @Avri and @Chuck - co-chairs are fine with discussions on the list and during calls.

Avri Doria: there may be issues about the problem of division into three separate operational threads that we save for the IGC comment period.

Greg Shatan: @Avri, not that they had to be introduced, but rather that no one should wait until AFTER the call to engage.

Paul Kane: I would like to understand when the Accountability Track intends to submit its report to us for our review to ascertain if it is relevant and appropriate for the model we envisage.

Avri Doria: Greg: thankd. I came in late and only had partial understanding. just coming out of the AfriNIC discussion on all of this.

Elise Lindeberg GAC: Alan - the action is going to be taken by the PRT

Philip Corwin: Good point. If the contract counterparty entity feels it needs to take enforcement action for a perceived breach it will need funds for enforcement, including perhaps litigation. Where does it get the funding?

Robert Guerra: indeed there's a question of jurisdiction and liability that exists for the new contracting entity.

Alan Greenberg: Should have also mentioned cost - who will be funding this. We have had a general statement that we should not count on ccTLDs. gTLDs I think have said they would consider it, but certainly not the ccTLD part. We cannot presume ICANN funding if it is out of the picture.

Seun Ojedeji: and one will wonder what the contracting entity staff will be doing after the contract is awarded....except that it may be waiting for next RFP or sudden occurrence from the operator that goes against the contract term. In the long run, we may be creating a more redundant organisation

Avri Doria: Well one of the contractual requirements might include not only a zero dollar process but funding the overhead, i.e. us.

Avri Doria: i.e. whoever want to do IANA pays for the priv as ICANN is doing. .

Guru Acharya: ICANN could continue to fund the new structure as the policy authority even if it loses its status as the IANA operator.

matthew shears: Interesting point Greg - I always considered that the CSC was more of an ICANN-like structure and the PRT was separate and different that would be broader in its representation

Wale Bakare: Would then mean entity be part of ICANN/IANA instead?

Milton: True, Guru. That is possible but also a potential conflict of interest

Alan Greenberg: @Elise, are saying that ENFORCEMENT action will be taken by the PRT - with what authority - it is not a party to the contract. And potentially does not exist as a corporate entity that can take legal action.

Bernard Turcotte - staff support: Greg - HAND?

Greg Shatan: @Bernie -- we need an "EAR" icon....

Greg Shatan: @Olivier: If not now, when?

Chuck Gomes (RySG): @ Olivier: The numbering is being worked.

Marika Konings: The idea is that the flow charts will be included as an annex but we are just trying to see if there are any updates required based on the conversation today.

Wale Bakare: +1, @Olivier

Elise Lindeberg GAC: No - but they will have the authority to call for enforcement by the contracting entity. But I do agree there is a funding issue here..

Elise Lindeberg GAC: PRT that is :)

Greg Shatan: +1 to multiple threads (and keeping them focused or renaming those that go off to different topics. But not to the exclusion of discussion here.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: +1 Chuck -- we absolutely need independent contracting expertise & International law too ASAP

Keith cctld: +1 to Chucks comments on legal assistance

matthew shears: + 1 Chuck

Fatima Cambrero: +1 @Chuck

Avri Doria: are we having a meta discussion about discussing?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: @Chuck: +1

Greg Shatan (GNSO):+1 to Chuck

Alan Greenberg:@Paul Kane: Earlier you asked how the acct track will be integrated. A very good question. However, given that things are working very well with IANA now, if our current recommendation were accepted, it is not clear that there needs to be a lot of change (except for the external appeal of IANA decision). ICANN is going from one entity that issues a contract to another entity that issues a contract. What needs to be changed??

Wale Bakare:The issue we are trying to put aside that's greatly impacting on the work of CWG, RFP timeline

Peter Van Roste - ccTLDs:Agree with Chuck on independent legal advice. Will need concrete questions though to get anything helpful back from them.

Seun Ojedeji:Maybe we should look forward to a legal person that could volunteer....i don't think funding an independent person to do that may a good way of utilising resources. Maybe a full legal view may be appropriate once we sense the community acceptance of this route

Martin Boyle, ccNSO:Legal advice implies a decision on jurisdiction, no?

Alan Greenberg:@Lise, communications does not address the question, as it has been proposed that the acct track will go to the ICANN Board and then to IANA and will not be integrated. Not proposing that, but it has been mentioned as the way it will be (perhaps incorrectly).

