

ICANN

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
March 10, 2015
12:00 pm CT**

Grace Abuhamad: ...(seventh) meeting of the CWG on March 10 at 1702 UTC. We will be doing the roll call based on the Adobe Connect room. But if there's anyone who is on the audio only line - I now Cheryl will be rejoining the room and (Steve) is on his cell phone but also on the Adobe Connect. Is there anyone who's only on the audio line?

Rick Boucher: This is Rick Boucher from Sidley. I'm only on the telephone.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you Rick. Anyone else? Okay. Looks like we're good to go. Off to you Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Grace. Welcome everyone. And especially welcome to our guest from Sidley. Just to let you know, the protocol is that if you need to speak typically, you put your hand up in the Adobe room. If you are unable to do so because you're only on audio, just know and we'll put you in the queue and make sure you can speak.

So welcome everyone to this 27th meeting. We've got a few things to get through. You can see the agenda up in the top right hand of your screen. I'm

sorry I wasn't available to work with you last week but I hear (Lise) did a good job of chairing the meeting and as happens she's traveling this week and so won't be in on this meeting but she plans to be in on the Thursday.

Man: Okay. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Just a couple of very brief remarks. Obviously we - as I've said before, we need to continue to make progress and we seem to be making progress. We've got two full weeks before our Istanbul face-to-face meeting. And overall clearly our objective is to build out the draft transition proposal.

Just to remind everyone that some of us are working all the hours that (God sends) and it's very appreciated what people are doing and just remember everyone, this is a working group and we need as much work and contributions from as many of you as possible.

So if you are in any position to assist with the ultimate objective of creating the draft proposal by contributions to design teams or the main list that's very welcome and we appreciate any constructive efforts to help us develop the relevant content, which of course is ultimately our objective being to develop a functional, implementable and complete plan.

Clearly with the design teams we've been focusing on the...

Man: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: ...functional requirements of any part of the plan before we undertake substantive work. And all of that will be rolled up into the transition proposal plan draft, which is in the form 2.x.x.

You will have seen one or more variants of that already. I believe (Bernie)'s working on an update version, which will include at minimum references to all of the existing design teams and the placeholders for those in the document either proposed or active design teams.

So we are still attempting to work towards producing a proposal for publication for public comment relatively shortly after the Istanbul meeting. It's an extremely stretching timetable. I know some of you have concerns about how we synthesize that effort with the input of legal advice and the overarching issue of how we handle any separation mechanism.

So that's certainly a challenge to marry all of that up. But just a reminder, please focus on as many substantive contributions as you can as possible. Let me pause having made those remarks and just see if there's any other comments or questions before we move onto reviewing the outstanding actions (unintelligible).

All right. There are three outstanding actions from the previous meeting or meetings. First of all, the one to present the group with the overall design team list and to commence the prioritization of that list. As you know, that (unintelligible) done. And we'll come back to that in some more detail under Item 3.

The second was to review the design team template for Design Team A and make sure that the perceived or anticipated scope of work was in line with what had been proposed and published.

I guess we will come to that. I'm just checking if Paul is on the call. I don't see Paul Kane on the call. He's the lead of that design team. So have some from staff could reach out to Paul and make sure he is clear that we'd like him on

the call to at least come back to us under Item 3b. Someone confirm to me that they're able to do that. Thank you Grace.

And then Item 5 - I'm sorry. The third outstanding action from (the 5th) of March was work on modifying the principles and there's been quite some discussion on the list, which is great.

And I think that seems to be moving ahead well; the key point there being that we - right now we don't have (Martin) on the call nor (Lisa) nor (Elise) or some of the key players in that (unintelligible) around. And so I expect we will pick that up on Thursday. And that's what (Lisa) and I discussed previously. So it seems to be good progress on the list and we're close it feels to me. But that will pick up. So that remains an open item for Thursday.

Right. Item 2 and we brought this to this point on the agenda in terms of the order of play for a couple of reasons really. One because it's clearly a topic of substantial interest in any event and also I am aware that one or more members of the Sidley Team are available to us in this first hour. So we'll take advantage of that and use that availability to deal with that under Item B.

I think there's probably a small (unintelligible) from the Client Committee that we could make although much of it has been covered on list. It's clearly that recognition that one of the areas we need some input on is the working letters document, which you'll know has been published and is available by Google Doc to be worked on and the input created.

Greg, I am not sure if you would like to provide any other comment or input at this stage. But feel free to do so. I'll pause for a moment to give you that opportunity and we'll take it from there.

Greg Shatan: Oh, thank you Jonathan. Not too much more to add. I think, you know, we are at a great inflection point in our work and I'm very excited to - that we are introducing Sidley Austin to the CWG. You know, whatever kinks we need to work out in our working methods I'm confident we'll work them out. There's already work in progress.

I don't want to hold up having Sidley introduced. So I'll step aside at this point and add things further if need be. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Greg. And if under Item 2 anyone would like us to come back to and review in this meeting or discuss any elements of the working methods document, let's do that. But let's go to 2b first, have the introduction and if necessary - in fact (you could) potentially create an Item 2c Grace for us to have a look at any comments or input on the working methods.

So Holly, if you are in a position to do so, I'd like to offer you the opportunity to introduce yourself and any colleagues from Sidley on the - who are on the call with us today. That'll give you the opportunity to introduce both yourselves and make any remarks you would like to. And then we can of course take it from there and give an opportunity for Q&A. So over to you Holly.

Holly Gregory: Well thank you very much. Can you hear me okay?

Jonathan Robinson: Holly, we hear you nice and clearly. Thanks.

Holly Gregory: Terrific. Well thank you very much and I'm very pleased to meet all of you by phone that we haven't met in our discussion up to date. We at Sidley are very much looking forward to working with you and taking our direction to you and advising you as you think about a transition proposal for IANA.

And with that being said, we think that this is really a complex and multidimensional project. And we've brought to this project a team that I'd like to introduce to you. We think that there are a significant number of areas of expertise that are needed.

We do assure you though that even though I'm about to introduce the team that may seem a little on the large side, we're very committed to working efficiently and effectively. And, you know, interested in whatever processes you'd like us to follow to help us do that.

We've already spoken with the Client Committee with some ideas about work processes to help us stay as lean and mean and efficient and fast moving as possible.

