

ICANN

Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
March 12, 2015
8:00 am CT

Coordinator: Excuse me, the recordings have been started.

Grace Abuhamad: Hi, everyone. This is Grace Abuhamad. We'll wait just one more minute .we have the recordings started. It's 11:03 UTC. We'll take - while we wait I'll just take attendance for anyone who's on the phone only. I have Peter Van Rost for now.

Greg Shatan: Hi, this is Greg Shatan, I'm getting into Adobe but not there yet.

Grace Abuhamad: Okay thank you, Greg. And for everyone else, we'll make sure we make attendance based on the Adobe Connect room.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Hi, everyone. It's Jonathan Robinson. Welcome to the next meeting of the Cross Community Working Group on the IANA Stewardship Transition. This is Meeting 28, 12 March, 2015.

Thanks for bearing with us those of you who were able to get in on time. I just want to give a few minutes in order to ensure that we had as many people as possible on the call from the outset.

We've got at least one person who is not muted so if you could please just check that your microphone is muted (unintelligible) background noise. Please

check your microphone is on mute, everyone. Thank you. Still got background noise. Okay better to mute your microphone in Adobe Connect in the top left hand corner as many of you will know.

All right so these meetings are coming thick and fast. We've got a face to face meeting a little over a week, around 10 days from now, and we really need to be in shape to have substantial content to discuss at that meeting.

What will influence that is the progress we can make with the design teams and the work that they can bring to the group as a whole. So it's vital that anyone involved with design teams works hard and fast over the next seven days; and anyone who's not involved in the design teams rolls up their sleeves and does get involved.

We have a working list of design teams that you will have seen and we'll come to that in Item 3. We've also got the overarching - or the proposal, the draft proposal that's been circulated to you recently, the latest version thereof which includes the (unintelligible) to the design teams.

We've had one or two comments on that, in particular in terms of the appropriate placement of the design teams in that document. Please treat it as a live document and feel free to contribute. We'd like help obviously, that's the purpose of this. This is a working group, not simply one to sit back and watch the progress. So really that's the theme of the meeting is we need as much sleeves rolled up help as possible to actually produce valid valuable and relevant content for the proposal.

It's really about more or less seven day hard sprint because if you think about it it's clearly the 12th of March today; a week later it's the 19th. We really need to be producing any content that's relevant to Istanbul by the end of next

week, Friday 20th, because thereafter members of the group will start to travel or prepare for travel and be in a less likely position. So that really gives us a clear deadline of next week to get content - by the end of next week to have content in a position to be useful in Istanbul.

As I said on Tuesday, I think, having talked with Lise, our thinking is to dedicate at least half the meeting to processing and moving on the content arising from the design teams. I know that many of you are anxious to get back and get some input from the legal advisors. They started their work later than we might have originally hoped and anticipated.

But I am still hopeful that we will be able to get some assistance in content from them so we should have - we should be in a position to spend some time dealing with preliminary input from them and starting to work that up as - and seeing how that stacks up against the different models that have been proposed.

Overall the work plan needs to take account of all of that. Clearly, we have an existing plan which envisages us producing a draft for public comment early in April. We are working to that plan at this stage although it looks challenging at least.

And in terms of revising that I think realistically we have to make an assessment as to how far we've got coming out of Istanbul. As I said, I'd encourage all of you to help and be as sleeves-rolled-up as possible in assisting us get as much progress as we possibly can in advance of Istanbul and of course during that intensive period of work.

So that's really what I wanted to cover in the opening remarks, setting the scene if you like. So let me pause for a moment and see if there are any

thoughts or input that anyone would like to provide on the sort of overview and the plans. I note that we've got the comment from Avri looking for some further input on communication and dependency and interlinking with the Cross Community Working Group on Accountability and that's been put under AOB for now.

We have a meeting scheduled between myself, Lise and the co-chairs of the CCWG tomorrow so it may be that that's something - we can pick that up under AOB and just make sure we cover what we need to there.

Any other comments, questions, at this point? All right, please do make yourselves known on the audio here. We quite often get comments on the email and then people don't necessarily speak up but feel free to make yourselves and your views known in particular put your hand up for any areas you can assist.

Right, so moving on then to the proposal, 2.1.0 the objective here is to have a form of proposal that is both comparable to the existing proposals and responsive to the RFP. And moreover, gives us a map of work where we can see, and others can see, the emergence of a draft proposal that is suitable for ultimate submission to the RFP and that provides appropriate placeholders for the design teams to go into.

So we had some - what I thought was useful input from Kurt Pritz on this who provided another view of this by just presenting a very simple structural map of how the design teams fit in. I thought that was a useful contribution to just view things from another perspective highlighting four different categories of Design Team 1 that related to the NTIA oversight tasks, one on monitoring IANA performance, one on the authorization function, one on approving

operations changes to the IANA function and one on - in and around designating the IANA provider.

So having had a chance to initially, and probably not in detail, view that latest iteration of (unintelligible) draft proposal I'd love to hear if anyone's got any input or comment on structure, form and detail content. Any comments or views on Kurt's overview? Is that helpful? Does it accord with your thinking? It's up in the Adobe room now. I don't know how many of you have had a chance to look at it.

