

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White  
January 8, 2015  
8:00 am**

Coordinator: Recording has started - please proceed.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you so please be aware as usual this meeting is being recorded and if you have any objections to that please disconnect now. So welcome everyone - Happy New Year to all of you. I hope it's going to be a productive 2015 and obviously especially for the work of this group. Just the usual reminder - be aware we have the audio enabled in the Adobe Connect Room so you'll need to mute your computer microphone or microphone in the top left hand corner of the Adobe Connect software and obviously similarly if you're dialed in. So please make sure you're on mute so we don't get any unnecessary interference.

Good - so we've had continuous work throughout the holiday season and it is a huge thanks to everyone. I think it's often under estimated quite the commitment that it takes to get this work done and this is possibly one of the most dedicated groups I've had the opportunity to work with. People have worked night and day regardless of personal and other commitments and especially over this traditional holiday season for many of us at least.

We have a plan to keep the meeting to an hour today - it's normally scheduled for two hours, but you will all or almost all of you be aware that there are now two surveys out and in particular one whose deadline for completion is eminent and we in discussion - co-chairs and the coordinators felt that it would be very useful if we gave some time back to you to complete those surveys. We really would like to see all of the CWG members contributing by giving at least their personal view in the survey if not represent the views that they are aware of the respective groups they represent.

So that's some key points. Just to note that we will record everyone who is in the Adobe Connect Room as present so if you are not in the Adobe Connect Room it would be great if you could make yourselves known now over the audio - only if you're not logged into the Adobe Connect Room. I'll pause for you to make yourself known. All right so we assume that everyone in the Adobe Connect Room is in attendance at the meeting and we'll record you as present and we'll not record anyone else as present.

We have been working - Lisa Fuhr my co-chair - myself - to coordinate with the CCWG on accountability. I know that this is a sensitive point for many in this group and an issue of heightened awareness and for some a problem that these two groups are operating separately. I just wanted to assure you that we've been meeting on a weekly basis as far as possible and making sure that there is good communication between the groups. There is an expressed intentional (part) of the chairs which wasn't helped by the holiday season so now it's right to attend one another's meetings.

And I'm personally aware that one respective solution to making sure this linkage is strong is that we may end up with some - one or more of the propose made by this group conditional on particular accountability pieces being implemented. So just to give you that assurance if you are concerned

about the way in which things are working and being coordinated that's not necessary transparent to the group, but there is on going activity and communication taking place there. Any objections to trying to keep this meeting to an hour and any other comments in this welcome section?

All right in the interest of keeping things moving let's do that. I'll call now on the agenda Item Two and I'm noting that - I apologize the agenda wasn't sent out to you previously. It follows a relatively similar format to that which we've used before, but never the less it should have been sent out to you 24 hours at least before the meeting and wasn't so apologies on behalf the co-chairs for that.

If we could move straight on and into updates from the sub groups to the extent that there is something to update on and if we could keep it brief that would be great. I think it's probably logical to go into three first if Greg is on the call and ask for any recent updates or key points from that.

Greg Shatan: Good morning Jonathan - it's Greg Shatan. In terms of recent updates we've had our calls - (I called) this week on Wednesday - yesterday and we used that call to refine the second of the surveys while it was in draft. And I think we've made a number of very positive improvements in the survey which is now out for completion and which - and (communicated) - will be used for completion of the survey later in our call tonight.

We had intended -- if possible -- to also get to a section of the structure of the CSC - we could not get it during the call, but I will remind all on the group that it will be good to review the strawman structural analysis document prior to refining that on the list especially given all the comments and the impending work weekend. It will be good to continue drilling down on that

and also other elements of the - other framework even though it's  
(unintelligible). That's about the size of it in a nutshell - thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Greg. I'm noting your continued tremendous outgoing  
dedication - commitment throughout the last few weeks.

Greg Shatan: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Is there - can I have any input or update from RFP4 please?

Robert Guerra: Sure - good morning all or good day all - this is Robert Guerra - co-chair of  
RFP4. We met earlier this week - I think we're - the best way to summarize  
our discussions is that the previous week we have done - agreed to some  
approaches and they're waiting for RFP3 to go through its comments and  
finalize what they wish to be putting forward. And so we're a little bit on  
hold, but have an approach and a methodology to go forward and some  
documentation just ready for that to finalize. And so we're - I think one bit  
that we have for RFP3 is that any changes to the model that has been  
developed please be communicated to us so we can adjust our documentation  
accordingly. And that's it for RFP4.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Robert. And then I think it's likely - is it Cheryl from five? I  
have someone available to report on the work of five in the interim to the  
extent that there has been any?

