

ICANN

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
March 17, 2015
12:00 pm CT**

Coordinator: The recordings are started.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you. This is the 29th meeting of the CWG. It is 1704 UTC on the 17th of March. And the chairs will lead today's meeting today is Jonathan's leading. So I'll turn it over to Jonathan Robinson. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Grace. I believe we both Lise and myself on the call where Lise has to leave a little early due to prior engagements in Copenhagen.

Welcome everyone. We have a reasonably full agenda. We'll see how well. We've obviously got to make some updates on the emerging proposal and the work of the design teams as well as the very near complete principles.

It's been great to see the enthusiasm with which you all embraced the design teams to try and get us in shape to have a productive meeting in Istanbul.

You've seen proposal 2.2. A version has been circulated and we'll come to any feedback on that. I've seen some very initial feedback on the list already.

Obviously it's vital to make as much progress as we can on the design teams in order that we're then in shape to either critique, develop or absorb them into the proposal in Istanbul.

And so clearly we need a good sprint from now on as I said on our previous meeting on Thursday last week. And we'll come obviously to that in more detail in Item 3.

I think we'll come to any other detail and updates as we go through the different items in the agenda. And we'll pick that up as we work through the items.

We'll do is we have done before. We'll take you're record as present in the meeting if you are present in the Adobe Connect room. So let me just checked a moment if there is anyone who is on the call in the meeting who is not present in the Adobe Connect room.

And if I can remind you as usual, to please be on mute unless you are actively speaking. Raise your hand if you want to speak and come off mute at that point.

Anyone who is not in the Adobe Connect room who would like to be recorded as present?

Seun Ojedeji: Hi. This is Seun (unintelligible) in the Adobe Connect room and (unintelligible). Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Seun. I've got that. You are a little faint so if you do come in on audio again just bear in mind your voice is a little soft. So if you could just speak up a little bit. I did get that so we'll record you as present.

Seun Ojedeji: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: All right let's go straight on then to take any feedback or comment on the proposal Version 2.2 that was circulated yesterday.

I and we Lise and I realize that there is a partial issue with the circulation of the documents. So soon before the meetings we it's unfortunately as a consequence of working at the pace we are at the moment ideally there would be more time to review documents.

These were - this was circulated with an attempt to get it out 24 hours before the meeting. Clearly a longer period would be desirable. A shorter period may have been necessary.

But hopefully some of you at least have had a chance to look at it. And it is an iterative change on what was done previously. It's not a radical restructure.

And it will be really good to get any either initial inputs or online, you know, via the mailing list contributions to reviewing the document.

If anyone feels they got a particular strength in editing or any particular areas of the document in terms of its coherence, clarity and general fitness or purpose it would be great to hear from you and hear your contributions.

And I know Brenden at least has put in some comments very recently.

Also the list includes anyone who are key contributors or coordinators of the RFP 1 and 2 groups to ensure that they are accurately represented in this version and in this document.

And ideally in fact if we could start to move any information, relevant information that was developed in the initial work on RFP 4 and 5 subgroups so that's the work that was led by the coordinators (Robert) and (Cheryl) it would be great if we could begin to include any content that was previously developed in those groups if it's relevant to get those in the document.

Has anyone got comments or questions? Milton go ahead.

Milton Mueller: Yes. Can everyone hear me okay?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Milton Mueller: Okay. So I wanted to address the Section Roman Number III.a.1.1 contract extension cancellation renewal discussing just some L. There's a statement there should there be a mechanism to move the IANA functions away from ICANN and if so what should that mechanism be?

Partly curious as to why that's a question because I thought it was part of our principles if there should be.

So equally important the note after that says given the IANA requirement for a complete and implementable transition proposal any proposal which has such a separation mechanism has to include significant level of detail to meet this requirement.

Now I'm first of all not sure what that requirement is or where it's stated. But I'm wondering whether that NTIA requirement if it actually exists is also applicable to the numbers and protocols proposals which do have a separation mechanism but they're not very detailed.

In fact they're basically just saying we can cancel this contract and look for another provider. So is that considered sufficient implementation detail?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Milton. Before I attempt to make any kind of response does anybody have any comments or responses to that point? Anyone like to respond to those questions or comments?

Greg go ahead.

Greg Shatan: I guess I would. It's Greg Shatan for the record. I guess I would say to ask the ICG but since Milton sits on the ICG I assume the ICG is not prepared to or hasn't, you know, figured how much implementation detail is enough implementation detail.

I, you know, I personally would rather have, you know, less implementation detail only because that gets our job done faster. But if it's not sufficient then that's - the job isn't really done at all. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Any other comments or points? I mean I just to - Jaap go ahead.

Jaap Akkerhuis: This is Jaap speaking. As far as I know there had already been comments on the side of NTIA that the description of by numerous people was not detailed enough.

So I mean just but I think but I must speak too early. What I think is actually what you really want to do is put down the principle points where you have look and not really see that certainly in all the nitty-gritty details but at least give some inventory of all the subjects you need for doing this transition.

Milton Mueller: If I could just respond. I didn't hear exactly what Jaap said. Did he say that he had indications that the numbers proposal was not detailed enough?

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes. I mean I have people - I have heard people saying that.

Milton Mueller: What people? I mean are we the...

((Crosstalk))

Jaap Akkerhuis: Mr. Strickling he personally said that. So...

Milton Mueller: Okay. So but so that would mean that the IATF proposal is not detailed enough either. Is that what you're saying?

Jaap Akkerhuis: That's what I'm saying. That but I have heard in Singapore comments in that respect.

Milton Mueller: Well I would say we really have to have a lot more to go on than some - something that you heard somewhere in Singapore.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Will you ask. I answered.

Milton Mueller: I'm just saying the criterion being used to vet these proposals have to be a bit more rigorous than scuttlebutt in the hallways at a ICANN meeting.

And I also think we cannot apply a double standard to the names proposal and not apply the same standard to the other proposals.

And I think that the protocols and numbers communities would be very, very surprised at this stage of the game to be told that their proposal is not

acceptable because the official (organ) for reviewing those proposals has not deemed them unacceptable so I'm just wondering where this is coming from.

And I think this proposals are sufficiently detailed in terms of their separate ability mechanism and that the name proposals could take a similar approach. And I'll stop now.

Jonathan Robinson: This has prompted a buildup of a queue and I'm conscious we should go to that queue. I also think that we've got to be careful about going - I mean the clear question for us is is are we responding to a direction that has been appropriately given in terms of implementation detail and if we aren't sure about that we should establish it.

That seems to me the key point. I mean you made some other points Milton which we've got to be careful not to go off track about because they were directly relevant to the document.

But let me let the queue respond and then we'll come back to some of the other points. Go ahead Matthew.

Matthew Shears: Yes. It's Matthew Shears. I may be preempting the discussion for later on when it comes to the design teams.

But what we're doing in Design team L actually is looking at this transmission, the four-page transition document that's a part of the existing contract under C7.

In fact we're looking at C7 generally but most (unintelligible) C73 which is the plan that (Ed) gave required of ICANN for the possible moving

(unintelligible) was to (access0 operator. So that's what we're doing essentially in that.

It doesn't quite align with what's in that note that Milton has raised concerned about. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Matthew. Greg?

Greg Shatan: Greg Shatan again. I'm just wondering if, you know, this is something we should seek guidance on?

I agree that going on scuttlebutt or on informal statements from people who could make formal statements is not sufficient.

We don't want to overcook or undercooked the level of detail in the proposal. One is a waste of time because we've done more work than we have to. The other is a waste because we won't submit a proposal that won't get kicked back to us for more detail.

It seems to me that whether it's the ICG or the NTIA that, you know, we should get some guidance. And may be the guidance is as I said earlier, you know, I'd perfectly happier if the guidance is as Milton says that the other two proposals have an adequate level of detail around, you know, this topic and presumably around other topics as well and that we don't need to be any more detailed than those other proposals.