Elise Lindeberg GAC:Martin, Yes :)

Alan Greenberg:@ Martin, not necessarily. Companies often get legal advice on WHERE to establish a company.

Alan Greenberg:ie what is allowed where.

matthew shears:Alan - the Accountability WG will focus first on workstream 1 which are accountability issues that need to be put in place prior to the IANA transition

Martin Boyle, ccNSO:@ Alan: that might be the case, but where the issue is most appropriate with them, they'll need to consider how to address

Milton:great, thanks, Jonathan

Martin Boyle, ccNSO:(Last comment was about the ICANN Accountability discussion)

Greg Shatan (GNSO):+1 to Jonathan

Lise Fuhr, ccTLD:@Alan, I agree with Martin

Chuck Gomes (RySG):@ Seun: I think the implications of this are much too big to worry about getting free legal advice. Free advice is good but it may not be independent.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:@Matthew - the worry I have is that the Accountability thread, even with a workstream 1 is completely out of sync with the work & timetable we are following here

Milton:I think Jonathan gave the right approach, we can make some modifications to this document but the basic outlines are set and we also need to flag areas where we really need public comment

Chuck Gomes (RySG):@ Seun: If we wait to the end of December to get independent legal advice, we will be behind schedule.

Alan Greenberg:@Matthew, I understand that completely. My point was there may well be VERY little for it to do, and thus integrating it may not be onerous.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:With many saying that the accountability thread workstream 1 work needs to be complete before transition takes place, we are going to have a hard time sticking to our own timetable

matthew shears:@ Alan Olivier - agree that there are real timeline challenges

Paul Kane:We also need to check the Accountability 1 track proposal is appropriate/acceptable for our use.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:Re: Legal advice: urgent question from the co-Chairs to ICANN - how much funding is available for this?

Seun Ojedeji:Thats fine @Chuck....i just think we don't necessarily have to spend so much resources if we have not gotten some community support for the proposal.

Philip Corwin:Agree with what Greg is saying. The structuring and location of Contract Co. are too important and complex to rely on ad hoc free legal advice.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:@Paul: the two extremes re: the linking of the accountability track & IANA stewardship: 1. strong integration of the committees/entities we have described with ICANN in which case the link between accountability & iana stewardship is crucial. The other extreme is that the entities are all independent of ICANN & therefore what do we need ICANN accountability for - it becomes moot.

Alan Greenberg:In many jurisdictions, lawyers who are not contracted with AS lawyers are explicitly forbidden to give "advice".

Milton:I would like to hear more about the composition and formation of the PRT

Allan MacGillivray:@Paul - the Accountability process has yet to really get going. The call for ccTLD members is still open for example.

Alan Greenberg:@Allan as is the ALAC members

Elise Lindeberg GAC:Ok Greg - so you see it as workable to go through this without any pre preference of jurisdiction from the CWG

matthew shears:are we able to get all comments and incorporate and agree by Dec 1?

Marika Konings:@Alan - we expect the broader call of volunteers to go out on 1 December, followed by a first meeting of the Accountability CCWG on Tuesday 9 December.

Brenden Kuerbis:Agree with Greg about getting advice. There are other issues where we may need it, e.g., disposition of IANA trademark and domain name which I don't think has been mentioned in the document.

Alan Greenberg:Much noise.

Milton:Whew

Seun Ojedeji:there is a background noise

Chuck Gomes (RySG):Huge interference. Cannot hear.

Greg Shatan (GNSO):@Alan, true -- or the opposite -- if you are giving legal advice, you are de facto engaged, whether you intended it or not. Caveat: I am not providing formal legal advice in my role as a member of this august body.

Robert Guerra:someone else is drowning out Jonathan

Nathalie Peregrine:Please mute your AC mics as the noise is coming from there

Eduardo Diaz - (ALAC):It looks that the line was captured by someone

Alan Greenberg:Capture seems to be a focus of this group! ;-)

Chuck Gomes (RySG):It might be helpful if a subgroup of attorneys in the CWG developed a list of questions and issues for which we need legal advice.

matthew shears:Is there not merit in taking a few extra days to work through the comments and incorporate and agree comments related to this draft by Dec 1?

matthew shears:so extend to mid-week or end of week?

Greg Shatan (GNSO):I am happy to be part of Chuck's subgroup to act as "client" liaison to counsel.

Marika Konings:@Matthew - that would push the whole timeline out and will put delivery date at risk.

Greg Shatan (GNSO):"Group suggested by Chuck, not suggesting he would be part of it.

