

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Jonathan Robinson  
January 13, 2015  
9:00 am CT**

Jonathan Robinson: Hello, everyone. Welcome to the first of our four weekend sessions of the CWG. These are a set of what we've called high intensity work sessions over a weekend and sometime this weekend session that really the genesis was - was back when we - was back in the original plan of our timetable.

And I guess the idea was really to bring together the group to deal with the work post-initial draft, post-public comments and in an attempt to take that work and synthesize it into a revised or at least the foundation for a revised draft be prepared in the week following these weekend sessions.

We've got four meetings in succession, as you well know. We originally planned to collocate the co-chairs and the group coordinators in a single location and in order to ensure that they were - the group was effective in planning between meetings as well as running the meetings and being very effectively organized to be as productive as we could.

So really the meetings were intended to pull together the CWG to deal with the public comments and the basis for a revised draft. I don't think we are where we intended to be when we originally planned the meeting for a

number of reasons including the size of the group, the diversity of the comments we've received during the public forum, some of the challenges on the details of the proposal or proposals, possibly even including the legal issues that might come out of that.

There's the interrelationship with the accountability track. So for a number of reasons, complexity, diversity and progress, we're not as far as we perhaps hoped or planned to be.

And we are acutely aware, as the coordinating and co-chair group, that there is a need for consensus and in the background of all of this we're aware of the timing issues both the pressure to produce something in good time but also not in such good time that we don't produce something that has sufficient consensus or buy-in of the group.

So we're walking that tightrope collectively. And nevertheless we, as co-chairs, Lise and myself, and - felt that it was really still a very good opportunity to have a high intensity set of productive sessions over the weekend and continue with the structure we had previously planned.

I should say that perhaps in the background, in part response to Avri's question on the list and maybe some other concerns that some of you have had, there is a lot of work that goes on in the background. We typically have preparation calls, sometimes a post-CWG meeting review call, to try and capture key - to plan for the calls, capture key outcomes of the calls, plan the work. So there's a lot of paddling that's going on underneath the water, as it were, during - between calls and so on.

So I'd just really like to say there's no private meeting, there's no plan for a core group to run away with this. We really are very respectful of keeping this

open, keeping the coherency of the whole CWG group and working as effectively as we can.

So we think there's an opportunity to make progress. We need collective buy-in to that opportunity and to focus on some of the areas where we can make real progress. And in order to do that we've planned out a structure and an approach to the weekend with these four meetings and some proposed content for each of the meetings.

But I and we acknowledge that these may need to shift as we work our way through it. So whilst there is a nominal structure to the way in which the weekend session is going to be worked there is an opportunity to modify that as we go of course.

I should say that by definition, given the number of participants, time will be limited so please be aware individually of not necessarily - of not - of speaking in a timely way, not to take more than your fair share of the microphone time.

We will probably run a timer and I hope that generally won't be necessary. And of course speaking of that, like I said a moment ago, we're fully aware at a bigger picture level of not only the time constraints within each of these meetings but of the timing and timeframe challenge that this group as a whole faces.

What that means is that we are working to a particular timeframe which, as you know, we've already extended beyond that which was originally requested by the ICG to whose request for proposal we are responding.

Notwithstanding that we do think that we will need to review carefully where we're at in terms of that - our original time plan at the end of this weekend. So our goal really is to make as much productive progress as we possibly can during the course of this weekend and then take stock of where we are in overall timing at the end of it all.

The plan for Meeting 1 is to really focus in on the work - the outcomes of the surveys and walk through and discuss the outcomes and to use this first meeting to take a detailed look at where the survey is pointing us in terms of areas of convergence and really areas of divergence I guess as well.

This is something where it should give us the opportunity, I hope, to ultimately then build up further on those areas of convergent thinking and start to produce more detail on those as appropriate.

I think those are the main points. We may, in the next meeting, or just thinking about where the meetings might go next, having talked and worked through the outcome of the survey it may well be that it's worth then going into some further detail.

Grace Abuhamad: Hi, everyone. Please remember to mute your computer speakers so that we can limit the echo on the line. If not I'm going to have to (unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. That's great. Thank you, Grace, thank you for muting that computer. So Call 1, discuss - look at the outcome of the surveys. Call 2 perhaps go into some more detail on areas of convergence and divergence if appropriate. Call 3, and on Call 2 we may well use - there's some specific tools that's been drawn to my attention and Lise's attention, which could be very useful with Adobe which is the use of the polling tool.

So it may be that we can use some of the Adobe's tools rather than letting everyone necessarily talk to every point we might be able to use the polling capability to try and build further on those areas of convergence or divergence.

And then one of the things that the group's been pushed on a little is detail, is producing more detail in key areas. So there's an opportunity in Call 3 perhaps to produce more detail.

And a key, key area that underlines so much of what - where there may be concerns is the relationship with the accountability work, the so-called CCWG on Accountability. And to the extent that this group wants to have conditional links or particular hooks into the work of that group that we felt that Call 4 could be a very useful basis to develop that thinking further.

So we'll make this iterative. We'll revise and republish these - the scope of the different calls as we work through the weekend. And I know it is a weekend and the times may not be convenient but I'd encourage you to participate in all of it as much as possible to the extent that you can. Your contribution and participation is vital to drive us to where we need to get to which is ultimately some form of single proposal that has a strong common support across the group.

So that's where we're trying to get to, that's what the purpose of this work is ultimately going to underpin and very much look forward to working with you.

Let me pause there on that preamble before we go into the detail of the survey and see if there are any questions on logistics or other issues related to the work of the weekend and the work of the CWG as we presently stand.

Okay I'm not seeing any hands up in the Adobe Connect room at the moment so I think we'll take the opportunity to go straight into the results of the survey. Now as you know Robert Guerra has been one of the stalwarts of the group in helping with a variety of things including building the logistics and practicalities of running these surveys.

So I'm going to hand over to Robert and ask Robert to start to present to you the outcomes of the surveys so that we can discuss those. And we'll try and segment it into a number of components so that we can have an opportunity for questions, discussion and points.

Now I know you've only very recently received in your email box the sort of outcomes of the survey so Robert will talk you through that now. Let me hand over to you, Robert.

Robert Guerra: Thank you, Jonathan. And good day, all. Pleasure that we're all working together today. What I'm going to try to do is kind of go through a kind of a three-part agenda. The first part is to talk about the methodology that was used and a bit of a description of the documents that you were emailed earlier today. And then go through and walk you through some of the results.

And so for the methodology just wanted - though it's been discussed on email I just wanted to very quickly summarize where we are today. The group worked together to develop a series of questions both for CSC, MRT and Contract Co and IAP.

I took those together and formulated two Google forms which were then sent out to the community to complete and to get what in my opinion is the sentiment of the discussions. And then for the two polls there were official

close date and times. And the analysis that you have in front of you is based on the time the polls were closed. I closed - and so that's the numbers that we generated.

There are - the results that were generated were based using the View feature - the View Summary feature in Google forms doc. And for each of the two polls you will have received three documents. One, a PDF version of the survey that was also shared on the list; second, a table of the results and, third, a more annotated version that goes through each of the questions and the summary of responses and the comments that were added as well too.

The table was basically based on taking the numbers in the poll with summary and putting them in a spreadsheet so we could do some sort of calculations on them. And so those are Documents 1, 2 and 3 and so you should have six documents.

I'll just go now into the CSC table which I believe is - here just want to have the right (unintelligible) for everyone here. So it's Document Number 2 which is the CSC MRT poll. There's a variety of different columns that are very quickly explained right now.

You'll see that for the CSC and the MRT sections we have 1a, 1b and 1c. And 1a - or A and B refer to the first two preliminary questions before the numbered questions that appear in the poll. And for CSC Question Number 1 corresponds to 1c and the same thing for MRT.

I tabulated the responses including non-responses and calculated a column which is the number answered which rows not including the no responses. I then grouped together percent agree was basically all the responses weighing accordingly that there are different values for each so completely agree, agree

and is acceptable were lumped together in percent agree. And disagree and completely disagree was grouped as percent disagree. So then you have the percentages for all the different questions there.

And you'll see that there's three different colors. There's no color at all which is white; there's a green color and a yellow color. The green colored rows are those where the percent agree is higher than 75% and the percent difference is also higher than 75%.

The yellow entries are ones where the percentage agree is higher than 75% but the percent difference is less than 75%. And the ones that are white don't have percent agree higher than 75%.

