

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White  
February 25, 2015  
5:00 am CT**

Grace Abuhamad: So this is the 19th meeting of the CWG. It's 11:06 UTC and I'll turn it over to Jonathan to lead the call. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Hi, everyone. Sorry for being a few minutes late; there was a minor technical glitch joining the call. So - everyone to the call. Can I confirm that I'm clear and there's not too much echo? Great, thank you. So I believe there's good quality sound and I'll hope that remains the case.

Good, so we've obviously got a reasonable agenda to go through. So welcome, everyone. We will do as we've done in the past and assume that you are - we will add you to the roll call if you are in the Adobe Connect room.

So Question 1, is there anyone who is on the call on audio only that is not in the Adobe Connect room? Please let yourself be known now. Okay, thank you.

A couple of quick thoughts then just before we get going. We're obviously at an important point for a number of reasons. Clearly we're about to head up to the - we're very close to the ICANN meeting in Singapore - 52, which is an

opportunity to both meet many of us face to face and also with the broader community get feedback, discuss key ideas and so on. And we need to be in shape to do that.

We've also hit a significant point in terms of having passed the threshold for when we had - when the ICG originally asked for its proposal to be - for our proposal to be sent to them. And in discussion directly with the ICG on the note you've seen sent to the list there's clearly a recognition that our job is complex, multifaceted, requires significant input and therefore it's reasonable that we have taken the time we have to get that done.

That said, we can't drift into a position where we're on an open-ended schedule. That will not do us any good nor anyone else who's relying on our proposal. So it's critical that in relatively short order we come together to produce a new and revised timetable and sort of focus our collective minds on getting towards a concrete proposal that can be submitted.

And I'm sure that's going to require compromises to get to a form of consensus that we'll require and that we can get ourselves behind as a group and that we can get support from the chartering organizations.

So just encourage you to have that in the back of your mind to think about perhaps as much as the overarching positions you represent to try and see if there are ways in which you're underlying motivations can be met through any form of compromise as we work through what we have to do.

I think that's probably enough to be said for now but just recognizing that the sort of optics of all of this we're in the spotlight, we have an opportunity to demonstrate the effectiveness as well as the challenges of the multistakeholder work we do.

Certainly myself and Lise see it as a challenge to work with and (unintelligible) this group together with the coordinators to some form of concrete proposal in a reasonable timeframe. And balancing that both the pressures and the need to do things fast as possible with the need to properly percolate up the various requirements and take the bottom up input is no easy task. So hopefully you can work with us in the right spirit to get that done.

Typically we start off with an update from the various subgroups. And as you know, in the interim we've commissioned a variation of subgroup 3 called RFP 3b so it will be useful to hear from both Greg as coordinator - overarching coordinator of RFP 3 as well as Alan who is responsible for coordinating the subgroup of RFP 3 which we know as 3b.

So, Greg, if it's - I think we should hear from you first and then we'll go on to hear from Alan under Item 2 status update from the different groups.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Jonathan. And hello to everybody. RFP 3 did have a call earlier this week. And on that call we completed a review of the structural analysis of CSC. And I think made a good deal of headway in that. I need to take the outcome of that call and update the - and repost the - or recirculate the CSC structural analysis document.

I think one of the more sticky points that we dealt with was the composition of the CSC. And there's, by no means, any sort of final decision or anything that could be termed "consensus." There was, I think, some sense of convergence on a, as we've said, an idea of how you would structure something that was primarily composed of registries but that would have a multistakeholder component.

And roughly speaking, on the call this kind of evolved into a group that would have a - albeit a relatively small group; might have as few as two registry representatives from each side, the CCs and the Gs. It could have somewhat more but not a huge number more.

And then might have a single multistakeholder seat, if you will, composed of the non-registry GNSO as well as the ACs that are not directly involved in the root.

And the feeling was that there should be a separate seat for the RSAC and also the SSAC as well and that this essentially multistakeholder seat could be a member taken from the MRT that might also function in a liaison fashion but would not, as Alan Greenberg, has pointed out, have the limitations that are typically put on a liaison. This would be a full member who would also kind of have a relationship with MRT. So it'll be a representative/liaison in a sense.

And that there may also be a seat - or seats for IETF and for similar representation from a number's side. Again, fairly tight committee and with a tight set of functions based around operations and technical performance but including the ability to resolve issues with the IANA functions operator that can be (solved) relatively quickly.

As I said, we will update and I'll post a link to remind people that the CSC structure has been - is at this point. And I think there is, in the sense, a situation where, you know, each group may grumble a bit about the structure but that perhaps is sign - the grumbling sounds are relatively equal that is usually a good thing in the world of convergence and other words with three syllables that begin with a C. That is where we stand at the moment. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Greg, thanks very much for that summary and succinct description of the position. Any questions or issues for Greg at this stage? All right let's move on then to hear from Allan to - I think, Allan, if I'm correct you've had one meeting only so far but correct me if I'm misrepresenting that.

Allan MacGillivray: Thank you, Jonathan. It's Allan MacGillivray for the record. Yes, we had one meeting last week - last Wednesday. And I actually gave a brief report to our meeting last Thursday. The RFP 3b meeting for this week is not going to occur until tomorrow - until Friday. So I guess I would just say that I thought we had a good first start at the issue and we'll just to have continue the discussion tomorrow. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Allan. Any questions, comments for Allan at this stage? Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Appreciate that, Jonathan, and Allan as well. Allan, I just noted, as I got up very early this morning, that auDA has sent another alternative proposal. Haven't had a chance to look at it yet but just a general question, how is a proposal like the auDA proposal, or their new one, being incorporated in the internal solution with the one that was submitted by ALAC and any other variations that have been sent? Thanks.

Allan MacGillivray: Thank you, Chuck. Many will recall that both ALAC and auDA made comments to our original (Frankfurt) proposal in which they were seeking a so-called internal to ICANN solution that did not include a Contract Co.

I was aware that the auDA proposal was coming but I actually haven't read it yet. It's very early here and I appreciate it's even earlier in California, Chuck. But certainly insofar as auDA, was, I think, one of the principle reasons we took the step of creating RFP 3b, I think that we will look to them I guess for

inspiration and ideas and certainly would want to do what we can to incorporate those ideas into the alternative proposal.

You can tell I'm being a bit vague, as I said, because I haven't read it yet but, thank you, Chuck.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Chuck. Thanks, Allan. I mean, that's the spirit of the kind of input that would be useful. Does anyone else have any comment or guidance or simply, you know, any thoughts for the work of RFP 3b perhaps not even so much on the substance but just how to, I mean, it's clear that there's an (urgent) to get things done, as I said in my opening remarks and just in generally.

So are there any other comments, guidance or thoughts for Allan ahead of that group's next meeting? Olivier, go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thanks very much, Jonathan. Olivier Crépin-LeBlond speaking.  
Can you hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, Olivier, no problem.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Okay, thanks Jonathan. I was just going to suggest one thing for RFP 3b having sat on the previous call. There were requests from some people to get back down to B6 and to look at the exact functions, the IANA functions and basically start again reboot everything from scratch and come up with a brand new proposal that does effectively the work of what we've done in Frankfurt onwards.