Graeme Bunton - RySG:YOU're getting lost in some noise Alan

Robert Guerra:repeat

Eduardo Diaz - (ALAC):say it again

Keith cctld:I'm sorry I have to drop off the call now

Milton:Can we identify the source of the noise problem?

Nathalie Peregrine:It is a participant AC microphone, I have private messaged them

Robert Guerra:a set of questions related to - RFP4 - Transition Implications- might be good to include in the "pool of questions" to include in the mon draft

Mark Carvell UK Government:I think this proposal is ready to issue for comment but some useful framing steers for stakeholders to focus on will help management of the process and keep it on track. Appreciate all the contributors to this work: solid, highly commendable progress indeed. GAC should reinforce the primacy of this, Elise.

Greg Shatan (GNSO): Framing Steers = Key Questions for Public Comment
 Greg Shatan (GNSO): ?
 Avri Doria: and ad hoc as necessary means it gets an alarm from the so called CSC?
 Mark Carvell UK Government: Greg: Yes - short, concise questions grouped under a few precise headings - need to bear in mind this is not a multilingual exercise.

Greg Shatan (GNSO): @Avri -- that's my thinking.
 Alan Greenberg: CSC may not CARE that some policy is not being followed - it may prefer that!
 Avri Doria: that is part of the reason I think the CSC needs a bit more latitude than customer SLAs
 Avri Doria: ... than ...
 Greg Shatan (GNSO): @Avri, agree as well.
 Alan Greenberg: If CSC is wider, it MUST be MS. and morphs into a completely different group.
 Guru Acharya: A fresh PRT will be convened everytime CSC escalates an issue? would there be two PRTs for two escalations?
 Jonathan Robinson: @Avri / Milton - Please provide suggestions on scope / delimiting scope of CSC / PRT
 Avri Doria: I disagree Alan. It needs to have experts from the other specialties, but it is still small and expert and makes no decisions just raises alarms.
 Matthew Shears: Yes, CSC needs to have ability to flag range of issues
 Chuck Gomes (RySG): @Guru: A fresh PRT will be convened everytime CSC escalates an issue? I hope not. That could be a logistical nightmare.
 Jonathan Robinson: @Greg - Agree "periodic" is perhaps misleading. More oversight & escalation but not day to day
 Olivier Crepin-Leblond: @Guru: I would be really worried if two escalations took place simultaneously to the PRT. That would mean a multiple failures in IANA's processes. Wow
 Seun Ojedeji: so if ALAC for instance has issue....they pass it through CSC?
 Seun Ojedeji: so if ALAC for instance has issue....they pass it through CSC?
 Matthew Shears: ACs may have liaisons on CSC according to draft
 Milton: Right, we don't want CSC to become a fully MS entity that duplicates the PRT and second-guesses policy
 Olivier Crepin-Leblond: @Seun: I think they take it to the PRT but this needs to be decided
 Alan Greenberg: @Avri, if it is more than just service levels, ie it looks at whether policy is being followed, it may well be that there is policy that the CRC members do not like (that is the nature of consensus policy - it can be forced on contracted parties). So not the best body to raise the alarm.
 Guru Acharya: if a fresh PRT is not freshly convened at each escalation, it essentially becomes a standing team
 Brenden Kuerbis: Right, CSC should be focused on specific issues which it monitors
 Milton: Exactly., Guru
 Olivier Crepin-Leblond: @Guru: do you disapprove of the PRT being a standing team?
 Amr Elsad: I would prefer that the CSC stay focused on customer/SLA issues, and amend the mechanism by which the PRT can react to a problem in policy implementation. This should also ideally be coordinated to make sure that there is no unnecessary overlap between this function within IANA and how implementation reviews occur within ICANN itself. Although I understand the accountability needs here, would like as clear a demarcation as possible between IANA function accountability and policy issues within ICANN.
 Allan MacGillivray: @Seun - what kind of 'customer issue' might ALAC have? If it has a policy related issue, it would go to the Policy Decision Review Panel.
 Avri Doria: CSC? CSC? I think the CSC needs to work as a group. They only raise alarms, it is the PRT that deals with them.
 Seun Ojedeji: okay @Olivier great then so it means CSC is in the position to decide to accept those flags or not. Which also means there is need for a fair review of the flags which may mean good representation on the CSC
 Martin Boyle, ccNSO: PRT surely has two roles: a regular review - yearly or whatever, But also an escalation mechanism. So it does have periodicity, but a standing nature