Man: Hello.

Jonathan Robinson: Hi. Would someone with a live mike but no - Jaap I see your hand up - go  
ahead.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Since there's nobody else around - I mean I just can say that there was a call last night from (unintelligible) and there is a draft - I mean a skeleton of a draft for RFP5 and it's actually on the Website - you can find it on CWG Website and there is not a lot of progress happening because actually this is difficult to say a lot about - because it's so much dependent on the outcomes of all the other groups so. And one (unintelligible) I remember correctly is that we will try and find some - try to find time to get another call probably at the end of (summer) something like that to see whether there is some more, whether some things are getting more clear from the other groups. So we are actually more (on hold) than anything else.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead.

Jaap Akkerhuis: I just want to make this claim that I'm doing this from scratch from what I remember from yesterday and there might be more, but I - there are not notes yet.

Jonathan Robinson: No problem - thank you. And noting your - there is intention (unintelligible) over the course of the weekend potentially. Are there any questions for under this Section Two on the updates at this point? Seeing no new hands up - I'll move on then to the work in progress. Now as you are well aware there are two - there has been some (sub sequential) work on the summary and I'll ask this of the public comments which was presented to us by the staff lead on that - (Bernie) who has been working on supporting us with that analysis.

So there has been a further iteration of that since our last call so I felt it was probably useful that (Bernie) just gives a very brief update as to what that iteration was - any changes and we take comments - inputs or suggestions from the group on that so (Bernie) if I could ask you to just comment on what's changed or moved on since our last meeting and then we'll take input - questions or comments on that.

(Bernie): Thank you sir. Basically I think it was fairly well stated in the email. What's been done is basically there were several responses missing and these are now included. We've moved things around the page, but haven't changed how we do the analysis so basically everything is coded in the yes - no - no comment - yes, but reservations and the analysis is based on yes and yes, but reservations and no discounting no comments except that we assign a wait to sort of match up things.

The results did not significantly change since the last time this was presented. It's probably easier to understand. Our major agreement level for defining major agreement was 75% or plus and basically when that is achieved either in a yes or no you end up with the box being yellow. If you see the box in pink it usually means that there's an issue with the weight. And given that not a lot of things have changed I'm not going to spend a lot of time on it.

It's broken down in four groups basically all the responses are blocked together. Then we've got them in the next tab by type. The types that we have are basically given the volumes ended up being 60 TLV's groups and individuals. We then did an analysis of ccTLD's in the wide sense of the word which include regional organizations versus the (R SIG) proposal to see how they match up and they did on a lot of things and that's interesting to look at.

And finally we did analysis of those people that operate in one way or another inside the ICANN arena versus those that do not and, again, that was interesting for the fact that there seemed to be a fairly high degree of correlation on the major agreement points for those inside ICANN versus those outside. That's my summary sir - I'll be glad to take questions.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you (Bernie) and any comments - questions or issues arising on this? We did cover it fairly well at the last meeting, but it may be that or whatever reason there are questions or comments since then. Go ahead please Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks Jonathan - Donna Austin. So I have a general question about the analysis that was done and whether there is an intention to do any work on the - I guess the alternative proposals that were provided within the comments. The registry stakeholder group provided some - provided an alternative proposal - Google did - I know that there were a number of others as well.

The reason I ask this is that the sticking point that seems to be with this group is Contract Co or internal to ICANN and I think we're doing ourselves a disservice by not actually developing something that looks like what would an internal to ICANN proposition look like. A number of the alternative proposals actually address that so I'm just wondering if that's a path that we intend to go down or - and if it's not I'd like to understand why that is?  
Thanks (Jon).

Jonathan Robinson: Donna thanks that's a very good point - I mean some ways it's kind of - it speaks to Section Four of this agenda and that's currently missing on the - a looking ahead - yes. So that's - and to my (mind) that's really and maybe that's something, you know, you and others want to flag up as to how we route our way of going forward because it's clear that we've got, you know,

(bifurcating), you know, we've put primary solutions was developed or proposals developed in Frankfort and alternative proposal and what I'm starting to see is a series of hybrids or in-betweens that come out.

