ICANN

Moderator: Nathalie Peregrine
February 19, 2015
5:00 am CT

Coordinator: The recordings have started. You may begin.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you. This is the 22nd meeting of the CWG Stewardship. Today is the 19th of February and it's 11 UTC. I'll turn it over to the chairs.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Grace. And welcome everyone to this meeting - 22nd meeting, wow. Feels like we should have done our job by now. So welcome to the first meeting post-Singapore. I suspect for some, including myself, a breather might have been desirable, a break this week. Some of us worked on the weekend or traveled back over the weekend so there's only been a few short days to get reoriented and prepared for this meeting. But on balance we decided to move ahead.

So I hope we can have a productive session. We've done some preparation work yesterday and in the run-up to the meeting. So I hope that puts us in a position to do what we can now. We'll do what we can and aim to have a productive session and keep the ball rolling as it were.

Obviously we had ICANN 52 in full glare of the ICANN community and arguably the broader community with an interest in this. And as I think I said in Singapore, this, to me and discussed this with Lise and others felt like a bit of a watershed. We're certainly aware and - that there are two proposals that have been submitted to the ICG. And to some at least we appeared to be struggling to make progress.

So there's definitely, in my mind, and in Lise's mind, having discussed it with here, a need to make and be seen to make demonstrable progress towards a comprehensive and complete proposal. That's not to say we won't do it with thoroughness and care but nevertheless we need to sort of focus on what the endpoint is going to look like in so far as that's possible.

We obviously had many session including a meeting of the CWG, our group, on Wednesday. I know for some of you that sort of felt (unintelligible) by the front desk a little and sort of very process-oriented. I think it felt to us that, to some extent, that was necessary probably for two reasons; one, because of a need to rethink the processes and the mechanics of how we work; and, two, because to some extent although it was cast as a meeting of the CWG, it was very obviously a public and highly visible meeting. So it necessitated doing things a little differently.

I know when we went then into the Thursday meeting with the Q&A we got encouraging feedback from you and from others in the community about the substance we went into. And so that's something we'll pick up on to the extent that we can in 2a on the agenda next.

But it's just a reminder that overall we did commit to a sort of refreshed and refocused approach. We're not going to do an about turn but we are going to need to, as I said, continue to make progress and be seen to be making

progress and work towards functional, implementable and complete plan and give the sense and the immediate sense really, of the emergence of that kind of plan.

So one of the key things we'll focus on is ensuring that any part of the plan that we work on has the functional requirements defined up front so we're very clear what we're working on by defining it - by defining the area we're working on, the requirements of that component and then work towards the solutions. And obviously we'll pick up on that a little more in Item 4 which is another sort of process-oriented point.

I think just prior to the recording starting Avri asked about the RFP groups. And I know when you made reference to the - I think it's the NCSG proposal or in any event the proposal that you've been working on, Avri, there was a reference to RFP 3. I think we are likely to try and work in a different way where we don't necessarily run RFP 3 meetings as such but focus more on smaller groups, the taskforces that focus on smaller chunks of work but then feed back into the sort of committee of the whole.

In any event, I think everyone is likely to be involved in at least two meetings per week. And in a sense your - I'm not saying there's going to be big brother watching you - but you should measure your own active participation by probably participating in at least two meetings a week if you are able to.

That's the full meeting of the CWG every Thursday at the alternating times that we've been running it at and in addition to that one or more - contributing to one or more taskforce meetings. And I think that's the way we're likely to work going forward.

So while we - that deals with Item 1 really. Okay thanks, Avri, for clarifying that; it's not an NCSG proposal as such but rather three of you who happen to be NCSG members.

Let me just pause for a moment if there are any other additional questions or comments before we go onto Item 2. And I will note that I didn't ask for a formal roll call but I'm assuming we're working to the process we have previously which is we will record everyone in the Adobe Connect room as present at the meeting and those that are not able to be in the Adobe Connect room but are on the audio should please make themselves be known now. So I'll pause for anyone to make themselves known if they are not in the Adobe Connect room now.

Chuck Gomes: Hey, Jonathan, this is Chuck Gomes. I'm not in Adobe Connect and I'll be in and out a little bit on audio because I'm heading to the airport.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Chuck. All right so we assume we have present or we work on the fact that we have present everyone who is currently in the Adobe Connect room and in addition Chuck who's joined us - Chuck Gomes - who's joined us over the telephone.

So let's move then onto Item 2 which is the mechanics and approach to processing outputs from ICANN 52. Now, I mean, there have been various comments around the intensity, diversity and the type of sessions that took place. I made a couple of remarks on that in the opening remarks as well relating to the Wednesday and Thursday sessions.

But clearly there was a session hosted by the ICG, there were various other sessions both Lise and myself were present and/or participating in each of the CCWG meetings. And so what we've done is taken a twofold approach to this

in the first instance at least. And it'll be helpful to have any comment or input you might like to provide on that.

With respect to the sessions as a whole, Grace has gone through all of the transcripts and essentially pulled out the transcripts and to the extent that it appears relevant there - any references that were made to questions or comments and put those through in a form of sequence of the different sessions. And so at present that forms a large document that is essentially a reference point.

Now talking with Lise a little bit before the meeting we felt that at minimum this would be useful as a reference point going forward for any work on the principle proposal or indeed any contributing work that the taskforces undertake to be able to cross reference, and for the group as a whole, to be able to cross reference this.

I think it's hyperlinked, Grace, from the table of contents so you can go through to the different points in the document. So a couple of thanks to Grace in the chat. But let me see if there are any other comments, if anyone else would like to put up a hand, comment or question this.

But it's certainly an attempt to produce an integrated - summary is not the right word but an integrated document that covers the sessions pertinent to the work of this group where the work of this group was the primary topic or a component of the work including, for example, the first one which is the GAC session on Sunday 8th of February.

All right, I'm not seeing any hands or questions now. I'd obviously encourage you to look at this. If you have any suggestions as to how this could be better developed or - but in any event I hope it'll provide a useful reference point.

Now Berry Cobb from staff, who's also one of the staff members working with us on the group, has taken this a step further and worked on the Q&A work.

And just a quick reminder there what we did was we - instead of producing a revised proposal, as you know, we produced a discussion document, a document that really describe the work of the CWG to date and some of the key issues and challenges we're faced and in particular segmented out the model as associated with potential separation of the IANA function from ICANN and then sought to ask a series of nine questions.

We dealt with those two ways; we asked people whenever we could to be looking at those questions and thinking about those questions in their groups and to provide responses. We made it clear, I hope, that those responses were not to be in the form of highly tied down and specific statements but rather more general responses to the questions as they were asked.

And then we dealt with those questions systematically in our session on Thursday and we made progress to around Question 4 or 5 from memory. So that's what we did. And then we made it clear that we would remain open to written responses to those questions. And I'll highlight that with the group now - that we do remain open.

There was some ambiguity whether it was until today or tomorrow but in essence a week from the session we held on Thursday the 12 so up to today or tomorrow, it's not a desperately - if something creeps in tomorrow we're hardly going to say it's not relevant but we do want to draw a line under it.

So we'll say no later than let's say approximately close of business UTC on Friday so 1800 UTC Friday the 20th. We won't - we'll draw a line under responses. As it happens we're not receiving any written responses either through members and participants to the list or to the extent ah people don't have access groups don't - people or groups don't have access to members or participants we haven't received anything but we are receptive to receiving input via Grace whose email has been publicized for that purpose.

What Berry has done - Berry, let me hand over to you and let you just say a word. Personally I found this a useful format at least to review the input so let me hand over to you and just - to describe what you've done and see if there are any comments or questions relating to that.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Jonathan. This is Berry Cobb for the record. So as Jonathan mentioned basically what I've taken is the extrapolation that Grace had taken from the transcripts of the Thursday morning session and imported them into - everybody knows I love spreadsheets so I imported it into a table form delineated by the question type and then of course segmented by the particular individual or person that was making a particular comment or responding to the question in our forum.