 Martin Boyle, ccNSO: So the p is not right.
 Greg Shatan (GNSO): @Martin, that's my view.
 Allan MacGillivray: @Martin - that is my view as well.
 Brenden Kuerbis: Basically agree with Amr about limited role and participants on CSC
 Martin Boyle, ccNSO: For CSC: I'd see it having a right to look at decisions basis in policy
 Alan Greenberg: No one has addressed my question. Why do we think CSC will raise alarms if they are happy that a specific policy is not being followed.
 Avri Doria: Seun, I think the CSC raise fact based issue of a serious risk. I think stakeholder issues go directly to the PRT through comments.
 Greg Shatan (GNSO): @Focused on registries, but plus a liaison from each other SO/AC, in my view.
 Alan Greenberg: Liaisons typically have no authority to act.
 Amr Elsad: @Alan: It'd be more helpful if policy implementation issues are out of the scope of the CSC. We need a different mechanism for the PRT to be able to address this.
 Wale Bakare: Where would the PRT representatives be located?
 Martin Boyle, ccNSO: @Alan: because drift from policy is dangerous. Next time it might bite. Also the PRT would be looking at it as its periodic review
 Greg Shatan (GNSO): Perhaps liaison is not quite the right term, but it is the authority to speak, not the authority to act, that is key in my mind.
 Greg Shatan (GNSO): PRT reps would be the same place we are on the CWG -- everywhere...
 Eduardo Diaz - (ALAC): Where are the CSC and PRT going to be located? within ICANN or outside?
 Milton: outside
 Greg Shatan (GNSO): @Eduardo, Milton -- I think that is an open question.
 Eduardo Diaz - (ALAC): @Milton: so both the contracting entity will be all outside the realm of ICANN? Is this the idea?
 Milton: How about the person/entity that is harmed by the policy not being followed?
 Allan MacGillivray: @Olivier - if policy is not being followed, one can go to the Policy Decision Review panel
 Mark Carvell UK Government: Milton: I think you're right: need some active linkage through representation or liaison between the PRT and CSC - ensures better prospect of rapid response if CSC gets into difficulty on any operational matter.
 Matthew Shears: Perhaps there needs to be a mechanism for flagging policy issues - not performance issues - to the PRT directly
 Greg Shatan (GNSO): But need to avoid conflict/capture issues. Would note that I don't feel this group is conflicted or captured...
 Lise Fuhr, ccTLD: I agree with Jonathan - transparency will ensure further
 Wale Bakare: @Greg, thanks. That means from each of the six registry regions?
 Milton: Agree with Alan that we need to be consistent about this
 Olivier Crepin-Leblond: @Jonathan: on your mention of transparency why could we think that transparency on the CSC would be any better than ICANN Board transparency. This is a really hard question to resolve except if we have either on the one hand some checks and balances that come in action, or we stick purely to adhering to SLAs
 Amr Elsad: Agree with Alan.
 Milton: I think it's a mistake to rely on CSC to flag deviations from policy. But since that is such a serious breach, that could threaten the holder of the contract, it is the PRT that should be notified of it
 Wale Bakare: *@Greg, thanks. That means, be located in each of the six registries regions?
 Amr Elsad: There is a gap in the process with regard to a policy watch-dog.
 Milton: @Greg, no this is a confusion of functions
 Alan Greenberg: Agree with Milton - we cannot flip-flop - the entire proposal needs to be self-consistent.

Milton: You are confusing the PRT function with the CSC function

Elise Lindeberg GAC: +1 Allan M - that is the escalation mechanism we talked about

Fatima Cambroner: Do the CSC and PRT have F2F meetings?

Avri Doria: Milton, Amr and Alna, I disagree, we need a group of expert watchers to raise alarms, these are in addition to complaints that come from customers.

Avri Doria: and complaints that come from stakeholders.

Milton: raise alarms? what? :-)

Alan Greenberg: @Milton "it is the PRT that should be notified of it" Notified by WHO?

Avri Doria: raise alarms.

Eduardo Diaz - (ALAC): @Fatima: it will depend on funding.

Amr Elsadr: @Avri: Not disagreeing with you, just saying it should come from somewhere besides the CSC.

Milton: I like llamas, but this is the IANA CWG

Avri Doria: though llamas are nice too.

matthew shears: policy issues could go straight to the PRT

Bernard Turcotte - staff support: Greg hand

Fatima Cambroner: yes @Eduardo, that question is related to costs to do that...