It would be a lot easier to stick to our timeline than if we need to have, you know, what some have called a turnkey proposal.

I don't care whether - I have no interest in being right or wrong about this.
Personally I only have an interest in us being right about this as a group.
Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: So the suggestion that we seek clarification from ICG and/or NTIA on the level of sufficient or adequate detail. Jari?

Jari Arkko: Yes. Can you hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Jari Arkko: Excellent. So I just wanted to say two things. The first thing is that I think it's important that when we go through this process we're not relying on sort of hearsay of things that someone might have said.

I think the decision is on the communities and if anyone has - even if it comes from NTIA that, you know, let's get it out in the open publicly and deal with it. And so far I have not heard anything of the kind.

Although of course there is, you know, things to do for both (ITA) and the numbers community and maybe a little bit more for the numbers community because they didn't start out with a contract as we did.

And, you know, even in the case of the (unintelligible) we were proceeding with some edits to those contracts and I think that's natural.

But we did discuss a little bit this topic in the ICG like what's sufficient implementation detail? I don't think we decided anything.

But we made a point that the level of implementation detail that you may require probably depends on what you're trying to do.

So if you have an existing thing that's been running for a while, you know, it seems reasonable that you don't have to describe it any further unless you have to make some modifications that are smallish. Then those need to be described in some fashion.

If you are creating a completely new structure then you can't waive it off with, you know, with just a paragraph of text. You have to describe it in fairly good detail. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Jari. And I noticed that Wolf-Ulrich also highlighted in the chat earlier that I think the level of implementation required is still to be discussed at the ICG.

Underscoring to return to Milton's original question which really dealt with a couple of issues in 3a 1.1.1. And that is first of all the phrasing that says should there be a mechanism to move the IANA functions away from ICANN?

I mean just to be clear this is not the draft of the document. This is the prompt or the issue for the CWG. So and then it says and if so then what should that mechanism be?

As far as I know Design Team L has dropped is not dealing with should there be a mechanism to move the IANA functions away from ICANN and assuming that there is a requirement to do so and therefore what are the mechanics?

And in fact I was going to suggest that a slight change to the title of that group Design Team L which is it's called separation mechanism.

And I think it would be probably more accurately named as separation mechanics just to make the smallest possible change but to get it more on target with what actually is likely to be done as far as I understand is likely to be done in that group.

Second is this issue of NTIA requirement for a complete and implementable transition proposal.

I'd quite like to know at least for the benefit of this group where that language comes from so at least we have that anchored. It would be useful to know where that anchor comes from.

And so that where that language comes from so we can understand and be sure about that.

So those are my two suggestions to try and at least provide - well it was really three I guess. One is that the design team doesn't deal with the question of it's a CWG issue should there be a mechanism to move away?

The design team is assuming that there should be a mechanism and therefore what are the mechanics to achieve that?

And then third I'd like to understand where this note given the NTIA requirement for a very complete and implementable transition proposal.

I think Jari makes a very sensible point to the extent that we retain existing operations the detail is likely to be much less bad than to the extent that there's a change or sizable change.

So unless there's is serious objection I suggest we change the Design Team L. Thanks for your support Cheryl to separation mechanics so it's perhaps clearer what the purpose of that is. It's the implementation mechanics. Greg?

Is that a new hand or an old hand? Okay any other comments, questions or inputs?

And I would encourage you I know you haven't seen this document for very long as I said in the introduction. But really it would be great to get your help in actually constructively driving this draft forward to the extent that it's possible where it doesn't preempt the work of the design teams.

No other comments or questions on this for the moment?

All right, good. We are going to pick up on the principles in five minutes at half past the hour which is Item Number 4. And that is to accommodate Lise and Martin, Lise Fuhr and Martin Boyle who will respectively join and need to leave the conference in a relatively tight window.

So we'll move to design teams for five minutes and then move to principles and then come back unless Lise can you confirm if Martin is on the call already in which case we'll go straight to principles?

Lise Fuhr: It doesn't seem that he's on the call. I haven't heard from him. So but if he's not joining within the five minutes I can do the presentation for him. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. Well if you could let me know as soon as you hear from him we'll know whether he's joined and we'll pick it up in around five minutes.

Greg Shatan: This is Greg. He said he was joining about a half hour in.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. That's when we're expecting him Greg, yes. Thank you.

So as far as the design teams are concerned we are encouraging everyone and again just acknowledging that getting out of the starting blocks very rapidly, acknowledging that we aren't following the steps absolutely rigorously. But that doesn't mean we want to go into a sort of a (NOC) situation.

You would've seen my notes from yesterday I think where essentially we have initiated all of the design teams that are either agreed a priority one or a priority one in principle subject to finalizing the design team template.

But the objective here is to try and give the various groups an opportunity to not get tied up in waiting for approval and start moving, getting moving in an agile way.

So if you're at all unsure just refer back to myself and Lise. And we'll work with you to try to get these design teams commissioned and working such that they can produce material comfortably in advance of Istanbul.

Ideally you've got something coming out by the end of this week. But we recognize that's tight and that for some it may be advantageous even if it's hard work to do things over the weekend.

And so we've set a final deadline for design team or output to contribute to meeting. The aim is to get that out by 800 UTC Monday.

Okay I think we are sufficiently close to the half hour point that I would like to switch to the principles. And hopefully Martin joins us at or around 30 minutes past the hour.

So Lise why don't you introduce the principles, the latest changes and what we intend to do with them under what was to be Item 4?

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Jonathan. I will do. Grace can you or Marika can one of you put up the latest version?

As Martin sent out an email yesterday regarding this there's been some smaller changes for the principles. And but a lot of the outstanding issues were resolved.

We had two issues with one with Seun about Footnote 1 that's been settled and another one with Paragraph 10 where must was replaced by should and it has been changed back to must.

So we'll keep the original wording saying multi-stakeholder there isn't any proposal must foster multi-stakeholder participation in the future over (sign) of the IANA functions.

So these changes were closed and agreed on. And then we have some changes made from Andrew Sullivan. And I'm going to have those presented very quickly because are more - mostly changes of wording. It's not in the actual content of any of the actual principles.

So we have one in the title where it's added that the draft is for the names function. We have one in number four where it's the changes are instead support the open Internet, the transition proposals should contribute to the open and interoperable Internet.

And we have another clarification in 5.4 saying that protection against capture safeguards need to be in place to prevent capture of the service off or of any IANA oversight and stewardship function.

And that was the changes provided by Andrew Sullivan.

Does anyone have anything to add for this to this?

Paul because I just got a text from Martin saying that he is trying to get into the Adobe Room and on the call. And I would really like him to - we had the last outstanding issue if everyone is accepting the changes made by Andrew then we will have one last issue and that's going to be 7.2.

Greg your hand is up. Greg go ahead.

Greg Shatan: I actually wanted to raise an issue with Footnote 1. I find the way it's phrased it's confusing at least to me.

The IANA functions operator if what we're referring to is the root zone - is what is currently the root zone management staff that's not an entity.

So the use of the term entity in Footnote 1 seems misleading to me and confused me as to as to what was being referred to as the entity which is ICANN or the actual team or staff that's providing the IANA functions?

So I would suggest that using a word like group or unit would be more appropriate than using the term entity.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. So okay, I can't remember what Martin he was emailing you regarding this. And I don't know what he agreed or not regarding entity or group. And being not a non-native English speaker I would prefer to confer this with him.

I hope he's going to join call in a second or two. I don't know if he's here yet.

For me it's well group entity it sounds like almost the same so...

Greg Shatan: Well I think the question is whether it has a separate existence or not. A group be an entity...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: ...but an entity isn't unnecessarily not all groups are entities.

Seun Ojedeji: Hello. This is Seun. May I?

Lise Fuhr: Yes.

Seun Ojedeji: Sorry. May I comment? Sorry I'm on audio only. May I...