And what I tried to do is to flush out like responses or categorize, for lack of a better word, the responses to those questions. So for example the first one, you know, is almost pretty much a simple yes/no kind of response. Do you believe that the transition from the NTIA should happen and please provide a reason.

So we're - those persons that seemed to support that the transition would go I would flag it over to the right as a yes or if there was opposition to or disagreement that the transition should happen I would flag it as a no.

And then in simple terms some of the responses it wasn't exactly clear whether it was a true yes or no and I tried to remain objective, you know, knowing the - who participated on the group and their positions. I could have tried to say well, yes, I know that Milton Mueller, for example, does support the transition and, you know, I could easily select a 1 or not. So I tried to remain objective but isn't perfect.

Where it becomes a little bit more detailed is starting with the second question which is, you know, dives a little bit deeper into the substance of where the proposal may go. And from there there were more attributes that started to emerge from the responses such as that there was support for internal accountability versus external oversight or if somebody had mentioned that some form of agreement needed to occur then I would try to flag that here.

So I'll just conclude that we're only done two questions so far but if the group finds this useful we'll go ahead and continue to move forward with the remaining seven questions.

And lastly I'll state that, you know, while we're - the flagging of these attributes is really just for a quicker read of the responses; none of this will be tabulated in any way to try to show that there's weight towards one position or another, it's really just kind of a quicker way to highlight some of the responses and some of the key attributes to that response.

So with that I'll turn it back over to you, Jonathan, and thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Berry. There's a couple of points coming up in the chat about, A, reminding on written responses; B, questioning whether written responses will be added to this; and, C, whether we'd consider an extension.

My thoughts are yes, written responses should be added. Two, yes, we should send reminders out and I would like to ask that members take this on board themselves and communicate back to their groups to remind them that they can utilize members for this purpose and should submit written responses as soon as possible.

As to extending the deadline, I think it would be very useful to try and deal with this at least in part, although this will form a reference point, I'm not 100% sure how we would deal with this. I think it would be useful to deal with this as part of our ongoing work. And I'm ever-mindful of this balance between making sure we include as much input as possible yet continue to move forward.

My temptation is to perhaps stretch the deadline out to Monday so something like 1800 UTC Monday which will give at least two or possibly even three more business days to provide responses.

Whilst additional responses are important, at this point we aren't strongly quantifying the output of this. This will be a reference point to guide the writing of the document. So that feels like it will accommodate the requirements. But let me pause now to respond to the hands that have gone up. First from Martin Boyle.

Martin Boyle: Thanks, Jonathan. Martin Boyle here. I was under the impression that you were looking for inputs to the questionnaire from members and participants. And that seems to be what you were saying when you referred to working back through the various organizations like, for example, the ccNSO. Are you actually shutting it off to individual organizations putting input in?

Jonathan Robinson: Martin, my understanding - and I thought we had communicated this - was that we would take input from members and participants or through members and participants. Ideally that input was representative - as representative as possible of the organizations they represent but acknowledging that that wasn't always possible.

I think we're seeking for any member or participant that made that contribution to qualify whether or not that was simply their own opinion or representative of the group they were a representative of. I hope that's clear.

Martin Boyle: Thanks, that's very helpful, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Martin. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I'm sensing something here that I didn't have going into this meeting and that is you're explicitly looking for input from the organizations that are present around this table. And that implicitly means that if we don't submit something, you know, our views are perhaps going to be somewhat discounted.

Certainly from an ALAC point of view we had not planned to go through this and give you formal answers to the questions. But if that means, you know, that we have effectively less input into the process, if we're not represented in this chart then that of course has to change. So that's different from what I thought this was the document largely for the rest of the community to provide their input to augment what we're doing. So I would appreciate some clarity there.

Jonathan Robinson: Alan, I'll let others offer their clarity as well but my understanding was that we made it available to the broader community which includes ICANN

SO and ACs, members, participants and frankly anyone else who was participating in ICANN 52 for us to get as broad a possible set of inputs.

We weren't looking specifically for position statements from the different groups, formalized position statements but rather diversity of inputs to guide the work of the group.

Alan Greenberg: Forgive me for coming back. I'm not 100% sure what that means. Assuming that people on this group are representing, in our case At Large and ALAC, does that mean you need the additional comment in writing formally answering these questions or not or...

Jonathan Robinson: Alan, my personal view is no, that to the extent that you are confident of the views but to some - we just gave cover to those that felt they were unable to solicit and or represent the views of their groups to say that this is my personal opinion...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Jonathan Robinson: ...to not shut them off from providing that input either. So it's almost the opposite way around I think that's the way I understood it at least.

Alan Greenberg: And that's the way I understood it going into it also. I had just gotten a little bit - anyway okay we're talking on the same wavelength, that's fine.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Alan. Any other comments or questions? And clearly these can come out in the interim as well. This doesn't include a summary of all of the questions, it's a start and a proposed format with which to record the input that we receive.

Okay well we will continue to take input up until Monday next week. We will process all of the input, in other words that received at the Thursday session and any other written input received. I am not sure that we will be able to quantify it more than has been done on the table but if anyone has any smart ideas as to how better or otherwise to deal with this data by all means provide that.

But in the meantime it's a reference point for all of us should we be either preparing documents or cross referencing our principal document or contributions to our principal document against this to see whether it passes for one of a better expression as sort of (unintelligible) against the opinions expressed through this process.

Okay let's move us along then to Item 3 which is an update on the work of the client committee and the seeking of legal advice. I think I'll hand that over to Greg Shatan. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Jonathan. Greg Shatan for the record. And in terms of the client committee it looks like we are trying to schedule another meeting of the client committee for tomorrow. We still have the same - probably so much the same short list that we had before. We have - it's a total of six (terms) on the list although one may drop off due to a conflict. They represent an active IRP complainant, if you will and therefore their adverse to ICANN in that sense.

What we need to do is schedule calls between the client committee and the kind of a finalist firm. And I think we'll talk about how to do that on our client committee call tomorrow. We're still waiting from a couple of the firms they are kind of a capabilities document. We did receive a couple while we work in Singapore so we want to have, you know, potentially the same type of

information from all of the firms in that regard before we - not before we talk to them but kind of as we make our judgment.

And I think the intent is really to make (unintelligible) and talking on my cell phone. The intent is to I think make next week a very busy week in terms of the client committee and closing in on a firm and dealing with details of the engagement. We'll need to sign an engagement letter which is basically a contract to give the legal services.

We will need to figure out how to manage the relationship of this committee and the CCWG's client committee and also ICANN who has been participating in the law firm kind of selection and discovery process.

I've also been participating in the CCWG's legal committee. And we had a meeting while we were in Singapore and move forward on kind of the same thing. So we're really looking at this point at the same list of firms. So while we might not kind of merge the two committees I think there will be a heightened amount of coordination between the legal and client committees of the two - of the two groups so that we can likely make a joint decision.

Clearly is our needs seem to diverge from theirs, to the extent that a single law firm, you know, wouldn't be the right choice for both then we will, you know, we'll deal with that. But basically the firms we're looking at I think it's highly unlikely that would be the case. So, you know, all the firms are large US firms with just significant presences in California. Some are California-based, some are based elsewhere but all have strong California bases, strong corporate governance and deep familiarity with California law including nonprofit law.

So, you know, I would expect that probably 95% chance that we would select the same firm of the CCWG. And I still think we will be on our schedule to

engage a law firm by the end of the month. If that goes off it'll go off only by days and not by anything longer than that. We'll certainly have done this in, you know, in discussions and think about before that time. I think that's it. And if there are any questions happy to take them.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Greg. I'll keep an eye on the Adobe. I notice Andrew Sullivan's point of view in the chat that in his - from his perspective a single law firm is essentially a hard requirement of the process in that almost like a necessary condition in order to be able to deliver things on time.

Personally I'm very sympathetic to the use of a single law firm. I think it- I mean, just from a kind of...

Greg Shatan: Yeah, that's absolutely the direction that we are going in. And I don't see any reason why that wouldn't be the result. The only reason for the result is if somehow in looking at our work methods or issues somehow we diverge from our original plan so markedly that a different kind of advice is needed but frankly I don't see that happening.

