

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White  
February 27, 2015  
11:03 am CT**

Jonathan Robinson: Grace, if we could prepare to get the call going now. For those of you that were concerned it was very silent. Maybe my voice will confirm that there is live audio now.

Grace Abuhamad: Great. Thank you, Jonathan. The recordings have started. As usual we'll take roll call based on the Adobe Connect room. If there's anyone who's on the audio-only line please let us know now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hi, Cheryl here. I'm still having issues getting into the AC room but I'll be there eventually I'm sure.

Grace Abuhamad: Okay, thank you Cheryl.

Theresa Swinehart: And, Grace, I'm on the call. Theresa. I'll be in the Adobe Connect in a few minutes.

Grace Abuhamad: Thanks, Theresa. Okay, Jonathan, I think we have everyone. Turn it over to you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Grace. And as you made the point, please could anyone who is not in the Adobe Connect room make themselves known by audio such that we know you are here and can record you as present.

Grace, I sent you some minor revisions to the agenda. It's not material but if you can locate that on email it may be just copying and pasting that into the update to the agenda. It won't stop us making progress now anyway.

So welcome, everyone. Welcome those of you who have had particularly early. Thank you for joining us. I hope to provide you with a productive meeting and make it worth your while working on the call today. Bear with me while I find some notes.

So just a couple of points before we go into the substance of the call reminding you that, you know, this is part of a refreshed phase of working where - and you'll see firm evidence of that from the draft proposal that was sent out to you. And I know there hasn't been any substantial amount of time to look at that prior to this call but some of you may have had a chance to look at it.

Essentially, the objective being to develop a functional implementable and complete plan and also as - not quite as important but significantly to be able to demonstrate to anyone observing the work of this group the sense of the emergence of such a plan. So in doing so a focus on the functional requirements of any part of the plan before (unintelligible) work on that by a kind of definition requirements - definition then requirements type approach.

So that's where we are at. And, as you know, from our meeting on Tuesday and the fact is that we are meeting twice per week now which makes it a very

tight turnaround and in doing so we commissioned a couple of design teams or at least started that work and we'll come back to that later in the agenda.

I think those are the main points I wanted to make. Let me just see if there are any thoughts or input at this stage with respect to either the content of the agenda or the work we propose to undertake today. Please go ahead.

Greg, I see your hand is raised.

Greg Shatan: I think one other thing we might want to add to the agenda down in All Other Business is a discussion of the ICG's meeting this week where they discussed to an extent the level of detail, the issue of the level of detail to which our work needs to go. We may also want to touch on Larry Strickling's comments before the US senate on that same point.

And finally, the - it may be worthwhile looking at some of the other issues that the ICG discussed to the extent that they, you know, play into our work although that may be something we can also just bring to the list depending upon our timing today. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Greg. So, Grace, if you could add that as a second sub bullet point under AOB, proposal detail probably ref ICG/DC hearings. And then we can - the second point we can see if that makes sense to cover that, that's great under AOB or on the list. Greg, if you could drop your hand as well now that that's been made.

Okay so next the Item 2 on the agenda moves to - have an opportunity to make any initial comments on that draft proposal that's been sent out, version 2.0 which is now in circulation. We committed to doing so shortly after the Singapore or ICANN 52.

And if you'll remember, the primary characteristics of that proposal are that it is intended to be in a form that can be submitted to the ICG and moreover readily compared with other already submitted proposals.

In being in that format we can also use it as a map for the future work of the CWG on the path towards our final proposal and therefore as a backbone on which to hang any incrementally developed work of the design teams.

So I, and we, acknowledge that you have only recently seen that. But if you do have any thoughts or input or comments on the structure or content of that document it would be very useful to hear any immediate feedback. I mean, I expect that we will produce continuous iterations of this document in a sort of software versioning type format, 2.1, 2.1.1, 2.2, etcetera, as we add either incremental contributions from the group and/or more substantial incremental contributions from the design teams.

So let's see if there are any comments or questions from you with respect to the form, structure or mechanics of working with that document. I don't propose to walk through it in detail, it's too substantial. But you'll see it has the form, as I said a moment ago, of responding to the RFP from the ICG so it can be readily compared with what the ICG is requiring and so being - can be identified as an emerging proposal.

Any comments on the effectiveness of this as a methodology or anything else that anyone would like to raise in relation to this? All right we'll keep working the agenda. And it seems like your early start may be rewarded with an early return to the rest of your day's business if we go at this - with this level of interaction. Let's see where we go. So that document that's useful. It would be great if that could be reviewed and any input.

Moving then on to the design teams and updated version of the design team guidelines was posted to the list. Clearly this is part of the revised or new way of working. And it contains any updated or revised version relative to Monday, a point on the process (life) of the design team, in other words how the design team comes into being, how it becomes commissioned, how it produces (unintelligible) and get back into the flow of the working group.

You'll see that in front of you, that document now. And in particular the part that I just referred to is towards the end, referred to as process lifecycle of the design team.

One of is there is that it has the cochairs being pretty involved in signing off on both the priority design teams. Now that's a form of management control that some of you may find unusual. We feel it's necessary in order to keep a degree of coordination and organization in the way in which we do the work. It's about the way - the order and organization of the work rather than influencing necessarily the content of the work of the design teams.

So I think we are very keen to work with that level of management (unintelligible), if you like, of the way in which the design teams come to life and integrate their work into the work of the CWG. To some extent this is experimental. We will see how it works and if there are tweaks that are needed or if there are critical comments of the mechanics of working we are open to do that.

I will remind you that all design team work comes back to the CWG. It's not a done deal when it comes back, it's reference and review by the CWG but it's a method by which we can anticipate that work will be done productively and relatively speedily.

So I think those are the main point I wanted to say on that. Come to - I see a question from Matthew in the chat, just seeing the documents for the first time how does it account for the broader discussion of internal and external models and Lise has given the point there but that's not included yet.

You'll note, Matthew, if you go back to the email list and just search for the inputs from me, I addressed this I think in a question from Eduardo recently who asked a similar question. And essentially a concern to date has been that the overarching issue of the models, internal external, has dominated the work of the group at the expense of producing a practical and operationally oriented proposal.