As I said, for me in some ways it was helpful. I certainly think it gives us some guidance as to where we go forward with the design teams. It feels to me like column on the left, monitoring IANA performance, is something we can work on almost in its entirety so that gives myself and Lise I think some guidance that Design Teams A, C, M and N could well be worked on right away. And there's no reason why we shouldn't continue with those.

And in terms of elements of the authorization function, the next column, Column D, that as an overall structure that may need some discussion. Certainly the CSC feels like, which we have already selected, so there's some interesting guidance there. Staffan, go ahead, let me respond to your hand being up.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you, Jonathan. Yeah, just response to your question. Yes, this is helpful, Kurt's map, and we've also been discussing this very briefly in Group C or CSC whether to get hold of all issues so they don't fall between chairs and (unintelligible) forgot so to say. So this is a good macro help to do this. We also need to do this in a more elaborate form maybe between the design teams, but this is helpful. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Staffan and thanks, Kurt. I don't think Kurt is on the call, I suspect it's a little early in the day for him. But it's a useful - hopefully he picks this up on the recording and sees. I notice there's - wondering if there's any other comments like to make. Has anyone else got any comments or suggestions? It would be very helpful if the design teams do look at this. I think it gives you a sense of where they may overlap.

Say, for me, most simply it certainly gives a complete guidance to what should be done under - or at least a good start on the completion of Column A which is monitoring IANA performance. It's not marked as such but it's the first column and some of the other areas and seeing how they might overlap.

Okay well I would encourage you all to please review that proposal.

Ultimately that's - if you - that's what this group has got to do is produce a proposal in the form that is response to the RFP and that is the whole point of having this document is that it's in a form that's suitable to the RFP.

I - one of the things that strikes me about the document is that it's light to empty on Section 4 and 5. And whilst we might think that 4 and 5 are dependent on 3, I think we did some previous work and I think we could usefully attempt to populate areas under 4 and 5 at this stage. And so I'll be reaching out to former coordinators of 4 and 5 and see if we can't bring some of that work that was done previously into the document.

I mean, it goes back to a theme that was discussed previously and that is that there was a lot of (unintelligible) under the previous structure working on pre-Singapore and it's important to get that - to ensure that that content isn't lost. So a reminder to the design teams feel free to ask either the RFP coordinators working in so-called RFP coordinators or anyone from staff who's working on the document if you think there is relevant content previously that might help

you and we will - I'll talk to the RFP coordinators from 4 and 5 and see if we can't either work with them and/or with staff help to start to populate.

Thank you, Cheryl. I note your point in the chat that the wiki work archives, the various RFP work and that still stands as a basis, agreed. (Unintelligible) really whether we start to map that into the proposal at this stage.

Right, so if there is no other comment. Staffan, that's an old hand, I assume. I think that was your previous hand up so if you could withdraw that or - yeah, that's great, thank you.

So going on to the design team list, we have a current design team list which is in circulation with all of you and is usefully mapped in this one-pager. You can leave that - okay that's - we can switch to that design team list.

That's usefully mapped in the one-pager which is in front of you here. Now, I was expecting to, at this point, go into some updates and here from the different design team leads. So I'm wondering, Grace, if you can confirm if we've got Paul on the phone at this stage.

Grace Abuhamad: Jonathan, this is Grace. I don't believe that Paul is on the line at this stage but we'll keep reaching out to him.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Then I will move straight on to B and see if we can - well let me - before working through those, is there - are there any other - has anyone got any - are there any gaps - clear gaps or points identified that anyone would like to flag in terms of the list because in some ways this list has been pushed on to the group as we've built the proposal and so is anyone - is there anyone got a suggestion that they feel is missing or that they'd like to see added at this point?

And clearly, if not, please feel free to do so via the list because we have the capacity to add suggested teams even if we're not working on them. The important point is to map the landscape which is why this one-pager is so helpful and just visualizing. Staffan...

Staffan Jonson: Yes, thank you, Jonathan. Well, again, the escalation path is a good nominator for a lot of issues that maybe need to be taken into consideration in one draft. So maybe that's a good heading, the escalation of problems because it relates to several design teams.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, good point. And I think we've got that captured in Design Team M. It's subject to the scope. And I note that Chuck helpfully put out a scope for a design team to work on escalation issues and to scope out that. And I suspect that may be covered by that but we need - that - the template for that works. But, yeah, good point. And I hope that that will be covered by M. Thanks, Staffan.

Let's move on then. Allan, sorry to have given you a false start but if you could give us an update? And, if you can, say anything about your - I think we really need to push as much as possible and perhaps you may find this difficult but if at all possible we'd like to bringing some content and in particular from A, B and C, as complete as the content as possible by the end of next week. So, Allan, fire away and let's see what you can tell us.

Allan MacGillivray: Thank you, Jonathan. It's Allan MacGillivray for the record.

Unfortunately, I don't have really much to report relative to Tuesday. We dealt with the (unintelligible) manners of (unintelligible) and there's been another change in the membership, Martin Boyle from Nominet actually was seeking to join DT C on the CSC. So really that - all that's happened. I'm still waiting

for some feedback from my team members on a proposal I sent out on Monday. So hopefully I'll get something from them today or tomorrow. Thank you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Allan. And just as a question from Matthew that I just responded to in the chat relating to Design Team L, separation mechanism and whether that is coherent with D7. And so in my view it is; I think they're one and the same. And frankly I think we need to slightly rename Design Team L so it's clear that they are the same. And thank you, Matthew, for volunteering to work on that.