And my feeling is we don't have time to go back to the beginning of time. We absolutely have to jump on this now. Looking at the auDA proposal, seeing

the common bits that are there with the ALAC proposal and other proposals that seem to, you know, that favor an internal to ICANN way and effectively build something from that.

I'm really concerned that if we go back to basics and look at the actual functions of the different organizations and - of IANA itself we're going to need another few months rather than a few weeks. So that's what I hope we'll be able to do. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Olivier. Let me pass the microphone straight over to Staffan Jonson.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you, Jonathan. Staffan Jonson here. Well, I also participated in the last meeting and I would beg to disagree on talking about starting from the beginning. I never heard that mentioned actually. That was a little overreaching in what was actually being said in last meeting.

It was, however, proposed that we should limit the scope of the work and approach a minimalistic solution. And I still believe that is possible within a reasonable amount of work. So I never heard anything about back to basics and restart everything. I rather say minimalism, again. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Staffan. Any other comments? I see, Martin, your comment in the chat saying when we look at ideas we should look carefully of the functions. And I guess that means that any refinements or developments to the proposals are firmly rooted in the functions but that doesn't mean necessarily going back to first principles completely but being aware and cognizant of them.

Any other comments or thoughts that you'd like to add in before we move on?  
I see a couple of hands have shot up now so let me hand the microphone over  
next to Olivier followed by Paul. Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you, Jonathan. Olivier speaking. And, yeah, I mean, I  
mentioned going back to basics as, you know, ultimately if we were to go into  
a deep analysis we would have to go back to basics. And I think we're all in  
violent agreement here. I have taken into account what was just mentioned  
now. And we just have to move forward. And I see several people in the chat  
have also agreed with it. So we just have to come up with a proposal as soon  
as possible and look at the functions.

I don't think that the disagreement is that great. We're just looking at this  
Contract Co and not having a Contract Co look at what that means for the  
functions that we had allocated to Contract Co.

And I would say that beyond that there is mostly on the whole - all of the  
other different committees and so on which have been designed by the  
mainstream - well designed so far from Frankfurt onwards, as far as I see it  
could happen within ICANN scenario equally as well as external to ICANN  
scenario, of course with a few tweaks here and there. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Olivier. And I understand the principle there it's as much about  
banking, for want of a better description, areas of convergence even between  
RFP 3 and 3b, you know, RFP 3 mainstream and RFP 3b and setting those  
aside to the extent that we do have areas of convergence in order to move  
things forward. (Paul).

Paul Szyndler: Thank you, Jonathan. I just wanted to reconfirm that you can hear me clearly  
over the phone line?



Jonathan Robinson: Yes, we hear you clearly, Paul.

Paul Szyndler: Wonderful. I feel it's only appropriate given that the term outer proposal has been bounced around over the last half hour or so that I speak to it. I just want to be clear that we're not seeking to be obstructionist here.

And I actually have a great deal of sympathy for what Olivier has said in terms of what we're looking at doing is proposing whether there are any alternatives where we could finesse the model as it's currently being proposed whether some adjustments can be made that broadly speaking, encompass the principles that have been proposed previously.

So, yes, we are proposing something that is largely an internal to ICANN model and that's a separate discussion. However, our model, which as it currently stands, uses the term "guardian" which essentially would be an MRT.

We encompass the CSC, we have the IAP there. It's just in terms of how we define the peak entity that derives key power or has the authority for taking decisions, how we enshrine future arrangements with regards to the IANA transition. So it's not a case of last minute interventions or something that means we need to go back to basics; we're just trying to propose something that looks a little bit different from what has been proposed to date.

And I won't go into too much detail because everybody will be able to read through their emails over the next few hours but I just wanted to make that clear before we go any further. Thank you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Paul. That's timely and useful to understand the sort of spirit and the context in which that proposal or supplementary proposal is made. Allan.

Allan MacGillivray: Thank you, Jonathan. I think, to quote Olivier, we're all in violent agreement on this. I certainly want to go on record as saying I'm very much looking forward.

I think later in the meeting we will (unintelligible) our game plan for Singapore but certainly I think that RFP 3b should work very hard to put a alternative proposal together and to have that available for discussion when we're in Singapore. And, again, not having read the outer proposal, but certainly that should be at least informed and possibly even based on what auDA has said. So thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Allan. I think I hear you saying you're going to meet every day from now on between now and Singapore but maybe that's not quite correct. I appreciate the point. There's going to be some work to be done. Milton.

Milton Mueller: Yes. I, again, appreciate the fact that this internal group is trying to stick with the basic elements of the model. I guess they've abandoned the idea that that's too complex. But one interdependency between the two groups, and I think (unintelligible) point at this stage, is that the legal advice that Greg has solicited I think would be extremely relevant to that proposal.

I think one of the biggest question marks facing an internal proposal is its legal viability. So I'm assuming that you guys are waiting for that legal advice as eagerly as the other group is.

Jonathan Robinson: I think that sounds like a reasonable assumption, Milton. Let's come to that, though, and if we need to uncover the relevant points that we certainly do need to touch on that and you'll see it's an agenda item so fair point.

I think I'd like to nudge us on to RFP 4 now. And I know Robert did say in the chat that there was no update since the last meeting so I appreciate that. But I guess one thing if there is things to say, really, to the extent that that group meets it would be great to have active participation there thinking about the implications and any stress tests and associated points that come out of their work.

Let me just give an opportunity for anyone to comment on, A, anything to do with that group's work; and, B, any comments about how much productive work can be done at present if you have a view or opinion on that.

Okay so we - we'll leave that for now but it would be - just important to the extent that that group meets to have your sleeves rolled up and assistance doing that work as well because we need to find ways of running these efforts in parallel whilst at the same time recognizing that there are limits to what can be done while the foundation work of the preceding group's work has yet to be completed.

There a significant meeting on Monday and Tuesday this week of course, as you'll be familiar with, which is - sorry, let me not gloss over RFP 5; let me make sure that there is nothing - no update or any additional information required there. Cheryl, let me check if you're on the call and if you would like to make any comment. I don't know that I see Cheryl on the call. Does anyone else - Grace, go ahead.

Grace Abuhamad: Hi, Jonathan. Cheryl sent her apologies for today's call. I think she's returning - she's traveling back to home from the Frankfurt meeting. But my understanding at least in terms of scheduling was that she's postponed RFP 5 calls at least until Singapore just because RFP 5 is very dependent on the progress of the other groups.

And so there were originally two calls, one scheduled this week and one scheduled next week, that she has since postponed until very likely until the end of Singapore - the Singapore meeting. So we might revisit that later but I just think that the group should know from a scheduling perspective that that's the understanding.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Grace. I think that's what I had in mind and yet I didn't want to just inadvertently presume that. So let's then move ahead to where I was which is to recognize the work of the CCWG on Accountability that's taken place via a face to face meeting in Frankfurt, Monday Tuesday of this week.