So whilst it's not off the table to deal with that if something - deal with the overarching issue of the models, nevertheless it doesn't reduce the requirement to get on with producing much of the operational and/or technical and administrative detail that the full proposal requires.

James, I understand that point that you make. And I'm very sensitive to that point. Lise and I have talked about this. So your question in the chat about concerns over perceived exclusivity of the membership of design teams, I don't think there's any intention to exclude, in fact in some ways it's the (unintelligible) because one of the motivations that's been put to the group is can we include members in the design teams who are not members or participants of the group.

My concern over that is just ensuring that we don't end up reinventing the wheel in the design teams and that we properly recognize any work that's gone on in the CWG or the so-called RSP subgroups to date. But notwithstanding that, I think we have agreed to have participation in the design teams from

those who are not members or participants of this group and the - so I think there is, A, openness to who participates in the design teams.

The objective of managing them, if you like, is to make sure they don't all come at once. One isn't a substantially populated at the expense of another. So I hope they will be seen as (unintelligible) and, you know, to the extent that anyone feels unreasonably excluded from a design team were unable to participate if for whatever reason, I mean, there's still all the opportunity to discuss that's on the list, make sure of any relevant criticism.

I suppose it's also relevant to just remark that there are a number of conditions that are in there. But one of the most significant is to ensure that any - to be qualified (unintelligible) and it's a self qualification although subject to review by the cochairs in order to be qualified to participate in a design team you must be committed and ideally be qualified in the form of some knowledge of - is that a universal problem with my audio or just James?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's very choppy.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank Cheryl. I'm not sure what the cause of that is. Is that any better now?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Get going. If it continues I'm sure Grace or someone will try and establish another line out you.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, please let me know if there is an ongoing problem. And hopefully those of you - others of you with hands up can contribute to the audio so I'm less (unintelligible) in the whole thing.

So just to reiterate that point I was making (unintelligible) skills or experience that have been posted to the list any other questions or (unintelligible). My audio is still alive. I'm going to have to check something so (unintelligible).

Lise Fuhr: Okay, I can hear that Jonathan is breaking up and I hope you're trying to call him. But while he's being called I can continue. Can you hear me?

Marika Konings: Yes we can.

Lise Fuhr: Well that's good. Thank you. Okay so we're on the design team. And I don't know if there is any other questions to what Jonathan - okay, Jonathan says - we're now on the next issue and that is that Paul Kane is due to report on his design team and that's the SLA. So, Paul Kane, are you with us on the - oh, I see - sorry, Olivier has his hand up. I'll just take that question first. Thank you, Olivier, go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you very much, Lise. It's Olivier Crépin-LeBlond speaking. Can you hear me?

Lise Fuhr: Yes we can hear you.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Oh okay. Just making sure that the sound works well. As we now moving on to the actual design teams themselves, I wondered whether we actually had an updated list of those design teams. Because as they are being built up I know there is a document that circulated a couple of days ago with initial examples of design teams.

But I am having trouble tracking all of the design teams that are being created. And obviously we have in the ALAC a concerted view of the whole picture



and so obviously we would like to kind of share ourselves between the different design teams and according to people's knowledge and interests.

So are you planning to have a wiki page or a Google talk that will be a live document with all of the design teams?

Lise Fuhr: Well we - at the moment we have chosen two design teams and one is the SLA with Paul Kane and the other one is the IAP with Alan. And we have the CSC pending. And we will make a list that is available on - and I think it's going to be both on the wiki and a Google document as far as I know. And I can see Marika is posting that it's already a wiki page available with this.

But what we want to do is to have people put in suggestions to the design teams. And we made a call for this Sunday. And I resent it - the guidelines for the design teams today.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Okay. Yeah, thanks. It's Olivier speaking. Yeah, the wiki page has the guidelines; it doesn't have the list of design teams at the moment so it'd be...

((Crosstalk))

Lise Fuhr: Oh okay, sorry.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: ...update that.

Lise Fuhr: But we will make one available...

((Crosstalk))

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: ...but not everyone is able to make it to the calls so that's why it's a little bit - it would be good to have a list. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Yeah, okay. There will be a list. And actually the list will contain groups that are active, groups that are included or teams that are open and concluded and also which ones are a proposal. So we will try to have it all in one document so you don't have to look at several places to find out what design teams are pending and which ones are actually active.

I see Greg, your next. And then I see, Jonathan, you might be taking over, please.

Greg Shatan: Hi, it's Greg Shatan. Thank you. I'm not actually - putting aside the fact I'm (unintelligible) I see the (unintelligible) list of design teams I see an example of relevant design teams listed at the bottom of the page. I have put in a proposal for a design team relative to the IANA trademark and domain name so that should be pending as well. And indeed was the subject of discussion at the ICG at their most recent meeting.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Greg. Jonathan, you're next. And I guess you're taking over the leadership again. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Lise. Assuming my audio is clear, yes.

Lise Fuhr: It's clear.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. That's actually the same connection so hopefully it won't dial out to me because it seems to be fine still now. So I apologize for that problem previously. There are - just to make sure we comprehensively answer Olivier's question, there will be three documents working.

One is that guidelines; two is the list of active and potential design teams; and the third now escapes me - of the template. We had a prospective template but I'm not sure we will work with a template. I think we may just work with the guidelines and the list of active teams. The template may be a bureaucratic step too far. So we should have a comprehensive list of both proposed and active design teams at any given time and the guidelines for working with them.

Okay so, Paul, are you - Paul Kane, are you around and are you able to give us any sort of update as to the SLA design team, just reminding us of course that there's potentially three phases to the life of this team and any update on either proposed membership and or any initial work that's gone on.

Paul Kane: Yes, I'm assuming my microphone is working?

Jonathan Robinson: Hear you Paul.

Paul Kane: Yeah, can you hear me? Can you hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, Paul.

Paul Kane: Good, excellent. So, yes, so it's rather early days. I have the privilege of trying to get this work program going - this design team going. I'm pleased to say that we have received from the gTLD community three willing participants who have operational experience in the interactions with the IANA.

And as far as ccTLDs are concerned we're trying to have likewise three representatives. I think if I am counted as one we'd probably have the three. And then we have a representative, Jaap, from SSAC as well.