My name is Holly Gregory. I'm co-Chair of the firm's Global Corporate Governance practice. I also am the Chair of the American Bar Association Corporate Governance Committee.

And my practice involves counseling a variety of types of organizations on accountability mechanisms and things like board duties, risk oversight, transparency.

I'm joined by Ed McNicholas who's the co-leader of our Privacy Data Security and Information law practice. He has a lot of experience in advising on cyber security and information technology and privacy issues.

I'm also very pleased that we have with us Rick Boucher. And Rick and Ed are both on the phone today. Rick is the head of our Government Strategies Group where he practices in counseling clients who need to make sure that a

path that they're going down is going to be in line with expectations of government and in a regulatory environment.

Prior to joining us Rick was a Congressman for 28 years. And he was on the committee that oversaw the commercialization of the Internet and its transition from a government owned project to a global platform. So he'll bring a valuable perspective to bear.

We also have Cam Kerry who's the former General Counsel and Acting Secretary of the United States Department of Commerce. And as you know, the Commerce Department plays a significant role in the oversight of the IANA Stewardship function now. And he brings great experience that will be also helpful.

Sharon Flanagan is the Managing Partner of our San Francisco office. She's a corporate lawyer. She works in Corporate Governance and M&A transactions and structural issues with corporations and is a California lawyer.

We're joined also by Josh Hofheimer who's a partner in our LA office and he has IP experience as well as corporate law experience and structuring experience and not for profit experience.

In addition to this team, you know, we're an international law firm with a range of very deep practices that we will reach out to on an as needed basis. For example, we have a very strong not for profit practice that's very specialized and a strong trust and foundations practice that's very specialized. And those experts are available to us as needed as we consider the issues that are before you.

So with that, I'm just going to ask Rick and Ed if they would like to add anything to what I've said. Rick? Or Ed.

Ed McNicholas: This is Ed McNicholas. As Holly mentioned, I'm one of the co-leaders of Sidley's Privacy Data Security and Information law practice. It's very much a global practice. And we have worked on the legal issues involving that (unintelligible) from the Internet for years now.

And it is a great privilege actually to be providing guidance to the CWG in this context. We very much look forward to working with you. We have the issues that have been presented in the request for legal advice.

And we look forward to addressing those questions and more substantively helping shape the legal aspects of the proposals so that we have the questions answered and we have effective efficient proposals that ensure the transparency, legitimacy and accountability that are necessary to have effective solutions in this transition.

I don't know if Rick wanted to add anything more.

Rick Boucher: Yes. Thank you Ed. I'm sorry. I was disconnected momentarily. I'm back now.

I think one important element is to make sure that as we are devising a transition proposal that it meets the benchmarks that key members of Congress have set forth.

And fortunately they have given us a guideline in the form of a letter that Senators Thune and Rubio sent to (Steven) Crocker in July of last year. And that letter sets forth some benchmarks that I think it's very important that we achieve as we go forward with the proposals.

And I don't think they will be difficult to achieve but I think we have to be conscious of them and work to make sure that as we are putting structures in place and assurances of accountability in place that we are conscious of and meet the standards that these two key Senators have set forth.

Senator Thune for those who are not familiar with him is the Chairman of the U.S. Senate Committee on Commerce. That is the committee that has jurisdiction over NTIA. And that is the committee that has already held one hearing on the IANA transition and probably will be holding additional hearings as the transition progresses.

Almost certainly at the point at which ICANN sends to NTIA a transition proposal we can expect that Senator Thune and his committee will want to learn about that proposal. They will have another hearing. And they will be watching very carefully to make sure that the proposal meets their announced standard.

It is not necessary for the U.S. Congress to affirmatively act to approve the transition but as we're all aware, Congress has the power of the purse and can negatively act in a way that blocks funding to accomplish the transition. It has already done that for the current year. We want to make sure that Congress does not choose to do that for next year.

Holly Gregory: Thank you Rick. Jonathan, I'm going to turn it back to you. But again, we're looking forward to working with the working group.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Holly and colleagues Rick, Ed and others. It's very helpful to hear from you. I note recognition of - in the chat of, you know, the considerable strength that your team brings. And I'm sure as we get to work

with you and understand how we can work with you that'll become evermore apparent.

I think this is an opportunity for Q&A with you. Clearly we are not about to do a deep dive into the legal issues at this stage. This is about giving the CWG the confidence that you have the grasp of the issues and that you have the relevant background and any other comments or questions or discussion points people would like to raise.

I strongly encourage people to do that now and not be intimidated by the sort of open audio side of things and the fact that the team is on here. This is an opportunity to get comfortable and be comfortable with the team that we're going to be working with.

So it would be great to see some hands come up and a couple of questions no matter how basic so that we can leave this meeting with confidence of knowing that we can work with the team and we can concentrate on the substantive issues we need to deal with and the group is broadly comfortable.

CW, I assume that's Christopher Wilkinson. Go ahead Christopher.

Christopher, if it's you we don't hear you. So if you could try and come off mute so we can.

Christopher Wilkinson: Can you hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: That's loud. Thanks Christopher. Go ahead.

Christopher Wilkinson: Okay. (Unintelligible) that comes with the technology. Just a quick word. Not exactly a question. But what (expertise) and experience with the (unintelligible) Council that (has been the time)? And (unintelligible)

(learning) the Council (unintelligible) with which some of you are closely associated with the original transitions within the Internet and ICANN many years ago. And I associated myself with that (unintelligible).

There have been a lot of changes. There have been changes geographically, international, the governmental interest in ICANN has increased from (tens) of governments to more than 100 governments. This is (unintelligible)...

Holly Gregory: I'm very sorry to interrupt you but we're having a very hard time hearing you. And I was wondering if perhaps you could speak farther away from the microphone and that might help us hear what you're trying to say.

Christopher Wilkinson: Try with this way.

Holly Gregory: That's better. Thank you.

Christopher Wilkinson: That's interesting. I'm (trying) to my right (ear) to (put the microphone away). Just to say that ICANN community and the Internet Governance community At Large have become vastly more diverse and geographically deepened. And the participation of civil society, of user interest, of the ccTLDs as well as the gTLDs have become deeper and more complex.