And we have a number of members and/or participants of our group, the CWG, cross over and participate so they may well have input. But in addition to that crossover we have Avri Doria as a official, if you like, liaison between the two groups. So let me now hand over to Avri to give you an update on that weekend's work in particular any issues and outcomes relating to the linkage between the two groups.

Avri Doria: Thanks. This is Avri. It was actually, you know, quite a good meeting, quite a collegial meeting. And they did start the meeting by, you know, calling me up to sort of talk through the note that, you know, together and was sent to them at the very last minute, and went through those issues and then basically those issues were in the background for most of the two days and came up again explicitly at the end.

The first day of the meeting really focused very much, I think, on the larger picture of the accountability and the kinds of solutions, etcetera, that were possible, and starting looking at the issue of which issues belonged in Stream 1 and which issues belonged in Stream 2.

The second day got quite seriously into working on - and the use of a mind map had been created, working on the stricter definition of what issues were in the Work Stream 1 basket and got very far along that to a point - now the Accountability Cross Community work works on the principle that no decisions are ever made in one meeting; you always come back to them after there's been a time on the list to check again. So there's nothing that's been sided yet, although it's sort of - I would describe it as a decision in process.

That certainly there's a set of items that have been tentatively posited as these are the issues that belong in Work Stream 1. I don't know if you want me to sort of go down that path a little bit in this report or just leave it and wait until something comes out of the group. I'm able to do either to some degree of success. I'm able to wait easier than anything.

But let me go on. Then towards the end of the meeting they went back to the letter we had sent and started discussing specific answers that, at the moment, the chairs of the group are writing up or, you know, some group, including the chairs, are writing up that will be reviewed in that group and then sent back to this group. So there's no official response yet.

But they went through the issues, you know, in a one by one. And I did jot down some notes. And, for example, on the budget accountability and transparency it is certainly something that they're working on but that they

also think that we need to work on, as I say, my answers are very drafty; these are notes that I jotted down while we were talking.

That basically this is something they see that we both need to work on. They would certainly work on in a general sense but that any specific issues that we had, especially specific issues that we have now with getting visibility while trying to make decisions, are really things that we need to continue to work on.

I didn't get the impression that that accountability group, for example, will solve the problem of us getting a good view of the current budget and exactly what all, including the overhead and other costs that go into the IANA basket. So, yes, it's something we're both working on and there is a linkage.

In the accountability - and, please, the people from, you know, that were also there, I just got back late last night. Really I'm still sorting out everything. That in terms of the accountability for redelegations was that their inventory of broad issues that they need to cover does include these items but they haven't taken a deep dive on these.

And one of the questions that came up on several of these issues is how 2 relates to 3 etcetera, that there seemed to be relations, there seemed to be questions of what is post-delegation, what is pre-delegation and questions between 2 and 3, the accountability for delegations and independent review of Board actions.

You know, that took into account that what we're, you know, the Board's actions in the redelegations, first of all B and C, and also relate also more to, you know, making sure that everything has been done properly especially on

C sides, etcetera. So that's still being developed and that's, you know, still being discussed.

The independent review of actions, there's certainly strong ccTLD concern when it relates to them as to what degree are they, you know, involved in all that.

On certainly independent review of Board actions, that's a very big part of the accountability's work and, you know, and seen as a strong crossover point between the two groups in terms of those independent reviews of Board actions.

The appeals panel is a major issue on, you know, the table for them. Let me see if I have anything more in my notes on that one. Okay, not, but basically that one is but that is not - that's part of a solution space that wasn't explored that much in that meeting but there was acknowledgment that that certainly is a big part of the work.

The control over Board decisions discussions came up in sort of the difference between accountability often being the review post versus mechanisms to control and that the accountability group - I didn't get the impression that we were, in that group, overly strong on the notion of controlling things in an a priori sense.

You know, so there's certainly, you know, limiting power of the Board within, you know, various definitions, various bylaw changes, what have you, but really it's limited also by independent review. And there was a lot of discussion of what independent review actually meant and did not mean but it didn't include, you know, the notions of creating other boards.

And that, yes, there was a certain concern that mandating Board decisions is sort of the bottom up recommendation process and any separate vector of controlling the Board decisions in some ways threatens the multistakeholder model so there's certainly concern in that respect.

So as I say, the - and I'm sure the chairs will have a much more, you know, complete review, and there's also a Work Area 3 that will continue to focus on these issues and on the linkages as they go forward. That's the - it's a fairly big group of people that are interested in this team that that's the team that I'm acting as rapporteur with.

So the notion of the liaison is that in both this group, you know, I was - I volunteered to help put together the letter and acted as a rapporteur there, and I'm acting as a rapporteur on the other side so in that manner trying to make sure that both groups stay in some sort of sync with each other.

So I'll stop there. If people wanted me to take a slightly deeper detour into what was WS1, Work Stream 1, yeah, Work Stream 1, I can do that but I'm not sure the degree to which it's relevant so I'd leave that up to you all and the chairs. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you very much, Avri. That's...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: And I hope that was somewhat coherent.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, it was helpful, insightful and to my mind coherent so that's great. I should just remind everyone that there is, in addition to this rather significant overlap group and Avri's work in acting as, in effect, rapporteur of that group,



as she described, the chairs are in close contact. And in fact we plan to meet with the - Lise and myself plan to meet with the chairs of the CCWG group tomorrow and potentially produce some form of combined statement about the work and the interaction between the groups.

I have a question for you, Avri, as to one thing I thought I perceived and maybe heard from you as well as are our draft conditions sufficiently clear? Is there - is part of the challenge for the CCWG one of interpreting our output? Because if that's so perhaps we need to home in on that a little bit and figure out how to clarify that. Is that your thought or anyone else's thought for that matter or have we been sufficiently clear?

You know, with thoughts - with comments like potential overlap between different areas and so on it makes me wonder whether we - and as I say from my own observations I wonder whether we shouldn't do some more work in sharpening our position or our requirements and keep them aware that we can do that.

Avri, I see your hand is up so by all means respond and we'll put it open to the floor as well.

Avri Doria: Yeah, sufficiently clear is any condition. I would say no in that there was a lot of discussion about what does this mean? What does that mean? And to the degree to which and the other CWG people there were able to sort of, you know, untangle some of the entanglements.

I think that, you know, there was recognition in our putting this out that it was just a draft. In fact after I took the freeze on the document so that I could get, you know, chair's approval to send it forward at the very last minute, you

know, there had been some other contributions, there had been a (SIC) statement put there.

I think all the way through our editing we said, you know, you'd see the line in some of our, you know, in 2, well this could relate to 3 and in 3, well this could relate to - and so we even built in that degree of fuzziness of saying, you know, these concerns in some sense are able to be individually stated but in the stating we realize that there's balance and that fixing one could fix both in a sense.