Lise Fuhr: Just go ahead Seun.

Seun Ojedeji: All right thank you. I think yes, I think I understand the (unintelligible) great list.

And I think perhaps we'll easily address this concern by actually looking at the Section Item 9 high which was actually referring to - I'm sorry I'm on audio so I can't actually read it (unintelligible). It's actually referring to the (unintelligible) IANA function from the IANA (unintelligible). And in bracket it puts in that its ICANN.

So if it recognize this, if we recognize the IANA (appraisal) as ICANN in that context then any other places where we have IANA operator defined then I think it should just logically refer to identity and not a group.

So that is why I specifically would say the new proposed definition of IANA operator as proposed by Martin is acceptable for me.

However if the intent of the principle, the IANA principle defined in that principle is actually to refer to the group team or the team (unintelligible) doing the - forming the function then it means that we need to have - may need to (rename it from (India)).

I know but maybe for it IANA functions operation team or something. Because even in the contracts of NTIA those (unintelligible) the functions the contractual service it's ICANN and ICANN are the ones that signs the agreement.

So that makes the NTIA operator. And that does not mean that it's a given. It can change whatever as the rule is the operator. So that is what I want to (unintelligible). Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Seun. And I see that Martin Boyle has joined. Are you also on audio Martin Boyle? Martin?

Greg Shatan: I'd like to respond to Seun if I could.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Go ahead Greg.

Greg Shatan: Yes. First off just 91 that Seun sites who doesn't use the term IANA functions operator so can't really tell us what term IANA phone operator means.

There are several points elsewhere in the principles that refer to the IANA functions operator. And for instance says that the IANA functions operator needs to be separate from the principle or rather from the - from policy decisions.

So clearly it's, you know, when a term being used there is referring to the IANA team or the root zone management team and not to ICANN as a whole.

And so it's because ICANN as a whole is where the policy decisions are made. So clearly saying that the IANA functions operator is a group that needs to be kept separate from policy that implements policy that's made elsewhere.

So again just trying to clear up that the IANA functions operator refers, you know, in particular to the team that performs the service of the IANA functions and not to any larger unit. Therefore again because the IANA function the root zone management team is not an entity. Using the term entity is confusing.

I don't want to waste a lot of time on this but it just, you know, trying to achieve some clarity.

Lise Fuhr: Yes. So you think will bring clarity to address it like group instead of entity?

Greg Shatan: Group or unit.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. I think a unit might be better than group because...

Greg Shatan: Yes.

Lise Fuhr: ...group for me sounds like more well...

Greg Shatan: Informal perhaps?

Lise Fuhr: Informal yes.

Greg Shatan: You so I would go with unit if we could and move on.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. So since I think that we have agreed Seun is units fine for you and then we move on to 7.2? Seun?

Seun Ojedeji: This is Seun.

Lise Fuhr: Yes?

Seun Ojedeji: Yes I think I'd just like respond to Greg in relation to 9. If 9.1 is referring to - can we just (unintelligible) the statement for 9.1 it says suppression of IANA functions from IANA operator in a bracket it goes just ICANN.

So I don't understand the rationale. I mean I understand the fact that the separation between policy but I don't know what is written there. Policy is not written there. It said recognizes ICANN as an operator.

I don't mind if it is determined that IANA operator is now the team naturally (unintelligible) the work fine. However we need to make that to be consistent with 9.1 because 9.1 is actually according to ICANN is the IANA operator. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Yes. Just it helps to quote the language accurately if we're going to analyze the act about language. 9.1 says to separate the IANA functions from the current operator, i.e., ICANN so that's a point.

Lise Fuhr: Yes okay.

Seun Ojedeji: So the current operators, i.e., ICANN that means ICANN's the current operator right?

Lise Fuhr: Yes. Let's not have this as a private chat between the two of you.

So I don't think you disagree that much. So could we get on or is it a point that you really want to discuss now?

Greg Shatan: I think I'm fine with unit. So unless Seun objects to using the word units we should close this.

Seun Ojedeji: Yes. I do object but I'm fine with moving on if that is going to make us make progress.

Greg Shatan: Well...

Lise Fuhr: So...

Greg Shatan: ...no problem.

Lise Fuhr: ...you do object to the - okay. If - is anyone else objecting to the word unit?

It doesn't seem like it. Okay but we will - I support GNS.

Okay we'll and Seun you're sustaining that you're objecting to the word units.
We will take this off-line I think.

Greg Shatan: I see other support for unit in the chat. I don't think a single person should
keep us from moving...

Lise Fuhr: No, no, no we are - I know. But before we close this unit I'd like to have all
the others closed too and then we can get back to it. So that's fine. Thank you
Greg.

Martin are you on the call? Martin Boyle?

Paul Kane: He says he's waiting for the call to be answered.

Lise Fuhr: Yes but...

Paul Kane: There was a very long delay...

Lise Fuhr: ...I'm there.

((Crosstalk))

Martin Boyle: I am here now. Can you hear me?

Lise Fuhr: Yes. You're a little vague but if you speak up. And I think what we reach now is 72. And I would like you to go through this together with Lise and Paul.
Thank you.

Martin Boyle: Okay thank you. I'm sorry if this is hard to hear. I will speak as loud as I dare in a hotel room.

Seven two until I've picked up (unintelligible) at the last big discussion I thought was a difficult bit that we had a proposal from the GAC that was then accepted by those other people who had commented on that particular item except for Paul Kane who then flagged that he had - that he objected to that particular phraseology.

I've asked Paul to provide alternative text. I have heard nothing yet but then I've been off-line for probably as long as he has because we were on the same airplane.

So I don't know whether he would like to talk us through. However the documents -- and I'm still looking through my papers to try to find the document -- was essentially a response to the comments that had come up from Milton Mueller about the earlier language on sovereign, national sovereignty and translated that into rather more direct terms of the national legal base.

So that's the first sentence in that paragraph. The second part of the paragraph is one that I'm not aware of being any controversy on that Andrew Sullivan proposed the wording.

I think the wording is of it Andrew proposed is clearer than wording that was in the document that we last saw.

And since having proposed this text I have had no comments from anybody on that second part. So the only bit that is giving us concern now is the bit specifically on the applicability of laws. And so I still can't seem to manage to find the text. I thought I had it in my papers and I haven't got there yet but that's incompetence on my behalf rather than anything else.

So I am happy to hear whether other people are okay to live with the text. But in particular I think we need to...

Paul Kane: All right thank you.

Martin Boyle: ...hear from Paul what his wording will be.

Lise Fuhr: Yes Paul Kane you're next.

Paul Kane: Yes. Thank you very much. And I apologize. And I am suffering from the same problem Martin. I've actually left my papers behind.

So if I may just explain very briefly my issue is not with the second paragraph of 7.2, just with 7.1, respect for national law, that is a given, processes and decisions.

I would like to know or specifically to clarify who's decisions? Is it a judicial decision? Is it a decision of the minister? Is it a decision of the Internet community?

And I think it would be helpful to tie that down so that there is a proper process where the incumbent registry operator and the users that the

incumbent registry operator has have the opportunity to make sure that proper process has been followed.

The second issue is any consensus policies developed by ICANN. Within the ICANN bylaws and for ccNSO members there is a specific opt out in that ccNSO members reserve the right not to follow policies developed through the ccNSO process and adopted by ICANN.

And if we are in this document mandating that ccNSO members have to follow policies that they don't agree with they don't have the ability to opt out. And for non-ccNSO members they have proactively not agreed to follow ICANN developed policies.

And so that reference was - is obviously applicable to gTLD registries is not as applicable if at all applicable to ccTLD registries.

So that was just those two issues in that first sentence. But the high-level view is it is a matter of decentralized authority.

It is a matter of according with the legal processes within the relevant or the jurisdiction or competent jurisdiction, court of competent jurisdiction, but those are the points I like.