And I will trust that Council would take this (truly) onboard and (this) is speaking from a European perspective; it is very unfortunate in the case that the Congress has not yet (unintelligible) fully onboard the globalization and internationalization of the Internet in the last two decades. Thank you Jonathan. Thank you (Lisa).

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Christopher. And I'll just pause to see if there's any response or - from Holly and/or colleagues. Holly, I'll leave you to direct the Sidley traffic if you want to bring in someone specifically to respond to that. And feel free if you don't want to respond also just pass on it and let us know.

Holly Gregory: Well I think Christopher raises a very, very important point. We have to be of course very mindful of the growth in the stakeholder community, the international aspects here and that this is not a U.S. centric exercise.

And I think we are mindful of that. We have an understanding of the complexities and I'm sure that we will learn more and with the working group's guidance I'm, you know, sure that if, you know, you feel that there's something that we need to be aware of you will bring it to our attention.

I wonder Ed if you would like to comment. And again, I hope that that's responsive. I was having a little difficulty hearing some of the commentary. But Christopher, again, I think that that's very important for us to understand the international complexities, the diversity of the stakeholder community and the critical interest that we're trying to address.

Ed McNicholas: This is Ed McNicholas. I would just add that we are very much - we approach Internet issues generally as global issues. And we are very familiar and comfortable with different approaches to Internet law across the globe. We have very detailed knowledge of the EU data protection regime, the different methods, the different directives that are relevant in the European Union.

We have also dealt very directly for global tech companies with the different issues that arise and Internet questions, you know, in Asia and the perspective of the developing world on these issues as well is something that often comes up as we work with a variety of global clients.

And so the perspective we bring to this although many of us are sitting in Washington and New York is one that is we hope a global one but we also are very much open to sharing anytime that we are - could benefit from further perspectives, we're certainly opening to - open to hearing from those as well.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you both. Just a brief remark before we go to the next in the queue. I think the comment from Christopher was as much about the Internet - international Internet governance landscape as international legal landscape. So that's a point I took from it and the changing and more internationalized nature of that Internet governance landscape. (Unintelligible).

Ed McNicholas: Indeed. And just if I could speak to that point as well because we did have a - at least I had a fairly hard time understanding what was the - what he was saying because of the audio quality.

We're very keenly aware of the transition and the move away from the current contractual framework into something that has to have legitimacy to all of the stakeholders. Obviously there needs to be a process that is transparent and comfortable enough so that the U.S. Congress and the U.S. Government agree to proceed with the process.

But it also has to be a process that achieves legitimacy with global stakeholders because that of course is the whole reason for the process to - is to achieve a more global transparent governance method for the IANA functions.

Jonathan Robinson: Exactly. Thank you.

Cam Kerry: And this is Cam Kerry if I can jump in a second. What Ed said is certainly (unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: Cam, you're a little soft. If you could speak up or speak close to the mic that would be great.

Holly Gregory: Cam, we're not able to hear you.

Cam Kerry: Okay. It's either an issue with my microphone or with my lack of voice. Let me just second what Ed said and I'll, you know, leave it for another time.

Holly Gregory: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Cam. And feel free to come in if you can get more volume on the mic. Holly, did you want to come back on that?

Holly Gregory: No. No, I'm good.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Thank you. Eduardo, you were next in line. So come in Eduardo.

Eduardo Diaz: Thank you (unintelligible). And this is Eduardo for the record. I have a question. First of all, I want to welcome the legal team and eager to hear what advice you're going to give us.

And in that respect, you know, we are going to be meeting face-to-face in Istanbul on March 26. That's around two weeks from now. And I just wanted to get a sense of how comfortable you're going to be in answering or providing advice to the questions that we, you know, generated quite a while ago because that advice will be key to the discussions that we're going to have in Istanbul. Thank you.

Holly Gregory: This is Holly. I'll respond. And thank you Eduardo and we're looking forward to working with you as well.

We have the questions and we're looking at those questions seriously now. We want very much in the next two weeks to make as much traction as we can on those questions.

In understanding - to understand the questions it's going to be very important for us to have a little bit of more insight into your thinking. And so we are planning this week to spend some time doing some diligence with the Client Committee to understand - to better understand the genesis of the questions and the concerns that underlie them. That being said, it's my hope that at least at a high level we can address many of those questions at Istanbul.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Eduardo and thanks Holly. One of the challenges we face and come back in in a moment Eduardo if you need to say something more. But one of the challenges we face is - it's the challenge we face at present and we will face in Istanbul is how much time to give to production of the proposal other than that which is impacted by the legal advice and how much to work with them.

And in part that depends on how much progress we can make in developing the thinking between now and then - developing - someone's got an open mic. So if I could ask you to just be careful to mute your mics if you're not speaking. Eduardo ,did you want to come back in on that point?

Eduardo Diaz: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Or did anyone else...

Eduardo Diaz: This is Eduardo again. I just wanted to - I'm asking you is because, you know, one of major things that we're going to face in Istanbul or maybe before that if we have a chance is, you know, which direction we're going to take between how (we make) general solutions and (external) solution or hybrid solution.

And I think the legal advice will be key (in helping) - legal group in helping, you know, choose the best direction for this proposal. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Eduardo. I'll just pause a moment if there are any other comments...

Holly Gregory: Well...

Jonathan Robinson: ...or (unintelligible).

Holly Gregory: This is Holly Gregory again. I just wanted - thank you Jonathan. And just Eduardo, I want to again reiterate we are going to take our best efforts to make sure that we understand the questions and that we understand them in context. And to the extent that we can provide guidance on those questions by Istanbul, we certainly will. And we're going to make real effort to do so.

At the same time, you know, depending on the complexities, I want to make sure that we manage expectations. And, you know, we may have further work to do.

We're also - want to make sure that these are the right questions. There may be some additional things that haven't been asked that really need to be understood as well.

So it's a lot to get done in two weeks. And therefore, I want to assure you we're making best efforts. But I don't know that we will be able to have it wrapped up with any kind of ribbon. In fact I know that we won't. I know that there will be gaps but our goal is to really get a good start and really be able to get engaged in these discussions with you in a meaningful way.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Holly. And I think that reminds me of a point that Greg has made in the past at least and I am mindful of. And that is that part of your initial and perhaps what advice not in the formal sense of comprehensive written advice is to give us some advice on the types of questions we should be asking.

