ICANN

Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
March 19, 2015
6:00 am CT

Coordinator: Today's conference call is now being recorded.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you. So this is the CWG meeting on the 19th of March. We're going to do attendance through the Adobe Connect room, but if there's anyone who is on the audio line only. Please say your name now

Okay. Looks like everyone is in the Adobe Connect room. I will turn it over to Jonathan to chair today's meeting. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Grace. Welcome, everyone, especially those of you who've had to get up or not go to bed for some extreme hour. It's a relatively civilized time where I am, but I know that's the not case for all of you. So thanks for my early risers and if you had to stay up late.

I don't know how long today's meeting will take. I will give you a commitment that we'll get it done as quickly as possible. I know all of you are working hard on everything you have to do, including the design team work.

I think it's very encouraging the pace with which that's picked up and the commitment that people are showing to really try and make a solid contribution ahead of the face-to-face meeting, which in many ways could have been done with being a week or two later. But we had to commit to a date because of practical arrangements, and it's great to see you all working with that level of commitment, so thank you.

There are a few things that have happened since Tuesday. It's obviously moving fast. So let me just capture a couple of those points. Of course there's a minor update to the proposal, the draft proposal, that's been circulated. And it's been captured as 2.2.1. Please feel free and be encouraged to provide any input to that.

We're obviously continuing to develop the work of the design teams, and in principle could be adding to those if there are gaps that need doing. We, as I said a moment ago, are obviously making good progress on those and in order to be able to best utilize the input and ideally integrate those into the draft proposal at or around the Istanbul meeting.

We have provided a provisional agenda for the Istanbul meeting, and we come to that in item five. And clearly we are still working on a very tight timescale which is just putting out a draft proposal for public comment in early April. We'll have to assess that immediately after Istanbul and work on our time.

I know some of you have volunteered for other design teams, and we'll come to that. I think there's - let me just go through the actions and see where we are on that. A reminder that we'd still like some help in filling out sections four and five, and that was something we were asking (Robert) and Cheryl to pick up on if there's anything to be taken from the previous work on the RFP four and five groups.

We still have an open item from the last meeting, which is only two days obviously, which is on the text in section 3A 1.1.1, which we discussed - or 3A 1.1, which we discussed in some detail on the call, in particular in the chat. And that was really in and around what the existing guidance from the NTIA and/or the ICG is on implementation detail, and try and capture that.

We are looking to still deal with, as a periodic review function, we've got a review of a segment of work and there's a question mark with an open question I think as to whether we extend that design team or build an adjacent design to do the periodic review and how we handle that.

I think we've got an open item - I mean some of these are still open, so I'd like to ask you, Grace, to carry over these over. They're not up in the agenda at this point, but certainly to the extent that they haven't been completed, I'd like to copy these over into open items from this meeting.

(Paul) has recently sent replies. There's been some revised work on the - I don't think we've seen any revised work - yes I think on the principles, we're all but done. I notice we haven't got that on the agenda. Lise, you can maybe help me as to whether we intend to try and deal with that or whether we continue to deal with it on the list. It looks very close to being done. I know (Paul) sent something to the list very immediately prior to this meeting.

So I see - okay I see they (unintelligible) working off a separate document in the absence of the actions on the right there. We'll copy over those that remain to be dealt with, so.

So I think that's all I wanted to cover in the review of the actions and the opening remarks. Can I just pause and see if there's anything that I have

missed or that anyone would like to add as part of this preamble to getting this meeting underway?

Grace Abuhamad: Avri has her hand up.

Jonathan Robinson: Let's just - sorry, Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Okay yes, thank you. Avri speaking. I just wanted to point to the other action item that was sort of hanging there which was the CWG's issues for the CCWG. And I can either write up what is happening with that or could speak to it. I just wanted to make sure that that hadn't fallen off. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes good catch, Avri. I do remember that. I'm just struggling right at this minute to remember how we were going to deal with that. Perhaps you can remind me, so in addition to what's been captured there already.

Avri Doria: Okay yes. The issue was that we were going to check to see if that document was still consistent, whether we needed to add anything to it or whether anything had changed. I opened up the document for people to review, didn't get any new comments, have read through it myself. I personally don't think it's changed, but of course I invite other people. Have discussed it within the CCWG with various people.