And that, you know, clearly the challenges whether or not these can be synthesized to the satisfaction of the groups so it may be that's something we want to direct in thinking about the work weekend and what our expectations might be at that. I'm open to any comments or suggestions as to how we respond to that, but I'm personally - certainly very mindful of those additional or related proposals as you've described. I've got a hand up from Milton and a hand up from Alan.

Milton Mueller: Yes, does that mean I'm recognized? Can you hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: Milton I can hear you load and clear - please go ahead.

Milton Mueller: Okay. Yes on the alternative proposal it's a bit of a dilemma because if you look at the numbers essentially the - what we have are only seven commenters commented on the alternative proposal that was specifically asked about. Of those three of them liked it and four of them didn't and basically most people did not comment on it. Of course there were individual alternative proposals contained in some of the comments.

And I think it would be somewhat strange for this committee to say that we're going to stop working on a proposal - the basic outlines of which were supported by about two thirds of the comments and work on a proposal that three comments said they supported or one comment said they supported. Now that doesn't mean that elements of some these alternative proposals were not worth considering.

In fact some of them have some very good ideas in them that should be considered, but I think we have to be in a framework or mindset of how do we make the basic Frankfort proposal better or more acceptable and not throwing it out and starting with something that has, you know, significantly less support and has had significantly less discussion. One alternative to that might be to set up a sub-group of people who all want an internal solution to propose something fairly detailed that they could bring back to the group while the rest of us are using the surveys to improve the Frankfort proposal. I think that two track approach might be a good way to proceed.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Milton and we are effectively moving - drifting into Section Four to some extent, but that's not necessarily an issue and that two track proposal is certainly one way we could think about - I'm very mindful of the surveys are going to, you know, they're out there. And so one of the reasons I was sympathetic to not getting it to involved in the detail in this meeting and concentrating on giving the time over to service was exactly that it feels to me like there's a lot of flux - a lot of discussion and a lot of activity that we still need to work through before deciding on the routes, but that's interesting to think about - to track a way forward. Let me hand over to Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I guess I strongly support what Donna said and I'm not a - I don't object to a two track of proceeding on a non contract conversion as well presuming, of course, we get staff support and things like that. The problem earlier in this process is a number of us were told to go off and develop a proposal, but you know, do it without any of the help that the mainline proposal was getting and that was very problematic.

It may be true that not many people commented on the other proposal or other proposals, but the results that (Bernie) has presented indicate a - were a significantly large component of those responding do not like the core part of

the CWG proposal and that is specifically the contracting entity. And I - as Donna said I don't think we can in clear conscious ignore that and just barrel ahead on the other path and presume we can tweak the contract well enough to make it inoffensive to those who believe there shouldn't be a contract entity. I think that presume is the outcome and I would have a real problem with that - thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Donna you're next.

Donna Austin: Thanks Jonathan. I guess I just want to respond to Milton and also to some extent - I think in my mind this is important enough that we need to take some time to look at the internal to ICANN situation, but I understand that we have two things working against us with that. We have the timing that we're working to and we also have the fact that the accountability stream is still under discussion. Much of the internal to ICANN is being based on a faith that the accountability working group will come up with something that gives us some level comfort that internal to ICANN can be sorted.

So that kind of works against us - I think Milton is breaking this down to numbers and I think that's a little bit dangerous, you know, there's been some conversations around this about waiting in certain groups. The internal to ICANN solution is being proposed by a number of (ccTLDs) and as a customer to the IANA function and have been customers who - the permanent customers for many years I don't think we should just discount that because it doesn't - the numbers don't add up. So I think, you know, this is obviously - and even breaking it down within the CWG itself in terms of the path that we've taken.

I think we went down a certain path, but again because of the timeframe that we're working to we didn't give due to consideration to the alternative. And I

kind of think we have some agreement around the MRT and the CSC, but it's that whether this should be internal to ICANN or if this should be a Contract Co is the thing that's outstanding. So I think in order to consider these properly I really think we need to look at that - what is internal to ICANN look like also recognize that we're - because of timeframe we're up against we probably haven't done so. And also because the accountability strain is, you know, still in the early stages. That kind of works against us as well so I guess I just wanted to respond to Milton and also to support Alan in some respects - thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so thanks Donna and Alan before you. I'm mindful there's a queue developing that the primary topic of this section is to try and critique or comment which Donna you did in that previous point to some extent in talking about the use of numbers or not as the case may be. The summary and analysis part of the comments and the effectiveness of the surveys and then I would like to move us on to looking ahead and bearing in mind the tight time scale. So I don't want to cut the queue short, but try and focus your comments on the effectiveness of the comments analysis then on the surveys and then we'll try and pull it together to how we use that criticism to figure out how weekends work - thanks. Over to you Robert.