And so what I thought would be useful in terms of going through is to go first if there's any questions on the methodology to stop now and try to get any comments on that. And then go through the questions that are related in green and just to see so we can all see the question and see where the response is and then do the same thing for the different two polls. So I'll stop now, try to get any comments from those that are online.

Steve, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Steve Crocker: Thank you. So thank you for your clear explanation. One small detail, you said that green and yellow represent where the agreement is more than 75% and then either the difference between agreement and disagreement is more or less than 75%.

Some of these questions - I haven't had a chance to look at this at all so maybe it'd be evident from looking at it, but did you also score green if there was



high degree of disagreement and because the questions can be viewed either as positive in the positive form or negative form.

Robert Guerra: The percentages are all there so just a quick look-through is we didn't have - just going through the CSC MRT - the highest percent of disagreement was in Question Number 10 where there was 68% disagreement. But it didn't hit the threshold of 75%. So I colored it if either column was either 75%. And so it's either percent agree or percent disagree was higher than 75% and a difference was higher than 75% positive or negative I scored that as green.

Steve Crocker: Thank you.

Robert Guerra: So in summary, yes.

Steve Crocker: There weren't any instances - you did what I was thinking about but there weren't any instances you're saying.

Robert Guerra: Correct, that hit that threshold, correct.

Steve Crocker: Okay. Thank you.

Robert Guerra: Paul. Paul Kane, please go ahead.

Paul Kane: Thank you. Thank you, I'm assuming everyone can hear me. My concern is high level. I find the survey of interest for background information but I do not feel the survey size, nor the representation from significant stakeholders to be adequate to be the foundation on which we base our ongoing work.

I think it's useful background material but from the CC perspective relatively few ccTLDs participated in the survey. But I would still welcome through the

results just to get a flavor of what people are thinking but want to highlight that I believe it should not be the foundation of work going forward.

Robert Guerra: Great. Thank you for your comments. And I forgot to mention one thing in the summary of results that has all the questions and the graphs you will notice that the names, email addresses and affiliations were redacted because that was actually part of the instructions.

But I do have access to that and so I - what I didn't say is a very high level summary is the first poll had the most number of respondents, 53 that came in on time. And the second one was slightly lower at 33 though it was a much smaller time to do that.

I think as was mentioned earlier, we're using this as a tool and to try to help guide us go forward and then we'll go through the different questions and see where we are. So it's really used as a tool. And I'll maybe, you know, if Jonathan wants to add to that it's just used in a lot of - it's used as a technique to help us and we thought it would be helpful given the complexity of the type of questions that we have on the table.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, thanks, Robert. And thanks, Paul. I mean, I suppose I would just say that, Paul, point taken. That's a fair point that - just to be clear and for the record whilst logistically it may have been problematic in terms of the time scales and so on for everyone to participate, there was no restriction on who could participate.

And we repeatedly strongly encouraged all members of the group to participate. So just to make sure that's captured. That's not necessarily negating your point but it is recording that there was the opportunity for everyone and anyone to participate.

I got Eduardo next.

Robert Guerra: Eduardo, please go ahead.

Eduard Diaz: Thank you. Thank you. Robert, I have a question - in fact two questions. One is maybe I missed it but how many people participated in the total answers, you know, how many people participated? And how many members from those - member's percentage wise, thank you.

Robert Guerra: Sure. So I - thank you Eduardo for those questions. So two things, one in the table - and as I mentioned earlier (unintelligible) MRT survey 53 responses were collected and for the second one 33.

In the more detailed summary responses, which we'll go through in the very first question there is a breakdown of those who identified themselves as either members, participants or others. And so those percentages are there. They're not presented in the table but they are available in the larger survey results.

((Crosstalk))

Robert Guerra: Yeah. Any other questions? Okay so what I will ask now is for - we'll start with the CSC MRT survey. And as I mentioned, for those that I have flagged as green in the table, which again has a percent difference of agree and disagree, 75% or higher, and we'll go through them just to review those questions and just to see. And so I'll ask Grace to go to - I think it's Document Number 3.

And just to very quickly go through it and so this shows us the total number of responses, which is 53, which is the number of responses that came in on time. The names are redacted, the email addresses are redacted and the affiliation is redacted as well.

And there, Eduardo, to your point, is the number of members and participants. And I will say is having watched the poll results in come most of the participants answered earlier on and the members answered a little bit later on in the survey.

We'll then go to the very first question that is flagged as green which is the Customer Standing Committee, should there be a CSC? And in that we had a percent agree of 88%.

Then if we go to Question Number 4 which is the next green one is - talks about the membership of the CSC and who should be...

((Crosstalk))

Robert Guerra: Right. So just one thing, in terms of logistical is you have the document on your screen. Can people go through it and scroll through it themselves?

Grace Abuhamad: Yeah, Robert, that's how it works but would you like me to scroll through it with you, is that easier for people to follow?

Robert Guerra: It might be because I'm going to be going down sequentially so that way everyone can see it at the same time instead of them having to do it.

Grace Abuhamad: Okay I'll do that. So everyone, just to let you know, I'm going to - I'll be controlling the scrolling of the document now. You have a version of it in email and then we'll also circulate it after the call.

Robert Guerra: Okay. And so I'm just going through the questions in the table that are (unintelligible) as green so we just have a sense of - and then we - yeah so just go...

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, so just - let's state which number we're at so she can find it.

Robert Guerra: Yeah. Yeah, so we went through Number 1 already which was should there be a CSC? And there was a very strong percent agreement on that. We're now going to Question Number 4 in the CSC section which is if there is a CSC what should it consist of, ccTLD, gTLD as well as related experts. And in that there was a 88.24% agreement on that.

If we now go to Question Number 8, is if there's a CSC should it have a continuous existence? And again there was a very - sentiment of a very large percentage agreeing that it should have a continuous existence.

Go to Question Number 8 next. Sorry that was Number 8 - Question Number 9 is should there be staggered terms? And I think there was a much stronger agreement to this.

The Question Number 11, which is users of the IANA naming functions should be able to address issues directly with the IANA functions operator rather than going through the MRT. There was 91% sentiment to go forward on that or that was the strongest view.

For Number 13, which is the next one, which is the role of the CSC should be focused on service level commitments. Again, looking at the graph you can see that there was a very clear sentiment on that.

And then that's for the CSC section - those that are highlighted in green. I'll just maybe pause here to see if there's any comments in regards to that or what people's impressions are on that. Do we have a view that at least these statements seem to get a pulse of those that are on the Adobe room as well? So I'll open it up for comments on the CSC findings for the strongest percent agreement on the CSC section. So I'll open up the floor for a moment now. Any comments or questions, please go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: We have a hand up from Milton.

Robert Guerra: Milton, please go ahead.

Milton Mueller: Hello. So, yeah, I think the survey gives a very coherent view of overall attitudes towards the CSC that it makes sense, it's consistent. They want there to be a CSC. They want it to be focused mainly on customers but not exclusively; they want external experts who are not registries.

And they want it focused on service level commitments, performance indicators and quality assurance and they want it to be a standing committee as the Frankfurt plan proposed. So in this area I think we're getting pretty clear direction from these results.

Robert Guerra: Thank you, Milton. Anyone else, please.

((Crosstalk))

Robert Guerra: Erick, please go ahead.

Erick Iriarte Ahon: Hi, Robert. Thanks. Question, as were 4, someone made some comments about the balance between ccTLDs and gTLDs in this commit or is only (unintelligible) that these measures to participation of ccTLDs and gTLDs. Thanks.

Robert Guerra: Eric, thank you for that question. I think there was no distinction, I think just the question Number 4 was just that CSC membership should primarily consist of ccTLD, gTLD registry operators with related experts and there was just an example of type of related experts that could be there so there was no distinction.

Erick Iriarte Ahon: Okay, thank you.

Grace Abuhamad: Olivier has his hand up.

Robert Guerra: Olivier, please go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thanks very much, Robert. Olivier Crépin-LeBlond speaking. I have a question, I'm really sorry if I - you might have touched on that but is acceptable is that taken in as a yes or is that taken in as a no? And I tell you why I'm asking the question because on the first - the second question relating to the customer standing committee asks the CSC should be an ICANN working group, customer standing committee, CSC.

And the majority of people said "is acceptable" in there and if you actually add - if you say it's a yes and you add, is acceptable to agree to strongly agree, you get over 50%. If you take is a no and you add it to disagree or strongly

disagree then you get 50% in that direction - or over 50% in that direction. So what is acceptable?