And the more that I, you know, spent time talking to Leon Sanchez, who is leading the client - or the legal committee on that end and other members of their committee, the more it became apparent to me that the - that our needs are aligned.

I see another question in the chat from Seun. "Greg, you mentioned six had been short listed and more may drop based on conflict. If I may ask, what factor determines conflict in this context?"

Conflict of interest rules are ethical rules that are standard pretty much under US law firm ethics rules. They're not laws but they are rules that are adopted

on a state by state basis. Basically it would be if a law firm that we were talking with was already directly adverse to ICANN in a litigation or litigation type environment.

If a law firm had represented a counterparty to ICANN in a transaction or is currently representing, rather, then that typically is waivable conflict or not a conflict at all. It's not a case that anybody who's ever dealt with ICANN or been (unintelligible) ICANN or represented ICANN is conflicted out; it's an analysis that takes place on the basis of the facts and circumstances in each case.

And it's - the nuances could take the rest of this call. And indeed most law firms have a specialist lawyer who spends all their time determining whether conflicts exist in particular client arrangements and then resolving those conflicts if they're waivable. I'd say probably in half the cases where lawyers think there's a conflict the specialist tells them that they're actually wrong. Lawyers tend to over-identify conflict.

I see Mark Carvel thinks this is moving forward painfully slowly. Well, there's a lot going on behind the scenes. I do think that, you know, being in Singapore - weren't able to keep up necessarily the pace to the same extent especially given time differences.

But as I said, I think that we will - we are having a meeting of the client committee tomorrow and I, you know, expect that we will try, especially toward the early part of next week, to schedule calls with the finalists with an eye toward having a - I'd say at least a tentative recommendation for next week's call this time next week. That would be my goal and I think that's a doable goal and keeps us on track for our end of month engagement.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Greg. And then in addition and in part response to Mark Carvel's comments the objective of the work method is - and we'll come to this in a moment, is specifically that we don't get slowed down by something like the legal advice becoming a rate limiting factor. So we recognize its importance but remove it from the critical path in - well, not in the final event but at least in the short term put it in a parallel path.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: I see Eduardo asking, "Are we going to have some..." Sorry, Jonathan, go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: You go ahead, Greg, it's fine.

Greg Shatan: Okay, thanks. Eduardo Diaz asks, "Are we going to have some legal advice before the proposed face to face in March?" I think that if we have, as I expect, counsel engaged, around the end of February and we have basically three weeks between then and March, that we absolutely will have advice by then. Whether we have a full written formal deliverable, which is, as I've said before, not the - it may be the ultimate end of this exercise but it's not the primary end of this exercise, it think that we will have a significant amount of advice on the issues before us before the face to face.

And I would hope far enough in advance of the face to face to have been able to consider that legal advice in advance of the face to face and at least in one meeting either a regularly scheduled meeting or another meeting of this group.

And so I think that's - that's the idea is that we would have, you know, a good three weeks with counsel and we would be able to have the necessary dialogue with them, bring stuff back to this group maybe even as soon as the

first meeting of March but certainly by the second meeting of March so that we have, you know, the kind of course setting and advice on what we're looking at versus what they might recommend and advice on how to improve some of the things we're looking at or how to choose amongst them or perhaps discard certain ones that would be the - kind of the result of a good back and forth with the lawyers.

You know, how exactly we will work with the lawyers, you know, with the client committee versus this committee of the whole versus some intermediate subgroup is something to explore. We can't necessarily have the lawyers available to every member of this group on an equal basis or else we would run up a very high legal bill very fast. And while there's no formal cap on the amount I think that would be not cost effective.

Nonetheless, we need to make sure that the legal advice is transparent and that issues that are on people's minds of being important gating issues are fully answered so that we can move on. As noted in the chat, these are, you know, dependencies. The legal advice is a critical dependency and therefore a high priority.

So I will keep people advised on the list as to the progress that we make tomorrow and over the course of the following week so that kind of, you know, watch things unfold in more or less real time. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Thanks again, Greg. And thanks for the comments and questions relating to that item. I note Mark Carvel's effectively closing comment there that the ability to make recommendations within administrations will depend on at least in part, although he says just depend on the position afforded by the legal opinion. Thanks, Mark. Thanks everyone else.

Greg Shatan: Jonathan, if I could just respond briefly to that. Legal opinion is a term that - of art in the sense in the law which usually means a formal written, capital O, opinion, of a law firm or less informally - or less formally, a full definitive kind of written memorandum, you know, on everything that goes on.

Initially the advice that we're getting - going to get - is more on the kind of oral and email level. It may be more telegraphic or at least not the precision and kind of heft. If people are looking for a full written document to take back to their groups, that is not necessarily going to happen so quickly. Those type of things tend to take a while to write.

The primary purpose in my mind is to get the kind of transactional advice that lawyers give their clients while they're trying to make a project move forward. So in the end I expect we will have a formal deliverable in the form of a definitive memorandum but if that is a gating factor in and of itself, which I don't think it should be, that is not going to come - is unlikely to come, I would say, before the face to face because I think, you know, it would be - the back and forth and kind of counseling that we need is really what has to take precedence during that period. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Greg. Olivier, your hand is up.

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

Greg Shatan: Yes.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Okay thank you. With this legal advice that's unlikely to reach us within the next month or so, and with the importance of this legal advice being recognized by many, including members in our community, in At

Large, I am getting a sense that our hands are somehow tied until that legal advice comes in.

Could you or anyone on the call, explain how we were able to move forward in the meantime and not be tied to this? Because I'm really concerned as far as timing is concerned. And this is a worry because it seems to be delaying us in proceeding and having a good proposal that's on the table. So I'd appreciate some clarification on this. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Olivier, I would like to ask you to hold that question. Greg, if you want to make a brief response but ideally I'd like to hold that question until later once we've dealt with the next couple of sections which deal with interim work and how we will work, what we can reasonably hope to achieve and then if the answer is (unintelligible) not clear to revisit that question.

Greg Shatan: If I could just briefly state that kind of reiterating what I said before, we'll start getting legal advice from the law firm as soon as they're engaged. That advice is not going to take the form of definitive lengthy legal opinions but rather the form of kind of, you know, back and forth which we'll try to document in, you know, emails or, you know, brief - in very informal memoranda.

But it's not that we're going to have to wait for some long memo to get, quote unquote, the legal advice. That may be a ex post facto summary of the legal advice we get but the legal advice we're going to get is (confident). Basically, you know, lawyers perform kind of as coaches in this. So to say that the legal advice only comes when the game is over would be incorrect. The legal advice will come while we're working.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Greg. I'm going to move us onto the next item and then, Olivier, I will encourage you to come back if a combination of Greg's answer and/or the

other items we deal with in 4, 5 and 6 don't help with a vision and a view of where we go moving forward.

So as you know, in Singapore we talked about work methods. And I mentioned that again at the start of this call. So what we've asked Bernie Turcotte, who is helping us from staff support to do, is to try and capture those work methods in the form of some draft documents which we will share with you immediately after the call and in the meantime I'll ask Bernie to work through those and describe to you - there's really three document.

One describes the proposed working method. Two describes the function of the taskforces in that method. And, three, is an initial indicative format for the creation of those taskforces. So let me hand over to Bernie for Item 4 and he can talk you through the concept and detail on those three documents.

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you, Jonathan. And I think it'll take a second to get the documents up. And then we'll get going. The - I think, as you noted, we will be proposing something to keep us working productively while we do wait for the legal advice. Grace, you get a hold of the documents? I guess the first one will be the working method one. We've got four documents there. I see Grace is working furiously at getting this up on our screen.

Is basically the concept I'll lead off a bit, from my own version here, hold on a sec. Okay, that. Oh, here we go, all right. So we're proposing to modify the work methods is develop the next version of the CWG transition proposal on a continuous basis. Do not wait to have all answers before putting pen to paper. It's an evolving proposal document that will be available to all.