And I do apologize. I did draft something but I have left it behind and my brain isn't functioning correctly to be able to recall it on the fly.

Lise Fuhr: Okay thank you Paul. I was thinking that the reference to any consensus ICANN policies are for those CCs that are actually following ICANN policy.

But, and I don't think that is going to apply for those not doing so. But I...

Paul Kane: But that's not what the text says. And I just - I share your concern Lise and I'm just trying to make sure the text accurately accommodates those CCs that do not wish to be impacted by ICANN development policies.

Lise Fuhr: Yes but I didn't - I wasn't concerned about this because I didn't read into it what you did. But let's clarify this. I see Elise's...

Paul Kane: Yes.

Lise Fuhr: ...is next. Elise?

Grace Abuhamad: Hi Elise. Go ahead, try now. You're un-muted.

Elise Lindeberg: Hello.

Grace Abuhamad: Good. We can hear you.

Elise Lindeberg: Can you hear me now?

Lise Fuhr: Yes.

Grace Abuhamad: Yes.

Elise Lindeberg: I just want to make a comment and that is that after a lot of back and forth on this (unintelligible) back and forth on this specific (unintelligible).

I think that the last suggestion that we now have in front of us it's time to and to give recognition to all the like interests of the ccTLD and the development assistance and development of those (unintelligible).

We are referring to national law. So they are applicable of course (unintelligible) otherwise it's not an issue. And national (unintelligible) of registries and they're all interest (unintelligible).

So I think that's in a way and this is the course not as precise (unintelligible). And we might have a lot of questions. That happens when any of these (unintelligible) conflicts unintelligible.

It gives a nod to all the like interests and it keeps them in the mix. But (unintelligible) without meeting and (unintelligible) confusions about how to balance them. And I think that is not the (unintelligible) task to give that balance.

So I think this is detailed enough. I think it's overall enough. So I think it's (unintelligible). So I would like to keep it (unintelligible) as a whole. Okay thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Elise. And I can see that Alan Greenberg made a suggested into chat about applicable ICANN consensus policies.

And I was wondering if that could take some of the concern away from you Paul. But I understand still that your questioning process and decisions.

You're not to answer now. We have Andrew and Greg and then if you have an answer for this you can do that after them. Andrew?

Andrew Sullivan: Thank you. On the - I think maybe some of the concern in this section is happening because it is not constrained enough.

Because the only relevant policies here of course are the ones about the root zone itself not how, you know, how you operate zones underneath the root.

And there are some consensus, some ICANN consensus policies that actually govern the operations of those subordinate (unintelligible) that are - that have been delegated.

But that's not a IANA issue. That's a ICANN consensus policy. So what needs to happen I think to this text - and I suggested something in the chat but I don't - it wasn't very elegant.

What needs to happen is that the line around the relevant policies have to be just for the root zone.

And once you've got that then it will be clear that any ccTLDs national policy could not apply to the root zone if it were in conflict with the administration of the root zone sort of by definition right, there's only one zone.

And I - so I think if that were adjusted maybe that would solve some of the concerns here. But I'm not exactly sure how to suggest the text. I'm sorry.

Lise Fuhr: Well thank you for that Andrew. That sounds like a very sensible suggestion. But let's hear Greg and Martin and don't know about Paul if you want to chime in afterwards? Greg?

Greg Shatan: This is Greg Shatan. I had just made a suggestion in the chat with regard to the less controversial second sentence which Andrew had no problem with. So I was just pointing that out and I'll step out of the way of the more interesting discussion about the first sentence.

Lise Fuhr: Okay, thank you Greg. Martin Boyle?

Martin Boyle: Thanks Lise, Martin Boyle here. Yes a pick up on the - on Andrew's useful comment and actually know that currently at the only IANA - the only policies that affect even those ccTLDs that are members of the ccNSO are those that are directly related to the root zone file and there are none at the moment.

So I think perhaps the language that's crept in here is the sort of fairly relaxed - well there isn't any. And the - and perhaps Paul's comment is right that the wording does have to take account of that.

And certainly I would see the suggestion of applicable consensus ICANN policies or even being a bit more specific about the applicable consensus ICANN policies related to the root zone and IETF technical standards and let - so put that one forward in the hopes that Paul might be able to find that one acceptable and that we can move a little bit closer into consensus on this item. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Martin. And I can see Greg your hand is up.

Greg Shatan: Yes. Thanks. It is a new hand and wading into the first sentence and also tying this back to the earlier discussion about the term IANA functions operator.

If you start with the lead-in to this it's - that we're discussing decisions and actions of the IANA functions operator and characterizing what they should be.

If we're talking about the IANA functions operator being the root zone management function and or Andrew is referring to as the management of the root then this is a fairly innocuous situation.

If we're talking about decisions and actions of ICANN being the entire entity within which the root zone management functions and this is a much more explosive potentially set of circumstances that are, you know, wrapped into here, much larger group of decisions and actions.

So again this is why I think it needs to be clear that the decisions and actions we're talking about are just the decisions and actions of the root zone management team and not of the - of ICANN as a whole. And that's why I want the term IANA functions operator to be as clear as possible in this meeting. Thanks.

Seun Ojedeji: This is Seun. Hello?

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Greg. Yes, yes you can come in. Martin Boyle is on the list too but just Seun go ahead.

Seun Ojedeji: Yes. This is Seun. Thank you. I just want to - I probably got it from my (unintelligible) hopefully went to (unintelligible). And I'd like to read out about IANA.

It says IANA is responsible for coordinating the Internet global unique identifiers. And it's operated by ICANN. And it's operated by ICANN. (Unintelligible) was saying that the definition on that Web site is not correct. And this is (unintelligible) by the way.

I don't see why we need to put the new definition for this purpose.

It's clear that ICANN is - and as ICANN said it's not a given. Another organization of (unintelligible) outside ICANN can still be (unintelligible) if it's apples.

So I think I agree with Greg we need to clarify this definition across very well. And I think it's important that it's consistent with the existing understanding that has been documented.

What we're seeing now if we're seeing (unintelligible) in the - it's a - is the team (unintelligible) carrying out the work that's indirectly contradicts what is on the Web site and (unintelligible). Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Seun. I see Greg your - you forgot to lower your hand. That's an old hand I think. And I have Martin Boyle on the list next.

But I would like to say I think we should once more try and deal with this on the list. I don't think we're that far away from each other.

And I think even though a lot of you couldn't hear Elise I think that was what she was saying that we need to try and reach each other in this and not be too - reading too much into the words of this is principles.

It's not the actual proposal text but of course it's important that we understand the same but we need to have this concluded in a way very soon.

So I'll get the work to Martin. I'll close discussion because we're almost on the hour and you have a lot more to deal with so Martin go ahead.

Martin Boyle: Thanks Lise. Yes I think your points about, you know, this is not a legally binding document and getting into a point where we are arguing over very fine details of interpretation is perhaps counterproductive because we then lose the site of what it is that we are trying to do.

And again not having documents in front of me I can't remember which paragraph it is and - but it is actually an important one is that in this particular paragraph the IANA functions operator is making its decisions that are based on policies that come from elsewhere.

It's under no circumstances should be writing its own policy. And as soon as you sort of take that view of the world and for many of us in particular from the ccTLD and I would assume the gTLD world it becomes really important that we don't end up with having a different set of rules that can suddenly come from the IANA functions operator.

These rules should be made objectively based on policy agreed to through the recognized bottom up multi-stakeholder processes.

Now the comment that was made about the ICANN functions operator. Yes it is just managing the entries and deciding on what should be made into the root zone.

And that is exactly what this one says. It doesn't say, you know, here is a sort of set of rules for the root for the IANA function operator to make up.

It actually says that there are certain things. And for ccTLDs I think that there is an issue but for the vast majority of ccTLDs they are under a national jurisdiction.

They have worked with their local community to develop the processes and identify the decisions that underpin their registry.