The focus is going to be just identifying what is currently provided by the IANA to the registry community. And there will be a description of that function to make sure we have captured the function that IANA delivers to the community.

And then the measuring metric. And once we have identified the task that IANA does and the signed metric, we intend to air that document which should be relatively concise with the broader community to make sure that we have not missed something that users of the IANA service consider important.

And then in consultation with IANA staff, we propose to identify what they are currently giving in their performance reports that we have already referenced. They're very useful and excellent performance reports. And to make sure that the timings are relevant.

And the final element - there are three tranches to this work program as we currently see it, to identify if there is a breach, in other words, noncompliance with the specific target, and the escalation path, how best to achieve the service that we are after with respect to each individual registry. So this is very low down in the weeds, not talking about the high level escalation program.

So there has been some progress in the couple of days that this design team has been operating. And I hope to update the list certainly early next week in the written form once I've had a chance over the weekend to formulate it.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Paul. So there's really two things we need in writing. And we're kind of running and walking at the same time here for reasons of, I guess Olivier's point, perhaps which is time is of the essence, and that is that we

need to - to make sure we have agreed in writing the scope of the design team so that would be helpful to get that in short order. And then second any written output that start to come from it, and also that we agree the membership - and we're not doing this in quite the optimal or correct sequence.

I was just going to highlight one other point that I made earlier to make sure that we're clear on this. When we talked about whether or not we talked around design teams and who may or may not be part of them, we originally - the original idea was that perhaps they were members or participants of the group. There was a motivation for the fact that we should commit participation in design teams from members or participants outside of the group, outside of the CWG.

That seems reasonable. And we agreed that on our last call. I suggested that it may be sensible to keep it to no more than 50% from outside the group. But it may be that that's an artificial requirement that we don't need. So the current guidelines require that the chair or lead of the group, the design team lead, is a member of - member of participant of the CWG.

The main objective for that is to ensure that the work of the design team is coherent with the work of the CWG and doesn't go off on a tangent or without knowledge of the CWG. So ideally the co chairs, together with the proposed design team lead, will ensure that that happens and that we'll gain assurance to the extent that the design team contains significant members from outside of the CWG.

Because, for example, there has been significant work done in the RFP subgroups previously and it would be a great shame to lose relevant aspects of that work should the design teams start from scratch. Now to preclude open

and innovative thinking from the design teams but it nevertheless should at least be cognizant of any prior work that's been done in the group.

Any other comments or questions either on the principles or on the input that Paul has just given? David asks - David Conrad asks, "Is consultation post-completion of the design team work?" Well, David, clearly any discussion on the scope of the design team can take place on list and the responsibility of the design team is to bring back their work to the group on a regular basis for review and comment by the group. And in any event, the intention is that the design teams are relatively short lived.

Alan Greenberg, your hand is up. Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I'm not trying to be bureaucratic but we are - on Paul's design team are we going to see the document that we're talking about essentially chartering it or has that been dropped because this one is just going ahead with the actual work.

Jonathan Robinson: Alan, yes, that's what I was asking for - from Paul in short order, the scope of the design team. Now there's been discussion of that on list and Paul referred to that by breaking it down into three phases. But I think we need to see that scope so that we're bought into that scope and accept it.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, as a follow on, I did see Greg's one that seems to have gotten lost along the way. I was a bit concerned that that was far more detailed and far more of a, I'm not even sure what to say, of an essay that we really want from these documents. So I look forward to seeing one that's completed and accepted so we know what the level of detail is for these. If Greg's...

Jonathan Robinson: Noted, Alan, thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Can you just make refer to which one Greg's is.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, Greg did one on the intellectual property, the dotIana basically. And he sent that out a week or so ago. And I was worried that if that's the level we're supposed to be doing no one's going to volunteer for one. So I'm really eager to see a completed one that's acceptable so that we have some idea of what's involved in this. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Got it. Thanks, Alan. Well we will circulate a current version of the list of either active or proposed design teams shortly and it'll be evident what level of detail is required from that.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Alan. Go ahead, Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thanks, Jonathan. It's Olivier speaking. I think Greg might have wished to answer Alan's question here so I could defer to Greg and then come in after him.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Olivier. We'll go to Greg then in that case.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Olivier. You are correct. I would not have submitted that level of detail if it was a subject that had been under discussion by the group or more generally understood so really more of that was by way of background rather than, you know, judging that that was a level of detail that I should use for all design team submissions.

And I would say the same for anybody else that unless something is arcane - and this does come a little bit out of left field from our work. But it comes from outside the group which is other - two other groups are dealing with in the ICG; we seem to be the only ones who are (sultering) on as if it's not an issue and that's why I felt it needed that extra level of detail to bring it to this group. But I think others - and hopefully others that I submit as well will be crisper so to speak.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Greg. Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Well thank you, Jonathan. Olivier speaking. And my questions is pretty straightforward, how does one join a design team? How does one volunteer? Does one just email the leader or the chair of that design team?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Olivier. I think it's covered in the guidelines but a couple of points on that. One, email the chair and the list so to make sure it's - chair is the wrong word, the design team lead and the list and make yourself known. What - the level of oversight that the co chairs propose to put on it is to not - is to try and - is to potentially limit participation in design team.

Hopefully there is not - that's not required and there's a relatively small number of volunteers who get active ideally there's a sign-off that says, right, we've got the right number. So there's intended to be a degree of oversight as the participation on the design team.

I notice that David Conrad asked in the chat whether staff or board would be willing to - would be available to participate. I hear the audio is not working properly again. Okay so I'm getting enough comments that it- that the audio is clear enough.



So just to clarify, there is - there is - from David Conrad's point of view, I don't see the design teams preclude staff or board participation. Again, there's a kind of - there's a sensitivity which is why Lise and I wanted to have an oversight of who is in the design team.

If it was dominated by one particular interest group or - the checks and balances on that are, A, we have oversight of who's in the design team and, B, there is a requirement to bring it back to the group. But we'd rather it didn't come back to the group in a way that was likely to be sustain that sort of criticism.

Cheryl, you've been patient. Let me go to you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Cheryl for the record. I'm always patient. Just coming to the very short list of first (unintelligible) immediate to get going design teams that we have already discussed and obviously you've heard from Paul and we're going to be looking towards getting something out of Alan with IAP as well.