So whilst our questions that we asked were preliminary and set out the issues in the first instance as we saw them, part of our work with you might be to develop those questions further or indeed create new questions that require new answers.

Holly Gregory: Agreed.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Holly. I'm mindful of a question from (Mark) in the chat but Philip you've been waiting for a while. So let me hand over to Philip Corwin. Phil, we're not hearing you. So it may be that your microphone is still on mute.

Philip Corwin: Let me start again with my mute off. Phil Corwin for the record. Good afternoon or whatever time it is. Can you hear me okay now?

Holly Gregory: Yes.

Philip Corwin: Okay. Just by way of overview, I think it's a very impressive team and I can say that I - while he was in the House I worked with Congressman Boucher on a number of issues both Internet and non-Internet and he's a very strong

addition to the team and has excellent relationships with both sides of the aisle. So I think he brings a lot of strength.

My question is - my understanding is that this is the legal team hired by the CWG transition that a separate legal team will be retained by the CCWG on accountability. Those two working groups will eventually have to integrate their reports and recommendations into one combined package for consideration by the entire ICANN community and then by the NTIA and no doubt subject to Congressional oversight.

Has any thought been given to once the CCWG on accountability retains its legal advice to whether at some point there's going to be some cross communication or at least where the teams are informed of each other's advice?

I realize that legal advice regarding accountability on the IANA functions could differ from legal advice as well as the prescribed remedies for ICANN as an organization. But still there's - we would hope there'd be some consistency in the legal analysis and in the final recommendation.

So has any thought been given to how the two different legal teams being retained by the two different working groups will - if they will communicate and how that will be done down the road?

Jonathan Robinson: Well I suspect Greg - his hand is up is to provide you with at least a partial answer to that. And I'll just note that Sam Eisner's point in the chat that relating to a point you made. The CCWG report does not have to be integrated into the ICG proposal. But both are expected to be delivered to NTIA at the same time. So let's go over to Greg and then we'll see if there's any other further response from anyone else including team at Sidley. Greg.

Greg Shatan: Hi. It's Greg Shatan for the record. Just to clarify. The CCWG legal committee is going through its own procurement exercise but largely, you know, piggybacking on the CWG exercise at this point.

While no decisions have been made so it'd be premature to say what the decision would be, it is at least contemplated that the Sidley team could be providing advice to both the CWG and CCWG and therefore there would be - this idea of two separate teams would not occur.

So as a matter of fact I believe the CCWG legal committee is having a call with Sidley later today. You know, that exploratory call - potential client call as we were having potential client calls ourselves.

So I think - let's not jump the gun yet and assume that there are going to be two separate legal teams that could be, you know, charging off in different directions or needing integration. So, you know, premature to say which is more likely to happen. But let's just watch this space.

I think that if indeed there are two legal teams I'm sure that integration or at least cross coordination will be on the agenda from day one.

Philip Corwin: Phil again and just briefly. Thanks for that clarification Greg. We'll just stand by and see what the CCWG does about legal advice. It may be (perfectly) acceptable to have the same team providing advice to both working groups. It would certainly be consistent - guaranteed consistency.

One last comment just to respond to something Samantha posted in the chat room. I understand that the CCWG report doesn't have to be integrated with the ICG proposal. But Secretary Strickling has certainly made clear that the

NTIA is going to regard them as one total package and evaluate them together. So I'll stop at that point.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Phil. Thank you Greg for the response. And I must say from my personal point of view it would seem pragmatic and desirable that there was potentially even same team if not close integration between the two. But as Greg says, it's premature to suggest the outcome. Let's see where that goes.

Are there any comments from the Sidley team or shall we move onto the next question? Let me just pause a moment.

Holly Gregory: I have no specific comments on that. Of course we would, you know, only consider taking it on if it was agreed with the CWG that they thought that it was work that we should do. But that being said, we are having a conversation to explore whether it would be efficient for the CCWG to use the same advisors.

Jonathan Robinson: Holly. Avri, let's go straight to you. Your hand is raised.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Avri Doria speaking. I guess I have two questions. One in terms - actually one's a comment. In terms of the - this group and the Accountability Cross Community Working Group using, I don't think that efficiency should necessarily be the only guideline.

It may indeed be that the specialization that people are looking for in one group versus the other may be different and being in both of those groups I already see that there are shades of difference in those. So while efficiency is always a really good thing, I think we should be careful of letting that be the dominant consideration in terms of the legal advice.

The question I have is in the introduction and the initial discussions by the legal team, I was impressed by, you know, their perspectives and such. But I was somewhat confused about the relationship between the Congressional opinions and Congressional hearings and all that hubbub that's building up, you know, in the American political arena with the answering of questions that we're asking in terms of does this structure, you know, is this structure consistent with law in this locality.

Does this legal structure that we are suggesting meet the requirements of our principles? Those all seem to be very much legal questions at very practical solution based scale.

And I thought that that was a primary goal versus the other that seems to be almost legal strategy for how to deal with American Congress, which could be very helpful but I didn't think was really our primary need - perhaps it's a primary need but wasn't our primary motivation for bringing in a team. So I just - I guess I'm a little confused as to the balance between those two.
Thanks.

Holly Gregory: I'm happy to speak to that Avri and I think it's well said. I think what you said is very well said and agreed that the core path here is to help advise you on legal issues as you explore potential structures for the transition.

And we've created a team that's well suited to that with a combination of governance, corporate structuring, a non-profit advice and also the ability to reach out and get much more specialized trust advice as needed.

We did think that it was critical to have on the team some people who could help us understand the context in which this arises. And so we've got and have

long experience in the Internet governance sphere. And Rick brings that the bear as does Cam Kerry.

In addition, at the end of the road you're going to want to know that what you come up with is something that will - you want to know what the potential issues might be, you know, down the road about whether it can be available, if you will. I don't think that that's a central issue but I think it's very helpful for the team to have some of that input as we move forward.

But I would definitely agree with (you on) how you...

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Holly.

Holly Gregory: ...characterize the focus of our work.

Jonathan Robinson: That's Holly. That's a helpful answer to me and I suspect it's helpful to Avri as well. I hope so. And I know Cam is in line to talk so Cam would you like to try and come in now? I'm just mindful of one of the supplementary points I suppose and mindful of Holly already having given a very good answer.