One of the things I'm going to come to in terms of methodology, I'll come to a couple of points on methodology when we talk about commissioning additional - thanks for that expression of interest, Matthew.

Okay so Design Team C, which is the work on the CSC, I know Donna is not on the call and so I think, Staffan, you may be in a position to provide an update here. So let's go ahead and hear from you.

Staffan Jonson: Okay, thank you, Jonathan. Well, my update is quite short. We had some 14 hour ago a confirmation of the group per se. Let's see if I could edit into - to paste it into the chat. I hope that will work. Well roughly. So we are now populated as a group. And we started about - we started talking about interdependencies with other DTs which is rather complicated in the case of CSC as Donna has made a point of several times.

So we haven't had very much results apart from being formulated or formed and nominated into a group. So we'll have our first meetings within short. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Staffan. And you're going to feel some pressure if you haven't already from me to make sure you get some content produced so that we've got something to work with in Istanbul.

One thing I should flag to all of A, B and C is that staff are willing to help with an initial draft. So - and that's one of the things that these groups sometimes struggle with is actually having (unintelligible) piece of content to work with. It's not to grab hold of it by staff but if that - that offer is there. And I'd strongly encourage people to take advantage of it. It's very easy to reject or edit something. And the difference between producing content and editing and modifying it can be quite substantial.

So if any groups either currently formed, A, B or C, or to be formed, which we'll discuss in a moment, would like help in getting their initial (unintelligible) going, please ask - please come back to us as soon as possible and we will assist via staff with helping produce an initial draft so that you've got something of substance to work with right away.

Onto then Item 3e, commissioning additional design teams. It's pretty clear from when you look at this - either this one-pager or the more comprehensive list of design teams that we've got that there are some other areas work on in short order.

And one of the things that struck myself and Lise as we were reviewing this is that we've probably been a little bureaucratic in - collectively in our setup of these design teams. In the sense that the idea is to kick things off and get moving right away.

Some of the process points are valuable but they needn't stop us getting started right away. So for example, we've had Chuck now, yesterday, produce an

indication of interest to at least lead the production of a template and get things going or Design Team M. We've now had a couple of people - Matthew and - with help from James - indicate an interest and are willing to kick things off with Design Team L.

So I think I would encourage you strongly to grab, as those groups have done, grab an item and start to work on it. As I say, staff will help. I really want - I feel the pressure and I'd really like all of you to feel pressure to get things moving and produce relevant content for the draft proposal insofar as we can do it right now. So that would be very good if people could do that.

We'll tidy up. We'll sweep up afterwards and make sure that, where relevant, the sort of bureaucratic or (unintelligible) oriented steps are completed. But it feels a little bit that if we're going to talk about being agile we might as well be agile and get on with doing it. So very much encourage you to do so.

So we've got M and we've got L. And if it becomes - if someone puts their hand up like Matthew has just done to make a start on this, a reminder for the third or fourth time, staff will help you get a first draft going. If it feels too much to be a design team lead going through the process flag it with us and we'll try and get someone else to assist you. But at the very least get things going if we could have volunteers (unintelligible) off and work on the template that's very helpful.

So there are a couple of others that are of interest in getting going that Lise and I marked up as provisional Priority 1s. And they are as follows; there is Design Team - what have we got here, we've got - maybe we could switch to the design team list now and have a look at those.

So Design Team D is the authorization function, that's (unintelligible) set out as a Priority 1 provisional. It would be great to get someone interested in getting some content going. Delighted to see if anyone is willing to, with staff help, pick that one up.

Thanks, Cheryl, that's great. I see a hand up from Cheryl offering to help with that from next week. Well we might even work with you this week, Cheryl, to start getting the ball rolling. And so that's very helpful, thank you.

Let me look down the list and see where we go next then. I think we've got probably Design Team F which is relationship between NTIA, IANA and root zone maintainer, could do with someone picking up. That's a - I won't intimidate you by saying it's a relatively challenging one but I think all of these can potentially be but there's no reason why we shouldn't make a decent start and get a straw man going to get some design template working. Anyone interested in grabbing F?

And, by the way, on list if you could just give expressions of interest, please if you - once you've seen someone's grabbed it as a provision lead or just prepared to work on the template, we're not going to force you to hang your coat on the hook of being a lead but by all means provide (unintelligible) interest on list to assist that would be great as well, sign up with expressions of interest to assist.

Okay I'll hold out on F. If I could ask staff for an action to call for a volunteer to be a design team lead or at least a provisional design team lead, someone who's prepared to work on the - at minimum the scope of the templates on F we'll put an action out to the mailing list for that.

What I'd like to look at is Design Team L, I think, which we've got so that's good. That's - Matthew and James to kick that off, which is great. Design Team M I wanted to look at which is Chuck's picked up and, remember, please feel free to jump in and work on those. And we haven't set out - as I say, we're going to skip over some of the steps, including defining who should be on there. But in rapid sort of parallel fashion we can start to shape what the idea composition of the design teams should be. Avri, thanks for volunteering on M.