We want to break up the work into manageable pieces so that a small group of participants, which we'll call a taskforce, can take on that specific piece to

deliver the proposal's text for the transition proposal, which will be reviewed by the CWG. We're going to focus on elements for which we have a green or that should be common to all models, internal or external, such as SLAs. One of these, continuous process to review active taskforces weekly, this is progress, issues and deliverables.

Sections of RFP 1 and 2 of the original CWG draft proposal of 1 December, are complete but contain significantly more information when compared to the protocols and address proposals submitted to the ICG. Therefore, an editorial objective will be to streamline our proposal so that it's similar to the other two, more accessible to the average reader and simpler to compare for the ICG.

Given that we're extending the time anything that's going to make this simper to process for the general public and especially the ICG, I'm certain will be welcome. I'll continue to hold the pen for the proposal and would distribute a current version of the document for our weekly calls.

So basically the idea, as you can see here, is really not to wait but to get going and keep developing the proposal as we go and not wait to have all the answers canned before we put pen to paper.

The taskforce is a small group of qualified people focused on a highly specific issue with the clear deliverable identified at the formation and with a time limited schedule that is part of the critical path. But we're talking about taskforces that have direct responsibilities for producing the segment of the transition proposal we are to prepare.

A taskforce should deliver work in a short period, two weeks or less, according to the mandate and will be dissolved after delivery of work product. Failure to deliver will affect the overall product - project schedule.

Meetings of the full CWG, or the CWG mailing list, will review the current state of the overall draft proposal, identify the need for new taskforces, review progress of ongoing taskforces and review output of any taskforces that have completed their work.

Taskforces that complete their work will be disbanded and new ones will be created to address new issues and points of convergence as we continue to develop the proposal. Summary work processes will be written and outcomes of the taskforce will need to be agreed by the CWG.

So that's the general lay of the land that we're proposing for moving forward. And I guess we can take questions on this part if there are any. There are a couple of more parts that follow this one. We'll describe the guidelines for taskforces in more details on the next one. I'll hand it over to Jonathan now.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Bernie. Please could you leave that up on the screen? We haven't taken any questions or comments. So I'll make two comments on that. One, that the objective clearly states that the idea is to make progress on the transition proposal, in brackets, while waiting for legal advice. So that's the key objective is to continue to make in definable and measurable progress.

Second, we highlight in the component on the taskforce that it should be a small group of qualified people. And I would think a reasonable question is what determines a qualified person.

I think the - in my mind there's two criteria that determine someone who's qualified; ideally someone with relevant expertise. So if you're going to be working on SLAs, which is our working example, ideally you have been the customer or supplier of an SLA-based piece of work before and have clear

experience of either executing according to an SLA contract or receiving services based on that. So that would be one example.

Second point on qualified is that you have the time to commit in short order to be able to contribute to that specific subject. So those are a couple of points. Any other questions or comments relating to this?

Stephanie, go ahead, I'm pressing the wrong button here. Go ahead.

Stephanie Duchesneau: Hi, this is Stephanie Duchesneau for the transcript. One of the things - and we've been talking about this a little bit on the Registry side, is that for the development of SLAs may be better to have some of our people on the operational side (unintelligible) on the policy side working on this.

I don't know if there's any flexibility. I know the plan is to have these limited strictly to existing participants of the working group but to extend is to that people who have actually been working and are very familiar with the IANA SLAs could participate in the shorter body of work but who might not have interest or bandwidth to contribute to being a participant in the full CWG. I don't know if there's the possibility of any flexibility around that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Stephanie. I'll throw this open to responses. But my personal view is that there's really two ways we can deal with this. We either accept that taskforces, you know, perhaps we could say something like it needs to be led by a member of a participant but is potentially open to nonmembers or participants to contribute especially if they are qualified by demonstrable relevant expertise. That may be one basis we could do it.

An alternative is to - and this seems perhaps unnecessarily bureaucratic is to require anyone who wants to participate in a taskforce to join the group as a

participant understanding that they may not be able to contribute in full as a participant but have a specific role.

So those seem like to practical points. I mean, I see Jaap puts in the chat that taskforces can always consult with experts. I guess that's a reasonable point, Jaap. The only issue here is we were hoping to define the taskforces by a list of participants really to - with two objectives in mind.

One, to make sure it was transparent who was actually contributing. And, two, to sort of manage the numbers a little bit such that we - they didn't get unwieldy in terms of overly large and also that there was potential for members or participants to contribute to multiple taskforces.

So, Greg, I'm going to come back to you assuming you aren't dealing with this specific point and go to Alan, assuming he is responding to this.

Alan Greenberg: I'm not longer sure what "this" is.

Jonathan Robinson: The point being the question on whether - Stephanie's question that she asked about whether or not it was acceptable for taskforces to contain members of contributors other than members or participants.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: My question is not related to that. Jonathan, my question is not related to that, it's a separate one.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Alan. I heard you. I'm just checking if there's anything else on this topic. Thank you. We'll come back to you then in a moment. Okay I will propose that we do allow nonmembers to participate in taskforces. Perhaps we

might say subject to them not being in the majority so as a minority contribution in numbers. And if anyone wants to pick this up in any further detail on the list that's what I suggest we do. It's a practical opportunity for experts to contribute but not necessarily dominate or hijack a taskforce.

And, Greg, you're next in the queue.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Jonathan. Greg Shatan for the record. My comment is kind of, you know, more broadly kind of a thought on the work method and the taskforces. And I think clearly getting taskforces to deal with discrete issues is important, critical. But I think it's also critical that we don't lose the forest for the trees.

I think that - two kind of overarching thoughts. One, I don't think that meetings of the whole group only once a week between now and the face to face will be sufficient. I think that when we were under the previous methodology we were effectively having meetings, you know, between this and the - and the RFP groups at least kind of three times a week and managing, to cover a lot of substance in those calls.

I'm sure there are future calls of the group as a whole will be more substance-oriented. Obviously this is a course-resetting discussion here. But I think that, you know, whether we call it RFP 3 or another meeting of the whole I think we need to have a meeting between now and next week - next week's meeting - to discuss issues of structure. I think that there have been a lot of discussions about structure and trying to work the different documents or possibly hybridize these models.

While I think that, you know, there is the need for legal advice before that discussion can go too much further there's a lot of kind of bottled up thoughts and discussions on this not just the model that Avri and others have been work

for but others. So I think that devoting our next call - our next Thursday's call to that will probably not work. And I think that we should try to put something together before that.

I also think between now and the need of - and March in order for us to march forward we'll need to work on more than a once weekly basis. If we get work back from the taskforces, which are intended to, you know, not to finish projects but to bring them to the full group for further discussion and finishing two hours a week is not going to be enough.

So I think that's - and my last point which is kind of unrelated but I - it also goes to both the issues of these taskforces and our tasks, is that it's clear that what we need to deliver is a turnkey proposal. And by that I mean it needs to include all of the elements in a way that they can be implemented literally the day that the IANA function contract expires or is terminated.

So the SLAs and escalation documents and any other documents that are agreements or documentation of how things work need to be done. If there are groups such as the CSC that exist they're going to need to be chartered so charters will need to be done.

So I know that in the GNSO we often tend to think about policy and then leave implementation to staff with our guidance. But we have to do policy and implementation in this group so I think I just, you know, kind of want to bring that up. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: So two good points, Greg. One, a proposal to have more than one meeting per week to focus on implementation in addition to the sort of policy components of this if you want to call it that.

Greg Shatan: And also not to lose the big picture...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry, Greg, could you repeat that?

Greg Shatan: Yes, I said also, you know, the thrust of my first comment was not to lose the big picture, not to lose the forest for the trees. And I think we need to, you know, not just discuss these issues about structures on the list but, you know, make them the subject of a meeting whatever, you know, we call that meeting.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, that's an interesting point. And I was wondering, as you were saying that, whether we made one meeting on substance and one on - on a - well not on substance but on a specific core topic, you know, focused in and around a core topic one or more core topics. But I think maybe we'll tie ourselves up if we do that unnecessarily. I think we can flex that as we need to.