But we've been repeatedly reminded of and need to be cognizant of the diversity of stakeholders who have an interest in the outcome of this and that's a tricky path to walk. But your ability to help us with elements of that is useful.

(Alan), I note your point in the chat. I did reply to you on list so perhaps you can check that reply and see if it's satisfactory. Thanks for your attendance so far. Cam, your hand is up in the Adobe. I wonder if you are trying to speak or that's an accident. Okay. I'll pass over Cam's hand for the moment.

Does anyone else - I know we're coming very relatively close to the top of the hour and the colleagues from Sidley need to move on ahead of that point. So let me do a final check if there's any other questions or (anything) that need to be...

Man: Yes. Hello.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. (Unintelligible) hear you now.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: If that's Cam, we can hear you. You're coming in and out a little but we can hear you. Afraid we hear nothing again now Cam.

Holly Gregory: Yes. I think there's a difficulty in the line Cam. Maybe we should just pass over and move on.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Holly. We've all had our glitches with this system before. But once you get settled on using the audio in Adobe, as you can see, it's quite a functional system. It's just a question of a couple of goes to get it right. And we can set up a test session with you if necessary to help with the practicalities of it.

Holly Gregory: Terrific.

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead if there is a comment there from someone. Okay. I think that's timely. It's sufficiently ahead of the hour that gives our colleagues from Sidley the opportunity to get to the next meeting unless there is something else. And

of course this isn't the last of a chance by a long way to engage. It's the first of various forms of engagement to get the tasks we need to done.

It was primarily an opportunity for the CWG to become comfortable with the aspects of the working relationship as we kick things off. So Holly, you may want to say anything in closing. But thank you. I'll finish by saying thank you very much to you and your team. I don't know if there's anything you'd like to add.

Holly Gregory: I just wanted to add that, you know, we are looking forward to working with you. We're looking forward to doing this in a very transparent way. And the sort of working procedures document is a very good one that we're committed to. And if there are ideas about how to further improve it, you know, we're happy to be part of that discussion. (Unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Holly. I feel that unique is an overused word. But this does feel like a unique experience for all of us. So yes, thank you.

Holly Gregory: Thank you. I'm going to say goodbye now. I have to run for another engagement. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. Good. Well thanks again and thank you to your colleagues as well. And we'll be in touch either on the mailing list or however best suits keeping working with you.

Holly Gregory: Thank you. Bye.

Man: ...you. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. Thanks everyone. I think that was a very useful opportunity. We'll undoubtedly continue the discussion on the working methods and the effectiveness of working with Sidley in this unique engagement.

And I meant what I said a moment ago. This is - I know it's unique, it's interesting and it's great to have this opportunity and let's make a good go of it. But I take your point Avri earlier. This is not all about efficiency and in some ways that was a shorthand for effectiveness and let's see what we can do to make this work effectively. And I won't presume anything to do with the CCWG at this point.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Cam. We see you (unintelligible). And we'll catch up with you in future. I've got an open mic so if anyone who's - is not trying to talk, if you could shut off your mic for now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's actually an echo Jonathan. So Greg might be able to problem solve that. That's Cheryl just by the way.

Jonathan Robinson: Cheryl, I was just waiting for the echoes to die off. Hopefully that's - yes. I think it - I see Cam's mic is still open. So Grace, you may want to shut that one off. I don't know if it's that one but that's one you may want to switch off.

Okay. It seems we've lost the echo now anyway so that's good. The next item on our agenda is - well, let me just pause in case there are any other further comments on the legal issues. But I think we've done that reasonably well.

I remind myself I guess that we opened up (too), which is an opportunity for any comment or input at this stage on the working methods. I see we've got a

healthy second channel going on in the chat. I'm going to find that difficult to monitor.

So I mean I realize it's on topic for the group but it's off topic as far as the agenda's concerned. So it'll be a challenge for me to follow that as well as keep to the agenda. So just draw your attention to the fact there's a second theme running in the chat and you may want to catch that up either now or later.

All right. So please under 2c I'll remind you that there are - there is an opportunity to provide comments and input on the working methods. And please do so. That document's live as a Google Doc live, which we can work on and try and refine so that we've got broad based buy in to the working methods and we can take it from there.

All right. So moving then on to the design team list. What you will have seen circulated to the group earlier was both - earlier in the week was the design team list. And that covered both - all of the information we've got to date including a summary of the - captures on 1-1/2 pages or so the design teams and including an appendix, which covers the steps that you can quickly refer back to the appendix and see what's going on there.

Personally I found it a useful document. I hope you did too. I realize there's a lot to digest at the moment. So and the latest version of that came out only today. It wasn't substantially different and really modified some details of Design Team A, which we're waiting to hear back from Paul Kane on as to satisfactory nature of that or not.

So there's the various steps, there's the priority and I just (said) on the list there is a priority allocated something, which is final. And (Lisa) and I felt it

would be useful to indicate our thinking on priority and that's what it means when it's provisional because we felt that it wasn't reasonable to let - it might impact people's thinking on where they focus their attention and so on and/or they may want to debate the allocation of priority and get some feedback on that.

So that's what the purpose of having a provisional priority. It's an indication of current thinking to do. And as Greg said, the document is in the chat now and available for each of you to scroll and look at there at whichever point you found.

Thanks Chuck. I'm glad you found it useful. And I hope others did too. Again, of course if there's comments on formatting and so on, I thought it was useful. Marika takes credit for the sort of pulling it together and the formatting. We did (do it but it) were comments to polish that up. And so I think it's in reasonable shape and I'm glad you found it useful.

We were - are there any comments on the shape or content of this document at this stage and the emerging methodology by which we are working and dealing with this? Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan. Just curious why there's a provisional Priority 1 for Design Team (F) relationship between the NTIA, IANA and Root Zone (maintainer). I'm not opposed to that. I just - I'm curious about the thinking on that.

Jonathan Robinson: That's a good question Chuck. And I'm not sure if I can give you an off the cuff answer. I'm trying to remind myself of why that is the case. I might have to come back to you on that and I may even need to come back to you on list. I don't - just doesn't come to the top of my mind why we allocated that one as opposed to two.

There may have been some third party input that influenced that. I'll think about that and try and come back to you. I'm sorry I can't give you an answer right away.

Chuck Gomes: That's fine.