Staffan, is that a new hand?

Staffan Jonson: Yes it is, thank you. I might volunteer on Team M as well, after concluding the CSC. But I'm wondering if it isn't an overlap between Design Team M and Design Team C just a thought. But I eventually might contribute in this group. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: And that's a good question and a good point. And you'll see that in - don't bring it up again, Grace, but you'll see on Kurt's overview, one-pager, C and M are immediately adjacent. And clearly that's one of the first jobs of whoever is scoping this, Chuck and colleagues, to ensure that it either doesn't overlap or to the extent that's properly communicated. Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jonathan. And thanks, Staffan and Avri, for volunteering. The - if you look at the description of M, I put in there the fact that there probably would have to be coordination between A and C at least and who knows, maybe others so that any duplication is coordinated and there's good collaboration there.

But I think for the most part that M can be fairly specific where - in terms of escalation procedures whereas C is going to cover much broader scope in

terms of the functions of the CSC. So - but you're absolutely right, Staffan, there needs to be close coordination there and that's identified in the description.

Jonathan Robinson: Steve, I see your - Steve Crocker - I see your point in the chat. And actually that's a really good point. And so just to highlight that - I'm not familiar with the red team concept but there is certainly a plan - and that's commissioned already - to analyze sort of different analysis between SAC 069 and the work that we are doing to make sure that there is not a sort of gap analysis, if you like.

And reading what you say I think that's probably the point here as well. So I think that would be helpful to do something like that. And that's a good point. I wonder if we might - I think just for the point of capturing that it needn't be called a design team, maybe we could call it red team, but we could put it on the end of the design team list as a crosscheck.

So I'd like an action there to just put that at the bottom of the design team list called Red Team which is to - to capture Steve's point in the chat there and make sure that that's a stress test/crosscheck. Thanks, Steve.

All right now I personally feel that - where was it, N, I think N feels a little standalone to me in that we could usefully do work on N as well. This is the periodic review function which is, if you like, some form of independent check or quasi-independent check periodic check function. And I think regardless of whether this is done by an MRT or an external audit firm or anyone else who might do it it feels to me that a periodic, let's say, for argument sake for the moment, annual check on a form of audit or periodic review, makes a great deal of sense.

Avri, I note your interest there. Do you think you're in a position to provisionally lead that - the drafting of a scope and - with the help of staff? Great, thank you. So we'll - this is like an auction - we'll give Avri the first right of refusal subject to anyone else coming along to provisionally lead that drafting team so that's good news.

Good. So it feels to me like that is the landscape that, having discussed it with Lise beforehand, we would - that's ramped things up considerably. And I'm sure that's going to test all of us. And like I say, at the outset we've got a week to sort this out so really you should feel that you've got a seven-day sprint now to try and produce something of value that both takes account of any historic work.

And we have a history here, make no mistake, that the work that's been done and to aim to produce some relevant content in short order for next Thursday/Friday. I see the auction analogy might run for a little here.

All right, I am satisfied that that's a useful pass over the design teams for the moment. I'm also not fearful of finishing this call early so I'm going to keep us going. I'm not going to spread this out for the sake of it. I know some of you (unintelligible) early and we've now committed all of us to get on with some work so to the extent that we recover any time in any of our schedules that's good news. But (unintelligible) make sure you do contribute here on audio or on chat if you do feel you need something to be got across to the group.

Just check my notes and make sure I've covered everything if let that we needed to. Just give me one. Thanks for all that enthusiastic putting up your hands, it's great to see that everyone is prepared to roll up their sleeves and get on with this. Right, next then is the - to deal with the principles.

So I'm going to give you a break from my voice and hand over to my able co-chair, Lise Fuhr, to give you a sort of update - a brief update where we are and see if we can make any relevant progress now during the course of the meeting.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Jonathan. It's Lise Fuhr for the record. Yeah, in front of you you see the document that Martin Boyle sent out yesterday evening. And I know there has been some emails on the list, and I know that Andrew Sullivan wrote something that is not included in this but since there are minor changes and the one issue that he points out is not going to be discussed today, I don't think I will - I don't think that's crucial to have those included in this.

But I'd like to do a quick walk-through of the changes that's been done to the document. And as I see it, and 5 - I don't know if you call it 1 or 2 - but 5.2 to 5.4, 6.2, 6.1, 9.1 and 10, are text that we discussed during the calls and online. I'll read them aloud very quickly and see if there is any objections to those.

So - and what I'd like us to do is to conclude on everything in this document except point - or 6.2 because that's still an outstanding issue that we need to solve between GAC and some of the members of the CWG.

But okay the first is 5.2 and that's the independence of accountability. And that's - we added processes to this sentence. And I'll just make a quick pause and see if anyone is objecting to this addition. You'll have to be fast here because we need to close this down and I think we've been discussing this for quite a while.

So, okay, the next one is 5.3, where there's been some deletion and some additions of the text. And that is independence of policy from IANA now - the policy processes should be independent of the IANA functions operator. The

operator's role is to implement changes in accordance with policies, the policy agree through the relevant bottom-up policy process.

And then there was a deletion from the last - the note has been deleted.
Anyone objecting to this? Doesn't look like it. Okay, we move on.