But at the end of the day they see themselves as part of the local community. And that is what this paragraph in its first two lines also is saying.

But the issue is that fundamentally that decision and policy interpretation of that decision does not provide with the IANA functions operator. And it kind of goes back to your earlier discussion then I think I probably have some concerns about your earlier discussion to which I was not party. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Martin. I think even though these are very important discussions we need to wrap up now and we'll need to have the rest of the discussion online and solve the outstanding issues that's going to be 7.2.

And we still have Footnote 1 where we need to have a final go on the changes for that one.

But everyone thank you for your participation in the principles and I'll hand it over to Jonathan. And I will unfortunately have to leave the call. So everyone have a very productive call.

Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Lise, thank you Martin. That was supposed to be a quick 15 minute tidying up the last loose ends on principles. But it does seem to have highlighted that there are a couple of items that still needs some work and noting the most, some work on issues and scope suggested by people like Alan and Andrew amongst others.

So hopefully we can actually still bring this to some kind of sensible close and understand the objectives and principles so that we don't spend too much time on this get on with the other work at hand which is of course completing the proposal.

Here we have an opportunity now to go back to Item 3 which is the update from the design teams and an opportunity to have any necessary discussion dialogue question or comment on the various design teams.

I think this makes sense to just simply work through them in relatively short order and just obtain any comments from the design team leads and any questions or input from the group.

So without any further comment I'll go straight to Paul Kane and offer you Paul the opportunity to say anything that you would like update on Design Team A and seek any input.

Paul Kane: Thank you Jonathan. First of all let me apologize to you all for not participating last week. I was planning on participating on Thursday but there was a technical glitch and my phone - my mobile phone didn't ring so apologies for that.

The Design Team 1 service level expectations group has been beavering away. And I just shared with you the performance analysis that we had done.

We have been consulting with various ccTLDs and ICANN chief technical officer to make sure that we try and get the document as close to real world as possible.

I admit that it's is not going to be perfect from the first iteration but certainly we will have a document for discussion for the Istanbul meeting.

So what we've been doing as if you remember the last time I presented it was on the performance reviews use in the IANA published performance records.

We have subsequently gone out to TLD registries that interact with the root to actually get more statistics, to the minute statistics of how their interactions with IANA have occurred over the last two and a bit years.

Once again I think the IANA is performing well. Certainly in some instances responses from IANA are coming back within minutes. And that will be contained in the report with references as to which CCs and timings.

So where we are is still trying to knuckle down on getting the status quo documented so we have a baseline for the service level expectations using real-world numbers moving forward.

Bernie Turcotte has very kindly offered to assist in making sure that the document that we are drafting complies with the requirements of the final proposal.

And we hope to work closely with Bernie once again trying to have something out I hope by the end of this week if not end of this week or early next week so every member of the CWG who is attending either in person or virtually the Istanbul meeting has had a chance to review the report and so we can have a substantive discussion in Istanbul.

The group both gTLDs and ccTLDs are working quite well. If you remember from last time we split into two groups.

I have just got to come up to speed a little more with the second group who are working on basically capturing the real world statistics and what should go forward so in the book.

But I hope as I say by the end of this week if not the end of this week certainly very early next week possibly over the weekend to have the first version circulated to all members so when we're in Istanbul we can have substantial comments. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Paul. That's pretty much what we need and require from you. Ideally by the end of this week and as we said at the outset of this call absolute and stop point is 1800 UTC Monday but ideally in advance of that.

I've got two questions for you and please feel free anyone else to make any comments or questions before we move on to the next team.

First of all in terms of where you think this document will be in terms of if you like a percentage readiness for insertion into the proposal where do you think you will be? What's your opinion of where you think you'll be later this week when we see the document?

And I'll ask you the second question so that you can have a chance to answer both. What - can you make it clear what the difference between an SLE and an SLA is for the purpose of this group so people understand or have...

Martin Boyle: So I'll do the second question first. SLA service level agreement requires parties to agree two parties to proactively agree to deliver to a certain standard.

If the internal model is the model that is actually proposed there will not be a party who can agree a service level agreement.

But the registries, the gTLD registries do have a service level agreement with ICANN. The ccTLD registries do not have an agreement or formal agreement.

And therefore it was considered a service level expectation which doesn't require formal consent but it does set a threshold and a standard to which IANA is expected to adhere to.

And should it not adhere to the prescribed standards then there is an escalation process. And then at some point the CSC will kick in.

So it is really to get over the problem of certain CC registries not being the majority, the vast majority of CC registries not being willing to enter into any formal agreement so but the effect is the same.

In terms of your first question where do I think we are or will be at the end of the week, the document in my mind will be about 80% concluded.

That is to say it is defining what we consider or what we are told are the processes that IANA does today. And it defines the service level expectation as to how long each service element that IANA delivers should take bearing in mind today 95% under the existing arrangements 95% of all root zone changes should occur within three calendar - three days of which one and a half days are allocated to NTIA's involvement.

So without NTIA there's an expectation that updating the root zone will take about 1-1/2 days.

In some instances the IANA is significantly outperforming that which is why the emphasis has been on trying to capture the real world examples of how efficient IANA is running. And it is as I've highlighted numerous times running quite efficiently.

So where is the document going to be deficient? It is likely to be deficient on the thorny issue of where parties have contention or hostile reassignments.

So in the event what we captured are not hostile reassignments of ccTLDs. There is good evidence, historical evidence of how efficiently that can and has occurred.

In some instances the delays have been more processed than anything else and are not down to IANA's fault in any way.

The areas we have no knowledge of are hostile ccTLD reassignments re-delegations and gTLD, hostile gTLD reassignments. So we haven't got any statistics for that. And so we will need to liaise with IANA as to what they think would be appropriate.

The problem, we have been in discussions with IANA staff and they're under contractual obligations with NTIA not to release specific information without specific approval.

But at this stage we would prefer to consult with the CWG members to ascertain which areas if any they would like further clarification on and to have a list of those areas of further clarification so that when we make the request to NTIA to allow IANA staff to provide the information to us it's an exhaustive list.

So we're not going back to NTIA asking for permission for disclosure of various bits in a drip drab manner.

So the intent is to try and be as efficient as we can to have to capture all the issues where the report is considered to be deficient then ask - formally ask NTIA for permission to allow IANA to answer our specific questions so that we can conclude the report as efficiently as possible.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Paul. That's helpful on both counts. And the only thing I would say is bring that to the group in advance of Istanbul if you can any preliminary questions or issues so we can help with that even in this week if necessary.

Paul Kane: We'll do our best rest assured.

Jonathan Robinson: So thanks. Great thanks. Alan you had a question or comment?

Alan Greenberg: Sorry. I just threw up my hand in relation to the SLE versus SLA. I think Paul was semantically correct but the confusion I think is in the industry the term SLA has been used as a set of norms published by a service provider to tell their customers what to expect.

That technically was never a service agreement, service level agreement. The term has been use which I think was causing some of the concern. I have no problem with being more specific as Paul has. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great. So I thought it was helpful to have the clarification. I'm mindful of time. And I realize that some of the other groups may not be as far advanced as this. But I am also mindful of any help we can give them or any discussion we can have as relevant now to assist them on their way towards this (unintelligible) will be helpful.

So let's move. Thank you again Paul and let's move on to Design Team B and hear any updates or areas where they need help or guidance or input. Allan MacGillivray are you available to give input from Design Team B?

Bart Boswinkel: Jonathan this is Bart.

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Allan asked me to provide a brief update on where the Design Team B is right now.

So for the participants on the call I'm ICANN staff and I'm intimately - I'm involved in Design Team B supporting them. That's why he asked me.

So just following on his update from the last call, the Design Team B has concluded its survey. And we'll send it out this week to the ccTLD community to seek their input on whether the independent appeals panel is needed for delegation and re-delegations and if so what type of requirements they have and they will - and the working group what the design team will provide the feedback as soon as it has concluded its work and will provide the CWG with advice if any on how to proceed with this topic.