So, you know, I think sufficient clarity is something we don't even necessarily have on these dependencies. And it's in an iterative process between the two groups that we'll find that that each of us will keep working on it or keep clarifying it more until we'll be able to point to a set of solutions.

And remembering that that group is not at the solution point yet; they're still at the which issues belong in which basket point. So sufficient clarity? I would say in one - I started out by saying no - in one sense yes. We know what issues we're talking about. But you take the dive down to the next level and then it does start to fuzz out.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Avri. That's sufficiently clear for me in the sense that it now makes it clear to me that we need to keep that channel open rather than, in the sense that, lest anyone think that we sort of tossed the ball over and said here are our - over the net and said here are our accountability requirements and that's - so I think that's an action there twofold really.

Probably one for the chairs to discuss this and make sure it's understood between the two groups properly that this is work in progress. And it needs to be work in progress in such a way that it doesn't destabilize the work of Work

Stream 1 but assists it which is, to your point on iteration; and second, that I think it's probably a live item for our group then possibly with you continuing to hold the pen and to further develop this.

Siva, go ahead, your hand is up. Siva, we don't yet hear you.

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy: Yeah, can you hear me? Okay, talking about...

Jonathan Robinson: Hear you now.

Sivasubramanian Muthusamy: ...the interaction between - within Work Stream 1 and - sorry within this working group and the Accountability Working Group is that relationship still relevant for Work Stream 2 of accountability? Because Work Stream 2 of accountability is conceived as a work stream post IANA. So will we still have two working groups looking at Work Stream 2 of accountability or will it simply be the Accountability Working Group?

And secondly, I have a question to Avri. Is there anything concrete identified as possible work area for Work Stream 2? Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Thanks. There was - I didn't catch - I didn't have 100% attention 100% of the time but I didn't catch a notion of there being a separation even now really into those two groups. The two groups - the one group was really working on both - though there could indeed be separate subgroups working on separate elements and that kind of discussion started to build of putting together a small, you know, working group - a small subgroup to work on specific issues of this.

And then I think there's going to be a large concentration of most of the group but, you know, the chairs and others should correct me. But I didn't pick up a okay now Work Stream 2 people are going to go off.

The was also a notion that - and if, you know, we were to have gone down what's in Work Stream 1 area you would see that even were perhaps aspects of the basic Work Stream 1 solution where part of it needs to be done as, you know, the gating solution as it were in - for transition.

And some of the aspects, even within a lot of these issues are issues that would take longer and once the sufficient guarantees were in place that they could continue out in the longer stream 2.

There was no specific, I mean, there is actually a long list of issues that's called the Inventory that one of the work areas put together that's a long list. And within the mind maps built to show that only a few of them are marked out as Work Stream 1. And the others, I think, are by default, the Work Stream 2.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Thanks. I think that's a useful update. I'm just mindful of the ticking clock so providing there's no other questions or input on that we'll keep moving through the agenda. Okay great, yes, thank you Avri.

Let's move on then to the next item which deals with the work that's been done on the legal brief. And I think there's been quite substantial work. And this is obviously one of the items in the critical path. And it's therefore urgent, as Milton highlighted earlier, and others will be aware that we get moving on the road and form of productive output on this. And this is very much the first step but let me hand over to Greg to give you background and the required output from this meeting in relation to the legal brief. Go ahead, Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Jonathan. As you note, we have now completed the brief or scoping document in order to move forward with the requests to Council or rather I should say a request for Council to assist us in our labor and give us the kind of expert legal advice that we need.

A good part of the document is educational intended to provide a fairly concise background to the attorney who may consider being engaged, the rest being questions that relate to our work.

This document has now been through quite a number of comments and has been reposted in a second iteration which I would like to consider closed soon after this call since we - this document is essentially an invitation to the dance; it is not the dance itself, it is merely a document to be used as a tool to get the legal advice commenced and is not intended to be written interrogatories, we're not going to send the question to the lawyer (next day) (unintelligible) answers back.

This is a starting point for discussion so that we get legal advice that relates to these questions but it's a more interactive process to get legal advice. So if there are any final comments on the document it will remain up and open for some time today but we cut off essentially in the next few hours so that we can say that we have a stable document.

Second, and of equal importance, we need to identify what I've termed in discussion, a client committee; a small subgroup of us who would interact actively with the lawyers so that they're not answering questions individually from 30 or 130 different people or necessarily always interacting with the committee as the whole, so to speak. So I am putting out a call here and I will also put out a call on the list for volunteers for this client committee.

Obviously advice in process will be shared with the group and we'll figure out exactly how the lawyers may interact with the larger group; they are not intended to be hidden and filtered only through the client committee as some sort of Delphic Oracle but there is a need for a streamlined process and for someone to act as kind of the in-house client representing this group.

I'm happy to volunteer to serve on that committee but I think we would not benefit from a committee of one versus a committee of some. So look forward to some volunteers in that regard.

Lastly, would also put a call for this group for any suggestions. (Hoping) to have four lawyers that could be engaged in this process as the (unintelligible) document once out. Corporate governance it carries corporate structure (unintelligible) and carries California non for profit law are necessary attributes.

And just to clarify, we would be hiring a law firm, not a single lawyer. There is an aphorism that one hires lawyers, not law firms but the footnote that is that one hires typically lawyers in law firms to answer questions of this nature and that they can call on colleagues who have related and necessary specialty as well as calling sometimes on associates to do some of the drafting and the like of documents at a cheaper rate and will be more cost effective.

So we would be looking for potentially law firm recommendations but highlighting lawyers in those firms if at all possible. So just recommending say, (unintelligible) wouldn't be as helpful as saying I know this person or I've heard that there is somebody there who's, you know, answers to one or more of those specialties that I have just mentioned.

So to recap, basically take a final look at the scoping document, which I'm considering to be essentially stable at this point. Two, volunteers for the client committee. Three, suggestions for counsel. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Good. Thank you, Greg. That's helpful. Just to highlight - and forgive me if you did say this - we - for that client committee appreciate your offer of volunteering. We need to have at least another ideally qualified person, someone with the relevant business/legal experience of, you know, commissioning and managing the work of a law firm possibly ideally a lawyer.

And in addition that client committee will have myself and Lise on it in addition to you, assuming we run with you, and whomever else we put on that committee. So that's what we're looking for. Olivier, go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you, Jonathan. Olivier Crépin-LeBlond speaking. And first I'd really like to congratulate Greg and those who were involved in the drafting of this set of questions under the time constraints that we have. I'm very impressed with it. I think it covers most of the questions, if not all of the questions, I've been asking myself about the various structures proposed and the various scenarios.

A couple of questions. First, procedural-wise, if this document is frozen and ready to be sent out to a law firm by tonight UTC time or end of day, how quickly, I mean, have we identified law firms to send this to? Has - and what's the sort of timeline that we have until we'll receive answers to the questions that are raised there? That's the first question.