And here we have actually 5.6 and we need to find out if - I don't know, can everyone scroll or am I the one having the control of the document, Grace, or can you scroll the document so we show...

Grace Abuhamad: The document is unsynced so everyone can scroll through...

((Crosstalk))

Lise Fuhr: Everyone can scroll, okay. So we go to 5.6 and there we have appeals and redress. And there is an alternative wording proposed. Yes, and it says, "Appeals and redress, any appeals process should be independent, robust, affordable, timely, provide binding redress open to affected parties and be open to public scrutiny. Appeals should be limited to challenging the implementation of policy or process followed, not the policy itself."

And this is a suggestion as much in points out that suggests that this is not actually really - not actual - not really a principle, it's a new formulation to mirror this. So is anyone objecting to this? No, doesn't look like it.

And in 6 we have deleted, "The process should be automated for all routine functions." Any objections to this deletion? Doesn't look like it.

And in 5.1 there's been - it's been changed to "Be predictable, decisions are clearly rooted in agreed and applicable policy as set by the relevant policy

body." Is anyone objecting to this? No. Doesn't look like it. And we actually have a footnote 2 that's been changed too. And this footnote is - oh I need to see where that belongs because the wording is, "Stakeholders" are changed to "members" and we have added "Conditions for consensus will need to be agreed appropriate for the group." Any objections to this? No, doesn't look like it.

And then we have a change to 8.2. And that's a suggestion by Erick Iriarte. And revisions shown has been agreed offline with Erick. So now there is a new wording. And I don't know if anyone is - Erick, since you're the one suggesting that it's been revised with Martin, do you have anything - anything to add? No, says he's okay with the new version. Thank you.

And then we have the last that's multistakeholder, any proposal instead of "must" it says "should" foster multistakeholder participation in future oversight of the IANA functions. And I know I forgot a footnote 1, I have to get back to that one but just like to finish this. Anyone is opposing to this? Avri, your hand is up. Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah, thank you. This is Avri speaking. I have one question about it and that's - and perhaps it's a habit. When someone says "should" instead of "must" they're indicating that there are cases in which it would not need to happen. And I'm wondering if we've given any thought to what that means? And because we're making a specific decision when we say no (unintelligible).

And perhaps this is, you know, an old habit from, you know, a lifetime in IETF, where if you say "must" versus "should" you need to give some explanation of what is the difference? What is the case in which it isn't a must? And we don't deal with that so I'm a little concerned about the gap that

that opens up without having any explanation of when we would do something that didn't foster multistakeholder participation. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: thank you, Avri. And since I see Mary is not on the call and we will have 7.2 as an open issue, we'll keep this too. But we need to finish all the others. So I will note that this is an outstanding issue together with 7.2.

Okay, so I will - so what I see is actually - I forgot the footnote 1. And the footnote - there is a footnote saying, "The term IANA functions operator refers to the entity that provides the service independent of the organization that hosts it; currently IANA." And there is an alternative proposed by Seun saying, "The term IANA functions operator refers to the entity that provides the service. The entity is hosted by an organization, currently IANA, but operationally separated from other activities of the organizations."

Is there any thoughts on this? Any support for the alternative proposal? I don't know is Seun on the call? Doesn't look like it. Okay, so. Yeah, I can see Seun sent his apologies. Then I'll leave this out as a minor issue too because we - I'd really like Seun to be on the call and explaining why his alternative, yeah.

So any other thoughts, issues, if you - I went through this very, very quickly, I know. So if you have any last comment? Chuck, yes go ahead, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lise. I'd like to make a suggestion on the principles because I know that some key people aren't on the call, like Andrew for example, which yesterday added some comments on this. For any issues that are - where there are still some disagreement, I suggest that between now and our next meeting on Tuesday that the people that are involved in those discussions get together, it doesn't need to be a design team per se, but if they would get together and

try among them, to come up with proposed final solutions so that we can wrap this up.

I think there's only one or two or maybe three areas where there still seems to be some disagreement. But if we could ask those people that are involved in those discussions to work together before Tuesday to come up with some proposals that they would all support, I think that would help us wrap this one up. Anyway, I throw that out as an idea.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Chuck. I think it's a very good idea. We are actually trying to solve many of these issues off list and then to have a concluded text as possible. But since we are still having 7.2 as an outstanding issue because of the GAC, and I know and I understand the GAC has some feelings regarding this, we still might take a last go at it on the principles on Tuesday.

But it's a good idea and I will try and have a call made with the different persons, and Martin Boyle, if possible before Tuesday. And if it's not possible we will just solve it on the list. Thank you.

Any other questions, remarks to this? Because, as I said, we will close it now and because we don't want to reopen the principles all the time, we need to get going and have people focus on the design teams instead of the smaller issues on the principles because I think we mainly agree on most within the principles.

Okay. Seem like any other questions or remarks so I will leave it - leave the work back to you - to work back to you, Jonathan. Sorry.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. I think that's called an egg corn when you say something that's not quite correct but it sounds correct so giving the word back to me sounds about right since I'll be...

((Crosstalk))

Lise Fuhr: Sorry. That's how you say in Danish.