Greg Shatan (GNSO): @Wale -- not speaking to that level of granularity. Regionality is an issue that each SO/AC /community deals with differently.

Avri Doria: policy issues yes, but deviation from policy may not be noticed.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: @Avri: the way I understand it, all alarms from stakeholders would be raised directly to the PRT

Paul Kane: For ccTLDs the CSC should be BORING, limited in scope and just looking at SLAs. For gTLDs they may need more but ccTLDs must be able to determine Policy that best serve their community

Greg Shatan (GNSO): Amr -- could or "should only"?

Alan Greenberg: @OCL - raise flag to a group that does not exist at the moment?

Amr Elsadr: @Chuck: +1

Milton: Agree with Chuck here,

Avri Doria: Olivier, I agree and that seems fine. I am talking about alarms of things going wrong that get noticed early and deals with SLA, security, stability, root server issues and critical deviation from agreed upon policy. though policy is perhaps the least important.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: @Alan: bearing in mind the PRT would be a standing committee too

Greg Shatan (GNSO): @Alan, the group would exist by that time, in order to be able to react quickly.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: of course of the PRT is ad-hoc, then I don't know....

Milton: who has standing to use independent appeals process

Amr Elsadr: @Greg: I'd go with "should only". I'm in favour of limiting the scope of the CSC to very operational issues. I see those as a vital role in the IANA function and worthy of special focus.

Eduardo Diaz - (ALAC): Line when rouge

Wale Bakare: @Olivier, would the PRT be tackling (1) Security issues and concerns (2) implementation irregularities and/or policy?

Marika Konings: @Peter - you may need to mute your computer

Milton: go ahead Peter

Alan Greenberg: @OCL. I understand that some people say that PRC would be standing. Others have said it must be reconvened periodically. Another flip-flop. Cannot have it both ways.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: @Wale: at the moment the document says the PRT would be "addressing any escalation issues from the CSC"

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: @Alan: I agree

Guru Acharya: +1 Alan

Greg Shatan (GNSO): @Alan -- not a flip-flop (which I would note has connotations you may not wish it to have). It needs to be proactive periodically and reactive the rest of the time. Available when necessary but not working on its own initiative except periodically.

Alan Greenberg: Overlap in monitoring is FAR better than a gap!

Wale Bakare: @Olivier, thanks. As it stands, security aspects and policy tasks remained unaddressed?

Fatima Cambroner: sorry, not hand

Chuck Gomes (RySG): @ Amr: The SSAC might be the right body to appeal decision made that impact SSR issues.

matthew shears: oerhaos we can be more specific in the delineation of issues - CSC for performance - PRT for policy, security and escalated performance issues

Amr Elsadr: @Alan: An overlap could be used to appeal what has already taken place within the policy development bodies within ICANN; effectively a go around the normal policy process. We need to avoid this as much as possible.

Chuck Gomes (RySG): Members of the community could possibly flag concerns to the SSAC.

Greg Shatan (GNSO): If CSC is narrow and unistakeholder, the result will be that other communities will be dealing with the "gap" issues in an uncoordinated way. I don't believe that's a good plan.

Milton: Greg, but then the CSC becomes a duplication of the PRT in effect

Amr Elsadr: @Chuck: Agree on SSAC. There would need to be some sort of mechanism for this to follow through.

Chuck Gomes (RySG): @ Amr: Agree

Guru Acharya: +1 Milton

Milton: Not properly implementing agreed policy is a VERY serious breach of the IANA function responsibilities. Therefore it is of a different type than CSC-type performance issues, should have different ways of dealing with it

Greg Shatan (GNSO): @Milton, I go back to my first level/second level analogy to distinguish roles. Also, would see CSC unbalanced in favor of registries, while PRT is broadly MS.

Brenden Kuerbis: Why wouldn't those gap issues in the policy process (i.e., before implementation)?

Amr Elsadr: @Milton: +1

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: @Matthew: I'd be inclined to agree with you on the delineation of issues

Milton: CSC is SUPPOSED to be about and for registries, i.e. the customers of IANA services

Brenden Kuerbis: that was, "be addressed in policy process"

Mark Carvell UK Government: Goal is effective and efficient intersection between CSC and PRT - this does not mean duplication.

Greg Shatan (GNSO): @Mark -- sounds good to me!