The second one is whether Greg and others who have followed the accountability discussions - I've certainly heard the accountability discussions

also asking for legal advice on various points. Have you identified any additional questions that have been raised in the accountability discussions in Frankfurt that could be appended to this document so we work on our tighter timeline and therefore have our answers, and answers to these questions earlier than if they were to go via the accountability track? Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Olivier. I'm not sure that Greg is back on audio yet. But a couple of key thoughts that - just to, you know, sometimes things get known or understood and not necessarily communicated or - to the whole group or - the - my understanding of where this is going, as Greg said, this is the, in a sense the invitation to the party.

It provides an initial briefing for a law firm from which basis there will be an ongoing and more comprehensive dialogue. I take your point as chair, I think we need to - this is another key area of potential overlap and linkage with the CCWG. We need to make sure it's not duplicated for two reasons; one, because it's simply inefficient; two, because it will increase costs and potentially slow things down.

In terms of funding our expectation is that this will be funded and financially backed by ICANN as convener and supporter of this process. In terms of selection of firms there is a requirement to have a satisfactory degree of independence from work that's being done for ICANN as such.

That doesn't mean in the view that I have - and I think has been at least partially discussed that that - that law firm ultimately engaged needs to be - have never done work for ICANN and in fact the fact that they may have done some work for ICANN in the past may be advantageous in the sense that it might make commissioning their work for this group more efficient.



There's a couple of thoughts to get things going. I see a few hands have been raised so let me back off from the microphone now. I know Greg is back in and Lise wanted to say something so, Lise, let's hear from you, then Greg, then Chuck. Lise.

Lise Fuhr: Hi, it's Lise Fuhr for the record. I just saw Avri's comment in the chat regarding that lawyers don't make the best clients. And it's not to challenge that view but I think it's necessary to have another lawyer so we have at least two lawyers on this committee. And apart from that, I agree with you that it's good to have non-lawyers as well.

But we don't want this committee to be too big so it's not agile. You need a committee that can work fast because we need to get this done fast. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Lise. Just confirming that Lise and I will be on that committee. I am not a lawyer. I believe you are not either, Lise, so I think to that extent we've got two non-lawyers on...

Lise Fuhr: Yes, I'm not a lawyer.

Jonathan Robinson: Greg, over to you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Jonathan. I think you touched on (unintelligible) that I wanted to touch on as did Lise. As you point out that if we were to hire a lawyer from scratch they might have to go through some procurement process but that (unintelligible) some issues on some work for ICANN in the past but more necessarily deeply ingrained in the - in answering questions like these to ICANN's satisfaction over many years that might, you know, be perceived as not in the (unintelligible).

And I think that I should also say that while we're not - that I did participate as much as I could given the schedule in the Accountability face to face meetings in Frankfurt on a remote basis and I did volunteer to liaise with those on the - and in fact am liaising with a sort of a client committee that has formed or is in the process of formation, on the CCWG side. So we are linked.

I wouldn't say synchronized; that would be (unintelligible) and possibly disruptive. But we are looking to leverage off of each other's search for legal advice and (unintelligible) common points of our legal advice as well. So having those here we're not two people back to back with flashlights believing we're the only ones looking for something in the dark. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Greg. Chuck, go ahead, you're next.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jonathan. I want to talk about process a little bit because I think timing is really important. I first of all appreciate the fact that we're coordinating with the CCWG in terms of legal advice. But I'd like to hope that that doesn't cause delays in getting our legal advice because the two sub groups that are working on alternative proposals are heavily dependent on getting that legal advice. So I don't know if the CCWG is far enough along and what it needs as legal advice but I'd like to hope that that doesn't cause delays.

Now, where are we with ICANN on this? Because Theresa had told at least the chairs and the coordinators some time ago that we needed to define the requirements. Within a couple hours that will be done. Has - and I note that Theresa is not on the call. We need to get a status update and maybe Lise or Jonathan have a status update in terms of process with ICANN for making this thing happen.

So it'd be helpful to know where we're at there. And if really nothing has happened it's really important that something start happening and we get an estimate from ICANN in terms of bringing this thing together so that we can start the process.

Also I'd like to ask if thought has been given to what the process is for selecting a law firm to provide the advice. I know that - I'm glad to see that the client committee will be formed, hopefully that'll be formed this week if possible.

So - but what criteria are going to be used to choose a law firm? I think we all know there needs to be the not for profit California law expertise and access to other types of expertise and so forth. But I'm just curious how the decision is going to be made to select a particular law firm for obtaining the advice. And I'll stop there.

Jonathan Robinson: Chuck, I heard three questions, I think, or three points in that. Jonathan speaking for the record. First of all the synchronization with the CCWG, I think - I'll answer that. In my view this is about being coordinated but I take the points raised in the chat and elsewhere, including by yourself, that this must not slow us down. Point take and understood but nevertheless we need to keep in communication about that.

ICANN's role, as I understand it, is supportive and continuant on this brief, which we now have so I think there's nothing to stop us going ahead. I - Greg may comment further on that in addition also on the selection of the law firm. So I'll hold back for the moment and defer to Greg and happily come back in if necessary.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Jonathan. The short answer to the question is that Samantha Eisner from the General Counsel's office has been appointed as kind of the point person to deal with us. She participated actively in looking at the scoping document, though not all of her comments were taken, her comments were well taken. And I'll be looking to get back to her today to talk about the next steps and, you know, to move quickly on this - on this point.

As to how the lawyer will be selected, you know, I think that primarily would fall into the bailiwick of the client committee but with reference back to this group so that we don't just deliver a name like some sort of fully baked cake that this is now our counsel but would look for some feedback.

I've already collected a couple names on a short list but the short list is I think still a bit too short. I've also asked for, but have not yet received, a list of counsel that have been utilized by ICANN in the past and thus have - could be used again without a procurement process but that could be (Blunt) or not Jones Day.

And in any case, you know, we'd be looking at any of them critically. And in terms of the substantive qualifications we would, you know, clearly be looking for firms with both known expertise and a desire to work with us and the ability to work with us rapidly to meet our time scale and not have further delay.

I would think that we would, you know, need to have initial conversations, such as I'm having with a potential client after this call, where we hear something about them and their approach, their experience and see what kind of feeling we get about them. You know, these calls don't have to be long; there don't have to be long deliberations after them but we're not going to hire kind of sight unseen either. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Greg. Seun, did you want to come in at this point? While we wait for Seun I'll confirm that I've heard that we need to - as part of our overall time planning...

Seun Ojedeji: Hello.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...next item on the agenda we need to confirm the time scales for engagement and working with the law firm and make best reasonable efforts on that. Seun. Do we have you on mic, Seun?

Seun Ojedeji: Hello?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, is that Seun? Go ahead.