The CSC one is sitting there hanging in my view. I think the CSC one is vital, it needs to be started early. I don't want, if at all possible, a delay until people think, oh I need to fill out the paperwork and they need to work out whether or not I should step forward or not. I have been less than subtly pushing Donna Austin to step forward and put herself as the lead of the CSC one.

I think it's essential that an actual customer is represented in the leadership of this. And seeing as she is playing hard to get, she seems to be not adverse to the possibility and so I'm outing her. Donna, over to you.

Jonathan Robinson: Cheryl, I'll leave Donna to respond by putting up her hand when she's ready. But nevertheless I think that CSC is potentially in genesis and make sense as - I think Lise mentioned that anyway as the third likely candidate. And then we need to build a final or pipeline of other prospective design teams as people work through the overarching document and the mechanics for proposing and getting these commissioned.

Greg, sorry.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Jonathan. Just one other thing very I hate to keep flogging the design team cost us but here we are. The list of - under composition, the list of things that the proposal for the design team must include is listed, although it seems to have lost its dot or bullet next to it, a list of potential participants as well as their SOIs and qualifications. Does this mean that each design team lead is expected not only to come up with a proposal but to privately recruit their own kind of pickup basketball team of folks to join the team.

And are those that are recruited by the - if that is the case are templates that don't propose a team going to be disfavored? And also if this is the case, how will those cherry picked by the lead be prioritized over those from the rest of the group who wish to join that team? Or is that requirement of pre-seeding the group not absolute or maybe even not a requirement at all but just a suggested possibility? Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: I think at best a suggested possibility, Greg. I think we've got to keep this open and have volunteers on the list for the design team. And so I don't think we want any sort of backdoor processes of stuffing a design team or just - and I think the idea is that if there is - as I said, if we just try and manage it so that we don't end up with the boat tipping over one way with everyone rushing to join one particular design team when we want to be running two, three or four

at any given time and making sure they adequately supported and producing the work at a reliable rate. So I hope that's helpful.

And by the way, we will just go back and revise and check over those based on this conversation to make sure that the guidelines are as clear as possible. I hope you can appreciate that collectively we are trying to set this up and get it moving at the same time so we don't want to drown in process, we want to actually be productive in getting things going. But necessarily then there is a couple of little chinks in the armor of the fully ironed out process as we build it out.

All right, so we have design team 1, the SLAs we talked about. We have design team 2 which was a prospective design team on an IAP. Allan MacGillivray, are you on - you were proposed for this, is there any remark you could make or point on towards IAP? And when we might expect to see some progress on this?

Allan MacGillivray: Thank you, Jonathan. It's Allan. I trust everyone can hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, Allan, go ahead.

Allan MacGillivray: I have not yet submitted an actual proposal. And I apologize for that but I intend to get to that today. I thought I would take this opportunity just to give a bit of context of what I am hoping this - what I'm hoping this design team could potentially accomplish.

I think we all know that the CCWG on Accountability is itself looking at the whole area of appeals and redress. And mindful of the need to eliminate any overlap between the two groups, I first we intend to find out where they are on this whole issue but I just haven't done that.

At the same time, and I think the particular reason I put my hand up at our last meeting is because the communication exchange that we had with the CCWG, I think it was last month in which they indicated that they would not be - it was not their intention to deal with the sensitive issue of delegation and redelegation for the ccTLD community.

So it's with that particular issue in mind that I did put my hand up. And that's the aspect that I would hope the IAP could focus on at least initially - sorry, the design team. That is, what are the particular needs of the ccTLD community with respect to an appeal mechanism, to the extent that they may not be addressed by the cross community working group.

So that's how I hope to frame this as you, at least at the outset, and so just let the take the opportunity now to seek a recruit for this design team. Thank you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Allan. So we'll take that request on the list and ask people to join. And Steve, I note your point in the chat relating to design teams. And in fact the design team scope here - the document - does make reference to the IETF spec for design teams. And in fact we originally called these taskforces and in the discussion, which is perhaps potential for some confusion, agreed to rename them as design teams.

And - but in any event your point on proposals from design teams comes the full working group which is where the issues finally get sorted out. And Greg supports that, and I think that's the intention. There is every intention that these come back to the list.

Look, ideally, they are sufficiently well formed ideas that the list says this is great, you can slot that straight into the proposal. But that's possibly wishful thinking. And let's see how we go. I mean, this is - this is something where in any event the intention is that it comes back to the full group.

I'm very conscious we need to be mindful of suggestions on process and ensuring the process is something that group has bought into without letting it dominate our discussion.

Okay next hand up is Donna. Go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Jonathan. Donna Austin. Just responding to Cheryl's nomination for myself to chair the CSC drafting team - slipped into that pretty quickly - design team, I'll give it a tentative yes at this point in time that I'd be willing to take on a job but I'd need maybe 24 hours just to give a definitive response if that's okay with everybody.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Donna. That's certainly fine with me. It'd be great if you'd come back and let us know and if anyone - then we can start to rapidly scope what a CSC design team might look like - the scope might look like and who might be willing to participate so thank you.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Steve points out that management of design team process directly (unintelligible) of a design team. My thought here - and our thought was very light touch management. It's a matter that, you know, I take the point and this isn't an IETF design team. If it proves unworkable we may need to find a different way of doing it. The idea was from a management point of view at the very least was ensuring that they didn't all come at once and that they were

in some way prioritized that we didn't run off in all sorts of directions rather than who participates in it.

So let's see if we can work with a revision of the guidelines that is updated based on the feedback from this call and take them as that, guidelines, rather than a definitive hard and fast process rule.

All right so to capture that we have two, possibly three design teams either commissioned or immediately - or potentially coming out of the pipeline in very short order. The next phase of this will be to add others to the pipeline, start to build up a pipeline and give them a form of priority so that we can commission them in a sustainable order that meets up with our timetable objectives and resources and so on.

Olivier, you mentioned with four, which is the fourth.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Yeah, thank you Jonathan, it's Olivier speaking. I saw the three, the service levels, the authorization function, the CSC/MRT confidentiality and the perceptions of conflict of interest and the one about intellectual property for IANA.org. To me that's four.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, there could be even more than that, that's why we need the list out so we're working off the same list, Olivier, and we'll get that list out. Because CSC is also - also needs to be scoped properly. There's CSC conflicts of interest but there's also - there might be other elements of the CSC that design teams could work on so it needs some work to just refine what's on that list and all of those you mentioned have been in circulation at some point or another.