And what is attempting to happen is that they're looking at mapping both their stress test and some of the solution piece parts, mapping that to those needs we had. I'm not quite there with words yet today. But to the items we had mentioned. So they're doing that.

And the hope is that going from they're having the first meeting during week and us having the second meeting, that part of what either I or the chairs as

they wish can do is bring over sort of responses to those issues in the form of mapping the stress test and solution bit part. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Thanks, Avri. Well with you and myself and Lise we will continue to look at this. I will go back and look at the document after this meeting. We are due to meet with the co-chairs of the CCWG, that's Lise and myself, tomorrow.

We - of course you're right, there will be the meetings of the CCWG in Istanbul ahead of our meeting, and then we are scheduled again, Lise and myself, to meet with Thomas, Mathieu, and Leon, the co-chairs of the CCWG after their meeting.

So I think that would be useful to have that review, and I take your point that there has been no particular change at this point. I'll also look at it. I'm not 100% sure what we do with the stress test, but I'll have a look at that and we can continue to work on this.

All right, moving onto item two then, which is the proposal itself, the draft proposal. Are there any comments or points relating to that piece of work and that sort of significant thread or backbone of the work of this group as I've described it before? We did absorb the comments that were an input that was at the last meeting, and that's why it's a sort of minor revision, a point one revision.

And it struck me that it was useful to keep that ticking over and keep producing any minor revisions as necessary. That just deluges the e-mail box to some extent, but at least you can know that it is a work in progress and being worked on and should feel free to provide input into that at any time,

including obviously the orientation of the design teams within the proposal itself.

Any comments, questions or issues relating to that draft proposal as it currently stands?

I'll just note a comment from (Stefan) about the audio quality. Grace, if you can just keep an eye on that and let me know so there's one person monitoring it and just let me know if there's any problems, and I'll check my end.

Okay I'm going to move us through then. Donna, go ahead.

Donna Austin: Sorry, Jonathan. Donna Austin. Is my input here okay?

Jonathan Robinson: All clear, Donna.

Donna Austin: Great. I just have a question about the document, because I noticed going through it that some elements have already been assigned to the CSC. And I'm just unclear as to how that's happened or how that assumption was made that certain responsibilities would be picked up by the CSC when we hadn't actually agreed on those elements yet. So if I could just have some clarification about, you know, what's the assumption that's being made if that's the case. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes thanks, Donna. That's a good question. And I see (Bernie)'s hand gone up. I'll leave it to him and I'll come in after (Bernie) if there's...

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you. I believe there was a note in there saying that until such time as we decide which body is looking after what, we simply put in the CSC as the generic reference, the thing that it should report to. Most of these things are

about reports, and the original thinking was that the entity which would look at the reports from IANA would be the CSC. So there's nothing much more than that. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: So I guess I was going to answer it in a way that doesn't contradict that but just slightly differently in the sense that -- and I think it's the same origin -- is that we had a working - either working assumptions or knowledge based on previous work that it had been done that informed this document, but the expectation is that the design teams, so for example the CSC design team, will take a lead on this and then we will integrate those proposals, providing they aren't objected to when they come back from the design teams from the CWG of course.

But the route is design team work, back into the CWG for ratification and/or modification based on the views of the CWG, and then ultimately integration into the draft proposal. So to some extent there's placeholder text in there. As I say, I think that's coherent with what (Bernie) said. Donna, that appears to satisfy you for the moment. So that's good.

All right I'm not going to dwell on that. Instead I'd like to take us through this as rapidly as possible whilst still giving everyone the opportunity to feed in. I think we can quickly work through - now we heard from the design team leads, and I know everyone's been either busy doing really practical things like scheduling meetings and so on.

I don't think we need to hear from each of the design team leads on all of the sort of, you know, we've organized a meeting, we're going to do this, it's really a matter of if you've got something in and around the organization of the design team or the substance of the matter that you feel could be - help with

clarification, please feel free to ask. Don't feel obliged to provide content to this meeting now, but seek any informational knowledge that you need.