Robert Guerra: So two questions. Just in terms of the methodology that was used for percent agreement it was based on adding the responses for agree - sorry, completely agree, agree and is acceptable and percent disagree was based on disagree and completely disagree.

In regards to your question in terms of ICANN standing committee, can you tell me what number that question is please?

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: It doesn't have a number. It's Olivier speaking. It's the second question in the CSC. The first question is there should be a customer standing committee...

Robert Guerra: Right.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: ...to carry out the tasks and the second question says, the CSC should be an ICANN working group.

Robert Guerra: Right, so...

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: And I find this quite incredible because what you have is agree has the same percentage as disagree. And then...

((Crosstalk))

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: ...strongly agree and strongly disagree.



Robert Guerra: Okay, all right, Olivier, just going through. So as I mentioned, I was going through the questions where the percent agree was higher than 75% and the difference was also higher than 75%. For Question 1b in the table, which is the one that you're referring to, the percent agree was 69% and the percent disagreement was 30-some percent and the percent difference was 39.13%.

And so that's clearly - the percent difference is not higher than 75% and so that's why I did not mention it. So it did not score as highly and so that's why we didn't get to it. So if you want to say the sentiment - there is a more range of views expressed on this question than in the others. And so, you know, we're just going through where the sentiment is strongest in the questions and so that sentiment was harder to ascertain and why I did not go through that so...

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Yeah, but, Robert, the gist of my question was where did you add "is acceptable" so if you add is acceptable with the agree then that's enough for me, you know, with regards to the answers on that.

Robert Guerra: Yeah...

((Crosstalk))

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: So, I know we'll, I mean, we'll go through the questions which probably have more of a just slight percentage in one direction or another later on but I just wanted to know that. Thank you.

Robert Guerra: Thank you, Olivier. Just to be clear so the yes are percent agree add completely agree, agree, is acceptable and disagree and completely disagree are seen as percentage disagree. And flagged as green are those where the percent difference is higher than 75%.

((Crosstalk))

Robert Guerra: Greg, please go ahead.

Greg Shatan: I think maybe you've answered the question but I think the point is that is acceptable indicates that one could go forward with that without seeing disagreement from the person who answered therefore it makes sense, to me, to include is acceptable as an agree and not to count it as some other form of answer.

Grace Abuhamad: Bertrand has his hand raised.

Robert Guerra: Bertrand, please go ahead.

Bertrand de La Chapelle: Yeah, do you hear me?

Robert Guerra: Yes we can.

Bertrand de La Chapelle: Okay. Just a quick comment on the "is acceptable." For me this expression evokes naturally the can live with it, usually is used at the end of a process when calling for rough consensus like there is no real other alternative and there is a trend towards this and I have no better solution to propose, I can live with it.

So I agree it is something that has to be taken with caution because at the stage we're at it is not exactly the moment where you just say I can live with it. So we have to be careful counting it as support. In many cases it's I'm not completely comfortable but it's not that I have no response and just a note of

caution. And correct me if I'm wrong, do I understand correctly the meaning of "is acceptable" in that regard?

Robert Guerra: Is acceptable - is acceptable...

((Crosstalk))

Robert Guerra: ...is I've - for the purposes of this survey have lumped it in in percent agree. And if we take a look at the table, the results, we can see that in a lot of the questions where the percent difference is higher than 75% most of the responses are actually coming in in completely agree or agree. So there's - so, you know, I just want to - that's where we're seeing and going forward but thank you for that question. It's a tool for us to go forward.

Any other hands up?

Grace Abuhamad: Yeah, we have Alan's hand up in the room.

Robert Guerra: Great. Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. It's purely administrative...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...just the arcane numbering of the questions. Is it - the version I received in email has page numbers on it. It is possible to show those page numbers on the screen so that those of us who are trying to scroll our own versions have a chance of figuring out where you are?

Robert Guerra: Grace is actually paging through. I think it just may have been in the - I'll defer that question to Grace, please go ahead if you could answer that.

Grace Abuhamad: Hi, everyone. So at the bottom of your screen there's a page number indicator as to where we are in the document. So right now we're on Page 8 out of 39.

Alan Greenberg: I don't see that on...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Actually - actually, Grace - Cheryl here. I got two screens open, two different operating systems running. One shows the page number because it shows more of the screen than the other one so it's not always the case.

Jonathan Robinson: I can confirm I'm not seeing the page numbers on my screen.

Grace Abuhamad: Okay so what I'll do then is if I zoom out...

Jonathan Robinson: There.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Now you've got it.

((Crosstalk))

Grace Abuhamad: ...if I zoom out.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Grace Abuhamad: Is that okay?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you.

Grace Abuhamad: Does that work for everyone? And what I'll do is maybe I'll zoom out and then we're actually looking at detail on the question I'll zoom back in so you can read it, does that work ?

Alan Greenberg: Or, Grace, perhaps just as you go to a new question tell us what page you're on.

Grace Abuhamad: Okay, I'll do that.

Alan Greenberg: Then you can zoom in and we can see it but those of us who are working on our own version can find it.

Grace Abuhamad: Understood. Thank you, Alan.

Robert Guerra: Alan, thank you for that. I think for the CSC survey we'll have page numbers. We'll see when we get to the poll whether that's the case or not, I'm not sure whether I added that or not but let's just stick with where we are now.

Greg Shatan: If I could just interrupt? It's Greg Shatan for the record. I don't think the numbering is arcane after you get past the first question then the numbers correspond exactly between the two documents. It's only for the purpose of this - where we had two unnumbered questions they ended up getting referred to as 1a and 1b. I think after that there's no arcana involved.

Robert Guerra: Great. So...

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, so we have - hands have dropped out of the queue, maybe that's because answers have been given. I am mindful of time so, Robert, I'm going to encourage you to keep moving.

Robert Guerra: Great. So now I'm going to switch to the MRT section of the poll. And we're going to go to Question Number 6. And I think this is a very interesting finding for Number 6 is that there are no responses that disagree at all. And this is the MRT should not recreate another ICANN. And that's 100% agree.

We could then go to Number 7 which is the question right after that one. So...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Robert, interrupt, the screen is not showing the same Number 6 and 7 as you were.

Robert Guerra: Grace is now paging to Question Number 6 in the MRT section so I'll wait for her to catch up.

Jonathan Robinson: So while she does that, Robert, I'll just make the remarks that just to be clear there were - we are mindful in terms of trying to analyze these outcomes that there is more than just the choice answers to the different questions. There are also some qualitative answers given in the comments and we will do some work to try and recognize those inputs and feed that into the planning.

I don't have a straight answer for you right now as to how we do that but we'll certainly review that input and try and make sure it is dealt with in one way or another.

Robert Guerra: And I just wanted to echo that as well too. And the way the comments are they're not attributed to the person that put them in. And a lot of the comments were actually quite helpful and quite direct in many cases as well too, and I appreciate that because as Jonathan mentioned we will be going through those as well.

Just checking now with Grace is Question Number 6 up on the screen?

Grace Abuhamad: Yes.

Robert Guerra: It is okay thank you very much. And so that question was in regard should the MRT not recreate - the MRT should not recreate another ICANN. And everyone seemed to be in agreement with that.

In regards to Question Number 7 which is the question right afterwards is that adequate care should be taken to restrict the growth dynamics of the MRT. There were a couple people that had no opinion on this but those who did have an opinion all agreed.

And so now we're going to go to Question Number 8. And Question Number 8 was referring to the MRT is that if it's going to be there that there should be a multistakeholder representation. And there was a 93% agreement in regards to that so that's if we have an MRT it should be multistakeholder.

Then we go to the next question that has a percent difference higher than 75% which Question Number 18. And this is very similar to the question in regards to the CSC is that should there be staggered terms and there's a 93% agreement on that. So we see that both for the CSC and MRT staggered terms seems to be something that there is a sentiment of all folks to be in agreement with.

If we then go to Question Number 22, Question Number 22 in the MRT section please. Scrolling down...

Jonathan Robinson: It's up.

Robert Guerra: Is it up? Okay sorry about that. And that is that the term length should be limited to two contract cycles. And we have an 85% agreement on that.

Jonathan Robinson: So, Robert, we have a hand up from Steve. Steve, go ahead with your question.