Given the - because the design team started a little bit late the survey will most likely overlap a little bit with the Istanbul meeting itself.

But at the same time given this is a bit of a separate topic the design team feels reasonably comfortable that it will provide details in time. That's the update.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Bart. So it feels to me -- and maybe I'm misunderstanding this -- but it feels to me like we won't be in a position to schedule any particular session or part of a session to deal with the content and output from this design team in Istanbul. It's too early.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. But I think that's fairly correct because say what they wanted to do is first consult with the ccTLD community on its need.

And the results of that survey will not be available anyway.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. We'll have to - that will be as it is. But it's - and we'll have to weave that in either, you know, post Istanbul by whatever methods we can.

Move on then and keep things ticking over. Design Team C, Donna Austin are you available to give us an update?

Donna Austin: I am. Thanks Jonathan, Donna Austin for the record. So we had a first call of the group yesterday. We'd gone through a drafting exercise prior to that.

Basically if you look at the scope of the design team we broke the tasks down into each member as a group to responsibility for responding to the different items in the scope.

So we we've had a discussion around that a little bit more iterative work done by members of the team overnight.

We are myself and Bernie are working on a draft that we hope the team will review again during a call on Thursday.

And depending on where we get to during that call on - sorry, call on Friday so depending on where we get to with that we should we hope to have a draft available for discussion in Istanbul. And I would hope Jonathan that we can make that time frame that you've provided of Monday.

I think that's all I have.

Jonathan Robinson: Donna that's encouraging. Yes go, ahead.

Donna Austin: I will I'll just add two more points. So part of our team was somebody from IANA and somebody from NTIA.

So we've had agreement from Elise Garrick, for Kim Davies to help with the work of this team.

And I've also had an initial conversation with Ashley Heineman about whether it's appropriate or a possibility that NTIA can also help us with the task.

Now in terms of the involvement of those two people our - the view of the group is that they would only be there as expertise when we are seeking clarity on what currently happens at the moment.

So they're not there to assist in the drafting of any of the documentation but it's more of a can you please clarify that XYZ is correct?

So we're seeking their opinion. We're just seeking their general expertise and understanding of how much of the performance management as it relates to the contract and also as it relates to current SLAs is managed through IANA and NTIA. Thanks Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Donna. That seems like a very sensible approach and makes - and thank you for making direct approaches to get that input. Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. It's not a question for Donna but I've been out of the loop for the last two weeks or so. It would be useful if people go through their design team work whether - if they can identify whether additional people are still needed for the team or not because I certainly but probably others may be looking for homes to do some work. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: That's great Alan especially as you now aware that we're really pushing hard to try and produce relevant and effective content for the draft proposal as it emerges so but yes, that's a good point.

All right let me move us through then the others and see whether there are any other areas if and be mindful of Alan's comment please if you do need additional help in this team please flag that as well.

Design Team D?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here for the record Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Design Team D is just finished it's (administrivia) part of its work in terms of putting up as what I would trust is near final and now waiting for, you know, final stage approval, et cetera.

Our topic of course is the authorization function. And you have those of you that in the Adobe Connect room you have the current proposal in front of you.

The most recent change was to concerning the current members. We do have our minimum proposed membership now met. But that does not mean that anyone who has an interest in assisting in the work we're about to jump into cannot and should not offer themselves.

But we do thankfully have our minimum proposed membership now met. And I want to thank everyone who stepped up in response to our request for volunteering on that.

So what we're up to now is putting our - any background documents and discussion points up into Google Doc and of course replicated onto the wiki and discussing with our members on the mailing list which has been formed thank you very much staff as to how we're going to proceed and indeed if we're going to be able to see enough substantive work to have a meaningful draft with you by your deadline on Monday.

It is however our intention to have at least an early comment if not a fully fleshed out response to our work task available for discussion.

It won't be a long more lengthy one we trust but it will be at least something by the deadline on Monday the 23rd. And I think that's about it for me Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Cheryl. I'm not going to add part to the conversation just to recognize your effort, thank you. And we'll keep going to work our way through these so that we work within the time available.

Design Team - and I'm - and clearly if there are any comments or questions for the design team members please - for the leads or points primarily this is

intended to be done off list but off - out of these meetings but it does give us the opportunity to comment or question so please feel free to raise your hands.
Design Team F?

Grace Abuhamad: Hi Jonathan. This is Grace. So Design Team F doesn't have a lead at the moment so I don't know who would speak on part of the team.

Jonathan Robinson: That's right. Thanks for reminding me. We put out a call on list to see if anyone is prepared to step up on that.

So I will leave that that's on the relationship between NTIA, IANA, and the root zone maintainer. There is a lead it to be confirmed so just remind that that's a call out on the list at the moment.

I'll move us on then to L.

Grace Abuhamad: And Jonathan this is Grace. For L James Gannon sent his apologies today so I believe Matthew Shears will speak on behalf of the group.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Grace. Go ahead Matthew.

Matthew Shears: Yes (unintelligible) somewhat touched upon this. So this template actually was to have been and just I sent it out late last night or this morning. So you can see from the description it's really the purpose of it is to examine existing transition planning as we know that in the current contract (unintelligible).

It's in this - it's in the area of the continuity of operations in the contracts. And so we may well look at (unintelligible) transition plan that we've (unintelligible) we have a plan. We have a pre-paid plan.

We had not set (unintelligible) say we have not set any particular deadline at this juncture. But we're certainly trying to have as much information and fill out a template and work on the big issues certainly related to the (unintelligible) transition plan for next week. So that is our goal.

And (unintelligible) there are six individuals at the moment in the design team. But the others who have experience in transition planning or related matters they certainly would be welcome to join.

So I think that's pretty much unless (Guri) wanted to add anything.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Matthew. There was a little bit of a breakup of sound coming through there. So is anyone got any questions or issues?

And as you said we did touch on this earlier and got the tense of where this is headed so maybe that this is sufficiently well covered for now.

I'll move on to M and see if Chuck Gomes is on the call and able to give us a quick update there.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan. I am on the call. Let me start off by saying there was one other volunteer for working - for Drafting Team M last week, last Thursday on the call.

(Eric Yirate) also volunteered so that gives us two ccTLDs. I'm the only one from the gTLDs right now. We also have Avri and we have (Stefan) from the ccTLDs as well.

So, I think we have enough to get started here. So, just if (Eric) can be added to the list as soon as possible that would be great. Because I'm going to after

this - soon after this call send something out to get people going on this effort. And we'll see whether we want to schedule a call tomorrow or Thursday on that.

But there will be enough to get people thinking and responding on list.

And I think this group will - should work fairly quickly, maybe even having something by the deadline. At least that's what I'm going to try to get us to do. So we'll see how that goes.

Fortunately there's a group of ccTLDs and gTLDs that have done some work together that I just became aware of in the last week. And I just actually during this call got permission to use some of that work for our working group. And I'll distribute that to those on the draft design team, excuse me, to react to and add to.

Any questions?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck, appreciate the speed with which you pull this together and are seemingly in a position to raise content potentially in advance of Istanbul ideally would like.

All right, I'm going to skip over to Design Team N before coming back to this concept of a Red Team which in our previous - came up on Tuesday.

Can I ask if Avri has any input or update for us with regard to N? I know there's a document online (unintelligible) share (unintelligible)?

Avri Doria: Okay, hi. This is Avri. So with N basically I put together a basic template. I had it open on Google Drive for a couple days, got basically two comments,

one from Seun that was also seen on the list that basically said is there supposed to be work in another team which I don't think was the case.

But of course that's a pending question for here but basically differentiating between the work being done to define a statement of work or an SLA or an SLE and the notion of periodic reviews thinking that N was only limited to the periodicity and methods not to the what but wanted to acknowledge that perhaps that was being dealt with in other ones.