Robert Guerra: This is Robert for the record. I'm not sure if I'm jumping ahead, but I do wish to point out something that was I think mentioned a little bit earlier that in addition to the surveyor poll that was presented earlier we do have two other polls now open. One of which is closing today and in those polls there are more specific detailed questions and the ability for respondents to put in comments on far more nuance aspects of the proposals so I strongly suggest those who may not have yet gone through those polls to do so. And we - a reminder was sent out yesterday in regard to the CSCMRT survey and there is a quite a number of people that responded yesterday and that poll closes today

and so I really insist that that goes through and then I think I'll, you know, we'll try and pull out some of the sentiment that comes out of those polls, but I'm - so that's - I think one thing in - yes - that's what I'll say for now - thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Robert - I'll just keep moving through the queue then. Chuck go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan. I want to reinforce some things several people said and I'll try to be quite brief. First of all I think Milton makes a good suggestion that we should form a group that will start digging into the alternative proposal, but I want to add another nuance that Donna kind of hit on in her first comments - I think. I think we ought to also do what she said and we ought look at the other alternatives whether they're just variations or whatever they are that were proposed.

I think at least eight different commenters proposed some kind of variation or even a different approach and we ought to look at those in light of both the CWG proposal that RFP3 isn't working on and in light of the alternative proposal that the ALAC and even some others have seemed to support. Regarding the timeline - if we let the timeline drive what we're doing and we get to a point where all we're looking at is one alternative we're not going to get the broad support that we're going to need at that point.

So I think we have to look at various alternatives. And then try and make each of the primary proposals better by using the input from the others that have commented on alternatives - thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck and I think you make a very good point by what method do we get broad support because clearly that's the ultimate objective and we're pretty split at the moment. Olivier please go ahead.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking and I might have missed this in an earlier discussion, but are we expecting a qualitative analysis from (staff) as well or are we going to just have this quantitative analysis? The reason for it being - what I mentioned on the list - if you do have the - let's say the GAC - the ALAC the NCSG saying one thing or being in favor of XYZ and Mr. (Tom) and Mr. (Dick) and Mr. (Harry) being against that in the quantitative analysis, of course, you end up with three and three. But in the qualitative analysis one is able to put a lot more weight on the three organizations than on (Tom) - (Dick) and (Harry). Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Olivier and (and to the extent) of this I question there - are we looking at a qualitative analysis or we're certainly having the discussion about the qualitative components of it. I don't know - I don't believe we have a current plan or methodology to apply a qualitative analysis at this stage - it remains a possibility. Milton.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Jonathan, it's Olivier, and it would be in line with other public comment analysis. I do believe at least the ones that I was - on the other side of the consultation the side that was asking the questions that's not who was doing a qualitative analysis and was providing reports who said what basically in one document. So I realize there's a lot of work and that's why I asked the question and there maybe not enough time for it to be done, but thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: (Great) point - thanks Olivier.

Milton Mueller: Yes, in terms of commenting specifically on the analysis that (Bernard) provided I do have a serious problem with it and it's the same one that I expressed last time it was discussed. The big issues that we're debating here are separability - there are people who supported - there are a few who don't and then there is the can separability be achieved better or adequately through an internal or external solution. I don't think - I think what (Bernard) did or whoever did this analysis - they broke things down into some extremely narrow questions with the result that and they said that basically nobody commented on and if they didn't address those various specific breakdowns. And so that if you look at the (NC) column you see that it's actually containing the largest numbers almost all of the time.

I agree with Olivier that we need to take a more a more qualitative approach and we need to read their comments and see what they mean particularly with respect to those big issues. And I think in our analysis we did that, the IGP analysis and one could quibble you know around the margins of what we did, but fundamentally, we are finding that there is overwhelming support for separability. There are a few people who don't. There is a slightly preponderance of evident in favor of external separability but there is a substantial group that wants to explore separability in the internal context. And the analysis that we have in front of us now I think basically misses that. It doesn't quite get us to a clear direction in terms of what the fundamental issues are and how much support there is for each of those perspectives.