Steve Crocker: Yeah, perhaps I missed it but when I look at the percentages on the form, on the slide, they don't add up to the percentages that you're describing. Did I miss a piece of your methodology? No, just take the one that's in front of us, Question 22, term length. The strongly agree, the agree and is acceptable add up to 66%.

Robert Guerra: So I removed out those that had no...

((Crosstalk))

Robert Guerra: No opinion were removed from the pool.

Steve Crocker: But if you do that then what is the vitality of the double requirement that you have both an agreement greater than 75% and agreement minus disagreement greater than 75%? The only way to do that if you only have two possibilities, positive and negative, is that the agreement is greater than 87.5%. I mean, I would have thought that the reason for taking both of those into account is also to measure the no response.

Robert Guerra: That's just the methodology that I used and that's why I also - the table is there in case we want to do some subsequent analysis, the numbers are in the table and I can provide them as a spreadsheet as well.



Steve Crocker: Please do.

Robert Guerra: But it's a good question and thank you very much. Okay and so that concludes the poll results for CSC, MRT and I think very quickly we can see that some of the results for CSC echo MRT in regards to certain types of issues and that proved to be very helpful.

Now we're going to switch to Document - try to get here - is Document Number - try to get here - is Document Number 5 which is the summary - sorry, the table that I'm going to be using is Table Number 5. I suggest those - and Grace to put up Document Number 6 which is the summary of responses for the Contract Co IAP.

There are a lot of questions so this is going to take some time to go through.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Hi, just to let you know we're just collating a couple of results, pulling together the documents with the results to make sure they're all right for the second...

Robert Guerra: Great.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Okay we're on - Milton, go ahead with your question. Milton, come off mute and we can hear your question.

Milton Mueller: Yes, while we're waiting I just wanted to ask about some inconsistencies in the questions. It seemed very clear that we didn't want to create another

ICANN and we were concerned that the reproduction of ICANN within the MRT could politicize it.

At the same time, Question 16 there was not strong but somewhat of a tendency towards a continuous existence for the MRT. And I just wonder if anybody voted both of those ways if they'd explain to me how they think having a continuously existing MRT would be consistent with those other constraints of not making it reproduce ICANN.

Jonathan Robinson: I think we're going to try - Milton, I think what we're going to try and do - I appreciate that you were filling some time here but I think we're going to try and push through and get through a first pass of the substance of content and by all means park that and let's come back to it. But I think for the moment we're going to just try and crack on through and get the majority of the questions covered.

Robert Guerra: Great. So I'm now going to go to the Contract Co IAP document. And I want to flag something before I go through this is just in going through the table there is going to be an update to the table sent around because there's two entries in the table that I didn't color appropriately.

I'm going to mention what the corrections are going to be and I'm going to send that around. So if you have the table open you'll see that, again, there are items that are colored in green and items colored in yellow. Contract Co Question Number 29 is white and it should be flagged as yellow because the percent disagree is higher than 75% but not colored green because the percent difference is not 75% plus or minus.

And then for the IAP Question Number 9, similarly the percent disagree is 85.19% but the percent difference is not enough to trigger a green color. But those will be colored yellow and that updated table will be sent around.

And so now I'll ask Grace that - so the same methodology was used in regards to scoring. And again, the total number of responses that came in on time were 33. And we'll be going through the ones where there was a stronger sentiment expressed. If we can go to Question 17 please?

Do the same.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, I've got a question from Olivier while we - come in, Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Yeah thanks, Jonathan. It's Olivier speaking. Robert just mentioned 33; I see 34 responses on the page at the beginning of that document that was sent to us, contract IAP...

Robert Guerra: Thirty-four, my mistake.

((Crosstalk))

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Okay no big deal, I just wondered if I was looking at the right document, that's all. Thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Robert Guerra: Yeah. And so going to your - so Question Number 17 the question where we had a 96% agree response is whether Contract Co should be incorporated or not and subject or not to a particular jurisdiction's law. Should be examined by

a neutral unaffiliated expert. And so the importance of an expert to take a look at this there seemed to be a very strong sentiment for that.

If we then move to Question Number 19, please.

Jonathan Robinson: Question from Erick before you move on to 19. Erick, come in. Go ahead.

Erick Iriarte Ahon: Thank you. In the question - because I don't make that - sorry. In the question was some comments that what is the principle (unintelligible) thinking for - of the (unintelligible) or something similar or are these open question that could be some jurisdiction or some laws, some parts of the world?

Robert Guerra: Thank you, Erick. I'll defer to Greg but if I remember correctly there were three kind of related questions related to this. One is should the jurisdiction be the US, Switzerland? And then this other question is that if it's going to be located somewhere we should have an expert give us some legal opinion on this.

And there seems to be a very strong sentiment that if we go that route we would - it would be important to get an independent expertise on this. And so I think that's where it is. Greg, if there's some additional nuance that you wish to add to the answer please go ahead.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: Question 17 could be rephrased, should we get legal advice on incorporation and jurisdiction? So that's all it really asks. And Questions 19, 20 and 21 go to ask whether it should be - sorry, (unintelligible) a little further ahead, sorry,

23, 24, 25 asks should it be US? Should it be Swiss or should it be some other board?

Robert Guerra: Great. So thank you for that.

Erick Iriarte Ahon: I have another comment.

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead, Erick. Please go ahead.

Erick Iriarte Ahon: Thanks. If we have another question related with the jurisdiction and the majority of the person that answered (unintelligible) that's jurisdiction and have that point of view maybe this answer, you know, specifically 17, could be not correct analyzed. Is not only the person we need to know where is the people that answered that question.

If the majority is from United States and they say we want the United States jurisdiction is not (unintelligible) for me the answer is so consensus or so agree or - I don't know - I want to focus that not necessarily all the persons that answered the (unintelligible) have the diversity necessary for answer that question.

Robert Guerra: That's something to consider. We didn't ask region or other type of questions in this survey. And again this is - the result here is an aggregate of the stuff. I don't want to get stuck on that but I think that point is taken. But it's a very strong percentage that, in this particular question, which is Question Number 17 is should we get legal advice? And it's higher than 96%.

And so I'll go to the next one and I'll maybe ask you to park that question and maybe when we come back to the end of this section for Contract Co maybe revisit that because there's just another two - three questions to go through and

so I'd rather go through that first and then come back if that's still a question so if that's all right?

Jonathan Robinson: Greg, are you holding your question then in response?

Greg Shatan: Yeah, my end is in response to that point so I'll hold it.

Robert Guerra: Okay. So the next question where there was what I would refer to as strong percent agreement was Question Number 19 is that if there is a Contract Co that it should be extremely lightweight and its purpose should be limited to holding contracts for the names community.

And the next question, which is after that which is Question Number 29 in the Contract Co section, is complete no disagreement which is if this were to exist the bylaws should narrowly and clearly limit its activities.

And then we go to Question Number 32...

((Crosstalk))

Robert Guerra: ...second here while...

((Crosstalk))

Grace Abuhamad: Question Number 32 is on Page 25.

Robert Guerra: And Question Number 32 here states, circumstances for re-awarding the IANA function contract should be limited to issues of nonperformance related to the IANA function such as a failure to execute against established service

level agreements or non-adherence to contract terms. And if you group all the agree responses together it's about almost 91%.

And so one, two, three we have four questions where there was a very strong agreement for the Contract Co section. There are others that are flagged in yellow where there was more of a wide range view so that's completing this part.

And I'm just wanting to now go back seeing that we've completed the section, is there any comments at this point right now?

Jonathan Robinson: All right, there's a question from Martin Boyle. Martin, go ahead.

Martin Boyle: Thanks. Martin Boyle here. Yeah, it's...

((Crosstalk))

Martin Boyle: Hello?

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, we can hear you, Martin.

Martin Boyle: All right, this doesn't just apply to this section, this applies to the earlier ones as well but I've only just spotted it from the printout. In the printout there's a whole load of blocks of text that include the comments. Will we, at some stage, be coming back and looking at the comments against the high agreement?

Because obviously it is possible that the comments will, themselves, modify the agreement or disagreement on that particular - on those particular questions.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, yeah, that's a good suggestion, Martin. And, I mean, it's something where we will actually - I indicated earlier that we intended to review those comments and try and weave them into how we dealt with this so that's helpful to get that kind of suggestion and direction.

Grace Abuhamad: Yes, Alan Greenberg in the - has his hand up.

Robert Guerra: Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. Are we going to be doing any level of verification of consistency? You know, as an example, and I'm not trying to discuss this one but I just want to point it out, if you look at between 31 and 32 we have people who are saying we should be going out for RFP on a periodic basis but we should never re-award the contract to someone else unless there's a problem.