So the question is is there a willingness. And could you remind me when the RFP 3 meeting was conducted?

Greg Shatan: Typically we conducted them Monday and Friday at 1400 UTC.

Jonathan Robinson: So if this was a meeting of the group we would need to at least consider alternating the various meetings. Let's take that as a proposal. I mean, in one way it would be good to poll the group. I mean, it feels to me like that's a pretty strong motivation. I wonder if we could poll the group on a willingness to meet twice a week? Staff, is it possible to run a poll quickly now?

Grace Abuhamad: Sure, Jonathan. This is Grace. I can prep that for you. Give me a few minutes.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, let's go to Alan while we prep that poll. Alan, you're next in the queue. Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. The word "qualified" has me a little bit perturbed. Clearly we don't want unqualified people but many of us in this group are, I would put in the category of generalists and not necessarily qualified. Qualified, in some sense, either means you need to be a technologist who's doing this for a living, whatever the particular aspect of the task is, or very often, from the way we're looking at things, a lawyer. And I'm not quite sure how we're defining qualified in this case.

Jonathan Robinson: Alan, could you play back to me what you heard when I defined qualified and then we'll see if we are in agreement on that.

Alan Greenberg: No I can't play it back. We were talking about qualified then we were talking about bringing in subject matter experts. And I guess I have some fuzzy level of what you are qualified at for a particular task if you're not the subject matter expert.

Jonathan Robinson: All right so that's a good point. I think there were two questions. One, I made some opening remarks about what defined qualified. Two, we had a specific question as to whether subject matter experts who were not members or participants could participate in taskforces and so doing contribute.

I think we agreed that that was the case. And I suggested and got no opposition to having subject matter experts participate in taskforces who were not necessarily members or participants of the CWG subject to them - the collective grouping of those subject matter experts not being in the majority on any given taskforce. So that dealt with the subject matter experts.

Separately dealing with qualified, I realize we're on - in slightly potentially uncomfortable territory so I acknowledge your point here. The way I attempted to define it was twofold. One, that in order to be qualified you had some form of demonstrable expertise to the particular subject of the taskforce.

And quite how you measure that I realize we could spend the rest of the call on. So it's going to have to be a subject to test or a test that the participants ask themselves, "Am I suitably qualified to contribute or could someone else who's volunteering contribute better?" So there's - one issue is a - that form of qualification, expertise, if you like.

And the second was - a second qualification I referred to was that you had enough time to contribute in short order, in other words, over the next week or two, to the work of that taskforce. So and I made the example of someone who had direct experience of either supplying a product that - or service subject to an SLA or being the purchaser of a product or service subject to an SLA.

Alan Greenberg: If I may have a follow up? Yes, I caught all of that; it's the, you know, SLAs are easy because we have SLAs in all sorts of businesses and most of us have experienced something related to SLAs. I don't have a list of what's the other known tasks are at this point so it's a bit harder for me to give the counter argument. But let's just leave it at the fact that I have a little bit of unease that many of us on this group may be excluded because we are not qualified in the particular subject that the task may be about. As, you know, we're not unqualified...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: ...may not have particular credentials.

Jonathan Robinson: Accepted and acknowledged, Alan. It's not meant to be exclusive but it's meant to recognize that there's going to be multiple parallel tasks going on and ideally participants in the taskforce should put themselves through that - their own scrutiny to say am I best (unintelligible) and where can I best contribute in these areas of specific expertise.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: So thanks, Alan. Let's make a - let's take the poll now. And I don't see Donna's comment but I saw a reference to it and I imagine that's sensitivity on time zones. Yeah, Donna, I do scroll up and see that now. And of course that's relevant because it depends on where they are. And that's a natural challenge we face.

So - well, I mean, I think subject to that point it's pretty evident that we see somewhere in the upper 80% wise of a tolerance for respondents so far to meeting twice a week and around just looking kind of 90/10 in very rough terms for support of more than one meeting per week.

So there's a fine line here between some sort of revolving and making it practical. We have been running at 11 and 2 UTC but both of those are pretty early out on the West Coast and we may want to - you know, we've really got a stretch between - this can go on - this is another big issue how you handle the relationship between sort of, in very broad terms, Asia, Europe and West Coast of USA and how you find a simple formula to accommodate all.

But certainly we're seeing a support for that and subject to comments that they shouldn't all fall during night hours. So all right let's close the poll. We've had 24 respondents to that. And it gives us a pretty good idea that somewhere

north of 80% and somewhere south of 20% in terms of in favor 80% plus in favor and 20% minus not in favor.

We'll give some thought to the timing and try and propose some reasonable rotation that accommodates - that looks at - and I've done this before where you look at the, at minimum, the members and try and make sure that one accommodate the members. This is difficult; we have members and participants all over the world so we'll have to look at some form of rotation or - shifting of times of the calls to accommodate everyone.

Okay, we've been a little stuck on Point 1. Let's move, Bernie, from Point 1 to Point 2 which provides us with a little more detail on the - on the taskforces and then, Grace, if you could remove the poll from the display.

Bernard Turcotte: All right so we'll wait for the guidelines document to come up. I think that given our discussion over the last 15 or so minutes, there should be very few surprises here. CWG taskforce, the lightweight structure intended to be small group of qualified people who will work on a highly specific issue with a clear deliverable identified at the onset and with a time limited schedule that is part of the critical path so essentially what we said previously.

Outcomes, the taskforce is aimed to deliver work in a short period, two weeks or less, according to a set mandate. Dissolved after delivery of work product; failure to deliver will affect the delivery of the project. Results of the taskforce need to be approved by the CWG participants prior to integration into the evolving CWG proposal.

Working method, define the issue, relevant, clear, specific and critical to the success of the overall project. All should be able to be communicated in less

than one page in the request for a CWG taskforce. Definitions should also clearly describe the deliverable work product.

Approval for creation, chairs to review the creation of all taskforces and participants with CWG. Once agreed, the taskforce will be assigned a unique taskforce number. A register of taskforces will - and related issues - will be kept by support staff and publicly available.

Participants, unless there are clear requirements to the contrary a taskforce should not include more than seven participants and should be typically around five.

Proposal for CWG taskforce must include lead participant responsible for delivering the work product to the CWG; must include the list of potential participants as well as their statements of interest and qualification for the taskforce. We're just talking about one paragraph here.

Greg, I see your hand and I'll just finish this because it's almost done and I'll get back to you or Jonathan will.

There will be limited support for taskforces unless otherwise arranged. Teleconferences and Adobe room will be scheduled with staff if necessary and available. It is expected that most of the work can be carried out via email and online document editing.

Staff may be able to offer writing and research support but would not usually take action items produced any kind of minutes or - of the taskforce meeting. The taskforce encounters an issue which will make it impossible to work to the agreed time this must be communicated to the cochairs promptly. Issues will be logged in the CWG taskforce list.

So I don't - this is just, if you will, detailing what was presented in the previous document in a little bit more detail. I don't think there's anything strikingly new here.

And I guess I'll hand it back to Jonathan to take the questions.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Bernie. And obviously we'll take more questions and comments on the list. But, Greg, you had your hand up so let's hear from you.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Just a clarification on one point. In the end of outcomes, it says, "Results of a taskforce need to be approved by the CWG participants." That's a little bit different than I had kind of thought our working method would be.

Rather I thought these were being brought back for discussion, not merely approval by the CWG and that the intention was to prepare that done in terms of a deliverable would be done enough for discussion and further work and not that these things were essentially going to be up or down voted into the proposal.

I think it - I think the idea was to get - some of these may be noncontroversial and require little discussion but others I think will need to be further worked. I don't think it's appropriate for the work of five or seven people to end up, you know, in the document without appropriate level of work being done by the full committee. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Greg. My view is that that's, I mean, it's probably sort of semantics. I mean, I agree with you, I think it's questionable how you deem approval, it shouldn't be just up down. And it may be that the group produces - the taskforce produces sufficiently polished work that it is merely

(unintelligible) approval. But I take your point, you know, and this should be iteratively referred back to the group for either - in some instances approval but in others discussion and refinement and referral back to the group for further development.