Just to give you an example, you know we've got to move beyond you know picking an anecdotal or individual response. So yes Donna it is true that some ccTLDs wanted an internal solution but if you look at the entire group of ccTLDs, you find a six t to five decision. Almost - more like 55%/45% in which some ccTLDs came out explicitly in favor of an external separability

solution and the other 45% came out in favor of an internal approach to separability.

So I think again this justifies a two track approach in which we continue to improve on the Frankfurt proposal and try to address the problems people had with it. And at the same time, the other people can work on the details, which simply don't exist yet of what an internal solution would look like.

Jonathan Robinson: So we're about to - and thanks Milton. We are about to move into the survey so I would like people comment on where the usefulness and the effectiveness of the surveys in resolving some of these issues and also I guess one of the challenges we will face if we do go down that two track approach how on earth we reconcile those at the end if they end up appearing to have (unintelligible) equivalent quality. Greg and then Alan.

Greg Shatan: It's Greg Shatan again. Thank you, (Jon). Two quick - one I do think that when you look at the differences in similarities of proposals, there is at least a fair amount of variations that still use something like the MRT and the CSC and the (IAC) so those I think are the less difficult to reconcile the Contract Co versus no Contract Co is one that's much more of a dichotomy and there is really - that really needs to be looked at I think in two pieces, which is maybe not in - but there needs to be acknowledged that there are two aspects of that.

One is Contract Co and the there is the contract itself. If there is no Contract Co then there is either - then there needs to be some other documents by which everything that the contract would do would (unintelligible) internal to ICANN documents. (Unintelligible). So I think we need to think about what the vehicle would be that the contract would be - and if there was an alternative solution, it needs to take both of those elements into account.

And in terms of the survey particularly while obviously while obviously I am a contributor to and proponent of the survey there is a danger as we look at things granularly in leaving kind of (side of) the forest for the trees. And looking at alternative structures and not just that alternative elements or refinements.

So I don't know if all of that got through since somebody had decided to put an awful noise in front of my statement. But that's my view in short for the no Contract Co means no contract and we need more. We need to deal with that too in terms of any alternatives and the surveys are a bit granular so we need to try to be also looking holistically. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Greg and a reminder to all to keep your phones on mute. I mean the survey has been modular as they were where in part as they are is in part designed to try to break away from a particular solution and focus on some critical complements. But I do take your point that that perhaps moves us away from seeing the wood for the trees and therefore considering alternate structures. Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I would like to go back to the analysis we were talking about and the fact that at least some of the proposals, some of the comments, a simple analysis really doesn't do it and I am looking in particular at the registry proposal, which we keep on talking in this group about the direct customers of IANA. Ultimately the gTLD registries will be a very large number, a percentage of the direct customers and their report is very nuanced.

And I am not going to try to speak on behalf of the registries, but the report almost says we would prefer an alternative to ICANN but we do not believe the accountability issues can be addressed properly in a way that satisfies us

and that goes directly back to what we were talking about much earlier of the coordination between these two groups and the timing dependencies.

We are making here what may be one of the most important decisions on behalf of the Internet that we have ever had to make and we are doing it on a timeline that is rushed and perhaps without proper analysis and discussion and I am really afraid of where we are going because of that. The - some of the comments are very nuanced and are not amenable to simply be put in the category. One category or another.

The whole issue of risk comes up and is mentioned by a good number of the proposals and that has - that we haven't done that kind of assessment yet. I understand we hope to but again the timeline works against that and I am really worried that we are making such a crucial decision on behalf of the Internet and not just ICANN. And we are not giving it proper you know time and process. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Alan so I am mindful of both the big picture time issue and the small picture time issue, so let's try and conclude on the work in progress and then concentrate on next part of our conversation on looking ahead and how we make best use of the future time available and indeed where that starts to need thinking about.

Greg is your hand up again or was that an old hand?

Bertrand de La Chapelle: No it is an old hand I didn't raise my hand before.

Jonathan Robinson: All right Greg, (unintelligible) this was Greg's - Greg's was the old hand not yours (unintelligible) go ahead.