Jonathan Robinson: Donna's up next. Go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks Jonathan. Donna Austin. I guess the question I have is related to timing. It's not clear to me the timeframe for completing the design team work. And it would be useful being the co-lead for C to understand what the vision is. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Frankly Donna, that's a concern for me as well and from a kind of project management point to view, I don't think the dots all join up at this point. And it's a matter of the design teams to start slower than we might have liked. There's plenty of work to be done.

I'm hoping that as we get going on these we'll develop a habit of working and an ease of working and have enough hands on deck to start to do a lot of this in parallel. But I acknowledge and agree with you that right now it looks like - it looks challenging to get this done in a reasonable timeframe and it's a matter of getting it done as fast as possible. And it's difficult.

I don't want to suggest we should put an unrealistic or unreasonable deadline on things. But from the point of view of these design teams it's start working as fast as possible and producing the relevant content or at least a decent first pass at that content into the raw proposal.

Donna Austin: Jonathan, could I ask a follow up?

Jonathan Robinson: (Do).

Donna Austin: In the context of the face-to-face meeting, what is the expectation with this work? So it's not clear in my mind what the purpose of the face-to-face meeting or what the agenda will be. So it would be useful to understand that in order to understand particularly from the design team that I'm leading how that fits into the mix.

I understand if you haven't kind of got that thinking straight yet but I think it would be useful to understand that piece of the puzzle as well. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Donna. I'll be as open with you as I can. And I think this is work in progress. But the way I see it working is that Istanbul looks like it's shaping up into - well, it's clear we structured it in eight sessions.

It strikes me that the group expects and we would hope to spend some portion of those eight sessions dealing with moving ahead on the overarching issue of, you know, separability and how the mechanics of that may or may not work depending on the extend of legal advice.

So in my mind currently have discussed this briefly but only sketchily with (Lisa) at this point. One might allocate two of those eight sessions - a quarter of the two - of the two-day session to that topic. And that leaves six other sessions, which might individually each be dedicated to one of - one or two fixed design teams.

So it may be that we can do more than that in terms of breadth. But that feels like a method by which we might be able to make reasonable progress. So to

the extent that the (design teams) are far down their track, it would be an opportunity to review the work and integrate that into the proposal. To the extent that they are less far, it may be an opportunity to work with the design times in this (community) as a whole and make progress there.

So that's how it shapes up in my mind at this stage. And being the kind of person that likes to have things organized, that's given you a window into some thinking rather than a concrete plan, which is relatively unusual. But the (advance) to that is of course it gives you and others the opportunity to feed into that.

So we are committed to undertake in the meeting. We're probably not as far ahead as I would have liked prior to the meeting. We've got to work really hard in the two weeks ahead of it and try and make the best and most effective use of that - of those two days having done so.

So welcome any input and hands on deck to both get us further beforehand and make effective use of all of our time and the resources have gone into that meeting and we are present here.

Of course finally the - there's nothing like being face-to-face to make more productive progress and trying to do it by these online forums as useful as they may be. Thanks Donna. It's an important question and a key issue.

Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. Avri speaking. First of all I want to say I appreciate the chart. I'm wondering, and perhaps it already exists and I just haven't seen it, whether it is possible within the chart to have it linked to the write up that

people gave and to include the name of the person that suggested it, which I guess isn't always the same as the person that's leading it.

For example, I see in some of those there's a TBC in the leader spot. So that's one.

And I know certainly in looking at design team (Ellen) and they certainly are multiplying where we talk about the separation mechanism and it says pending legal advice. I'm not really sure I understand what's going on there. One of the issues I did have was wondering how many of these, you know, rapid solution DTs are expected to have sort of come to their kneeling point, basically completed as far as they can get before the meeting?

Because I would think that as many of them as possible would be the case but I just don't know. I admit that I still have trouble with understanding the utility of the method but I have suspended disbelief. So I'm really hoping that it does work, I'm just still really someone concerned and don't quite understand, thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Good Avri let me take that in order. First of all I think it's a good point to say that they, you know, to the extent that there's someone who suggested the design team it's a good idea to credit that to record that that person who suggested it is not necessary the lead.

So we can put that into the lead field in other words with the TBC, it could include in brackets suggested by, so that's a useful point. In terms of your point on the separation mechanism and pending legal advice, I mean it's always been my concern that this is not strictly - this is an overarching issue, it's an issue for the group as a whole. As some talked about whether or not this

could be handled by a design team, in my mind that's as much a placeholder as commitment to dealing with aspire design team.

It may well be the design team is not the right mechanism to deal with this. As to the utility of the design teams to deal with other smaller issues, I mean that's the proof is in the pudding I suppose and our ability to do so. What was apparent in Singapore was that both within the group at least for some of us including myself and certainly from without there were real questions being asked of our ability to deliver a concrete practical proposal that asked questions of us.

And it was required we felt as co-chairs to come up with a method and mechanic that was more productive and oriented towards that. Notwithstanding the substantial overarching issue that was being asked within the group. So this is a good faith attempt to do that and it seems to be producing some dividends although I acknowledge its early days in that sense of the working method.

I'll note your comment that you remain to be convinced effective Avri that we can make it useful. And let's hope that we can deal with that skepticism or challenge that you face and see (unintelligible). Christopher Wilkinson your hand is next.

Christopher Wilkinson: Yes hello it's Christopher Wilkinson again. I'll settle with the (remises) on this mic and I hope you can hear me well.

Jonathan Robinson: Christopher it's nice and clear now I've got right volume, thank you.

Christopher Wilkinson: Okay great, first of all I think there are rather a lot of design teams and I share some of Avri's concerns because I feel that at least within CWG

we may be stretching a point as to how - whether there are enough of volunteers available to consider all these different tasks.

I've scrolled through these SO statements of interest to many of us and I appreciate the vast amount of expertise and experience that is present here. But it's - there are some of the topics proposed which frankly do not compass towards volunteers for the - from the existing group and indeed if there were I would have expected more to come forward.

So I think there are rather a lot of design teams. I'm reassured however that there won't be more than 26 design teams. The - from my part I just want to be quite clear I support Design Team I of - I'm flattered that somebody thought that I should lead it. That was not my - I did not propose that. I have asked two or three people whether they'd be interested in volunteering as and when the appropriate time comes for volunteering to work in this area. And I have not yet spoke with some (people).