So that wording...

Greg Shatan: If I could just respond, Jonathan?

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: One of the things that has been discussed is it's important for these groups to know what done is and that done may not be fully polished and that that would take longer to get to done if that's what's expected.

And I think that, again, some of these things may be totally noncontroversial and require a little extra work but other things may change substantively as the work is done by the group and trying to over polish things so that they're final will delay getting the feedback of the group as a whole. So I'd rather see shorter work times and rougher documents than longer work times and more polished documents.

Obviously they have to be - they can't be kind of not ready for prime time but I think - I hope I'm communicating the balance there needs to be between a working document and opportunity for the group to actually work on these in addition to the taskforce presenting it to the group. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks, Greg. Any other comments or questions before we move on? Okay there's some question about a discomfort with limiting the number of persons in a taskforce and determining who is in or not. I understand that.

That's also a challenge and maybe we'll have to break from and accept that there isn't a formal limit.

And, again, these could represent guidelines so that, you know, you might say well there's five people volunteered and providing they, you know, I'm confident in their work that I'm happy with the five, it's really - the important point here is to try and make them manageable small groups that can execute defined tasks, bring those back to the committee as a whole and not suck up all of the resources into one group such that members and participants can contribute.

Yeah, and, Jaap, I'm perfectly open to design team. And in many ways design team perhaps captures the essence of what Greg was talking about. So for me that's a no-brainer; I'm perfectly happy to take the suggestion design team that Jaap suggests in the chat. Providing there's no opposition let's change the name to design teams. It captures that point well that. Okay I see some other checkmarks and positive comments on that.

So, Bernie, let's visit briefly then the very rough draft format for the form for input for defining a taskforce. And, again, this is meant to be - the objective here is to - so that there's a clear and documented scope of taskforce. So I hope we won't take long on this. It probably needs a little more work but it gives you a flavor of the thinking here.

Jaap and others who have got experience of this kind of thing there may be - there may be something you can offer here as to a scope defining document.

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you, Jonathan. Fairly straightforward and I don't think this will take too long. The description of the issue, again, is to try to keep this to things that are very specific. So two paragraphs, no long chapters here.

Why is this required for the CWG transition proposal? We're focusing on elements that we can get into the proposal. The description of the work product to deliver, the timeframe for delivery, the lead participant and other proposed participants.

So nice and tight. As it says up on top, of course this could stretch depending on the particular work item we're discussing but the idea is that it would be - it would hold on two pages maximum.

Jonathan, back to you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Bernie. So I think that's - we can take a little input on this line and if there are any precedents that others have got that - yeah, and Avri makes the point about IETF design teams and her understanding is it's a recommendation to be considered by the whole workgroup and not necessarily priority. That's a tricky one.

Certainly not intended to overrule that other workgroup but intended to make significant progress in discrete intervals and one hopes that the work is of sufficient quality that it's not a question of who overrules whom but actually that it's sufficiently clear that the work is done such that the CWG - the committee as a whole is able to accept it based on its merits or at least accept the incremental development that's been done.

Okay mindful of people's concern about not spending too much time on process and wanting to go to substance. I think we should move ourselves on to a document that Bernie drafted to try and attempt to capture the initial landscape of taskforces because clearly one of the objectives is to get some taskforce up and running. So that's the document that we can look at in Item 5.

And we'd very much like to - I think we've set a - thank you, that's now up in the screen. So here are a set of names and partly described prospective taskforces without numbers that are shared with you under Item 5 on the agenda. So one of the interesting points that came up immediately under Item 1 is that Item 1 describes some of the key functions and this may need to be broken down further.

And in describing the functions performed it seeks to include the SLAs for those functions. I wonder if that's - I don't - I suspect that that may not be the view of those that initially volunteered themselves to potentially work on a taskforce on SLAs.

So really this highlights a few different tasks. There's one on key functions, description requirement, there's processing DNS SEC requests, there's the dotINT and (ARPA) zone management. This is really a subject for the group to start to pick out where relevant taskforces may be - may undertake their work and try and narrow these down as tightly as possible.

In my view of this we would have a spine - what I think of as a spine for the group or some kind of backbone for the group that is the work in progress of the draft document such that any given taskforce when commissioned can be linked to a section or subsection or sub-subsection in the proposal so you know exactly where you work is contributing to the draft proposal.

So that's a bit, for me, that's missing in the current structure. There isn't a link to the overarching document that would root any of the work in the proposal. Any comments or input - you should be able to scroll this yourselves on the specificity of tasks as they are currently defined or any particular - let's start to

refer to them as design teams that you think should be commissioned that aren't there already.

And I note that Paul Kane talks about merging 1 and 2 since the DNS SEC record is a key function. My concern is keeping these tight and small and but my concern with Number 1 or at least the first in a sequence is it may be too broad already for the purposes of a design team. But I'm open to hearing what others think about that.

Greg, your hand is up.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Jonathan. Greg Shatan for the record. I guess with regard to the first three that all have the same or see previous for what is either for the proposal it seems to me that some of this may already be in Sections 1 and 2 to the extent that they're currently being done and either would need no change or some change, perhaps, you know, move toward automation.

But it seems to me that this is kind of a muddle between bringing back an SLA or should the SLA be in a separate group? I see that's kind of question marked. But if we're going back to the descriptions of function it seems to me that, you know, maybe that's already to some extent been done and maybe that just needs to be brought forward from sections - from, you know, the 2 - actually it's I guess the 2a 2b section of the proposal that, you know, was already done.

And, you know, some of these - I'm not really quite sure I understand fully but, you know, maybe those who are working more operationally will understand exactly what this means and I'd be curious about that.

And, you know, with regard to dotINT I thought we were going to basically say, you know, leave it alone, let it be done as it is and the same thing with dotARPA but in any case that - I have comments on the other two but I'll cede the mic for the moment. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: I see comments saying - from others relating to the ARPA and INT noting that ARPA is under IAP which means potentially we can simply take ARPA off the list, it's not a requirement. But I think in some senses this is a - this is a strawman prepared by Bernie with some ideas but really we'd like the group to contribute and define what the taskforces are to say - or amend the overarching documents. So this is the thread that we'd like to pick up as soon as possible to work on including filling in the definitions.

Any other comments or - so, Paul, you say the SLA should cover all transactional service expectations, in other words, that's the complete document. Now - can someone remind me, have we had any - thank you, Suzanne, for referencing the IETF SLA for the IANA so that's a good background for anyone wanting to work on SLAs.

And in fact that's a key principle for us going forward is to try and reference other work that's been done relevant to the other - background for the other proposals. So does it make sense that the SLAs are a standalone design team of their own, which is the sense that I got coming out of Singapore.

Martin, go ahead.

Martin Boyle: Thanks, Jonathan. Martin Boyle here. Yes, I'm assuming that when I look at Items 1 and 2 in the list of stuff that - for them are both of those, which are 1, 2 and 3, all of those are pretty big chunks. So as there is quite a lot of stuff in existence on SLAs in the existing contract I wonder whether we could extract

all that material and give it a design team of its own just focusing entirely on working out whether any of those SLAs are - need to be modified or whether we start off with the SLAs as are at the moment as the basis for going forward. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Martin. I think that was my understanding of how we might work coming out of Singapore. I'll leave Paul to pick up the microphone. Paul Kane, go ahead.

Paul Kane: Thank you. Let me just confirm you can hear me (unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, Paul, it sounds like you're a little far from the microphone so we can hear you but if you could speak perhaps closer to the mic.

Paul Kane: Better. Okay so the key elements of any SLA have to define the task to be done and parameters under which the task should be achieved. And I believe whilst (unintelligible) some support of trying to bring SLAs or more accurate SLEs, there's an expectation many parties will not be party to an agreement so it's a service level expectation.

I think we need to define...

Jonathan Robinson: Paul, I'm sorry to interrupt you but we need you to talk either more loudly or close to the microphone.

Paul Kane: Okay, I'll shout. I don't know if that's better.

Jonathan Robinson: That's better or there may be a volume setting on your microphone.