A couple of points to make I think there are that obviously we all are aware of a deadline for input from the design teams at 18:00 UTC Monday next week. That's 20, 21, 23 I think, 23rd of March. Staff has assisted in various ways, including on the logistics and facilitating meetings, providing initial content where required.

And in particular, in case you've missed this, I really would like everyone to be aware that Marika sent out I think around 48 hours ago, probably 36 hours ago, a production - a content template. And really what this is intended to do is help provide the design teams with a template for a form of uniform input.

So when you're thinking about crafting your input back into the CWG, and obviously they're ultimately destined for the draft proposal should it make its way appropriately through the CWG, that it's in a relatively standard format. So please be aware of that content template. I personally think it's a useful document and a helpful way of standardizing input, and probably a necessary (unintelligible) given the speed with which we're working.

James, go ahead.

James Gannon: I just wanted to give a quick update. I wasn't able to make the Tuesday call, so I thought I'd use this opportunity to just give a brief overview of design team L.

Jonathan Robinson: Great, James. Look let's do that. Since you're ready and able, let's take it from you now, and then we'll go back up through the sequence in the alphabet

and I'll just check if anyone else is available. But fire away now, James. It would be great to hear from you.

James Gannon: Perfect. So design team L, we're progressing at a steady pace at this stage already. And if you - if anybody has looked at the templates that we've got up and we're phasing the work so that we can have something coming back constantly. And we're currently working on phase one and phase two.

So phase one is looking at existing documentation and any existing transition planning that's within ICANN. And phase two is basically building upon that to get down into the details of what will be needed if separation or a transition to a different form of IANA functions operator occurs.

So to that end we filed two DIDP requests with ICANN, and first for the contingency and continuity of operations plan, and secondly for the root zone KFK function termination plan. And the reason why we've done this is they are both referenced in the transition planning section of the existing IANA functions contract. They are referenced out as this is what we will do if this happens.

So we filed the DIDPs. We don't know if they'll go through. It's a long process. So basically we're working on the assumption that we may have them, but we've already begun drafting. So we have a draft document that we're working on already, and we hope that there will be kind of a framework within that document before Istanbul. That's the plan.

And another issue that we're going to reach out to is around the IANA.org and the documentation that's on IANA.org. So we're going to reach out to design team G, which is led by (Greg). So they're dealing with the IANA intellectual property.

So once we have some feel from them of how the intellectual property will be treated, we can then look at the details of how that will be transferred or moved to the public domain or whatever way that intellectual property is to be treated. And we're now looking the sent draft advice that she sent around this morning. We'll look at that for anything that may inform our work as well.

Jonathan Robinson: James, thanks. That's very helpful. And what's - from a kind of project management point of view, what's helpful for me is that this - your design team L is a necessary condition should there be a - as a requirement for this process. But it's not in the critical path to others making progress, which is great. So you can get on with the work while others can work in parallel, which is helpful and it doesn't feel to me like stopping any other work going on, yet you can work in parallel.

What - you made reference to the design team on the intellectual property. A couple of points there. One, that is currently sitting at priority two, which means it's in effect not doing anything. So don't expect a response if not - that design team has not been commissioned at this point.

Two, I should highlight that in general and including for the design team that you just cross-referenced, we are happy to take expressions of interest for participation. And there has been various expressions of interest, and we will record those not as participants at this point but as expressions of interest. And we will come back to those individuals as and when those design teams get commissioned.

I think those were the main points. There's a question mark in my mind. I mean for the point that you depended on the other design team, the IANA.org, it may be worth in your draft at this point indicating that this is a question as

to, A, whether this is in scope or not, which needs to be resolved, B, whether it will be resolved by another design team. And so you can - it seems to me that you could but a placeholder in there and yet continue to work with other items.

James Gannon: Yes so the beauty of the way that our design team is working is we're working really on different sections of the transition at one time. So for example, for design team G it's perfectly fine for us to put that back, and that can be last thing that we work on, if that design team comes up before the end. If not, we can still actually do out a technical look of what would be needed if the intellectual property is decided that it will transferred.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great. That's helpful. Thanks, James. It sounds like you're working both in the spirit in more ways than one of how it's intended to be. That's great.