Seun Ojedeji: Hello. Can you hear me? Okay. This is Seun. Yeah, Greg, I have a - I think my question has not been answered so I'm going to ask it directly. What - has it been determined that ICANN is going to fund and provide resources for this particular process of getting the Council to (unintelligible) going to be free. Has that been determined? Do you have a confirmation from them that they're going to fund this, is my question. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Seun, yes, that's been confirmed at least informally. We don't have anything in writing although if I went back through my emails maybe we do in fact have something in writing. But as Jonathan said a few minutes ago, that is, you know, that - I would say the answer to that is yes.

Seun Ojedeji: Thanks. Thanks, that's all. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Thanks, Greg. I think we're hopefully pretty clear on that. We'll pull together any additions to the committee and work in that group to effectively manage that process. And make it as clear as possible to the group as part of our overall timeline planning what - how this is going to work.

Moving ahead then, and in probably appropriate point here is to start to think about some of the critical points in and around the timeline. As I said at the top of the - at the beginning of the meeting, there is now a pressing requirement to develop a new timeline, not only because we have been prompted to do so by the ICG but also because it's naturally good management of our process in any event.

There are a number of key dependencies which we've touched on. I'm not sure we need to flesh those out further at this point although there is a placeholder there if anyone wants to flag something that hasn't been covered or needs to be covered.

In addition, on the list we've shared a revised version of the flow chart which in itself is a schematic of the interrelationship between the different groups. I don't think it's all encompassing. And we'll naturally have limitations as it's a sort of one-page representation of what's going on. But providing it doesn't badly misrepresent anything it should be a useful document (unintelligible), I think.

I wonder if it's probably worth having a quick look at that and just seeing if in it's most recent - I think Marika did update it based on some of the recent comments that were submitted on list. And it's probably worth spending five minutes just talking through it and making sure that there are no significant concerns with it.

I'll make a couple of remarks and then take any questions or comments. As it's currently structured you'll see down the left hand side of your view there is our group developing a proposal which has - which is conditional on certain accountability requirements being met.

In other words, we replaced the wording of so called conditional accountability - it's the proposal that conditional and it's conditional on accountability requirements being met.

We submit that to our chartering organizations, ideally get their approval and hand that on to the ICG who is then aware that they have a proposal which, from this group's point of view, is substantial and complete, save the fact that it is dependent on certain key accountability points being put in place.

So as we move over the right we make sure that the accountability group is aware of that and on an ongoing basis. And as they finalize their Work Stream 1 recommendations and prepare to present that to their chartering organizations I guess we would hope and expect that those chartering organizations might - that we'll have direct communication with the chartering organizations and indeed with the CCWG as to the adequacy of those accountability requirements to meet our conditional proposals dependencies.

And in so doing this should be a feedback loop between us and the CCWG such that a - ideally they're not submitting a proposal to the chartering organizations that they're aren't confident through their continuous interaction with us is satisfactory to meet the requirements set out in our conditional proposal.

So I think what this charter attempts to do is draw that out, respect the role of the different groups, respect the role of the chartering organizations and their position in all of this but create a schematic which shows how feedback loops might work.

So let me pause there and see if there are any comments now. We can share this revised version with the list and look to improve it as necessary. But bear in mind that it's necessarily schematic and therefore limited and it may need additional documentation to go with it if that's not overdoing things.

But for the moment it's meant as a basis on which we can evolve a shared understanding of how the processes and the interrelationships between the groups might work which as you know is a concern for some if not all of us to make sure that as this process is being split into two, you know, the work of the accountability group and this group, that they are (unintelligible) and effectively coordinated and interdependent and this attempts to build part of that picture.

Just checking the chat for questions or comments. and feel free to raise your hand if you'd like to make any as well. Olivier, go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thanks, very much Jonathan. So thank you for this full diagram. I think a picture is 1000 words so that it really helps with seeing how things interlink. I would say that latest version actually encompasses more the - my understanding than the previous one.

A couple of questions though, on here you have some boxes which are conditional. For example, one being, "Receive communication from chartering organizations or CCWG (unintelligible) concerning whether accountability requirements have been met."



And it's conditional. There is only a yes answer on there which shows finalize transition proposal. What happens if we have no answer on it in the cases where we have a condition? Should we show on this diagram where this has to go in the case - whatever it is, the condition is, is not met.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Olivier. I think it attempts to do that - maybe I'm not answering your question - but it attempts to do that by the dotted line where there is - where to the extent that Work Stream 1 recommendations are - do not - are not sufficient to meet the conditions - the conditional proposals threshold, we feed that back and ideally do that prior to a final version being submitted to the chartering organizations.

Because clearly if it doesn't meet that threshold our proposal is insufficiently supported by the accountability requirements and it's kind of back to the drawing board. So we don't want that situation in which is why there's the dotted line in there. I'm not sure I've answered your question but I tried to.

Milton.

Milton Mueller: I'm looking at this now with my (ED) hat on and trying to figure out when the ICG would send the CWG IANA proposal in-com with the other proposals from protocols and numbers out for public comment. Is it at this final conditional proposal stage or is it the finalized transition proposal stage after you've gone through this Work Stream 1 situation with the Accountability Working Group? Do you understand the question?

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry, I didn't realize you hadn't finished.

Milton Mueller: No, I'm just asking - I heard silence so I was asking whether you understood my question which was rather rambling.

Jonathan Robinson: I think I understand it, Milton. And whilst this isn't necessarily a definitive answer, my view on this is we make a proposal, it's a conditional proposal, but it is a proposal that as far as we are concerned is complete and it - complete providing those conditions are met.

Therefore, it's insufficiently good state to go for public comment alongside or synthesized as the ICG may see fit with the other proposals it has received. So - I would think it's in a satisfactory state, notwithstanding its conditionality to go for public comment. That's, I think, my take on it.

Milton Mueller: Okay that's good. So you would say that that first - that first block where we receive final conditional proposal would be when we would be able to combine it and put it out for public comment?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. Olivier, go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you, Jonathan. Olivier Crépin-LeBlond speaking. And thanks for your explanation earlier with regards to the feedback loop. I would say it shows very faintly on my screen and this being a critical component we might wish to make that dotted line maybe yet another or color or stronger than what it currently is. Apart from that I'm happy with your answer. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Olivier. I note Chuck's point in response to Milton that there may be need for a second public comment period. And all of this is a little loose at the moment because we haven't spent the time to fully flesh out the timeline,

which is what we need to do over the next week, if we are to respond to the ICG in the timeframe they recently requested.

I'm mindful of our time on this call and the need to perhaps spend more time on other things. So let me just make one final remark on the timeline just to be very clear.

I think it's incumbent on this group to make best efforts to produce one or more timelines for communication to the broader community, including the ICG, between now and our next meeting on the 29th, one week from now such that we are in a position to, in effect, sign off on the communication of that time table or time tables with the appropriate targets a week from now and be able to communicate those. So that's where I think we're headed. And just to make sure it's clear on that - for that view.

And just to clarify why I say timelines, it may be that we produce a couple of different scenarios and that's why I think there's scope for a timeline or timelines as we begin to work on it depending on how firm we are on the dependencies it may be that it's the timeline has one or more end points based on activity on route.