And, Alan, to your question, no, the design team on authorization function has not yet been commissioned or started yet; it exists as a - as an idea in the pipeline.

Correct, to James's point, exactly, limit the number working at any given time but keep a live and active list on prospective design teams and those potentially being scoped so that we can - and really we just - we're just getting this off the ground, as you know, we only got back from Singapore last week but this is a concept and so there you go.

I've got a question from Avri in the chat and then I'll go to Olivier's hand being up. So from Avri in the chat, no work other than design teams. I don't think that precludes any work going on in the - in the main group thread, Avri. And of course we made reference to the points on - to the extent that any work can go on in parallel there's no preclusion on that but this is really a mechanism for focusing work in and around the draft proposal and the backbone or map of the work of the group towards getting a proposal out.

Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you, Jonathan. Olivier Crépin-LeBlond speaking. And I realize those design teams are designed to be agile but yet the process lifecycle of a design team seems to be a little long-winded. I was wondering how long it would take for the co chairs to review the proposal and make their choice of accepting the proposal, returning it for a clarification or refusing it.

The question being we've got four teams on the table now, could you be able to come back to us by Tuesday, by the next CWG meeting and provide the feedback, accept, return or refuse?

Jonathan Robinson: Two points, Olivier. Yes, I think there's been a - broad point that the process needs a little bit of tweaking and to minimize the bureaucratic elements of it. And, two, yes, I see no reason why we shouldn't be 100% clear what's in the funnel or in the pipeline and what's actually active and live by - on a single document which we can have shared and available with the group by no later than Tuesday.

Okay that's probably a timely point to move on to the next major item in the agenda which is to give some sense and give the opportunity to review any input from the discussion document. Now just to remind you of the origins of that document, that came from the discussion document that we prepared in advance of this - the ICANN 52.

We deliberately didn't prepare a - intentionally didn't prepare a revised proposal, we rather presented a summary for the work to date, the issues the group had faced and the key questions that it was perceived that it would be useful to get broader community input on.

The downside to doing that was that it was potentially perceived that we were not as far along or felt that we weren't as far along in our work as we needed to be. I think we are attempting to address that through this new way of working, but nevertheless, the questions asked potentially provided valuable opportunities for broader community input into key questions for the group.

So we held those in an open Q&A session on Thursday in Singapore. And subsequently asked for any additional input to be provided by close of - by a particular time on Monday 23 - that's Monday of this week. Some input has run past the deadline, in particular there was a survey sent out to a number of ccTLDs that still - that's still coming in. And there have perhaps been some others.



But to date, Berry Cobb from staff has managed to collate a sig amount of that input and will continue to do so with an intention of closing off the collation and compilation of the input.

Let me hand over to Berry and let him, A, show you what he's got so far and just talk you through a little bit of - and/or remind you of the way in which this is being compiled and the direction it might give us.

Berry Cobb: Great, thank you, Jonathan. This is Berry Cobb for the record. Yes, so what I'll do is just give you a status of where we sit with this document and it describes some of the organization of it as well as kind of we'll run through a few of the questions just to give you a general sense of what we're trying to accomplish here.

Basically in terms of the overall submissions to date, most of those have been imported with the exception of the ccTLD survey that was sent out. I will get those imported in today. It should be noted - I think there were about 38 responses and thank you to Paul Kane for putting that together. In fact I'm somewhat jealous of not coming up with the survey idea last week because it would have made the import of the responses a little bit quicker.

But ultimately we will get those in. They are more or less classified as individual responses and not necessarily a collective position from the ccNSO as well. The IPC was somewhat similar to what their four or five responses, you know, that was distributed amongst their group. These were considered individual submissions so not a particular stakeholder group or constituencies position.

So a few other submissions were formal submissions from an SO or an AC. So but they're essentially listed in what is Column B. And I understand what is shown in the AC room will be difficult for you to read but you'll be able to see.

So in terms of organization, as everyone knows, there was 9 questions. This document will be divided into 8 sections of those 9 questions. If you'll remember back in Singapore during the Q&A session Questions 4 and 5 were very similar to each other and were thus kind of considered together. And so I've maintained that continuity in this document.

As you review through each question the first initial responses were based - were pulled from the transcript that Grace had provided to us earlier in the week and then the subsequent responses are those that we started collecting from late last week all the way up to yesterday.

So that's kind of the general organization. And as you traverse through each question you'll notice some responses from Jonathan which were part of the transcript as well just to kind of help ease in the exchange that occurred during Singapore.

So with that in mind I'm just going to run through a few of the questions just to help kind of extrapolate a little bit further. And, lastly, what I'll say is I'll - once I get the ccNSO input loaded into this particular document then I'll run through to close out or just to complete any of the attribute flags that have been assigned to each of the responses. And I'll be sure to get this out to the list today for your - for everyone to consume.

And just, as I mentioned, over on the right hand side that you'll notice with a kind of an orange highlight the idea here was to try to classify like attributes

of comments that were received. So some of the questions are structured in a yes/no format, some of the comments it was a little difficult to understand whether they were in agreement or disagreement of the question.

Some of the other attributes for other questions included yes with reservation or no with reservation. And a few other - there are a few others there are even more delineations, for example, there was general support for external oversight versus the internal models that have been discussed by the working group.

So again I believe everybody has scroll control themselves for the document. And I'll just run through just a couple of these real quick. So the first question which had to deal with, you know, was there general support for the transition from the - of oversight from the NTIA and whether that should happen or not.

In terms of trying to classify the attributes of these responses, more or less is in line with what I believe most of the group agrees with that there is support for that transition to happen. There were a few responses in the negative that you'll be able to see as you move through the comments.

In general with Question 2 is are you comfortable with ICANN as a policymaker also being the IANA operator without the benefit of external oversight. Some of these terms of classifying by the attribute is pretty much indicative of what we're, you know, what the general sense of the group is right now versus, you know, the external type models that have been discussed versus the internal models that have been discussed.