I'm not sure however Jonathan what is the protocol for seeking volunteers. Do we seek volunteers before or after the design team has been approved? And finally I share the thoughts that the Design Team I and Design Team J could usefully be merged. I cannot imagine that we would find ten volunteers to cover the whole of this spectrum of confidentiality competition and conflicts of interest. We'd be lucky to find five and they should do both, thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Christopher, some clear and comprehensive comments. I think it's probably an error to have put you in as lead for I and it goes back to Avri's previous point of, you know, noting who suggested it and that's not necessary so we'll update that lead TBC suggested by Christopher Wilkinson.

The - just to be clear on the design teams, these design teams are not necessarily agreed, they are suggested. So this is the landscape of suggested design teams. We may well create efficiencies by merging some of them, not requiring others of them if (overtaking), which is the whole point of trying to prioritize them and get work being done on less than the whole. So just because they appear on this list doesn't mean they're all work in progress, they've been suggested.

And to your point about volunteers it's a good point and that's one of the points - reasons I was making the point at the outset of the call and throughout that we need members and participants to roll up their sleeves and participate and contribute. Of course the CWG is open so anyone is still welcome to join. The only concern I've had with that is getting up to speed but to the extent they join to participate in a specific and provide a specific expertise design team that's great.

In terms of seeking volunteers before or after approval we've covered that by the concept of expressions of interest so people can indicate expressions of interest and then we will seek volunteers once the design team is approved and ready to go. So that's dealt with in that way. And in terms of merging I and J I'll just make the point that that's a live topic on list. There's been a response to the proposal, the effective proposal to merge them or suggestion that they might be merged in this document.

And so I suggest we carry that on list for a while and or if necessary here on the call, but it's a topic of discussion whether - how to handle the topics, whether all of them are in scope or not of I and J, so that's a live discussion. And I'll hold off there, that's - I think I've covered most if not all of your points and I'll pass the mic over to Chuck who's next in the queue.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan, Chuck Gomes speaking. The first comment on the I and J issue and that isn't why I raised my hand so I'll get to my main point after that.

My concern about merging I and J is that that J I see as pretty much procedural. We need to set up some procedures to deal with cases where there are conflicts of interest. Whereas I believe is much more policy oriented and I think the practical results of J might get bogged down in the more complicated policy issues in I. But I'm fine talking about that on the list, that's good.

My main point is this, as I look at all these design teams most of them make sense to me in terms of individual components of an ultimate proposal. But the thing that seems to be missing in our approach here is the overall solution that all of these fit into. I don't see where we have that covered. Now maybe that's the intent of the proposal development work after the face-to-face or maybe not. But that's where my concern is.

I don't see where all of these elements are going to fit. They all seem valid and they all need to be covered but what are they going to fit into and where do we cover that? I don't know if that makes sense or not but I'll stop there.

Jonathan Robinson: To me it makes sense as a question Chuck and I'll give you my answer and I'd welcome any comeback on that.

My answer is that we are responding to a request for proposals from the ICG. As we know there are two existing proposals from other communities that are sitting and lodged with the ICG at the moment. They were very helpful to me at least in that it gave me a clear view of what a complete proposal might be, although they're not necessarily - they're clearly not valid for our group.

But to the extent that we have prepared a skeleton or a shell proposal, in fact that shell proposal Version 2.X.X that (Bernie) has worked on contains various complete elements and of course various incomplete elements. And the design teams are there to populate those incomplete elements.

Of course what won't happen in doing this in that - in this component-type fashion is it won't magically provide the answer to how we deal with this overarching question of separability and extremist, but that's what we are working with the legal advisors to find what mechanisms may be possible and how those might work.

I think one concern again to go back to that point going into Singapore was that the group was absolutely preoccupied with that mechanism of separation whereas the mechanism for separation is an eventual and extreme scenario that may ultimately be required but we have a lot of practical work to do in the meantime, hence the work on the component side brick by brick buildup of the proposal.

But it struck me that what we didn't want to do was do that brick by brick componentized buildup of the proposal without a sense of the wood for the trees - or I think you'd say in the U.S. something to do with the forest. But anyway I'm sure you know what I mean when I talk about the wood for the trees and we - trees for the forest I suspect it is. And so we required an overall proposal which is what's been circulated the list.

And I'm very much hoping a revised version of that which contains the latest work and references to all the design teams and how they plug-in to that overall model will be available to us pretty shortly. So (Bernie) I don't know if you are on the call - is (Bernie) on the call? Maybe he could give us an update as to where - when he is planning on producing a revised version of that.

Bernard Turcotte: (Unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: (Bernie) go ahead.

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you Jonathan, I've been working with Marika and we hope to have that updated version with the potential and allocated DTs out today, latest tomorrow morning.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (Bernie), Chuck was that a satisfactory and comprehensive enough answer to your question or does it leave you with a hole in the answer still. And does anyone else have any comments or questions in relation to that - the design team mechanic and - for the proposal and the relationship with the legal advice and how we work?

Chuck Gomes: Jonathan this is Chuck, I'm not sure. I still don't have a feel for where all of these important individual elements how they fit together.

And I know we're going -we've got a draft proposal that (Bernie) and Marika are spending a lot of time on. But there seem to be some key ingredients or maybe it's the glue that ties all these things together that's missing. But I'll leave it at that and just continue to cooperate in terms of where we're going. I know where we're headed and I know what we need but let me leave it at that and maybe I'll - my concern will be addressed as we move forward.

Jonathan Robinson: Well Chuck I hope so and I also hope that if it's not you'll both feel free to highlight how it's not and assist us with doing so, which I'm sure you will.

So let's work at that and see if we can't make sure that the backbone as I've referred to it is draft proposal is that we can see it take some sort of shape

already. I felt it was necessary to say both to find places for - into which we could plug these components and as much to demonstrate to us and to anyone watching our work how a proposal might hang together. All right Paul Kane is not on the call I understand so we will skip over an update from Paul and I'll ask (Allan) if you are able - (Allan) to give us an update on any developments with respect to the work of Drafting Team B.

I think (Allan) may have stepped away from the microphone briefly so I will go to Donna if that's okay with you Donna and I'll come back to (Allan) in a moment.