Paul Kane: Okay let me - I'll do multiple things. I'll shout and do everything. So the point is the SLE, service level expectation, because many parties will not wish to have an agreement with the IANA operator, service level expectation needs to describe the operation in - in hand and also the time period in which that operation should be undertaken and obviously essentially penalties for failing to fulfill that.

                   So I'm afraid to say I form the view that the SLE, service level expectation, should not be separated from the key functions because we need to describe them as part of doing the IANA task.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Paul, although that description could be by reference to where it is described elsewhere in the document but point taken. Greg, you're next in the queue.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Jonathan. Greg Shatan for the record. I turned quickly to the most recent 2014 ICANN IETF MOU supplemental agreement and, you know, one of the problems with using terms everyone thinks they know what they mean is that they may not mean the same thing by them.

                   An SLA, in its narrow definition is an agreement on service level. But I think we need to distinguish whether we're talking - and I think, you know, Paul has already set on this course - we're talking solely about the service level section of an agreement or really about the agreement. And just without, you know, going chapter and verse on the latest document, the supplemental agreement I'm looking at and these are services, then service levels, then escalation, then documentation, then reports and collaboration and then action summary table.

                   So if you call that an SLA then there's a lot more than SL - then service levels dealt with in that document and that's really the kind of documentation we're

going to need. And if you look back at the IANA functions contract once you strip out all of the government contractees and other stuff kind of the operational parts of the contract and the RFP response that, you know, contains the kind of technical side of what the IANA function says it will do, really boils down to, you know, roughly the same kinds of sections.

We're going to need to deal with all those sections. So I think we need to decide whether we're going to have a subgroup for SLA and another group for escalation and another groups for reports and another group for documentation or whether we're going to have one group for all of those subjects and maybe other subjects that would fall into the documentation that is going to kind of indicate how the ship is going to run after the IANA contract evaporates. But we need to decide that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Greg. Certainly my expectation was if we could break it into smaller parts even if they were connected parts or to be connected parts we should, in order to keep the work flowing and in small incremental pieces. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I think we better - also have to be careful that we're not presuming that a word or an acronym in this case, SLA, is monolithic. We may or may not want to take that first task and break it up into multiple ones. But, for instance, when you look at SLAs in the third one, under dotINT, the normal SLAs that we're talking about here are SLAs dealing with registries, gTLDs or ccTLDs.

On the other hand the SLA we're talking about in the third one is IANA actually acting as a registry and it's probably a completely different level - different set of SLAs than we're talking about in the prime one.

So yes we probably want to keep all the SLAs related to registry servicing in one place and it may be with the rest of task 1 or separate but there are other SLAs that we're talking about that are a completely different function and it makes no sense to group all of those together. So, again, don't presume just because it's the same acronym it means the same thing in each place.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Alan. Hence the need for tight definition in each point. Greg.

Greg Shatan: Kind of following on that, I think that if we're going to use the term SLA to mean something more than the service level section of a larger agreement, if we're going to use the term to mean the larger agreement or documentation we should either decide we're using SLAs in that kind of technically incorrect manner or call them - call it documentation and then have just the service level section be referred to as the SLA section.

I know people refer to SLAs often when what they mean is something that has a lot more sections than just service level. But again that goes back to the need for tighter definition of what is being done a group and what done means when the group is done. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: So to my mind this is where the real value will come from having the skeleton or backbone that I talked about of the overarching structure of the proposal document because it will become very clear which portion or portions of the document that any given taskforce is trying to - or design team is trying to fill in for.

And to the extent that that section doesn't exist it then has to be completed. So in effect the draft form of the proposal document creates a form of roadmap for the work to be done or a template to be filled in. John, I note your point too objecting to blocks 4 and 5 where separation as a taskforce - and it's

related to your point you made on the list where you feel that IANA is in effect inseparable.

I guess this - in this instance it presumes - and to some extent that presumes an outcome of legal advice to support that, that separation is possible and therefore under what circumstances might that - well not - yeah and what sequences of events would take place to get to that point. It assumes that a mechanic for separation will be available and that mechanic is not yet determined, that's in parallel piece of work if you like.

Greg, is has a new hand?

Greg Shatan: Yes, a new hand. Greg Shatan for the record. I have kind of my own issues with 4 and 5. Separation is really the end of a road of escalation. And I think that talking about conditions for approval, separation isn't really kind of the right thing because we're really, you know, has to deal with all the levels of escalation before basically the nuclear option is reached.

And I think that can't be separate from escalation points. And the trigger for escalation ultimately would in most cases also be the trigger for separation if all of the escalations were unsuccessful. And I think we also need to discuss whether there are other nuclear or quasi-nuclear options besides separation.

And, you know, what kind of assuming separation is our endpoint per se and may be assuming too much or at least the concept of separability while it - don't go as far as John is going and, you know, tends to disagree, certainly, it could be separated just that it has to be documented appropriately.

That we need to kind of not just kind of loop on the idea that, you know, we're just going to have a condition whereby you can say okay we're separating it; it really is the end of the war at that point. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: So thanks, Greg. I'd like to make two points, one question and one point. The first would be I would suggest we start with a clean slate for proposed task forces. And this is Bernie's contribution to attempt to set the ball rolling. I haven't given this the detailed view over, it looks like in any event it would be good to get these coming from the group and as I said a couple of occasions now, linked to the to be shared draft proposal that will be work done, the skeleton.

However, it may be worth, Bernie, you providing a couple of comments on those two points relating to approval for separation and launching separation so they relate to issues that you've picked up in the past. And I'm not sure if you would like to indicate - may be that you'd like to indicate what's driving those two as suggested or potential taskforces.

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you - excuse me - thank you, sir. On the first one is just I don't disagree with Greg at all that, you know, it's not a question that there is not escalation. My point in that one is we keep talking about what gets us to that point. And that's a little bit what I was trying to address at least to clarify for the group is yes, all the escalation that are available have failed. What context in general, regardless of the model, would take us to the point where someone wants - not someone but the group overseeing this thinks that it has to recommend separation.

So just getting our thinking along that line because it may be a nuclear option, yes, but I don't see how in the proposal we are simply going to say well we exhausted all escalations and for this given point and therefore we are just

launching separation. It seems to me we need to have put some thinking on it or at least provide some words explaining how we're going to reach that point. So that's the first one.

The second one is based on the notion approvals required for launching separation. So in my mind what we've been talking about is pretty much in all models there's an MRT-type group that oversees this there would be responsible for making the decision that, yes, it would like to launch separation because this and that and that condition has been met.

I think what we've heard in our various discussions from the registries, that is the CCs and the Gs, that they probably wouldn't accept the proposal that didn't require their formal approval for separation. And so if there is that and that's a key element of these things, if there is approval required whose approval is it required, how is it obtained and how is it part of this package that we would document? Thank you, sir.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Bernie. I note John Poole's point in the chat where he says what you're trying to define is material breach. And John, my understanding of where Bernie was going with this was you've had the material breach then what do you do? It's what are the conditions or practicable points need to be met?

I also note that they are some points - a supported point in the chat from the experience and discussion in ccNSO, we need to be very cautious about the use of the term separability and separation. And I just remind everyone that one of the key things whilst these are absolutely fundamental to many people's view of the work of this group the ability to ultimately separate through nonsignificant performance issues, the IANA function from ICANN, is not the sole subject of this proposal.

And we need to be very careful to keep focusing the group on the substance of the proposal being the effective ongoing operation and supervision of the IANA function post-transition. So I'll just remind us all that that's got to be our focus in addition to recognizing any worst-case scenarios that might prevail.

Alan, I'm going to respond to your hand and then I'm going to try and move us on because we're coming up to just less than 15 minutes to go and we need to sort of work through briefly the other items on the agenda. Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I wonder to what extent Items 3 and 4 really are accountability issues and not within our domain or least something that the accountability group should be working on first. That was the end of my intervention.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Alan. I mean, and that's clearly an element of the point is how much - and again, I saw some support for my comments there in and around our focus.