Bertrand de La Chapelle: Yeah thank you. I just want to share that I am deeply uncomfortable with the way some of the discussion is going for quite some time. I have been trying to field the survey and I am really unable to field it in a way that allows me to reflect what I can say or what I think. I try to follow the discussions on the list and on the lists in plural and to be frank, it is impossible for anybody who has activities that are not entirely dedicated to this to be able to respond in the same manner that a lot of people are doing.

We take a lot of attention to maintaining time limit for speech when we face to face on conference calls, but on the list, there is an overwhelming presence of people who are pushing one particular solution and I do not feel I am sorry to say a desire to listen to what people who do not fundamentally feel that this is the right way or will fundamentally feel that this is complex unnecessarily. I don't feel the desire to listen and to try to take into account their views.

Arguing about percentages of votes on limited contributions is the exact contrary of a consensus building exercise. And I want to make a very important distinction on this issue of separability that we have been struggling with for a while and bear with me for a second. I feel that as I said on the list that there is a huge confusion between two visions, which is not at all separability or non-separability as those who support a strong potential separation try to argue. The confusion is between or the distinction is between the possibility of a separating if necessary, which I think, has a huge amount of consensus and the view that some people believe that the priority today is to prepare the necessary separation.

This is a way to address an issue that is actually preventing the (convergence) rather than supporting it and fostering it. I just want to say this. It is my two minutes. I cannot cope with the flow of the discussion but I do not see consensus merging at the moment and I think there are elements of the

methodology and the approach and also the attitude of some of the contributors that is not respectful enough of people who mayn't be of the same mind. And there is an unbalance between the time that some of us can devote to this and the time that some others who are deeply invested in this topic for very valuable reasons to devote to this. That's all I can say at the moment.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Bertrand. Indeed the list is very active. I haven't looked at whether or not it is - well it is - and it is hard to keep up to it unless you can dedicate the full time efforts to it. In the spirit of what you have said, let's move on to Item 4 and start to think about how we might work effectively and work together to try and build what we may do over the weekend

We've clearly got all meetings coming up. The coordinators or co-chairs and support staff will be collocated to try and most effectively and productively manage the discussion and move things through. It will need commitment from all of the members and participants to participate in all four meetings if possible and in order to prepare for that work as effectively as possible, I really want to encourage you to fill in the surveys.

I - my personal view is that the surveys will be an additional very useful notwithstanding the potential limitations will be a very useful additional contributor to the view of the group. Of the group working on this over and above the public comments or in addition to the public comments.

So given that we have these four meetings and the perspective work, we can I mean and in effect some suggestions have come out. The perspective development of qualitative analysis, the consideration of the second track of work a sub group working on further developing an alternative proposal. Are

there any other thoughts or suggestions as to how we best and most effectively manage the weekend.

And I should say really that the existing plan clearly has us working through the weekend and then pulling together using the output of that weekend's work to draw together and a final draft for submission to the chartering organizations around one week later. We can't help but notice that significant comments in and around time pressure and the potential restrictions that places on finding a consensus.

So I think we have to work with our original goal in mind but be mindful of the fact that that is exceptionally challenging to unrealistic and make an assessment of that at the end of weekend. So the co-chairs are very aware of the time constraints and that some might view those as unnecessarily demanding and to the extent that we feel that a consensus can be built with a little more time, that is someone that we might well be prepared to argue for, but let's not use that as a basis to not commit to the most effective working we can at the present time.

So suggestions or comments as to how to make best use of the weekend with coordinators and the coheirs will get together for a planning session late Friday and try and pull that together so we can take suggestions from you now and comments and anything about method, approach, structure , and between now and Friday.

Robert your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Robert Guerra: This is Robert for the record. Just seeing some of the comments in the chat I think what might be useful if there are individuals that for whatever reason cannot connect in on Saturday I think it would be worthwhile if there are some

comments or one that they take the polls to if there are comments that they can relate to us to make sure that their points are taken into consideration would be particularly helpful. And I think from what I am hearing, I think it probably might be useful to have a sense of the variety of different options that is being a binary - it is one option or another.

If there is a nuance scale of different issues that those try to be presented and discussed over the weekend and then the question would be coming back is you know how does the work from the weekend feed into what happens afterwards. And so I think that would be worthwhile commenting a little bit on this call before we wrap up. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Robert. So any response to that would be welcome. I curtly for one seeking any guidance as to mechanisms to synthesize rather than create the work that is kind of the polarity if you (Staffan) like and go ahead.