All right, so I think I will pick through in quick order then, alphabetic order, in short go through the different design teams and see if there are any updates from either the lead or a relevant participant. So design team A. I see (Paul Cane) is on the call. So (Paul), is there anything you would like to add or have received input on in relation to the work of design team at this stage? I guess it's incrementally different from our previous meeting on Tuesday 17. (Paul)?

Grace Abuhamad: Jonathan, I think (Paul) is making notes in the chat room as opposed to speaking.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Grace. I've got them. Yes that's fine. Thank you. So (Paul) tells that he intends to publish over the weekend and there's no additional update at this point, which is great. So we'll just simply record that and move onto B. And I'll just wait to see if a hand comes up for B. If not, I'll assume there's no

update. I see (Alan) is not on the call but I'll just wait one more moment if anyone else from design team B, that's (unintelligible) mechanism delegations.

Design team C? That is the - yes (Paul), thank you. (Paul Cane) notes that the survey is imminent for design team B. So Grace I know you're tracking the chat. So to the extent that it comes up and there are updates like that, I think those can just be copied across. I won't necessarily read them all out and you can - well I guess Marika's making the notes, but either they've been tracked, so thank you.

Design team C. That's the CFC. Donna, I don't know if you or (Stefan) would like to offer any input at this point or...

Donna Austin: Jonathan, it's Donna.

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead, Donna.

Donna Austin: There's no substantive updates since Tuesday. So we're still aiming to have a document ready by the timeframe of Monday.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Donna. And you are one of the people who I was acknowledging is at a particularly bad hour. So thanks for being alive on the call.

Design team D.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here. Thanks, Jonathan. Very briefly, I put a couple of lines in the chat so staff need only copy it across as a report for today's call minus all the usual typos that I tend to at this hour of day typing in the dark. But the only change between our last call this week and today is it needs to also be noted

with my thanks for the excellent interaction that's going on our e-mail list, so the hard part of course is going to be drawing a line under that to do the publishing for our document to be out over the weekend. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Cheryl. And reminding you and others that that point I made on the form, the template for formatting the input back to the CWG or the output, probably more correctly said, of the design teams and noting Marika's point that if you have expressed an interest in either participating in active design team or would like to record an expression of interest for participating in a to be commissioned or potentially to be commissioned design team and you're not recorded, please make yourself known via the e-mail list.

Actually I wouldn't mind asking Staff on Design Team E, I think Berry is working on this. I wouldn't mind if anyone is able to just give a moment to update to the group on this whether there's any, you know, what progress, when we might be able to get the initial output on E - Staff output on E.

Grace, I don't know if you can offer anything there. If you can't, I suggest picking it up as an action to just get a note to the email - oh Berry, you're here. I didn't realize you were on because you went above the line so to speak.

Go ahead Berry.

Berry Cobb: Hi Jonathan; thank you.

Yes, I did complete a first draft. I had not sent that around externally yet, but I will take an action. Essentially what we've done is inventoried the key components out of SSAC 69 and looked at where that might be addressed in the draft proposal and we'll make sure that that's incorporated into the version that's delivered out to the team in preparation for Istanbul.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Berry, that's helpful. And as I asked the question, I envisioned in my mind a form of matrix type approach which I suspect is similar to the method you are working, so that sounds good.

It strikes me that SAC 69 cross-referencing is not dissimilar and may even be almost identical to that work that was envisioned for the Red team.

Has anyone got any comment or input on that? Because, you know, if I think about a matrix that worked through a number of items in the draft proposal, cross reference those against SAC 69 and then perhaps cross reference them against any other items, I wonder whether these could potentially be integrated.

Does anyone have any comment or view on that that they could give as guiding thoughts on that?

Berry, absent any other input and in any event - and I see it would be - yes, thanks Avri. It would be great for you to just keep an eye on the emerging Red Team work and how that is scoped, and just to cross-check whether it makes sense to do something independent of the work that you're setting the base for on SAC 69 or whether indeed these can be in some way integrated. Yes?

Yes, we don't hear you yet.

Berry Cobb: Sorry about that. I hope this works. Given that Robert and I are from SSAC, it's only natural that one of us will join that team. But Robert has been out of (unintelligible). I only probably speaking tomorrow, so nothing has been decided yet but we'll be (unintelligible) for this. But that's the only thing I would like after this.