There was a recommendation by Greg that we rename this from periodic review of IANA functions to periodic review of the statement of work since the statement of work language is being used in A and C et cetera.

So that is - that didn't seem to be something that I should just accept but something since I should have received and as a half formed object that I volunteered to adopt.

I would question whether first of all there's - I don't think there's any volunteers on this yet other than the perhaps Matt. But Matt's already volunteer for a lot so I caution him.

I also don't necessarily believe that this is a priority one. I think that there's a lot of derivative in here. I think it - to look at the results of A and C and see where we're at to understand perhaps some of the notions of periodicity although it can do work, you know, in parallel. So that's where it's at.

There is a template. No one's really commented on it and nobody's ready to work on it yet but me.

Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Avri. Thanks for that comment. I happen to - I mean this is an interesting one. I must say when I saw a periodic review of IANA functions I - as a title I had in my mind more the what we might have originally conceived of this of period review function.

When I saw it come out in this form I wondered whether it was correct. I think saw the dialogue and can see there is value in the review of the statement of work.

But in order to make that clear I would support a name game. Given the name change and the scope within it I would - I'd be minded to agree with you that this might be a priority too and follow-on from some of the other work.

So I'd welcome any discussion on that, any input given on that. It does seem to be derivative as you so eloquently put it.

So and those are some initial thoughts. And that doesn't mean that the effort so far, the sort of kickoff is wasted. But it just may be that it goes on a parallel or slightly slower track.

I see your hand is up and I see (Stephanie) has responded in the chat to agree with the priority two assessment and also to potentially offer to assist. So that's helpful.

Any other comments or questions here? Avri your hand's back up so, let's go to you in#

Avri Doria: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I just wanted to comment that I had that same ambiguity in terms of what we were reviewing.

But when I looked at the summary that had been put in there in the proceeding that's when I decided that it was the derivative work.

But I had that same question you did in terms of what are we reviewing? Is it the periodic review of contract but, you know, and of the function and all that or the - now the SOW could expand into that other issue when you're talking about do we renew this SOW and with whom?

So the border between those two issues isn't as a bright line as it may seem.
Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Avri. Eduardo?

Eduardo Díaz: My comment is in relations to the old design teams or some bullet points to I say to Avri. I can go last. I don't know if Greg to answer to talk about what Avri said.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. Let's go to Greg if he's directly on topic then and come back to you Eduardo. Thank you. Greg?

Greg Shatan: Thanks, it's Greg Shatan and this is a direct follow-up to Avri. And like - and like Jonathan I also had the confusion in seeing the title that I expected this was about review of the performance of the IANA functions themselves on a periodic basis.

And when I looked back at the draft proposal 2.0 or 2.1 it became clear that this was about draft review or periodic review of the statement of work itself of the documentation.

And then I've also just seen that Milton commented on my comment on the design team template and thinking the same thing which is, you know, why is this just about review of the SOW?

And I've just looked back at the list of design teams and we have no design team that is dealing with periodic review of the IANA functions performance itself.

At one point this was a core tack or a core task and function of this - that needed to be taken care of. And somehow it seems to have completely disappeared maybe through confusion between the title of this design team and the content of this design team.

At one point that was the reason the MRT originally called the PRT was created. And somehow we've completely lost that function entirely.

Now maybe the idea is that the CSC or whatever it's going to be is going to be - is going to perform that function as well. But, I don't think that's ever been decided or determined.

It seems to me that somehow we have misplaced a critical element which is the longer term review of the IANA functions performance by an oversight entity or group or unit.

And I think we should un-misplace that. I think there needs to be both a design team entitled periodic review of IANA function which is supposed to do what you and I and Avri and Milton all thought it was supposed to do.

And there should also be a design team to review the SOW. We should have the title, you know, change in title. But I don't think we should lose sight of this critical or once critical function that somehow seems to have vanished in this - in our reshuffling of work methods. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Greg. So I take the action is from where it appears to be heading is to relocate the periodic review function and understand where that fits into both the draft proposal and therefore any related design teams.

And I think that feels to me for the discussion we've had like a prerequisite before commissioning this design team and making sure we go ahead in full with this design team. Because we do need to know how these - the dots join in these various areas.

So I've got a hand up now in queue from I think Avri and Alan while we wait to come back to Eduardo. So Eduardo keep your hand up but Avri and then Alan and then we will come back to you.

Avri Doria: Hi. Yes, this is Avri speaking again. I think briefly I'm not sure that what there is more than the SOW when we're reviewing the IANA function for names.

And so perhaps the - and I think we need to look at it and I - not disagreeing with Jonathan that we need to dive deeper and see where the two are connected.

I'm not sure that they're disconnected at the moment. I think what we're doing is teasing out the relation of when we say review the IANA function what do we mean? Do we mean reviewing the SOW or do we mean reviewing the SOW plus some other stuff and where is that other stuff defined?

The other thing I wanted to say is naming it this way and saying that the CSC has designed it's SOW perhaps as it's being discussed in the other group does not mean that it can't be the MRT or an MRT like thing that is doing this review.

We're not actually talking about, you know, because here we said some of this model depending on who is exactly doing this.

But I don't think that this notion takes out of the equation that it might an MRT or an MIT like thing that is doing this review. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: You know, and just to capture that that's very helpful thinking Avri. It certainly helps me. I hope it helps others.

One of the purposes of working in the way we are currently is to put the function before the structure. So to the extent that this helps us capture and expand on the functional requirement and that the structure therefore follows feels to me like we're likely to get a more effective or more appropriate structure to perform the function. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I think the two functions are linked and I think they're tightly linked. And maybe that means one group could do it but I think there is two different twists to it.

One of them I think is an over overview is the IANA functions operator doing a good job at what they are supposed to be doing, you know, at the statement of work. Are they meeting all the targets, essentially how are they doing?

The second part is assessing what should they be doing in the future.

Now the linkage is that if they're not doing the job well that may require a modification of the statement of work to make it clear exactly what they should be doing and, you know, putting more detail into it.

But the review of the statement of work also includes the concept of what should they be doing that we never thought of before?

You know, is there another function, another reporting capability, another, you know, measurement or metric that they need to be satisfying which we just hadn't thought of before and it's not in the current statement of work?

So the two are linked but - but, they're looking at it from a different slant and one clearly feeds into the other. Exactly how we designed design teams to do it clearly we have different options.

But, I think we need to make sure we understand what the differences are and what the linkages between them. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Alan. Seems to be a long a similar thing. That's helpful. So Greg I'm going to close the queue on this topic after you because we do have a few more items to cover up before the top of the hour and we need to finish on time. So please go ahead Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks Jonathan. Just briefly I think that Avri's comments kind of blurred the issue. And I do think that there's really two separate things going on here.

One is operational performance review of IANA. You know, put enough - just putting a stethoscope on to the IANA functions on to the root zone management staff and their performance of functions, that's the missing design team.

And then we have this design team which is going to put a stethoscope on the statement of work document itself and look at whether it continues to be fit for purpose as a document and whether it works in the long run.

I do agree that this probably not a priority one design team. I do think that the missing design team is a priority one design time. And I don't think that clutching the two together into one design team makes a huge amount of sense and may not make a huge difference.

But I think the missing design team needs to be constituted and this work should go forward as a priority. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes and you've got some support from Matthew. I'm very conscious that - he said I'd close the queue here and now Milton's put his hand up.

I do think this - we flushed out something here that I'd like us to pick up on the list. So I'd like to capture that there is - there's certainly a requirement appears to be missing for periodic review of operational performance as you've put it Greg. And we do need to try and capture that.

I'm not going to prejudge whether or not that can be merged in with design team and/or whether it should remain separate. Let's get the definition and then do something. Milton if you could be brief that'd be great.

Milton Mueller: I will and I'm sorry. It's actually not about this design team. It's about another one. I had to leave the call for a moment. And we were talking about the design team very crucial one on root zone management that nobody has volunteered for.