Jonathan Robinson: Take the word, thank you. So, let's pick up been on the next item. Thank you, Lise. And that is to take an update from the client committee here so we've got - I'm not sure if Martin - let me just check if Martin is on the call, but I think we've got all four members, yes, Martin is so I think we've got all four members of the client committee on the call.

We had an initial briefing with the law firm - with Sidley to try and give them some additional background, and that took place yesterday. And I know there's an outstanding question over the role of ICANN Legal. And it's clearly something that's a significant concern and interest to the group, so that's something I would like us to revert to ICANN Legal and ask them what their understanding and expectation is and then make sure we match that with the group's expectations.

So it's not being ignored; at the moment ICANN Legal is on the mailing list, as you know, and has the prospect to participate. It seems to me that any contribution they do make would be very helpful if it was recorded and transparent. And so I think we need to conclude that discussion as soon as possible so it doesn't get in the way of both the effective working of the client committee and in fact advice directly back to the group. So I think that's clearly an important and overarching point.

But it did feel - and those of you who have had the chance to listen to the diligence called yesterday - it did feel like it was a productive session and enhanced the understanding of the legal team of the issues and the scope that they need to be looking at.

Greg, would you like to make any other comments or input in relation to the work of the client committee in the last few days or so?

Greg Shatan: Sure, thank you, Jonathan. It's Greg Shatan for the record. In addition - first, we did have the call and it was a two-hour call, went to full time with Sidley. In large part we used the scoping document as a backbone for the discussion and kind of, you know, clarified and gave background to how we got to where we got in many of those cases.

And we have the first of our regularly scheduled calls of the client committee today at 1400 UTC. And a subject to adjustment, that would be a regular call though we expect calls in addition to being scheduled based on need but it's always good to have one regularly scheduled call at least as a lodestar for the group.

We've also assembled sort of a reading list of additional material on top of those that they've already read and referred to in our overall bibliography that we think are the most important for them to make sure that they are fully familiar with. It doesn't mean they haven't looked at them but it is kind of a list of the prime documents that we are dealing with.

I did see a question in the chat about how these design teams could communicate legal questions that come up in the course of their work. I think it would make good sense as those, to communicate them to the client committee. I'm not sure that we have - I will ask staff whether there is an

address to which that could be sent since the mailing list of the client committee has observer status for those who are not members.

I would say there's no need to wait so I would just send any of those questions to the four members of the client committee: Jonathan, Lise, Martin, (Simone) and myself. Or actually Grace is suggesting send those to the CWG plenary list. That seems like a better suggestion. Just clearly mark them in the subject matter in some way that it's a, you know, for client committee, you know, for the client committee from the Design Team N, whatever - N equals in that particular case. Thanks, Grace. Thanks, Jorge.

So just since there are so many emails it's just good to put something right in the subject so it catches my eye. I think I've opened every email that's been sent to me. I have stars next to the ones I need to respond to. I think I've still got about 20 stars but I'm trying to put out the stars.

Other than that, I think that's about it for the client committee. We are, I think in the next moment or on today's call, probably going to discuss more particularly deliverables, make concrete their first assignment according to our draft rules of engagement, actual assignments should be made in writing on the client committee list so once we decide exactly what that assignment or instruction is and what the corresponding deliverable is, that will be posted to the client committee list.

And again, any of you who want to watch that, you know, should sign up for observer status for that list. And I think we will also be discussing with them plans for their presence contribution to the face-to-face. So I think that covers the client committee subject to any questions others may have or clarifications that other members of the client committee may have. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Greg. I think you made one key point at the outset that this is not ad hoc work, the work that we did was, in many ways scripted and guided by the approved scoping document from the CWG. And the role of the committee is a mechanical and effective interface of skilled people between the CWG and the law firm for the purposes of having an effective working relationship, that it is not to fly solo without due reference to the CWG. So I think that's a really important point.

I wanted to just say I suspect I know the answer, and we could even run a quick poll, which might be the most useful way of doing it, but to guide us in our decision, because we have to be mindful of usefulness and of course cost is an issue as well that we have a responsibility to bear in mind.

But I would like to poll the CWG as to their expectation or requirement - really expectation is probably a good way of putting it, I think at the moment, expectation of the presence of one or more Sidley professionals in Istanbul. I would like to poll you so if you can just give a moment for Grace to bring this up so we get a feel for the expectations of the group as to the attendance in person of one or more of the Sidley team in Istanbul.

And while Grace sets up that poll, I'll just check if there - (unintelligible) my screen if anyone else has a question. I'll answer Jorge's question in the chat which says, "How were these questions set up?" And in preparation for the recruitment and appointment of the firm, we worked with the group to set up an initial scoping document. We were mindful that we didn't want this to be constrained and limit the scope but we needed to both brief in advance of appointment what the scope of the law firm would be and so that's the case.

All right, great, so I see the poll running there. And I think we should be mindful like I am, and I'm sure the rest of the client committee is, of costs,

practicality and benefit and weigh that up in your mind - in your individuals minds and so we see your collective thinking.

And in that we see a pretty overwhelming support which kind of doesn't surprise me but I wanted to make sure we did check this with you. So there's no "no" votes as it stands and we're looking at around 94% in favor of having the presence of one or more Sidley professionals in Istanbul so that's a useful barometer of opinion so that's great, great to have. Thank you. We can close the poll now, I think that's sufficiently indicative of the strength of feeling.