Chuck Gomes (RySG): @ Milton: I kind of like having the CSC favoring registries. :)

Wale Bakare: @Greg, CSC and PRT aren't going to be stakeholders? Bear in mind should PRT reps limited to registries

Avri Doria: Mark, agree with that.

stephanie duchesneau 2: I joined late, was a deadline given for input on the draft report

Avri Doria: Chuck, I don't

stephanie duchesneau 2: to be considered before it's published

Milton: Not really "Favoring" registries but narrowly focused on registry problems/issues

Greg Shatan (GNSO): @Wale -- disagree that PRT should be limited to registries.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: @Stephanie: from the note: Deadline for all input on the questions & document - no later than Saturday 12.00 UTC

Milton: No one supports having PRT limited to registries.
 Greg Shatan (GNSO): but should be favoring registries in make-up.
 stephanie duchesneau 2: thanks Olivier
 Allan MacGillivray: Another approach would be to leave the CSC to deal exclusively with narrow operational performance issues and then to have an annual PRT meeting which would give others in the community the opportunity to raise issues.
 Greg Shatan (GNSO): @Milton, there may be a few in the "nobody" category (but I'm not one of them)
 Milton: Not a bad idea, Allan M
 matthew shears: Allan M + 1
 Amr Elsadr: @Allan: The concern may be that an urgent concern can't wait for a yearly review. I am in favor of the narrow role of the CSC, but another mechanism(s) may be required to deal with the other concerns.
 Peter Van Roste - ccTLDs: @Allan, agree. That's what I understood from Frankfurt.
 Greg Shatan (GNSO): @Allan, think that issues need to be dealt with in real time. Annual PRT meeting (or perhaps at more than 1 time per year) should be in addition.
 Avri Doria: Allan that may miss something that happens at PRT+1 month. I do not favor that idea.
 Greg Shatan (GNSO): Happy to participate in webinars, if that would be helpful.
 Milton: I don't think it's a problem to have the PRT deal with the issues of IANA not implementing policy properly, the question is how they learn of these breaches and how rapidly they are addressed
 Chuck Gomes (RySG): I should be able to participate in webinars
 Greg Shatan (GNSO): Agree with Avri. Can't treat other stakeholders as crazy uncles in the attic, who get let out only for special occasions.
 matthew shears: PRT is supposed to be ad hoc so stakeholders should be able to bring issues to it that are not day to day performance related
 Avri Doria: I believe we need an active committee of watchers who can raise alarms to wake up the PRT if necessary.
 Fatima Cambrero: I agree with Webinars, and please with interpretation!
 Greg Shatan (GNSO): Will start cooking early today!
 matthew shears: @ Avri - I like that "watchers"
 Avri Doria: no turkey day in mauritius
 Allan MacGillivray: As I see it, if there is a specific issue related to implementation of policy, then the Policy Decision Review Panel would look at it. If there are persistent or systemic policy issues, the PRT could get involved but this could be done on an annual basis.
 Amr Elsadr: @Greg: Happy Thanksgiving to you and all the other Yanks. :)
 Greg Shatan (GNSO): Amr, thanks!
 Milton: Agree with Allan M
 Lise Fuhr, ccTLD: Thank you Jonathan and happy Thanksgiving
 Bernard Turcotte - staff [support:bye](#)
 Chuck Gomes (RySG): Thanks Jonathan.
 Lise Fuhr, ccTLD: To the US
 matthew [shears:thanks](#) all
 Wale Bakare: Thanks, bye
 Yasuichi Kitamura: bye
 Allan MacGillivray: Good day all
 jaap akkerhuis SSAC: bye bye
 Graeme Bunton - RrSG: Thanks all
 Martin Boyle, [ccNSO:thanks](#), Bye
 Eduardo Diaz - (ALAC): bye
 Milton: Bye all
 Bart Boswinkel: Bye all
 Carolina Aguerre: Bye all
 Fatima Cambrero: thanks all. Bye
 Elise Lindeberg GAC: bye
 Greg Shatan (GNSO): Policy panel is definitely reactive -- not proactive.
 Amr Elsadr: Thanks all. Bye.
 Alan Greenberg: Thanks all.
 Greg Shatan (GNSO): Bye all.
 Brenden Kuerbis: thanks all, bye
 Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Happy turkeys to the US colleagues!
 Mark Carvell UK Government: Thanks - the sun has gone in....
 Philip Corwin: back to sleep/on to turkey
 Greg Shatan (GNSO): The sun has come up!