And I was wondering I had proposed this earlier on the list I think. Why don't we merge that with the one on authorization because they're clearly related.

And if I'm out of order and you don't have time just now it's - we can (unintelligible). I think we wanted to raise that question and I had to leave the call for a moment.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Milton. Let's take that as a suggestion. I didn't have a view on that yet so I'm open to discussing that. And if you could either re-energize the discussion on the list and let's see if we - if that does make sense to merge it with the Design Team F or pick it up separately.

And just a reminder on that, someone proposed and become a proponent for a design team without necessarily being roped in to lead it.

So to the extent that it makes sense to commission something although clearly it will be difficult to make it work without (unintelligible).

Now, Eduardo let me go to you. And you've been patiently holding on while we carried on the other discussion. So let me go to you and then I'm going to go to Item 5 on the agenda.

Eduardo Díaz: Thank you Jonathan. I want to be brief. It's about the design teams that the categories are being one, two, three, four or what have you. I understand the category ones are like the - needs to be one.

My question comes into, you know, this other category define things it was, you know, being an over (layer).

Does that mean that they will not be incorporated in the proposal in the NTAG (unintelligible) proposal or are they going to be (found) later? You know, I'm not sure about that. If you can clarify that I would really appreciate it. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: I think if I understood the question it's what's the fate, the future prospects for design teams that are not currently priority one?

And I guess there's really two options Eduardo. They either become priority one and we work on them and incorporate them into the proposal or we determine that they are not relevant to go forward in the current form and therefore don't attain a priority one status.

Clearly that's - there will be some discussion on that. But, it's a matter of trying to get as much as can be done at the moment. And so that's the - that's a short answer there.

You - did your hand get re-raised Eduardo? Is that an old hand?

Eduardo Díaz: That was my question and thank you for the answer. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. And it's clear we've got a little bit of work to do especially in and around these design teams that we've just been discussing most recently and whether to merge or create additional design teams.

Greg I think it would be useful to switch now to Item 5 on the agenda and just get some brief updates on the client committee although I think you put something out. I recall you put something out late last evening. So it's really a matter of just whatever other current updates there are and prospective future updates.

Greg Shatan: I'll be brief. It's Greg Shatan again.

I think that as noted the client committee mailing list has our email list has now been changed. So it's just the client company and Sidley and (Presab Mohamed) is support. So everyone should know about that.

If you want to be an observer and you're not one yet go to Grace.

On other news Sidley has confirmed to us their current work plan which is both to answer as many of the kind of 12 major questions and many sub questions that were in the legal scoping document and to answer them before Istanbul so that can, you know, serve as a bed for - or beginning for discussions kind of to break the log jam that caused us to reach out for legal help in the first place.

You know, given a relatively short timeframe the answers are going to be relatively high level but I'm not going to re-judge what the document's going to look like before having seen it.

I think they're also going to - are working on kind of a document to summaries their thinking having read many of our critical documents and discussed documents and been on our call or at least on one of our calls so far and, you know, looking at other things about some of the key issues that and concerns that they believe we should be looking and, you know, giving some general overall guidance. So I'm looking forward to both of those documents.

We will have two members of the Sidley team in Istanbul, Holly Gregory the governance expert and (Sharon Flanagan) a California corporate lawyer from the San Francisco office I believe with us so very much looking forward to continuing to work with them.

Jonathan Robinson: Greg and just to add one minor additional point to that the there is likely to be as we schedule out the timing for the meetings others from the Sidley team available on the phone to support or complement Holly and (Sharon).

And clearly the opportunity there is for direct interaction with the CWG. So, it's an opportunity to both take advantage of that and to some extent experiment with it as well.

Eduardo is that a new hand?

Eduardo Díaz: No. Yes it is a new hand, yes. It's in relation to the Client Committee mailing list.

I just want to say that and in observing the list I haven't seen any significant topic. So I'm wondering where it is the work that has been done since last time is it done by conference call or it's done in different way because I haven't seen any of these (unintelligible). Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Greg I saw you're typing. I don't believe there has been - I mean Sidley are off dealing with the existing prepared questions. The group has been somewhat preoccupied with who is and isn't on the list.

And so there hasn't been significant interaction or personally I've had no interaction I don't think with Sidley over the last while. There may have been some minor off list interaction about things like travel or who could or couldn't come to the meeting. But there's no interaction of substance that I'm aware of Eduardo. That's why it's quiet.

Greg Shatan: We did have a call with them on Thursday the - before the weekend. So there hasn't been since then other than Sidley's communication that they were hard at work on the two deliverables that I described.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. My question was the same line as Eduardo's. But the reason I'm troubled is - and I'm the one who started this whole observer thing and maybe I should apologize for that.

But Greg just mentioned that we'd be informed Sidley would be answering a fair number of the questions by Istanbul. And that's the kind of communication I would have expected to see on that list. That is a substantive, you know, this is what we're doing. This is the progress we're making. This is our target.

So I'm a little bit worried that we've had a huge fuss over observers over a list that's not going to have any traffic on it so...

Greg Shatan: I had thought that that email was sent on the list. But if it wasn't sent on the list I will send it to the list.

Alan Greenberg: Please.

Greg Shatan: Just don't always - sorry, I didn't look at every - I didn't look at the destination of the...

Alan Greenberg: Greg to be clear I think we need to tell them that's where they should be making these comments also.

Greg Shatan: Yes. No, I will do that and that's a good point. I do - that the model of this is supposed to be that anything of substance, you know, that's being discussed between the committee and Sidley should be on the list.

So those of us who've lived around ICANN for a long time comfortable with list - lists are comfortable. And those that haven't been need to be get - need to be made comfortable. I will take care of that.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Good point Alan.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great. Thanks. I'm going to move us on. And I note Seun's comments about the Red Team, what is the timeline for the Red Team?

In fact I don't believe we've done anything on that yet unless someone can correct me and remind. I think that's fallen through the cracks a little bit. It

was only suggested on Tuesday mind you, I'm sorry, Thursday last week mind you.

But it is something which I don't believe we've picked up or stoked yet. And for those of you who aren't familiar with what a Red Team and that includes me to some extent and there you go Alan there's the question.

It is from memory it is a group that will review the proposal in total for completeness and that's - it's a sum - it's a sort of quality assurance type approach on the whole proposal is the way I understood it. And I'm sure someone will help me in the chat in a moment.

Mindful of time I'm going to move quickly on to ARB and recognize that we'll pick up this Red Team point on the list. So if you could capture that as an action please Grace that we need to define and clarify the scope and purpose of the Red Team.

And then I'll point that under Item 6 ARB really that there was an - there - we'll work on the detailed schedule for Istanbul. I don't believe we've published anything yet on it. So we may have published and outline schedule. But there's work to be done there.

And second that there was a question from Seun about this prospective high intensity a couple of days first and second of April. We've put that as a placeholder to warn you if possible to create some diary, clear a space in your diaries.

I understand it's a big ask. But if we are mindful of the kind of time pressure we're under to produce something and looking as you have seen in this call as to the progress the design teams are making whilst it's very encouraging in

many areas it's quite clear there's quite a bit of work to be done to contribute to a substantial and complete proposal.

So it is my and Lise's feeling that we are likely to need some additional time. And what we have in mind is possibly four meetings over a two day period in a high intensity couple of days. So that's what that's a place marker for to highlight that prospect for you.

Any comments, questions, or points in the last minute? If you have anything critical that you need that can't be covered on list raise it now. Otherwise we'll pick everything up on list since it's about one minute from the top of the hour.

Thank you. I'm sorry we got a little squeezed in the end of the meeting. It was the principles took more time than we expected. But thank you all for your active participation and contribution. And we will see you in the meeting in a couple of days' time and on with (unintelligible).

Woman: Bye.

Woman: Bye.

Man: (Unintelligible) bye.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. (Vickie) we can stop the recording.

END