Donna Austin: Thanks Jonathan, Donna Austin - so the draft team for the CFC has been - the (discovery) document has been approved by Jonathan and Lise.

And Jonathan has recently sent out an email this morning or depending on where you're located seeking volunteers for the group. So I think that's all I have to say really Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Donna and to your earlier point that we discussed, clearly the objective in getting things going now will be to bring as much as we can to - as you are able to - you and the group are able to in a format that can be useful in Istanbul and we can pick some of that up more offline, so thanks. (Allan) I - let's turn to you and see if you can provide any update at this point.

Allen MacGillivray: Thank you Jonathan I'm sorry that I stepped away for a moment. Yes so we are provisionally underway, we and (DT-B) - I like that, that's certainly cache I think.

And as I indicated in the draft proposal we're looking at doing a survey of the CCT of the community on their - on the need for an appeal mechanism for

(ccTLD) delegation. So we met for the first time on Friday, it's myself, (Margaret Simon) and (Dottie O'Neill), (Bart) and, excuse me, and (Alisa) (unintelligible). We had a very good discussion and through that I think we're going to make a couple of adjustments to the - I don't know what you call it - the design.

This is primarily a ccTLD issue to deal with. I thought it important that the GAC be involved which is why I suggested GAC participation. During the call we had - it was decided that it might be better to characterize the GAC involvement as an observer because if they are focused then it might be construed as endorsing some of the questions or the arguments that we might put in the survey. And so rather than deal with that so I believe you (could) really (better release their role) and take on observer status even though she sees everything and participates as she would otherwise.

So we're working on a draft survey, we've had a few exchanges that we know then we're rolling as they say. I believe that Martin Boyle has volunteered on the list to join, so welcome Martin. And (Stephanie Additional) from Nustar volunteered and then withdrew her nomination. And we're sad to see her go but that's all right, I think she did it by mistake. So for the moment it's Maarten and Martin, (Bart) and myself and (Lise).

We're certainly open to further GAC participation but by the same token I don't feel a particular need for them. So in an effort to bring a measure of closure to this (it's been) proposed that if there is another GAC volunteer I'd be happy to accept them but if we don't get them say by tomorrow then I think we'll just provisionally close it just so it's not hanging out like that. So that's being in my report but I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Oh I'm sorry one minor point, we have not set up our Wiki and our mailing list (at time) but outstanding. Grace had sent me an email and I will follow-up on that - apologies Grace, so that's the end of it - any questions, I'd be happy to answer.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (Allan), you answered my concern that the final point just to ensure that you are using a public (ER card) - mailing list and that where possible you use the ICANN provide core facilities.

Although it's not mandatory for the design teams but it's clearly desirable. Any other comments or questions for (Allan) or frankly anything to do with the work of the design teams at this point? All right I'm going to move us on to the AOB item. I've noted earlier there was lots of discussion in the chat, is there anything anyone would like to raise under AOB that hasn't been covered under the former agenda so far?

Any other comments for the group, any issues that anyone would like to raise, points to be made? It seems to be me - it seems to me to be necessary given the objectives that we meet regularly. I know it's challenging for everyone to keep on top of the pace of this. Believe me it's from a chair's point of view to be prepared for each meeting and to keep the ball rolling. But I assume we have your support to carry on with these twice weekly meetings. It's necessary to produce things.

Is there anything we could or should be doing differently that would make things (separate) for your support for that? Is there anything we could - I got an audio glitch there - I got a network connectivity glitch, something happened there I'm not sure what it was. So (Grace) if you could just confirm you can hear me again now?

(Grace): Jonathan we can hear you now, thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Great I assume it was - so really just according if there's any other input or advice or comment as to effective work in production of the work - Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes I'm just wondering whether it's reasonable to put target termination or target report dates on all of these and to indicate for example which of those we can expect to be done before assemble which are certainly aiming for it, that might be a helpful forcing function on driving these things, thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: It's a great point, thank you Avri I think it's desirable. It may not be reasonable but it's probably necessary and I think that actually in thinking about the piece that's missing here is clearly we've been very focused on creating all of these elements.

What - I mean Chuck made the point of how it fits into an overarching proposal. What's missing here is an update to the project plan. I'm loathed to promise you that we'll have something at the next call but I would like to achieve that I think putting this all in and seeing what we can reasonable target by Istanbul is highly desirable. So I hope that by Thursday we can produce an update to the project and do exactly that and map out what needs to be done in the interim.

What should be there for, you know a provisional agenda for Istanbul and how that all hangs together. I think Greg and Sidney made the point that they want to do some form of diligence core, try and spend a little time understanding what the landscape is. So it's important from that point of view in terms of creating any of their work and the desire to get input from them at Istanbul.

So I think we've got some project planning work to be done over the next 48 hours. And we'll do our best to bring that to the group on Thursday's meeting. All right I'm not going to stretch this call out for the sake of it. I - in fact that comment I just made on the project planning was the only substantial one I think I had in terms of any closing remarks and making sure that that was understood.

I guess the only other thing I can say is please be mindful of the objective to keep the work going as fast as possible and just be somebody co-chair or member anyone else breathing down your neck. Anyone involved in a particular design teams and any other element of the work. And keep your pedal to the metal as it were and keep working at producing this.

And we expect as (Bernie) said they'll be an updated version of draft two coming out and it will be very interesting to see how you feel about that to see where the placeholders for the design team exist in that document. We look forward to your comments on that. Yes I know that your comment Mark that and Avri on the project planning and including the fact that project planning would benefit from some risk analysis.

Okay any other comments, questions or points before we call the meeting to a close? If I missed anything - yes perhaps we should just make sure we cover up the action items then before we close. You'll see this we're going to come back the principle at the next meeting. We've got to make sure with an open item still on the Design Team A on the scope, make sure the scopes align. Ask Grace to circulate that letter that was by Sidley that sent to Steve last year in relation to this project or the ICANN Board I assume.

Be modified slightly that way in which we allocate leads and proposal or suggest of the design team and an updated version of Draft 2.X will be

available tomorrow. And we'll push hard on the design team. So perhaps we can put Todd on the design teams as well as a final action as part of overall project planning. Okay thanks everyone, useful meeting - hopefully a good half hour again in your respective days or evenings to get on with further work of this group. With that meeting closed. Bye.

Woman: Bye.

END