Moving on to Question 3, and again I'm just really kind of running through at a high level. It'll be better for the group to review through each of these comments in general and then kind of get the overall takeaway.

Third question is regarding whether registries as primary direct customers of the IANA function should they have more say with which the proposal is acceptable? Again, you know, this is more or less there are two yes/no camps that have - that seem to be appearing out of these comments, which I think is fairly in line with some of the previous discussions that the group has had.

Questions 4 and 5, as I mentioned, they were kind of considered together in Singapore. And I haven't completed the attribute or like attribute identification because these questions were a little bit more complex and certainly the responses had more content. And what I'm waiting upon here is to have all of the comments imported then I'll review through them and look for the key attributes to kind of flush out to the top and then, you know, I'll be able to tag those attributes.

And I should note that these attributes or these like attributes are being tagged but were not necessarily - we're not tallying any of these to get, you know, 60% yes, 40% no type. The idea behind these attributes is so that you can just kind of get a quick indication as to what the comment was about and just get a general sense of what the responses are in the aggregate when considering the responses to the questions.

Moving on into then Question 6 which is considering the key factors such as security and stability, ease of separating the IANA functions from ICANN, quality of services, accountability mechanisms, etcetera, for evaluating the various transition proposals, what importance would you give the ability to separate IANA from ICANN.

Like the previous question, our Questions 4 and 5 are fairly complex and so I haven't been able to - I'm still waiting to import some of those - or all the responses in before I begin tagging the attributes.

The same is pretty much for Questions 7 and 8 and then I'll just conclude with Question 9 and turn it back over to Jonathan. Question 9 being are there any other transition models which the CWG should be exploring.

Again, while I haven't imported the ccNSO responses in general, pretty much most of the responses to date are in the negative, you know, stating that, you know, we'd more or less have all the models that are being considered on the table. There's really not much support for adding additional ones which, again, when you do review through this you'll be able to see how these like attributes will kind of float to the top, if you will.

And in so that's all that I have for the update. Like I said I will get the ccNSO responses of loaded into here, finish the key attribute definition and then send this out to the lists sometime later today. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Berry. That was a very succinct summary of a lot of detailed information. My feeling on hearing that is of course in some ways this takes us back to where we were before Singapore and having set ourselves some new ways of working. Some people might feel that this is two steps forward, one step back.

But nevertheless these were questions we asked and people have gone to the effort to answer them. And these still deal with some significant overarching issues. So it makes a lot of sense to run with this and ensure that this is utilized as key information into some of those overarching questions.

I understand that for many people this is yet another document that is new to you on the group rather than having seen this. And yet notwithstanding that there's some positive reactions from within the chat recognizing that this is valuable collation of that information.

So I guess that's just a consequence of working at the speed we are working. If we work with two meetings per week inevitably documents are going to come out relatively close to the meetings. Again, we will try and manage that as effectively as we can.

Let me see if there are any other comments or questions other than those that I've already highlighted in the chat so far and just hear if there's any other points that people would like to make.

Olivier, your hand is up. Please go ahead. Olivier, your hand is up. Please go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Olivier Crépin-LeBlond speaking. And just realizing, reading the document just one small point I wanted to make. When it says ALAC responds, this is not a response which has been voted on by the ALAC and its ratification system.

This is a response of the ALAC working group on IANA issues transition so not an official ALAC voted response. I don't know whether one needs to just say ALAC working group or something like that to make sure it doesn't get taken up as a case where we've called all of our 160 (ALS)s for this. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Olivier. And that was - Berry's noted that I believe, and that's consistent with what we asked of participants that, you know, to the extent

that it was an official position good, but that wasn't necessary. And also the idea was to poll the broader community and give some direction rather than officially sanctioned and refined points of position.

Any other comments or questions on this item? I'm going to skip over Item 4 which is a summary of actions arising in order to open up to AOB topics to make sure those are covered, you know, relatively substantial and there may be some actions arising from those and we will come back to a summary of actions afterwards.

So first of all I know, Greg, you have given a couple of recent written updates to the list on the process with respect to obtaining legal advice. But let me give you an opportunity to speak to that and just ensure that's covered and if there are any current questions they can be dealt with.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Jonathan. Greg Shatan for the record. As I put out on a further update on the list yesterday, we have now scheduled meetings with all three of the shortlisted firms, the first one is in about three hours from now, followed by another one on Friday and another one on Monday. So we are trying to stay on a rapid clip here. So each of those meetings is expected to last 60-90 minutes.

To the extent it hasn't already been clear, wanted to mention that each of these firms, and the others that we looked at, you know, were selected, you know, looking for extremely high quality reputable, substantial firms particularly in the field of corporate governance but also more general corporate and nonprofit experience and also experience in the area of trusts, and then generally advising organizations on the governance and accountability type issues and issues of dealing with structures, how to make things work within

their structures as well as how their structures may need to evolve to make them work.

So the, you know, I think all these firms are large, international. They happen to be US-based but all international firms. Really high-profile firms. If and when we're able to share the names, which I hope will be soon, but has indicated that needs to be cleared (unintelligible). I don't think, you know, anyone would question the quality of the firms looked at particularly looking for folks covered in corporate governance expertise.

And the right kind of collaborative since in their corporate governance expertise. One firm I looked at their main corporate governance person his specialty was combating shareholder activism. I didn't feel that was the right starting point for a corporate governance discussion in this context.

So we expect to have these three meetings and discuss these firms, you know, as quickly as possible thereafter, bring that back to this list and review where we stand and the end to keep moving.

One other firm was suggested to us. We have to discuss how to deal with that suggestion and the firm was a somewhat different profile. But there are one or two firms in that (unintelligible) kind of smaller more focused profile, nonprofit corporate governance that has surfaced so need to see if there's any point in moving any firm like that into the list.

And there are always a few firms of real substance that do that, not that there aren't firms that - any firms that do it but we are looking for firms of substance and keep finding firms that, you know, stand up well to this process.



I see Chris's question, "What is your best guess on timing for receiving advice?" First I get to - and this goes back to a point I made before, the concept of receiving advice is not a monolithic situation where we will present them with a series of questions and wait for a period of time to receive answers. It's more of an iterative collaborative process.