(Staffan Jonson): Thank you. Yeah for sure I would like to give some support appreciation for working on RFP 3 and for (unintelligible) now. The written response anyhow because I think that is a god way forward in work and since you talk about the work weekend and methodology for it, I think this is a good idea.

If we have the ability to assess and get together remarks coming in from the written responses, I am quite happy. I am also happy about qualitative analysis and the second parallel sub group if that is needed. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you (Staffan). There is obviously active discussion going on in the chat. It would very helpful to - I mean it may be that that s - that we have to let the course continue to run on email. And I for one am mindful that we are very much midway in terms of the surveys and what they will produce which is one of the reasons why I was so keen to curtail the time spent on this call

and put some of the obvious energy into preparing - into responding to those surveys and also hear any contributions to how to constructively move forward.

We will take a comment from Donna and I am mindful that we are coming towards the top of the hour so let's take the comment from Donna and (unintelligible).

Donna Austin: Thanks Jonathan, (unintelligible). If I understand you correctly you are looking at possible items for discussion during the working weekend session. Is that what you are seeking?

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry could you repeat the question Donna?

Donna Austin: are you asking for possible agenda items for the session on the weekend? Is that what your question was?

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah agenda items Donna and also to any sort of thoughts as to how we approach. It is quite clear that we have got a significance at least and in around one critical component of potential different solutions and so there may be mechanics or methods or any techniques that the coordination group can take into their Friday planning meeting and say right. This we believe is the most effective way to utilize the time commitment that we and everyone else in the group is going to connect to this. So Donna feel free to contribute now or on the lists and if not if you don't have anything more to add right now, I will move on to Chuck.

Donna Austin: Sorry Jonathan I was on mute. So I think something that I would like to say discussion around is how we manage the proposal given the accountability work stream that is happening. I think it would be really useful to have some

kind of update on where the accountability discussion is and then the anticipated timing that they are working to just finalize their IANA work stream. Thanks Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah just two quick things. Number one, what Donna just said is - I want to note to everyone that some of the questions in the second survey deal with how we deal with the accountability group, so it illustrates why it is so important to get a lot of feedback on both surveys including the one that was just sent out.

And secondly Jonathan you really answered the second one. You are not just looking for feedback on this call, but if people will - you said this in an email. That if people will provide suggestions for the weekend on the email list as long as they are before later in the day Friday that would be great.

Yes thanks Chuck and Donna before you. So we are expecting to receive some form of update from the accountability CCWG chairs and so that will be very useful and we will share that with the group. And I take the point that the suggestion on immediately of managing our proposal and relationship to accountability and I think that is a (unintelligible) that is welcome. And as you say Chuck, anything else that comes in the interim.

These surveys - so I think what we will do now is allocate the remainder of the call to the response to the surveys and strongly encourage you to fill in them in acknowledging that they are - that you could criticize them but we - they have been produced in very short order with an intention to take another cut at getting substantial input from CWG members. Please go ahead and

encourage anyone you know who is not on the call or to take the time to do so.  
Alan Greenberg go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I was trying to address the Item B January 12 onwards. My recollection is that we decided that because of the diversity, anything that comes out as a final report is going to be significant. Sufficiently different from our preliminary report that we had to go for public comment again. And that decision being changed without discussion because the timing to submit something changes completely even if we come out of the weekend with a single unified decision. The public comment skews that timing completely and I am not sure how we could do it without a public comment, so quickly address that please.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Alan. I recognize that I should - sorry (unintelligible). I recognize the rationality of your point. I don't necessarily recall us agreeing to that. Can you remind me when that was that you know if you like second public comment was discussed.

Alan Greenberg: I certainly can't remind you of the time. Maybe (staff) can go back. I know there was a discussion on do we believe that we can refine this and then just (unintelligible) as a report. Certainly we have to go out to our chartering groups. The charter makes it very clear that the chartering organizations have to pass judgment on what we are doing. That alone is going to take time.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Alan. So the...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Excuse me.