And those two seem to be at odds with each other. And yet the numbers seem to have people suggesting that we should go out for an RFP but under no conditions should we re-award the contract to someone else if there weren't actually problems. So I hope we'll be doing some level of analysis like that.

Robert Guerra: I think what I had stated that I wanted to go through at least in this first pass through and everyone's got the findings is just to go through and talk through the ones where what I would say has a very strong level of agreement first because there are a lot of questions, try to get some of the sentiment on that just to see if those on the call agree with the sentiment or not. And then have a larger conversation again. So, you know, I just wanted to in a way share the questions with everyone.



Grace Abuhamad: Milton has his hand up and then (unintelligible).

Robert Guerra: Great so...

Bernard Turcotte: If I can just cut in, it's Bernie. On this particular question for Alan Greenberg, we have said we're going to get back to this in our second meeting today in more details and we can possibly look at some of those points if there is that.

But the other point that may be salient is that, you know, this was not built to be consistent. We grabbed the input from the public comments and tried to put it out there to see how the participants feel about those questions so that it can just be a general indicator, a tool, a room temperature, this is not consensus. \

This is about just getting a feeling that we can talk about and see if we think that's good. Analyzing this in too much detail, like any statistic, can use up a lot of time which, you know, if we're not using this as a real formal consensus, may not be useful. Just a general comment.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, thanks Bernie. I mean, for me that's helpful as well because it's a reminder to me and us I think that what we had was a comprehensive set of public comments. And as you say, we want to produce a form of feedback loop of those public comments back to this group, to the CWG, and say this is what we - this is some key points that are coming out of the public comments. Give us some sense of direction on these.

So whilst there are some valid and insightful comments in and around the structure, methodology and approach taken to these surveys, and we should take those on board and we are, I've made some notes and we'll cover those in the review session, nevertheless this is not a wholly empirically structured

survey in the sense that, you know, professional polling organization might use or something like that. So it's just worth noting.

I don't want to sound defensive but I just want to make it clear that we need to have a degree of tolerance with the way in which this has also been pulled together fast, we're also working on very fast time scale. So let me not hold things up. Milton, your hand has been up for a while, go ahead.

Milton Mueller: Well I'm afraid I'm bringing up another issue that is precisely the kind of thing you don't want to talk about right now but I think it needs to be pointed out as we go through these statistics and that is the huge discrepancy between the first and the second survey in terms of number of responses.

We've gone down by, you know, almost 40% in terms of the number on the second one. That means that every individual response is basically 3%. And if there was any way to keep this survey out there and get the rest of the people to respond that might have a significant impact on the results. I don't think it would have such an impact on the other survey. All right, I'll shut up and I really do want you to go ahead and just tell us what the rest of the results are.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, Milton, we will. But that's not a bad point at all, I mean, and clearly we felt - there was a shorter time for the second survey. We felt that it was vital to get some input from that second survey ahead of these weekend meetings, which is why, I mean, originally we planned to only reproduce that survey next week and we sort of rushed it out in order to get - test the temperature ahead of this weekend so we could be it not - not deal with only half the proposal at this weekend but rather deal with as much as possible with the input of the survey.

So that's a valuable point and thanks so we may well be able to extend it or do something else to try and equilibrate between the two. Go ahead, Robert.

Robert Guerra: Yeah...

Grace Abuhamad: Olivier's hand is up.

Jonathan Robinson: Oh, Olivier.

Robert Guerra: Olivier, please go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Yeah, thanks. It's Olivier speaking. And I'm - I was originally very concerned with the very short amount of time that we all had to respond to these surveys. And it certainly was a strain; in fact some people in At Large were not able to respond because of the short, you know, the short deadline.

That said, I would be very wary of reopening a survey that now has results because I'm really concerned this would start becoming political and you would just have people, you know, being asked to go out there and vote to counter some of the results that we have here. And we're just starting to place way too much importance on the survey itself. That's my feeling. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, thanks, Olivier. That's helpful input as well.

Robert Guerra: Great, thanks. So I'm going to proceed now to the section labeled Internal to ICANN. And in that section two were flagged as having a very strong level of sentiment. The first one being Question Number 2 which is adequate accountability mechanisms in ICANN internal option should include the possibility of removing the IANA functions from ICANN. And that's where we had 93.3% of the responses that came in.

And then Number 6, which is an ICANN internal - Number 6 - an ICANN internal solution should include a mechanism where the IANA functions can be removed for cause and contracted out to a third party. And of those that responded to the section I will note that there are considerable number of people that in this section did not respond. Please, Grace.

Grace Abuhamad: Eduardo Diaz has a comment in the chat that says, "Robert, we missed Number 1."

Robert Guerra: Question Number 1 is flagged as yellow. We have a percent agreement of 77.42%, percent disagreement 22% and the difference is 54. So I'm only going through the green ones so that's - I did not skip Number 1, Number 1 did not meet the threshold.

((Crosstalk))

Robert Guerra: So I'm going through the table but we're showing the questions and going through them. So, again, for internal to ICANN those were the two - any questions or comments in regards to that? If not I'll proceed to the IAP section. I see no hands and I'll go to the IAP section.

Scrolling here to Question Number 1 and Question Number 1 you can see the question and the responses here is that there should be a standard process for catching IANA process errors before resorting to an appeals process. And there were no disagreement in regards to this question so that's Question Number 1.

The next question we're going to go it Question Number 4 is appeals should be managed differently depending on whether the appeal involves a gTLD or a ccTLD. And we had a 96.43% agreement on this for Question Number 4.

Then for Question Number 5, which is terms of reference for the IAP and details on the composition of the panel should be defined. Again, a very strong agreement on this.

I will note, as I mentioned earlier, that Question Number 9 should be flagged as yellow because the percent disagreement is 85.19% so that's higher than 75% but the difference is not more than 75%.

We'll go now to Question Number 13...

Grace Abuhamad: Those of you following not in the Adobe room Question Number 13 is on Page 43.

Robert Guerra: Of the IAP section. And it's the appeals process should be binding on the IANA functions operator, 93.5% in agreement.

Then Question Number 17 is standing to file an appeal should be defined, 93.9%. Number 18, gTLD registry operators should have standing to appeal delegation and redelegation decisions to which they are party that they believe are contrary to improve and that's - sorry that's 96.5%.

And then the last question where there's very strong agreement is Question Number 20 is ccTLD registry operators should have standing to appeal delegation and redelegation decisions to which they are a party that they believe are contrary to applicable laws and/or approved ccTLD policy, 96.5%.

So in total we had one, two, three, four, five, six, seven questions where there was a very strong sentiment expressed one way or another. Any questions or comments in regards to this section before I proceed to the last section on accountability?

I see no hands up so I'll now proceed to the accountability set of questions. (Unintelligible) go to that. And Question Number 3, and this is where I don't think there's a surprise in the finding here is that ideally the CWG would have begun its work following the adoption of recommendations by the Accountability CWG and we have 89% that expressed a sentiment in regards to that.

Question Number 4, a surprising finding, I think, which is ideally the Accountability CWG should have begun its work before or at the same time as the IANA - this working group. And so there's a 100% agreement on that.

Number 6, is ICANN should formally link this CWG and the Accountability CWG processes to ensure the work moving forward takes into account equities from both processes and there was a very strong sentiment of agreement on this.

Next question which is the one right after which is Number 7, enhanced accountability must be in place prior to the IANA stewardship transition, very strong agreement on this and again it's one of the requirements, I believe, of the transition and so that's very helpful to know.

Question Number 9, following the publication of the Accountability CWG's draft recommendations an assessment should be conducted by this group to determine whether the outcome provides a satisfactory appeals mechanism, very strong sentiment of agreement on that.

Number 10, again this is something that has been discussed both in the comments but also in some of the calls that a placeholder should be included in the - in this proposal that is submitted to the ICG for further evaluation and work as needed after the Accountability Track 1 recommendations are finalized.

And I believe that's it so those are the findings of the Accountability section and indeed the Contract Co IAP survey. Again, as I mentioned at the beginning of this call is that all of you have access to the table that have the raw data as well as the summary of findings with all the questions and graphs there. And some of the comments I've redacted the names, email addresses and affiliations and as well the blank form is available as well.