So I hope that once we engage with the firm I will have a better understanding of the firm's proposal on how to work and give us advice that we would start receiving pieces of advice, you know, within, you know, a week or so after formally engaging the firm, which I should hope would happen within a week or so of identifying which firm we wish to engage depending on the engagement process and how the firm has any reticence about starting to work kind of while the engagement is being formalized.

And, you know, expect that we, you know, would look to make this decision, you know, as quickly as possible while still making sure that it doesn't, you know, act like a unilateral type of process which it is not.

At the end - I see Chris's follow up point, at the end they will provide something in writing that could be published and we can all read. I think the idea actually is to try to have things published in follow up during the process as well as perhaps to have some sort of end deliverable. So kind of like our own design team process.

As I hope it works, which is that things will be brought back to the group in writing from the - from the legal advice. And it's not going to be some situation of silence but rather we will have, you know, written advice that may be informal just so we don't get bogged down and kind of formalities of drafting final advice.

But that there is a back and forth as much as possible through this process without necessarily, you know, subjecting the legal counsel to treating the entire CWG as a client and meeting with us in order to get anything done.

I think, you know, the idea is to, you know, and again the idea - we'll talk to them and refine this process. We don't want them to be in a box either. And we'll figure out how best to kind of make them available to this - this body of the whole so that, you know, this is not, you know, an arcane and walled off process.

And, yes, it is - I know James Gannon - this is a somewhat unorthodox, but not completely unprecedented way of working. But I think it is necessary. You know, this isn't a situation where we're getting privileged and confidential advice so that we can spring a surprise on a target company or to, you know, begin a litigation or the like so kind of typical confidentiality and privileged concerns are not as paramount as they would be.

Nonetheless, you know, there's going to be somewhat of a balance in that area. But the idea is to - is to find a firm that will work with us and that appreciates the unique issues here, the - including the external issues in dealing with kind of the rest of the world occasionally, you know, shining a very bright light on us. And figuring out how, you know, how to assist us in that process.

So Alan, the idea of the client committee was actually - was to act in a sense as the prime point of contact therefore the client committee, not the law firm selection committee. I think that was the design from the beginning. So again, the opportunity there will be substantial opportunities for the working group to interact with the law firm but the interaction with the law firm will not be

limited to contact with the CWG as a whole, otherwise we'd never get anything done.

I do know that at least two of the three firms actually did watch the - or listen to the hearing in Washington. It may be that all three did it's just communication, you know, they're not all - jumping all over themselves necessarily to communicate exactly the same thing. So - but I do know that two of them did. Whether they have reservations or comments we'll find out as we discuss it with them.

So if there are any questions I'm happy to take them. I've been trying to answer the ones in the chat as I see them. If there are any live questions or if I missed any question that was posed in the chat let me know.

Otherwise, I will...

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Greg.

Greg Shatan: ...hand back.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Greg. Hopefully that's pretty clear. I think there is - there's clearly - there's going to be an opportunity to think about how we effectively interact and manage the interaction between the law firm and the legal advice we get in the group to some extent dependent on the law firm itself, which I think there's a point you make in their willingness and ability to do so. And in a sense that's got to be part of the selection criteria as well.

So if you do have anything, I mean, the meeting - the first meeting is due to take place later today. But if you do have any feedback or input that you'd like

to make to the client committee, feel free to do that on list to the extent that this is done now in the meeting.

Take this opportunity, John Poole highlights that he sent an email to the mail list. John, are you saying that that hasn't yet been sufficiently well answered and you'd like to flag up a point - a point or more from that?

Greg, I'll give you an opportunity to either respond now or we can pick that up on list to the point that - the point that John's made and we can go back to that and check the response, I mean...

Greg Shatan: Yeah, just briefly, I think that email came in somewhat late for me so I haven't had a chance to respond to it fully. I've tried to respond in part in my remarks but I'll come back to the email and respond to it. Forgive me, at least some working hours by which I mean daylight in order to respond to questions. I probably pumped out about 50 emails yesterday for this basically and I just - I'm going as fast as I can. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Great and I think that's just a - that's a good general point. And just recognizing that for all of us we are working hard at this. There's a lot going on. We're running two meetings a week plus potentially design - design team meetings in between. So I guess there's two things. One, let's be respectful and patient with each other to the extent that we can.

And, two, please do your best to try and figure out if something has already been dealt with on list or in a meeting. These are all recorded. The list is there. I know it's not always easy to see the information but we do sometimes get issues coming back around time and again that we've dealt with. So to the extent that you can try and find it out, please do. Thanks for your support on that, Cheryl.

All right, let me then - to the action items which Marika has very diligently placed under Item 4 now so thank you, Marika. Certainly the group as a whole can go back and look at that draft proposal and be mindful of the methodology that we're working to in reviewing that.

We will need to get a written scope for all drafting teams, sorry, design teams, as well as the membership to be shared with the whole group. We need to have - and to publish a list of the design teams proposed and the template submitted or the scopes - scoping that's been submitted. And we will confirm that through the use of that list or another means to make sure it's known to the group as a whole which are active and which are proposed.

I don't think it's captured in here but certainly there's been substantial feedback in and around the process of commissioning and operating the design teams. And we'll go back and provide a revised proposal based on that feedback with an objective to really simplify and make them as lightweight as possible while still managing the overall effectiveness of the CWG given the extremely tight time tables we're on.

There's a note about the input to the client committee to be shared with the mailing list and the input there. And of course encourage you to review the completed version of the responses to discussion document questions as they come through.

Are there any other points that anyone would like to raise at this point substantial or minor if you feel we're making better progress than we were or if there's something else we could do to make better progress. I'm mindful that all of us have been there for a while now, there is a significant desire within the group, and from without to make progress and be seen to be making

progress. So if any of you have any comments to assist with that that would be great. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks, Jonathan. I just wanted to return to a point that I put on the agenda at the beginning of the call which was the level of detail that our proposal has to meet in order to be sufficient. I listened to the ICG call that took place yesterday or two days ago depending on where you stand in the 24 hour clock. Frankly found it rather frustrating. There seemed to be some thought that we shouldn't even get an answer to the question but somehow prejudice out work.