And, James, I note that, I mean, you know, I'm always mindful of cost but I note your point, it's an expensive meeting, we're flying a lot of people together and so then the discretionary decision that's going to have to be taken place over the next while, and just to give you insight into that, is what I mentioned at the out is what proportion of the meeting we give over to working directly on those matters for which we are seeking legal advice.

And that's relatively delicate because it's about perceptions of importance and also the amount of useful content so that's something that's work in progress that we need to still decide on bearing in mind that our, you know, our objective post-Singapore is to produce a practical proposal with all of the inputs from the design teams but not to lose sight of the overarching questions for which we need the legal advice. So that's the delicate balance and we'll work on that but thanks for responding to that poll.

Now let's move on then to Item 6 which is the any other business time. And there we have - Avri, I'm just - I'm not sure I understand your point in the chat there, face to face (unintelligible). Yeah, so Christopher...

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: If I may explain myself? Yeah.

Jonathan Robinson: Please do, Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yeah, what I was saying when we were talking and this was - I started writing it while we were still talking about the Sidley team. I think it's important that at least one be there to sort of have the face to face organic understanding of where we're at when you're talking about, you know, expenses and the amount of, you know, billable hours one gets for participating live in a meeting and that, you know, perhaps others participating remotely is indeed sufficient. But I think at least one of the team needs to see our team, needs to see it in its organic sense. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Avri. And I'll confirm that that was where I was headed in any event. But it may be that we believe we can get sufficiently substantial input, not necessarily formal advice, but input and interaction with the team that more than one makes good sense. So we'll work on that and exercise some judgment and consult with the group as much as possible in the next few days.

Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jonathan. Just following up with Avri, and I tried to say this in the chat, I don't know if I said it too clearly. But if we have one person there, and I think she's right that one should be sufficient, but that depends on whether it's the right person.

Just having one of their team there who is very specialized might not be that much value, but if we have someone who can - is more involved in a general sense of the team, that I think would be valuable.

Jonathan Robinson: Well, Chuck, I think I can speak specifically to that, and if I don't cover it adequately Greg can come in after that. I mean, I think there's really, in my mind at least speaking personally, there are two objectives. One, is kind of what was dealt with by Avri I think and that's getting a sense of the group and having a kind of observer (unintelligible). The second is a more detailed and comprehensive interaction on some of the specific issues.

And there it's a delicate judgment because they need to have got up to speed sufficiently. And we're all mindful of the fact that the process ended a little later than we would like or a little too close to Istanbul. But they may well be able to produce some - or at least have some substantive interaction as well.

I know that Holly, who is playing a sort of leading coordination role is just happens to be in London the week before and may well be able to come to Istanbul. But we're going to talk with Sidley and it may end up that there is more than one for the reasons I've described.

Greg, have I covered things or would you like to add something?

Greg Shatan: I think that pretty much covers things. I would just say that, yeah, I get the sense that Holly as the team lead, would likely be there and that anybody else who would be nominated by them to come would not be a kind of an edge specialist but rather somebody else who would be key to answering many of the questions that are in front of us.

Further I think that there - the other folks who are on the team who have particular areas of expertise should be available to join most if not all of the calls, not necessarily on a moment's notice but if it seems, for instance, in the

morning session that in the afternoon we're going to need to discuss trusts, for instance, that the trusts person should likely be able to be teed up.

And indeed as we set our agenda we may also be able to work with Sidley to nominate particular people to participate remotely in particular sub session. Lastly I would just say that while I don't expect kind of formal legal advice to be delivered at the meeting, I think that I would be surprised if the lawyers were in listening mode. I would expect them to be fairly engaged and be in counseling mode and kind of, you know, working with us organically.

Obviously it will be a first go to some extent. Maybe we will have some of it next week on calls. But clearly the first major go in the face to face. So there will be some familiarization time required but I expect that as we get rolling there will be more of a organic teaming approach in that regard just based on my own experience. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks, Greg. But just to make it clear we haven't discussed in any detail with them - we've just touched on the possibility of attending at this point and recognize that given the practicality that needs to be solved quickly, we haven't talked about what the sort of nature of their contribution so those are, your and my, opinions about how they might work with us. We haven't really discussed in any detail at this point.

Okay let's move on to Item 6 then, any other business. And we have a point from Avri there about whether we need another communication to the accountability cross community working group refining any of our issues and dependencies.

Well, that's a really good question. And I don't feel I have an off the cuff answer to that. It feels like something we should be thinking about. And I'd

love to set up a quick email thread on that or have any contributions now. And noting that we are due to meet with the co-chairs tomorrow. Go ahead, Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah, thank you. This is Avri speaking. The reason I brought it up - and perhaps the communications that have been going on between the chairs is adequate, I don't know. I can't judge it because it's not something that, you know, is terribly transparent. And that's fine.

But what I'm thinking is that first of all we did submit a set of issues that the CCWG still has on it table. Beyond that - so we did make them aware of a certain number of issues and they still, to some sense, hold those in mind. Have any of those changed? Are there different nuances? Do we have different issues?

Part of what's going to be happening - and since they meet - the several days before this group meets, you know, one of the things that they're doing now is to try and basically get their definition of what is in Work Stream 1 basically defined and to have that.