Jonathan Robinson: You go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: I think we did decide on a public comment. I may be misremembering or maybe I am remembering correctly and we can't find the point. Regardless of whether we decided or not, I am - you know at the very least we have to go back to our charter organizations so the timing - I would like to see a projected timeline at this point. Maybe that comes on Saturday.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, well let's part that for a moment. As I said, I recognize your point and understand that - and it is certainly not uncommon to do that. I just didn't necessarily recall that we'd agreed that but let's not get into a debate at that at the moment. Let's just acknowledge the value of the point and I think the current plan, the existing plan, however challenging to extremely (unintelligible) as it is putting the -having the intense weekend of work producing a revised draft over the following week and then sending that out to the chartering organizations on or around the 19th of January for clearly ideally support. That's - recognize that where we are that seems like a stretch at best.

So let's see if we can move on to review the action items. There are clearly three of those up in front of you on the screen and I have also - I think I picked up one that at least gives consideration to a second work stream to explore a second group or work stream to further develop elements of an internal to ICANN solution.

We certainly picked up another action which said if consideration to undertaking qualitative analysis and finding resource permitting. So I think those are a couple of other items that I picked up. Are there any other

comments regarding action items that we might make. I guess should the emerging proposal be substantially different to the current draft, we would give consideration to a second public comment period.

We had a discussion with (unintelligible) and I will just make this known to you just prior to the call and both of us have looked at the surveys, contributed to their development, but independently considering that it is probably not appropriate for us as individuals to complete those surveys. So just letting you know that that's our view. If anyone feels strongly or differently that they - that it would be appropriately for the co-chairs to do so that it be known. But our current intention is not to each individually complete the surveys but that doesn't mean that we wouldn't very much like to have all of the other members contribute to them.

It looks like I've got a final hand up from Milton so that may give you that opportunity Milton.

Milton Mueller: Yeah I just wanted to say that I don't see any reason why the co-chairs shouldn't fill out the survey. If you made - I don't see how it prejudices anything or I don't see how it does anything bad. I do see how you not taking the survey removes you know the validity of the representi - the results by eliminating two people who are a part of the group. So I just didn't get it. Why would you not take the survey?

Jonathan Robinson: It's a fair point Milton. I mean, my sense was that I looked at it, considered doing it, and felt that it would - that in many ways the chair's role is to try and to some degree the (unintelligible) from the primary issues and so that was the motivation to try to keep a little bit of distance of going down the route of making decisions on some of the primary issues than rather to try to stand away from that. So that was really where my thinking was on that.

I do know...

((Crosstalk))

Milton Mueller: Have I changed your mind?

Jonathan Robinson: I certainly will think about it.

Sibasubramanian Muthusamy: I am sorry this is (Siba). I am not on Adobe so I am not able to raise my hand. Can I speak or please tell me when I can speak.

Jonathan Robinson: Please go ahead (Siba) and then I want to make sure that I remember to make a note of responding to Steve's comment in the chat.

Sibasubramanian Muthusamy: I hear about some reflections on co-chairs responding to the survey. Is it just the co-chairs of the whole group or co-chairs of the sub groups as well? And another question, are the co-chairs (unintelligible) located this week and (where) are you meeting? Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: So one this was simply expressing my personal opinion and I have conferred with Lisa what her opinion was on it, so really, at this point in my mind, it related to myself and likely Lisa as well as the co-chairs of the whole group and not neces - not those that are coordinators of the sub groups. And second just to answer before going to Lisa, (Steve)'s question about the weekend activities, the weekend activities are for meetings of the CWG, of the whole CWG to which we hope all members will attend.

The physical colocation is a practical point to try and make sure we as coordinators and co-chairs work as effectively as we can about planning

agendas being able to change course as necessary and work together in a collocated way. So we are not having an all weekend session of the CWG. We are having four meetings of the CWG with the coordinators being co-chairs collected in order to best manage that series of meetings.

Lisa go ahead.

Lisa Fuhr: Thank you Jonathan. I just wanted to get back to the co-chairs and the coordinators doing the survey and I think the coordinators should of course do the survey and I think in anyway my thought was to try and be neutral in this stage of the - or being neutral as a chair. And that's why we didn't want to imply anything. And of course, we can do it as a person and members and not as chairs, so it is just to try and have a view of any solution and not trying to affect anyone by doing the survey, but I will reconsider. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Lisa and I think with that we will recognize that we started to lose people anyway, but please the third time I ask at least. Please make sure as many as possible complete the survey. So with that, I think we will bring the call to a close. I encourage you to complete the survey and look forward to an intense weekend of work together in a couple of days' time.

END