So I think that leads into planning and understanding of where we are in the run up to Singapore. And, John, I note your point that it's dependent on the procurement of independent legal counsel. Clearly, that's one of the most critical dependencies and it has challenges with respect to the time scale so agreed, noted.

As we run - as we head towards Singapore, then, we have a possibility of producing communications webinars. And it'll be interesting to hear your comments on that.

I think the, in quotes, leadership team, the chairs and in consultation with the coordinators, had some reservations about producing webinars ahead of Singapore for two reasons. One, because of our readiness to do that in advance of the meeting when - and, second, which is kind of related, is our need to do as much work as we possibly can on refining and developing our work as opposed to communicating it ahead of the meeting.

So exactly, as Avri points in the chat. So I think we're a little on the fence about this at the moment so any comments about that would be welcome. But prior to commenting on the webinars - I know Chuck did put his hand up which may be relating to a previous point so, Chuck, come in now and let's hear from you on this or the previous point.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jonathan. It is on the previous point. Another dependency or - that would affect the timeline is obviously whether we do another comment period.

And I'll throw this idea out, we can talk about it in the coordinators and chairs group, but I wonder if it would be helpful for us to do a poll of participants in the working group regarding that particular idea; how many people really think that a comment period - another comment period will be needed before we finalize the proposal because that could add - if we go by the new comment guidelines that could easily add 40 days just for soliciting comments and you need more time to review them and incorporate them.

So I just throw that as an idea out. I'm not advocating one way or the other. But I think it would be good before we - next week prepare timeline or timelines to get a sense of the group as to how many really think another comment period is going to be very important. And I'll leave it at that just

something we can do between now and next Thursday when we have our other meeting.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, good question, Chuck. And I slightly misunderstood your chat comment in the sense I thought you were - and I think Milton was previously making the point about public comment on the ICG's proposal. Here I understand you to be making a point about public comment on our new proposal.

And I think it's timely - or not new - our updated and developed proposal. I think it's timely at this point to highlight where - before hearing about public comment to just make it clear what's likely to happen. And you'll see 5b in talking about Singapore talks about a discussion draft.

And what is being proposed here is that we will put out, ahead of Singapore, a discussion draft. Now that draft will be based on our previous proposal that went out for public comment, but it is insufficient to call that a full new revised draft because we don't have sufficient or arguably we don't have sufficient development of the proposal yet.

What we have is development in some areas, which we've referred to as convergence, recognition of key areas of divergence and recognition of key questions that need to be thoroughly debated and discussed in the community.

So the thinking here was to use the current draft that was put out for public comment, evolve that to the extent that we can based on the surveys, the discussions we've had, the various pieces of work in the RFP groups and so on and put out a discussion draft of the next - of the proposal such that those areas of convergence, divergence and key questions can be thoroughly tested in the community during the course of the Singapore meeting.

Then, thereafter, we should be - or we would ideally be heading towards a revised draft. And I think Chuck's question then is what happens in respect of public comment of that draft? And I suppose we could build in, in our scenarios, a - that we aim to sign off on next week on timeline, the existence or not of that public comment. And I think question (unintelligible) around that existence or not of public comment is the requirement to run a compressed timeframe public comment or not.

And Chuck makes reference to the new emerging standard of a 40-day public comment. And the question is does this group's work need to be subject to a 40-day public comment or can we do it as we did before in a shorter timeframe? And that's something, I mean, to discuss whether the work - the output of the group is ultimately compromised by a shorter public comment period.

So I think if you could all be thinking about that and perhaps discussing it in your own groups and be prepared to have a view on that either on list or now even but specifically when we come to really crunching out the timeline next time, that's going to be critical.

So I'll even put a bit of fuel on the fire and say that my personal view is that given the need to expedite this process or arguable need to expedite this process I would think that we should give good consideration to a shorter public comment period. So I'll kind of give, if you like, a view on that and welcome either supporting - similar views or any counterpoints.

Greg, you put your hand up just before I made the remark so go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Jonathan. I do agree with you. I think the shorter comment period should be sufficient but I would point out that there is kind of a second related thing which is not really a comment period but which also needs to have time allotted to it which is time for the SOs and ACs to come to the decision of whether to support the recommendation that we're making.

You know, our original plan we allotted 12 days for that which was kind of in lieu of a second comment period. But it's really - it's not a comment period because it's not a - it's not open to the world and it's really - it's triggering a process within each chartering SO and AC to come up with an internal result. So we have to leave time for that as well.

But I think that the all-comers comment period doesn't need to be 40 days because we're going to have not only time for that - we'll have that all-comers comment period but also the internal process period for responses by the SOs and ACs. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Greg. And I note your point in the chat at least we're coming to that now in terms of sessions for Singapore. So I hope we've given relatively clear idea of the thinking in terms of a discussion draft, what the purpose of that will be.

I'm afraid, given where we are, that draft will not be produced probably self-evidently in the - in what was - I don't know how well respected that is now - our previous window that was desired for discussion documents to be produced outside of I think it was three weeks ahead of a face to face meeting. That's not going to happen. It is going to come out in relatively shortly before the Singapore meeting so we will breach that guideline or convention.

As far as the meetings in Singapore itself we currently have at least a couple of meetings, in fact there's - this session scheduled for ICANN 52 shows our working meeting at 5:15 on the Wednesday. It shows a Q&A session on the Thursday.

But in addition to those the ICG is holding a meeting to which at least the co-chairs are invited to contribute. And of course all of you will be welcome to be there in person to the extent that you're at the meeting in Singapore.

There is - I know the various groups, the chartering organizations will be paying this attention in their own areas so - including the GAC (unintelligible) of course.

And, Chuck, I note your point - and this is the critical. The feasibility of a shorter comment period is dependent on how - these are not your words, these are my words - but how effectively we get representation from the groups and feedback loop to and from the respective chartering organizations.

So just to give you a perspective on that, the GNSO Council will be running a meeting on the 29th I think, next week, a week today, to focus specifically on bringing the Council and through its councilors, the GNSO, as up to speed as possible with all of the latest developments on this.

So whilst - whether or not we do webinars that process is happening. And I'm sure the different chartering groups will have their own mechanics for doing that but that's what's going on in the GNSO.

Olivier, go ahead.



Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you, Jonathan. Olivier Crépin-LeBlond speaking. Are there any plans to translate the resulting proposal in the five UN languages?

Jonathan Robinson: Good question, Olivier. Grace, is your hand up in response to that?

Grace Abuhamad: Yes, Jonathan. This is Grace Abuhamad. I just wanted to say that we do plan on translating all the - the agreement at the beginning of the CWG was to translate all the final documents so we would be doing that into all the ICANN-supported languages.

Jonathan Robinson: And related to that, Olivier, we - because of the sessions - because for two reasons - the two - generally our meetings, like this, are not subject to simultaneous or live translation but at the meeting itself in Singapore because it's a - well we have one session which is the Thursday session which is a Q&A session so that is more of a communication session.