Questions I think - some comments came in in regards to possibly extending the times of the IAP - or the Contract Co survey and so that's something that will be worthwhile to discuss or to consider over the course of today and tomorrow. But I just also - before I hand it back to Jonathan are there any questions in regards to Poll Number 2?

Jonathan Robinson: Alan Greenberg.

Robert Guerra: Alan, please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. For those of us who might be interested in playing around with the data ourselves, a spreadsheet would be useful but one that includes the actual questions because the numbering is difficult enough that without some text referring to the question there there's not necessarily a lot of assurance that we have the - or we know which question we're talking about. Thank you.

Robert Guerra: Alan, thank you for that question. What I can easily provide is basically a spreadsheet version of the tables for CSC, MRT - sorry, the first poll and the second poll. Putting in the questions will require a lot of additional time and so I think that for the second poll the numbers correlate exactly to the question numbers in the survey. And, you know, that's just the format that's available at this time.

And so if others want to take a look at it I'm happy to, again, we'll send a corrected version of the table with the yellow added to some of the entries and an Excel version as well if people want to do that. And, again, the - my interest is to collate the results and if people want to take a look at it, do some additional statistics that would be incredibly helpful.

Again, we do have a limited amount of time and so I would ask folks to please crunch the numbers perhaps if possible while we have the intensive work weekend so we could see if there's some additional nuance that we need to discuss.

But, again, this first part was a presentation of the findings that we have so far and I've tried my best to present them given, again, a very small amount - or the short time and I appreciate all your questions and I'll give the floor back to Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, thanks Robert. And, I mean, I suppose my thinking is to give a guidance on that. Any - really the alternative analysis should provide a - will add value I guess if it provides a materially different outcome bearing in mind that what we said all along about these surveys that they are a form of testing for convergence of items coming - feedback coming back from the public



comments and on the basis of the original core components of the model that was developed in Frankfurt and beyond.

So by all mean, crunch the numbers, do whatever it takes to - and I'll analyze it but really the question is, is this first pass analysis that Robert's done leading us in materially the wrong direction in terms of the sense is that it's providing?

Yeah, and I note - and I think it is worth recording this, I note some of your support of comments in the chat. And it's been given great service by Robert on this as a group so and it's worth acknowledging that.

What we thought about doing next, and I'll welcome any comments on this, but before doing that I see Chuck has got a comment so fire away, Chuck, and then we'll see where we can take this next.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jonathan. I put this in the chat quite a while ago but I want to state it verbally in case you didn't see the chat because I know that's kind of hard to follow sometimes. We shouldn't assume that because something is green that we don't need more work or more analysis.

Hopefully it points us in a direction where we probably can achieve good support. But please don't assume because the green ones we went over assume that they're done. As several of you pointed out, there are some cases where we need to look at those numbers a little bit more and add more detail and so forth and that's absolutely right.

Jonathan Robinson: So that's actually interesting because in a sense that's where I was going to suggest we go next. I mean, really - at a very simplistic level we've now got to build out on areas where we got convergence, clearly resolve areas where

there's significant divergence and give due consideration to areas where there's ambiguity.

And so it feels to me like we could valuably start to now pick out, in the first instance, those areas where we have convergence and start to build out a little more detail bearing in mind that one of the issues for us is that we clearly have to start to build substance into whatever proposal we develop.

And whilst we might have convergence that doesn't mean we've necessarily thrashed out the details which is I think, in a variation of perhaps what you were saying, Chuck. So I wonder if it wouldn't be useful to start to go back over the areas where we've got convergence and start to talk about highlight any detail points, ask for any comments on a point by point basis so relevant detail.

Are there any comments from either the - my co-chair or the coordinators on - with respect to that or indeed - I see Milton, your hand is up from members of the group so, Milton, go ahead and then Paul. And really looking for how we productively make use of your time now in going - in moving this forward in a way that seeks to build I guess convergence and ultimately consensus.  
Milton.

Milton Mueller: Yeah, I just made a comment in the chat room about bimodal distributions of the responses on some of the critical issues. I think you see them on some of the critical issues related to Contract Co whether it should exist or not.

And I'm also going to reiterate my point about this second survey should be reopened and we should get, you know, the people who did not respond should, you know, you've got almost 20 responses that are missing here. You have more than 20 that are missing but, I mean, you've got 20 less than the

first survey so it's a much less reliable indicator of where sentiment lies than the first survey.

And I just feel given that some of the critical issues are still in kind of a bimodal form where there's people who strongly agree and agree and there's people who strongly disagree and agree and then you've got, you know, a maximum of, you know, 12 responses for any given answer when you have a population of, you know, maybe 65, I think we really need to get some more information on some of these questions.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Milton. I mean, I must say I heard your point and I was immediately sympathetic to it. And then heard the counterpoints which do speak to a key point which is the perspective responding to a perceived or outcome and responding differently to how you might have had you not known of the outcome so far. So it is...

((Crosstalk))

Milton Mueller: Jonathan, I don't understand that. I mean, nobody is going to change - or is going to be allowed to change their position, right? You're only going to have people who haven't been polled yet. So if you think that the first round of voting was not strategic I would suggest that you're wrong; that everybody is behaving strategically in this poll.

And we simply need to get a better sense of how the entire population feels about some of these questions not, you know, not allow anybody of course to change their position or of course nobody to vote twice but I think we have, you know, less than half of the population here.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, well look, I mean, whether or not we agree the counterpoint is that people may - whether or not you agree that that's likely the counterpoint is argued that people might put data into the survey other than what they would have knowing the results so far. I can't say whether that would or wouldn't be the case.

But perhaps this is an opportunity to test the sentiment of the group now and see what - where the group is at by taking a form of poll and hearing how sympathetic or not the group is to reopening the second poll. Because if there is a strong support for that we could potentially open it up for another 48 hours or something during the course of the weekend.

If there isn't that's also - so, I mean, it strikes me that we've talked about - previously in our preparation about potentially using polling, the Adobe polling function. So I'm tempted to open that. Lise, how do you feel about that? I mean...

Lise Fuhr: Yes, I think a poll is a good idea.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So maybe that's the thing to do. Grace, are we in a position to run a poll of the group?

Grace Abuhamad: Marika is going to set it up.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. So and - so the question is really I think fairly simple, it's that do we open the second survey for, let's say, a further 48 hours or a further -  
Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I want to caution against opening it up if we decide to open it up just for 48 hours because it's a weekend, people are involved in four two-hour

meetings, and so forth. I think if we're going to reopen it - I wouldn't restrict it to 48 hours. It's a long survey and everybody's busy so...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so before we do the poll, I mean, we're definitely talking about opening it up. We could just keep it as opening it up and then make a decision for how long. But it strikes me that we don't want to open it up for too long therefore it might be 48 hours after the weekend, something like - assume the weekend closes at something like 1800 UTC and run it for 48 hours beyond that.

But it - so let's have that working assumption in our minds but nevertheless we can ask the question perhaps more simply about whether it's simply yes or no, do we open up the survey - the second survey for a further period of time?

I see Paul and Alan, you've both got your hands up so I would just check if either of you wanted to speak specifically to this poll or not? And if not then we'll continue with the poll. If yes then speak now and then - Paul, I see you dropped your hand, by all means, put it up for a later - as soon as we've resolved this issue of the poll. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. A question, is this poll open to anyone or only to people registered as members or participants of this CCWG?

Robert Guerra: Alan, the polls both are now closed. They were open...

((Crosstalk))

Robert Guerra: ...anyone who had the URL.

Jonathan Robinson: So they were open, Alan, and we classified them - this is important though, we asked the question whether the respondent was a member, a participant or other. I think that was what we asked, wasn't it? Yeah, so we checked those three. So it was open to anyone but we asked for their - both their affiliation and their status, if you like, as a member, participant or other.

Lise.

((Crosstalk))

Lise Fuhr: I must say that the purpose was to have the group's opinion because that was what I actually stated for the ccTLD community. And I think - or it was supposed to be only for participant and members but I don't think we kind of made it impossible for others to submit any answers.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, that's a good point. Our intention was to poll the membership, that is a very good point, I say the membership in the broadest sense, the members and participants.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, so we'll proceed then with a polling question of the group. Are there any comments? Please, can I have hands up in the room if you have any comments or questions?

((Crosstalk))

Grace Abuhamad: Paul Kane has his hand up.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, but Paul - Paul, go ahead if you would like to speak to this particular point?