So going into their (unintelligible) on that we should make sure that what we're presenting is, you know, a view, and presenting to the larger working group, not necessarily just the chairs, a picture of where we're at at the moment in terms of our understanding of dependencies on their work. Then they will be defining the Work Stream 1 stuff hopefully to the point of being nearly completed with that definition.

And then, you know, can basically bring an output from them as an input to our meeting of - and so a little bit more of the structuring. So one of the things that I was thinking about - and had a little conversation with some of the support staff on is whether we need to take that note that's still out there to

edit it, to change it to what have - basically do an edit pass through it and add change, delete whatever is necessary.

Now perhaps, you know, that note no longer pertains at all in which case we need to say that too. So that's really the perspective I'm looking at is more than the fine-tuned are we coordinated issue that I'm sure the chairs are doing well is to bring it down a level to the two groups and make sure that the concerns of this group are clearly seen, you know, by that group. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Avri, that's very welcome points. Just to be clear, I know there was nothing accusatory about your points on transparency. We did meet last Friday with the chairs and it wasn't a particularly detailed meeting. There were - it was one or more of the CCWG co-chairs missing. I think there might have only been one together with Lise and I, so I'm hoping we'll get full participation of the five of us in the call tomorrow.

And your points are well made and certainly well taken by me that we could usefully cross check that and perhaps even test that with our group before that meeting so thanks, that's a helpful point to just revisit that and make sure the scope of overlap and interaction is adequate and still appropriate.

Lise.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Jonathan. And I agree that Avri raised a very important point. I actually misunderstood it in the beginning because it was about the communication but I agree that we need to have a look at the actual issues and to see if we're overlapping or do we need to be cooperating on some of the issues.

And - but we will also meet with the chairs during the Istanbul meeting so it would be very good to have something prepared before we meet with them at - in Istanbul. So I completely agree. And I think maybe it would also be very helpful to have a look at the design teams and the actual chart that Kurt Pritz made. It could be helpful. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Lise. So, Grace, if we could capture that as an action. And I'm not sure who it's on. Reluctant to put it on myself and Lise. But really there is an opportunity here to review the work of the CWG and the communications between the two groups, CWG and CCWG, to ensure that the - I think the interdependencies and interaction is current and up to date really, I think that - that's the point and still relevant.

Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. It's Greg Shatan for the record. I just wanted to add a (unintelligible) and another item on CCWG coordination. I think - when you talk with the chairs I think it's important to think about some kind of deliverable that can come back to us ideally before Istanbul but understanding that their meeting will take place just before ours, at least before our Istanbul meeting.

Obviously it's going to be an interim document but at least giving us kind of at least an up to date idea on what their thinking is major items that they're discussing and, you know, kind of making sure that we are aligned, you know, some document that can be considered by all of us doesn't need to be highly formal document but it should exist.

Secondly, I should note that I am acting as a liaison to the CCWG's legal committee. So I am trying to kind of keep things - some level of consistency through that. They have not yet decided what counsel to hire; that's still an

ongoing process but, you know, will be resolved before Istanbul I'm confident for them.

And I should note that in the course of kind of identifying in an interim basis where the - where they're at, you know, identifies very highest level for discussion with the lawyers that three major subjects are in Work Stream 1 which is the ability to recall members of the ICANN Board of Directors, that may be one, it may be all, but it's a general subject matter, that's one.

Community empowerment over ICANN's management, whatever form that might take, and then the third is one that may not be germane to our work, at least some people believe should be in Work Stream 1 which is limiting the scope of ICANN's activity so that's kind of the high level playback, you know, to the legal committee of what they believe the lawyers should know as being thought of in Work Stream 1. I wouldn't hold CCWG as a whole to that, I'm just, you know, playing back what I've seen. But I thought that would be useful. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Greg. Is that list of three items captured anywhere sort of semi-formally or is that just - is that - where is that sort of recorded at all or is that just your view of what the three overarching points are?

Greg Shatan: That was captured I think in the meeting notes for the legal subteam that - at the most recent meetings.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great. Well to the extent that that's sort of an open document I think it would be good to have that shared with us as part of this coordination work. That would be very useful.

Greg Shatan: I'll put the link in the list right now.

Jonathan Robinson: Wonderful. Thanks, Greg. All right, are there any other open points under AOB that anyone would like to raise or capture? All right well I will recognize that this feels like it's been a productive meeting at least in the sense that we've - everyone's fired up to get going on some of these key design teams. Please let's carry on that spirit as we leave this meeting especially since we're leaving half an hour earlier than our schedules might have suggested.

Really need to get everyone knuckling down over the next week and producing content in preparing for a productive meeting. I mentioned costs, it is going to cost a substantial amount to get us all together in the face to face.

And as one of your co-chairs I'm very mindful of deploying those resources to good effect so let's work productively and cooperatively together and with the best possible content we can to make sure we get the most out of that face to face meeting. Big commitment from all of us both personally and in terms of the financial side.

So, good, thank you very much for a productive meeting. And we'll look forward to seeing you again in a few days' time. And in the meantime let's keep the pressure on all of us to keep the work going and get towards the light at the end of the tunnel that we all need to see. Thanks again.

END