And there also didn't seem to be a lot of consideration of the fact that we were kind of waiting - not so much waiting for that advice but needed advice on how deep into implementation we should go and noting that the other two proposals are really at a level that, you know, is not, you know, quote, unquote, implementable. There's, you know, work left to be done.

And indeed I would argue that our proposal even at the time of Frankfurt is as detailed as the other two proposals which doesn't make it sufficient and of course our task is bigger because for the most part the other proposals don't change much to the current way things worked in those - in numbers and protocol parameters.

But in any case, you know, I contrast - and there didn't seem to be necessarily any desire or - and I sure appreciate - mention that this discussion took place only in the last 15 minutes of the ICG's call so I think that this is an issue in progress for them and expect that the next call might be more fruitful. One member seemed to feel it was important to answer a previous question on the agenda during this discussion so it wasn't even really the first - the full 15 minutes but we know any large group has its process points and issues.

But I think this is something that, you know, we need to figure out because it seemed it was the view of some of the ICG was that we shouldn't go any further than the other two community proposals and that we shouldn't, you know, be submitting fully drafted SLAs or the like.

Larry Strickling, in his remarks to the senate, seemed to have a different view. I don't have those remarks in front of me to quote. But I think this is an open issue at this point and just kind of - I think it's something we need to keep an eye on. And it may be that the chairs need to meet with the ICG on this.  
Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Greg. I see a couple of hands are up. I'm just going to make note of this concern which I did address but I would like to repeat address and before we come back to your point, Greg, that anyone working in a design team and in particular the individual leading the design team needs to be cognizant of the work of the group.

And that was why I was concerned about making sure that members of design teams were indeed members of this group so they had a historic perspective on the work that be done on the RFPs. So there is no intention to discard or not take proper notice of the RFP points.

Greg, you raise a really interesting point on this detail, and there may well be something we can do as chairs, Lise and myself, but I welcome any other responses or comments to that. And I'm sorry I overlooked it in coming to - under the AOB.

I'll see if anyone does respond to that but in the meantime I'll go to Jaap who may or may not be responding to that particular point. Jaap, go ahead.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Okay. On - (unintelligible) particularly just to the AOB and I noticed that we now have this bibliography page on the web, which is a very nice to have. But it reminded me again to the fact that it was an action item in Singapore and that should be looking at SAC 69 and it looks like we have forgotten that.

Jonathan Robinson: Jaap, in what way forgotten it? I mean, I've certainly...

Jaap Akkerhuis: If you go to the (unintelligible) webpage you will notice that there is an action item from our meeting in Singapore where it was said that not only that everybody should actually read the SSAC reports but there should also be a small study group especially looking at SAC 69. And this is...

Jonathan Robinson: Good point, Jaap. I've got it. Thank you very much. We will make sure that - that's probably an opportunity for - we call it a study group, we could just as easily call it another design team, a group that just reviews that and it was intended that the document - and I've overlooked that in my covering notes, in fact, should be - the draft document should be consistent with and recognize the input from SAC 69 so thank you for that reminder.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry, Jaap, go ahead and finish your point then.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yeah, I was just saying that I don't mind calling it a design team or whatever. That's not important. But at least all - if we're not going to do that we should (unintelligible) move the action point - anyway that's all.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...and it's a welcome reminder. Thank you, Jaap. Chris.



((Crosstalk))

Chris Disspain: You can, super. I wanted to just pick up on what Greg was talking about. I'm reminded of (unintelligible) it was (unintelligible) important to look at what the ICG is expecting to receive from this working group. It's important - equally important, perhaps more important, to remember that there is a step before that which is that our output has to be approved/endorsed by each of the chartering organizations.

So I would recommend (unintelligible) be concentrating on making sure that they're comfortable with what we were saying before we get too carried away with worrying about what the ICG wants. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Chris. That's a welcome (unintelligible) that we do need to be very mindful of the fact that this group was chartered by a set of chartering organizations.

I mean, it was a key theme of the meeting in Singapore was making sure that we encourage both appointed members of the group and by whatever other means we could recognize that the chartering organizations need to be continuously informed and that they need to - it is - it's incumbent on the members and in my case the GNSO.

I reminded the councilors to - and we've made significant efforts to profile this work within the GNSO meetings so that the GNSO in this particular case was significantly aware of the work and the same with the other chartering organizations and were tracking and responsible for providing the members - channeling feedback back to the group so very much like to see that

happening and make sure that the work is consistent with the expectations of the chartering organizations.

Okay, so some useful points and reminders there about the elements of the way in which the work needs to be done. Grace, you wanted to make a point, please go ahead.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you, Jonathan. This is Grace Abuhamad. I just wanted to remind all of you that we have a face to face on the 26th and 27th of March and that the confirmation for in person attendance is needed by March 2, which is Monday.

So I have most of the members confirmed but I don't have the long list of participants confirmed so if you are a participant and you're going to be attending at your own expense please let me know. Starting on March 2 we will be finalizing the logistical arrangements for the meeting and it's good to know approximately room size, things like that.

So even if you're considering attending and you haven't confirmed yet and you might miss the Monday deadline just please let me know so I can anticipate a number for the seating arrangements and things like that. And I have a list on the wiki of in person attendees, I'll circulate that afterwards just so that you can all know who's confirmed so far. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Grace. So please can we have that responses and I think an additional reminder to the list by email would do no harm, either, Grace, for people that aren't on the call and rapidly catch up with the content of the call. And I note there's a few comments indicating that an expectation as it is likely that this group will have more detail for various reasons in its proposal and that would be a reasonable expectation relative to the other two proposals.

But certainly the - coming out of the current draft was a couple of key points. One, to reference the existing proposals and make sure that it could be - that ours was in a form and format that was comparable. And, second, in fact to Jaap's point that we had cross referenced it against SSAC 69.

All right we're at the end of the agenda. I don't see any other hands in the queue so it feels like we've picked up a variety of areas we need to work on, in particular getting productive use of the design teams in short order. And so we'll work actively on that and pick on hopefully some of the outputs and potentially commissioning additional design teams over the next few days and into next week.

Thank you very much, all. We'll look forward to working with you on list and meeting with you on Tuesday next week or at separate meetings in the interim.

Grace Abuhamad: Thanks, bye.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Jonathan. Bye.

END