Paul Kane: Yes, just - I would like to come back to the other issue but just on the survey I'm very much in favor of opening the survey (unintelligible) to expedite the process. Now I suggest that the survey be opened only to the elected members - sorry, yeah, the elected members of the CWG and indeed the CWG elected members are encouraged to solicit comments from their various constituencies.

The problem is it's open to capture if one opens it to all and sundry. And I'm very worried that a lot of reliance is being made on the survey. At the end of the day we have to come to a common consensus respecting the views of our respective communities. So just another thought.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Paul. That's a good suggestion. Of course we can identify if anyone responding or if there was a drive towards capture and we could produce the results with and without members. So I'm tempted to leave it open but recognize that we need to keep an eye on whether or not it's been - there's significant participation from outside of the group. I take your point, it's a good point.

And Alan makes a point in the chat presuming people are honest about who they are which of course is another point. So all right let's ask the question then, and I guess the question is should we reopen the poll? And we'll keep it as simple as that for the moment. So should we reopen the poll? We're not specifying the time limits or the ability or who can participate simply should we reopen the poll.

Now I'll hand over to one of the support staff to just give you a quick indication of how to respond to the poll. It should be straightforward I expect but just if you want to comment, Grace or Marika, as to how to respond to the poll.

Marika Konings: Yeah, so this is Marika. I'll open up the poll now that you can see in your Adobe Connect window. And you should be able to select yes, no or no opinion to the question: Should the survey on the Contract Co IAP internal to ICANN be...

((Crosstalk))

Grace Abuhamad: And just the response, Eduardo, I believe that everyone who's in the Adobe room can respond to the question so it's not restricted to anyone in particular on this call.

((Crosstalk))

Bernard Turcotte: ...ask if there's anyone not in Adobe.

Grace Abuhamad: Oh and if there's anyone - okay, so yes, if there's anyone who's only on the audio line if you can - I guess you have to say it out loud. So if there's anyone on the audio...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Type it into the chat. Type it into the chat.

Grace Abuhamad: Right, but if someone is only on the audio line and only on the Verizon line.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh yeah, that'll have to be audio, yeah. Sorry.



Grace Abuhamad: So the line is only on the Verizon line...

((Crosstalk))

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy: Siva. I have no comment.

Grace Abuhamad: Hi, Siva. Thank you. I've noted Siva. Anyone else on the audio only?

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Okay and then finally...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Martin is asking how do we send the vote? The vote is tabulated and the - the survey controller will be able to see the percentages, Martin. As soon as you click the radio button it should go out and you'll get the results...

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, so you - thanks, Cheryl. You have an opportunity to click on the radio button on the - in the Adobe Connect room in front of you and express your opinion and then that...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Crocker: There's no way to change - you just click on the radio button, there's no - there's nothing that says, and that's my choice.

Grace Abuhamad: Yes, that's correct. So the results of the poll are only viewable to the support staff at this moment.

Steve Crocker: Well that's a separate question. Just but you don't - so it's a single button, you don't mark it and then say oh yes, if you want to change your mind it's too late at that point.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's only too late to change your mind, Steve, up until the point where the poll is closed. And I have watched people sit in polls flicking through all the radio buttons just to see the percentages change. It's very annoying, please don't do that.

Jonathan Robinson: All right so...

Steve Crocker: Never occurred to me.

Jonathan Robinson: Olivier, you've had your hand up, did you have another question about the polling or - and, Steve, I'm assuming that was your question, thank you. I see your hand is down. Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Yeah, thank you very much, Jonathan. It's Olivier speaking. And irrespective of which way this vote is going I just want to register by disappointment with the way this is going at the moment.

We're supposed to work by consensus; we're having votes on polls. We're having polls on polls basically. And if we're starting to have polls on polls because some segment of the working group does not like the results of the previous poll then we really are placing too much time and too much importance on the polls. Ultimately I would like to see consensus. I think this is really becoming very divisive. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Olivier. I really appreciate the sentiment and I'm with you on the sentiment. I'm less with you on the tool. And the intention was to try and where there was - I mean, essentially we've got a big group where there can be lots of discussion on issues.

And the intention - I know this is the first time we've done it - but the intention with introducing polling was to quickly test the temperature of the room. So I understand your point and I'm sympathetic to it. We do want to be as - converge towards consensus as much as possible. But this was clearly a controversial decision.

We had talked about, and the - the co-chairs had talked with the coordinators previously about potentially using polling as a tool. So it seemed to me that this was a good time to introduce it and use it as a tool. But I do take your point and it's a fair point.

Bernard and Erick, your hands are up as is Grace so let's get Grace first in case it's - and then we'll come to you, Bernie.

Grace Abuhamad: Hi, this is Grace Abuhamad for the record. I was just responding to some points made in the chat on the logistics of the poll. So to respond to Seun's point it says, "Reminder, you're going to be on default yes so if you do not want to be on yes you can move your radio button around." And that's if you haven't responded, right, if you're just staring at the screen it would default to yes.

And then the second point made by Eduardo is that you'll know that your vote is counted as long as there's a button selected which goes back to Seun's point why you shouldn't just leave it on the default.

Jonathan Robinson: Grace, there's a couple of comments on the chat. And I certainly can confirm that that's in my window that the default is no vote.

((Crosstalk))

Grace Abuhamad: Okay, thank you. Apologies.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay well next is - and if I can just encourage you to keep these short. I've got Bernard, Erick, and Robert in the queue. Go ahead, Bernard.

Bernard Turcotte: For those that are not used to this feature we are not recording who is voting, okay, is just - we just get a temperature of the room, nothing is being attributed to anyone. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay you should now be able to see the results in your screen. Erick, go ahead.

Erick Iriarte Ahon: Thank you, only to have a question to Bernard (unintelligible) staff. I really want to know the diversity of the (unintelligible) right now, (unintelligible) and how the diversity of the nationalities of the countries that made the answers. It could be very useful to understand better the answers in the general picture. But about this poll we'd only be - that we need to have poll to poll to poll all the time.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Erick. Robert.

Robert Guerra: So, Erick, thank you for your question and revisiting your question I think if I'm not mistaken when there are conversations in regards to the development of the polls the issue of adding a field for nationality was not flagged as something that we needed to add at that time. And so then that was not added.

And so, you know, again as part of the conversations, you know, it's really important for some of those things to come up and it didn't. And so we did not

capture that. There was not enough information captured in the survey to be able to have that level of detail available. So I can't...

((Crosstalk))

Erick Iriarte Ahon: Thanks, Robert. Robert, but if this is the case it could be complex if all the answers could be from the same jurisdiction and the same point of view of the law, is completely complicated to have correct decision and analyze and especially we are talking about contracts, rules and laws. So we need to be very careful if we have more surveys in the future, yes or no, we will need to know where is the people that answers.

Robert Guerra: So, as I mentioned earlier and I did have a - just responding to your point is just that if we are to do additional polls and stuff like that definitely it's important to make sure that that field is captured going forward. And so all I can say is point taken at this moment in time and, you know, we'll add that.

I just wanted to - I'd had my hand up when we were commenting. It was more my reaction to Olivier's comment earlier on. I think in conversations like this it's very important not necessarily to use polls but to use tools and techniques to try to help us guide our conversations.

And we've been very careful to say at the very beginning, you know, how we're using this. And it's, you know, my belief is really to get a sentiment of the room since we're not all physically together is very important to try to use these type of things. And I think it helps us get a sense. And that's why we went through the responses where there was very strong sentiment and raised those.

And so I think those are - I think my question back out to everyone is that there didn't seem to be - when I announced the results there didn't seem to be people jumping up and down saying no, no, this is not, you know, the sentiment is something that I fiercely disagree with.

And so my conclusion at having gone through this is that there seemed to be, I wouldn't say a consensus but a strong sentiment that where there was strong sentiment expressed that there is more or less agreement on that and that is very helpful kind of going forward. I'll stop with that comment but that's a comment that I wanted to make.

Jonathan Robinson: All right so we've got two more people - thanks, Robert - we've got two more people in the queue. I think there's a couple of points I'd make. I mean, certainly as a, I mean, especially with something as controversial as this for the chair to make a call or the co-chairs to make a call is very difficult without some kind of tool like this. And I don't think, you know, it's quite clear that this isn't a straightforward outcome.