So I would encourage everyone - I think what I'd suggest we do is wipe the slate clean of these proposed set of taskforces and encourage anyone immediately with what we've learned and discussed on the call to propose - to work on proposals for some - on the list for some tightly specified design teams as we proposed and I'll call them, and start to put us in a position to get to work on these immediately.

So I guess that's an action coming out of the team to make a call for - to reinvigorate the call for specific design teams and start to build those out with leads, volunteer participants and scoping according to the current definitions.

Right, let's move on to the other elements of the agenda here. I think it's worth - so under Item 6 where we accidentally got onto scheduling of meetings earlier, and dealt with that item so to that extent we have dealt with that. You'll see at the bottom of the agenda in the top right hand corner of your screen that you may need to scroll back up to the key target dates.

And I'm not sure we need to look now at a bar chart. We can share the bar chart with the project work that Berry has been working on. If it's readily available we can put it up. But in essence the critical points that are highlighted in the current best case scenario that we are seeking to work to is covered in the key target dates and the project land there.

So any comments or questions about those key target dates, the project management side of things and the sort of future deliverables? There are clearly some issues in here, as we've discussed before, things like the 21 day public comment period, the risks. This of course still reflect the previous way of working with RFP 3, 4 and 5 and so that will need to be rejigged as we settle down to the design team way of working.

Just make a comment about the face to face. This is challenging, picking a date that fits in with this project schedule that doesn't clash with other groups and in particular in our case there was another factor as well which is the proposed face to face meeting of the CCWG on Accountability.

And they are currently proposing to meet a couple of days before our proposed date. This serves a number of purposes. It permits potentially those traveling to participate in both meetings, although nominally, at least at this point, the funding would be for members to travel and participate and be accommodated in a hotel according to mechanics of how we did this previously.

I'm not quite sure how we work up the potential synergy benefits from having the two adjacent to one another from that point of view. It is clear that if the CCWG has met immediately prior we will be best placed to know and understand the extent of their work and how far they've got. And in addition almost certainly to take advantage of a meeting between the co-chairs in between the meetings to best coordinate the work and ensure that that goes on.

And then I note Mark Carvel's point in the chat saying - linking the sort of larger context of other work that's going on with WITIS +10 in autumn and UN General Assembly and so on and recognizing that the criticality of this work and the optics of this work and the ability to perform - and there is some support recognizing Mark's comments from both Matthew Shears and Martin Boyle to, you know, an awareness.

Alan, your hand has come up.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, thank you Jonathan. Just one comment. There is an issue of people who are members of one group and participants in the other. There's a synergy, as you mentioned, for having the two meetings adjacent with presumably a day in between the two.

There is an anti-synergy if you're only funding members in that for many people traveling to the one for which they're provided travel would prohibit them from participating as a participant remotely in the other one for at least one of the days because travel may well be more than a single day getting to or from whatever the site is. So not providing travel, not providing hotel and - or lodging for the two days where they're a participant may stop them from participating at all. And that's, I think, a very significant issue.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, thanks Alan, for that point and acknowledging that you made that to me privately off list as well as a point. So I think this is something we need to think about whether we can - whether and how we can deal with that. I suppose the presumption, and I'd welcome any comments to the contrary, is that there is - yeah, let me not say anything.

I agree, there's a - there is a challenge there for those that are not - if we are not funding members of the first who are participants in the second to some extent we prejudice or potentially prejudice their participation in the second meeting depending on how far they need to travel.

Bear in mind as it's currently scheduled the one is a Monday Tuesday. There's a Wednesday in between and then other is a Thursday Friday. So in principle there is travel time in between.

Alan Greenberg: Depending on how far you're coming and when planes fly.

Jonathan Robinson: Agreed. I'm going to move us on then. I don't think there's anything significant under Item 7 to report other than that we do - Lise and I will meet with Matthew, Thomas and Leon, the co-chairs of CCWG on Friday. We continue to plan to work as closely as possible with them.

I - and we've talked about the timing - relative timing of the face to face meetings. Avri, let me give you an opportunity - I don't want to put you on the spot here but if there is anything you'd like to make a point on in your capacity as liaison between the groups feel free to do so at this point. But I know I haven't prepped you for this so we'll understand is there is nothing for whatever reason if you'd like to say at this point.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I mean, this is Avri speaking. At this point, you know, you all as chairs have been meeting so frequently so that there's been little for me to add. I keep watching. When I see you guys not covering it I'll jump up and down and say there's something additional. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Avri. I'm sure you'll keep us honest. That's good to know. And we'll do our best to coordinate and work effectively together. But it's useful to have someone keeping an eye on that.

So let's review then the action items under Item 8 and make sure that we've covered everything. As it stands we have - well a set of points coming out of the minutes relating to things like the design teams but specifically I think, Grace, on the action Bernie to review documents, well it's review documents and it's a sort of comprehensive review of the documents based on the inputs received in this meeting and, to use the new terminology, that's the one action.

Certainly we'd like to hear proposals for both a name, a lead and content of specified design teams. In addition, we'd like to have, as soon as possible, a skeleton or backbone proposal document that we can start to work with that we can coordinate the work of the design teams to and so that's something which we are asking Bernie to produce and in fact we have discussed offline already.

Are there any other key actions arising that haven't been captured so far? It's Berry's work on the table, I notice, I'm just scanning over it. I won't read them all out. Lise.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Jonathan. It's not been mentioned in - it's been mentioned in the chat and I saw that Elise were mentioning the principles that we should work on. And I think we should put it as an action item so we could put in that

Martin Boyle and I are to finish the principles in the - well in the next coming two weeks so that we have those done and not to deal with those anymore. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Lise. And for the record that was an earlier piece of work that appears to have been left slightly open. I mean, it's substantively worked on but there's obviously some - I'm not sure it's fully signed off or complete. So that's useful to acknowledge that.

Yeah, and note there's some relevant points in the chat or a point on simplicity. Let's see if that finds its way into the principles. Good, I hope that feels like a satisfactory meeting. I'm conscious I've talked - I really would like to have a balance of voice coming from the members and participants so please do take that as encouragement. I realize there was some material to be got through.

Thank you, Olivier, for your support for the content and - at the start of the meeting. Any other final questions or comments under AOB? Seun asks about venue of the face to face. Seun, just to clarify the way this works, first important thing to do is to nail down a date; second thing that happens is that that's then referred to the ICANN meeting teams who take some very practical points into consideration such as, you know, availability and cost.

But in our case they also take something else into consideration, and presumably they do in other cases as well, but I'm aware that in this case they are and that's the other practical point such as the makeup - the national makeup of the group and therefore the likely requirement for visas and some sort of overarching budget which includes travel. So there's a few practical considerations. And a couple of venues have been mentioned but nothing has been set at this point.

Avri, that's a really good point. And I recognize that you've put that point on the integrated proposal. We've hit the top of the hour. Why don't you make a couple of remarks now on that integrated proposal. To be honest with you, your earlier question of how do we deal with that as a kind of overarching point I haven't quite got my head around yet but feel free to take the microphone now and make a couple of remarks on that.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. And this is quick remarks. We're, you know, we've got the big question of we have inside models, we have outside models. We're trying to bridge that discussion and find a way to tackle it and find a consensus point while defining the model.

The document is open for comments. You know, we keep working on it. I'll have another document out in the next couple of days on how the model meets some of the accountability requirements for IANA so we could take the discussion further.

We're continuing to work on it. And, you know, wouldn't mind seeing other people join us in this informal ad hoc forms from the ground up invitation drafting team. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Avri. And point noted so if we could pick that up on list and think of two things really, it's contributions to the structure and architecture of the model and, two, how we handle that within the new working methods given the objective of trying to push forward that some of the practical substance of the proposal whilst recognizing that - how we might integrate and deal with this and other models.

Okay, thank you everyone, for what feels like a good meeting. We've no doubt got tons of work to do so I'm not sure what our end number of meetings will be but thank you for your contributions to Meeting 22.

Woman: Thanks, Jonathan. Thanks, everyone. Bye.

Avri Doria: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

END