And indeed we have a working meeting. And so the Q&A session naturally it makes sense to do - to make that as clearly communicated and translated as possible. And so we intend to do that.

And in addition, taking advantage of the presence of translators on site, we will ensure that our working meeting has the same services on Wednesday at 5:15, I believe, unless Grace tells me otherwise.

Thanks, Grace, for confirming that. I was just checking that that wasn't a new hand. So comments, questions, thoughts around logistics, plans for Singapore and any issues or matters related to that. Olivier, go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you, Jonathan. Olivier Crépin-LeBlond speaking. I note that on the Thursday of the Singapore meeting there is a session, CWG

stewardship questions and answers. And is this a case of questions being asked by the community or is this - how would that be set up?

Jonathan Robinson: Good point, Olivier. What - first of all my understanding is that this is a Q&A session as part of us communicating the work of this group, the outcomes of the work so far and potentially in a broad forum, the critical questions we're facing. So that's the way I see that meeting.

And as we - in the next week or so we will work with the support staff to prepare a set of slides that communicate along the lines of the - well, first of all any sort set the scene, any historic and background and work that's been done to date but in addition probably move on to also cover some of the scope in the discussion draft as well where there are significant open issues or challenging points to be dealt with.

So it's my view that we will use that slide deck to both - to varying affect depending on the meeting that's concerned but possibly to set the scene for that Q&A meeting as well and then do that. But of course, you know, any other comments on that Q&A meeting are welcome.

And I note, Matthew, that point. And you did make it previously as well and it hasn't, as yet, been acted on, the opportunity for this group whether we could take advantage of any more face to face time. I'm conscious that scheduling is a real challenge at the meetings so I'm highly sympathetic to taking advantage of being in the same place. But whether or not we can fit something in is a question of logistics as much as desire.

A related point is whether or not this group will need some form of further face to face time after Singapore. In discussing this with the coordinators and the chair yesterday, we felt that it was - that our intensive work weekend was

a pretty satisfactory way of moving things forward without the overarching logistics of making everyone travel to some single place in the globe.

So maybe that's something members of the group could also think about whether how supportive they are of another sort of semi-marathon type session along the lines of what we ran before. I mean, we've really got three options, I suppose, if I'm not constraining my imagination too much.

One, don't meet again after Singapore at all apart from these kind of meetings; two, meet in the way that we did over that intensive weekend where we got the coordinators and chairs together and brought everyone else in over the Adobe Connect facility; or, three, try and get everyone together for a face to face. So if there are comments or thoughts on that on list and in particular as the new time scales emerge and the new plans emerge that's also welcome.

So, Olivier, over to you.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you, Jonathan. Olivier Crépin-LeBlond speaking. And unfortunately I'm not going to be able to answer your question here directly. My question was to do with the fact we keep on referring as the face to face meeting but I also realize that some members of the working group may not be funded to be in Singapore. Has any consideration been made about that? I'm saying members, not participants.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Very good point, Olivier, again, it's inaccurate to refer to it as a face to face meeting in that sense; it is a meeting of the group which will take advantage of the fact that many members and participants will be in Singapore but it is not a face to face meeting of the group per se.

And also I was questioning, just to be clear, I was questioning that in addition to our meeting in Singapore where many of the group will or are likely be present, do we need to think about another either high intensity or face to face meeting - high intensity set of meetings or face to face meetings in the aftermath of Singapore? And if so we will need to factor that into our planning as well.

So the related question to that is was the high intensity weekend, in the view of the group, a satisfactory way of working? Eduardo.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Jonathan. Jonathan, it's Olivier still. If I may answer whilst I'm still here?

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead, Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: I would say it will largely depend - it will largely depend on the legal advice we receive and on how Singapore goes. If we find that everything finds consensus and so on then obviously it would be a waste of money and of time to have either the high intensity weekend or have a face to face - an additional face to face meeting.

But if there are big differences and problems that we need to fix or find consensus on then I would really suggest a high intensity weekend or a face to face, in fact with a face to face - depending really on the severity of the discussions. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Olivier. And that's a great answer because I didn't expect that we could necessarily have the answer right now but seed the thought in the group's mind. And thank you, Avri, for your comment that the high intensity was good.

Certainly my sense of talking to the - to my co-chair, Lise Fuhr, and the coordinators was that we felt we were productive. We were very sensitive to the potential criticism that such a meeting was in some way exclusive to face to face but it did seem to balance high productivity with cost effectiveness and logistical issues. So, you know, there is a compromise to be made there as well and that's something we were mindful of.

Eduardo.

Eduardo Diaz: Thank you, Jonathan. It's Eduardo. And my comment is in regard to the question and answer meeting in Singapore during Thursday. I suggest that to make it more effective for - or very focused - more focused that we go back to our organizations and ask the community through our organizations, you know, what kind of questions they want to be answered. So if we can get some of these questions beforehand it will be easiest for the flow of the meeting. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, and, thank you, Eduardo. And to that extent this preparatory discussion is as much about that as possible, it's getting as much work done to prepare for productive use of the time in Singapore.

I think we're almost at the point of going on to AOB. We did - just to deal with the topic that's gone on about whether or not we could link a face to face in some way with the Singapore meeting. Clearly that's, in many ways, a logical (decision) but there are issues with that that are sort of coming out in

the chat as well such as other commitments people might have around that meeting at this stage, previously scheduled travel arrangements, simple exhaustion on the back of a seven-day or more meeting. And so those are some of the challenges we face there.

I'm going to nudge us on to AOB now. I have a couple of very brief points I wanted to make and willing to hear from you any other points any of you would like to make. I'm sure there are some very attractive locations near Singapore to tempt us to stay on but there are real (practical) issues as well.

So as far as AOB is concerned, there were two, I just want to make it clear to the group that Lise and myself will talk with the ICG chairs I think later today and keep them informed, although I note that Elise has done a very good job to date of also listening in and participating in our meetings.

And, second, that we will also talk with the CCWG chairs tomorrow as part of the sort of background work that's going on and making sure that the coordination happens and that we work towards the prospective joint statement from the chairs of both groups to clarify where we are and cement the current position.

Any other comments, questions or input on - under AOB? And I note the theme of the chat about the prospective changes and marginal costs associated with adding something on. But I should let - I mean, from a personal point of view I arrive the Thursday before the meeting so by the following Thursday I've been there over a full week already and so.

Any other comments or questions? Well thank you. Please remain active, vigilant and engaged as you have done to date. We need all the help we can

get with 3, 3b, any preparation in advance of Singapore, timeline and so on.  
Thanks for your participation today.

I've spoken a lot from the chair but I feel it was necessary to try and  
synthesize where we are at the moment and given the point we're at I hope  
you have not felt that you have been unable to contribute for what you needed  
to do. And please do continue to do so. Thanks, Lise. Thanks, coordinators  
and thanks all of you for your work to date.

END