And so I think we should hear from Greg and then Bertrand and then close the poll. And you will see, it looks evident to all of you who've been watching that to the extent that the poll remains open it's dynamic and some are influenced by what they see in front of them. So let's hear from Greg and Bertrand then close the poll. And I think that'll leave us in at least some position to start to go forward.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. It's Greg Shatan for the record. I really just wanted to respond briefly to what Erick had to say. There are only a couple of questions on jurisdiction, per se, or only a few questions on jurisdiction. Second, one of the things I noted as this group formed was how international it was.

And I think the only - among the members I believe we only have two American citizens and maybe a couple more American residents, US residents, I should say, and one alternate member who is a American citizen. The rest are all European, Australasian, Latin American. So it's actually - and Canadian - I think there are more Canadians on here. Actually I'm technically qualified to be a Canadian citizen so maybe I'm going to go that way too. I can get my (red) passport, I know I can.

And even if you look at the list of participants it is quite international. So I think that perhaps the lack of - the information in front of you is making you assume that there's something that you would see if the information was there. But I think that given the overall makeup of the group it's highly unlikely that what you think occurred in fact occurred. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, to thanks, Greg. Bertrand.

Bertrand de La Chapelle: Yeah, two comments. The first one is the exercise on the poll - and I think it was great to take the poll - shows in real time basically the two most of making a poll that is blind where you don't see the results and making a poll where you see the result and you potentially evolve - evolve consensus points and so on the contrary to counterbalance.

So it shows the difference between having questions that are being asked with or without the result. And actually the tool can be used in different cases in different perspectives.

The point I want to make is irrespective of whether we reopen the poll or not the fundamental issue is that the results in the two surveys show very different pictures. On the first one, I quite agree with the summary - the rough summary

Milton was making earlier on. There are trends that are emerging that show an element of convergence.

On the second poll, the only conclusion that we can draw is that it confirms that the question of Contract Co is a delicate question. And I don't think that the poll alone, even if we reopen it, is going to solve either in one direction or the other. Even if the poll were going to change saying that the Contract Co is good it would be the definitive answer or if the poll were to strengthen the notion that we should go to an (unintelligible) solution.

What the poll showed in the second, even with the limited number, is that there is no consensus at the moment on the option of Contract Co or non-Contract Co and that this deserves discussion; it cannot be solved by voting at that stage.

So I would encourage to continue the discussion and to not interpret on either side the result of the poll as anything more than clearly the community is not aligned on this issue of Contract Co or no Contract Co, as much as we might have expected from the previous discussion. That's all it said and that's all that even continuing the poll would say. Just a note of caution here.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, I note there's quite strong feeling in the (unintelligible) to keep things moving. I - there are a number of hands up and we do need to close this poll. So let's hear from those in the chat - here from those in the queue then I think we're going to have to bring the meeting to a close as well and wrap things up at some point.

So we're coming to the top of the hour so if I could encourage you to be brief please. Milton, go ahead.



Milton Mueller: Yes, I'm agreeing with Bertrand that while it would be nice to have a more accurate reflection of the group and in some cases they might actually make a difference in showing some level of greater consensus on certain points, that the overall conclusion we reach is that the Contract Co concept is still controversial and divisive and conversely that there's no consensus on an internal solution.

So I think, you know, we should just close the poll. Get it off of my screen. Forget about that whole business and start talking about how to close these gaps. I think in a previous meeting I made the suggestion that we have this two track process where the real advocates of the internal solution come up with a detailed proposal and that the advocates of the external solution go about refining the Frankfurt model. And I'm wondering if that's what will happen in the second call tonight?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Milton. There's no doubt that we need to move on with the detail and - of key components of both the - well I wouldn't say it's the existing proposal, it's key components that we have a commonality of across the group. And I think that's an important area.

And you know that since you made that suggestion in the previous meeting we opened a second track, if you like, to RFP 3 group in order to develop - to give the opportunity to develop further detail on alternatives or variants.

I've got Paul and Robert.

Paul Kane: Thank you. This is Paul Kane. Unfortunately I'm unable to join you for the second session that's taking place today; I have an existing engagement (unintelligible). But I would like to come back to the core issues. In Frankfurt I was very pleased with how Frankfurt went and I felt there was strong

consensus over the desire to simplify the transition process to try and keep as much of the status quo in place as possible.

I came away with the impression that there had to be - and there were benefits in receiving or having an entity that awarded the IANA contract. And whether that's a legal entity, an association or whatever. And certainly that (accords) with those ccTLDs that want to keep the process simple as possible to keep whoever is operating the IANA function accountable as possible.

I sincerely hope that, as for this transition, we can continue to use the excellent services that IANA has delivered to date. But I have been, and many CCs have been customers of the IANA well before ICANN came into existence. And so the emphasis has always been on avoiding single points of failure or capture. And I fear that if we were to place the internal model, as it's now been merged, I do not feel comfortable with that.

But at the same token, I don't want to break something that is working well. Nor do I wish to place the new entity, Contracting Company, whether it's incorporated or unincorporated, subject to litigation and loads of risks. It is a very simple function - or should be a simple technical function.

And I fear we are making this whole process far too complicated. So I wish you well in your deliberations later today or the second meeting today. I had hoped to participate or I will be participating tomorrow in the latter meeting. But I would urge that we move away or move on from discussing the survey in great detail, move to the substance. Thank you very much.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Paul. And that's our intention. And we'll do our best to keep you and anyone else who is unable to participate informed and engaged. But

please, and it's not directed at you, but to everyone please participate as much as you can.

I'd like to close the survey. Robert, do you have any reason why we shouldn't close it at this point? I think we've run it for long enough. I'd like to close it now. Is there any - Robert, was your hand up?

Robert Guerra: I had my hand on another point which there was a conversation in regards to the findings of the second poll. And what I will say is looking at the results is that there was a lot of agreement in regards to the accountability questions. And so that accountability is important and it should be linked to the Accountability Working Group. That's also something that very strongly comes out from the poll. It's not been mentioned so I just wanted to point that out as well.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay.

Robert Guerra: And I think for the poll - the poll related to keeping the poll open or not I'm - I think we're ending the end of our call so it'd be great to know what the results are.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, so a couple of points. One, on your point on Paul Kane's point on detail, I mean, I think it's very much our intention to go into some more detail on the subsequent calls. Second, you'll note from what we - certainly opening remarks accountability and the links to the accountability track are another key area of detail that we need to go into.

And, third, on the point of the poll on should the survey be reopened or not it seems to me pretty clear that there's - that that was a useful tool on an area that we would have struggled - I would have struggled to make a call on a - Lise

and I would have struggled to make a call on as co-chairs. And it highlights that there is sufficient opposition not to do it. I recognize that it's close call but there was sufficient opposition to reopening the poll.

So thank you for participating and I realize it's not totally comfortable to everyone to spend a lot of time on that but I think it was a useful experiment in utilizing that.

Bertrand, your hand is up as we...

Bertrand de La Chapelle: Just a quick comment regarding the use of the time during the following meetings, unfortunately for the same reason as Paul, I have another commitment tonight so I will not be able to join the call tonight.

I would suggest that the call tonight could be (unintelligible) to the issues that were addressed in the first poll and mostly the issues related to the CSC and the MRT. In the ongoing functioning and the distribution of responsibilities between the MRT and the CSC on day to day operations of the functions of the IANA and maybe keep the discussion on the second survey more to tomorrow if people are more able to participate. That would be my case. But it's just a suggestion.

I think focusing on the first poll that has more consensus would actually bring momentum this evening and we could probably reach more elements of convergence on that topic than on the second survey on the subject of the second survey. Just a suggestion.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Bertrand. And that's very helpful and I think that's likely certainly broadly where we - had intended to go. We are coming towards the top of the

hour, I would just ask if there are any other comments along the lines that Bertrand has just made about constructive use of the next three sessions.

And so if you'd like to make any comments to feed into our inter-meeting planning for the agenda's content and detail of the next meetings please fire away and do that now. It'd be great to have your input along the lines of what Bertrand has just suggested.

Okay I'm seeing support from Elise to Bertrand's suggestion in the chat. Get the recording out as soon as possible. And Milton, again, let's design CSC and MRT. So we'll work with you in terms of planning that and trying to get that content for the next meeting along those lines. Obviously the mailing lists are open and let's keep this moving on. And just encourage you to work in a spirit of convergence where we can and resolving divergence where we don't have it yet.

Okay, I think that's probably enough for this meeting now. Thank you very much to all of those who did participate. Please do participate as much as possible in the next three sessions. And we'll look forward to working with you in those. Thanks again and we can stop the recording now.

END