It occurred to me that maybe some of the things are actually indeed work for the Draft Team that's - we didn't have any discussion about this yet.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, that's certainly - that in combination with James and Avri responses in the Chat is it's probably enough to satisfy me that they will be at least thought about together.

And yes I'm aware that Robert hasn't been well; it's likely unusual use of them out of commission to a human but I understand exactly what you mean; most likely technical term. But yes, send these to Robert and hopefully he'll be able to rejoin us soon.

Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Jonathan; Greg Shatan. Seems to me that the Red Team, you know, would look at SAC 69 but would also be looking at other input besides SAC 69.

So if the question is whether Design Team E should look only at SAC 69 or should Design Team E be the Red Team and look at SAC 69 plus other inputs to check against it, perhaps including the document that Chris Disspain just distributed on the list on behalf of a number of registries.

So I guess that's the question is whether Design Team E should be narrowly focused on only SAC 69 check and the Red Team should be a separate group, or should Design Team E kind of become the Red Team but add (sic) some things other than SAC 69 to its work. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: I'll add my two cents worth for what it's worth. I think certainly right now Staff is preparing the initial review of SAC 69, and I don't think it's clear yet whether Design Team E should morph into the Red Team and take SAC 69 as an input. We'll see. But yes, certainly the jest of what you're saying I think represents - and yes, Avri says keep it for now and I agree. It's likely to maybe crossover with participants and so on.

I think I've had a chance to look at that document that Chris circulated this morning. I see that is slightly different although of course it could be an input into the Red Team as well. But the way in which he phrased his introduction to it - and I'd like to chat about that once we've been through the review of the design teams at least briefly touch on that.

But I saw that as, the way he's introduced it in any event, as input to the relevant design teams, which of course if it is used as such, when it gets reviewed as part of the Red Team if indeed it was done in that way, that it's likely that the circle would be closed in any event.

All right, so we got as far as E. Let's - providing - Greg, did you want to come back on that point or is that hand just remaining up?

Greg Shatan: That's an old hand.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. So let's move then on to I think F. To the best of knowledge, we haven't had a response still to the core interest on that, but I may stand corrected on that.

Yaap, your hand is up. I don't know if you have a reference to that. Or Grace, your response to that question and then I'll go back to Yaap.

Grace Abuhamad: Okay, thanks Jonathan.

So we have a few volunteers for Design Team F. We have Rudi, Gary, Milton and Yaap. And at this point I think Rudi has volunteered to lead the design team but I'm working with the group to figure out exactly how, you know, if they are agreeing on the lead because I think Milton also volunteered at one point. So we're working together to figure that all out, but we have some volunteers and of course would welcome any additional volunteers.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Grace. Yaap?

Yaap Akkerhuis: Yes, I was about to say the same. Yesterday Rudi contacted me and he said that he would at least take the lead for everything going and then we will see what happens afterwards.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. Okay, so Design Team G remains at (B2) Design Team H (unintelligible).

So my next P-1 is Design Team L.

James Gannon: This is James. Is the (unintelligible) okay for Design Team hours or I need specific details you need on top of that?

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry James. I'm now the one who hasn't worked enough properly. Forgive me, I forgot to get that out of order.

James Gannon: No problem.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, and next (unintelligible), the escalation mechanisms. And I see Chuck, your hand is up; go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan, and just one thing on that.

Some of you may have seen a paper that was sent by Chris Disspain from a group of ccTLD and gTLD registries earlier today. That paper - and having seen an earlier version of it - that paper contains some interesting suggestions with regard to escalation procedures. So Design Team M has used that as a kickoff point to explore some of the ideas in that paper which we've found pretty constructive. So we're discussing those and refining those and moving ahead on that, and I'll leave it at that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck. And I'll just remind the group that if you - this isn't just a dialogue between myself and the Design Team Lead should they choose to offer an update, but please feel free to comment, critique or provide other input in relation to the design teams as you see fit.

Okay, thanks Chuck.

Avri, on Design Team N, any additional comment from Tuesday - since Tuesday?

Avri Doria: Yes, this is Avri speaking. The discussion on whether it's IANA Functions or SOW Review has sort of continued among various people.

And I'm still at a point here, while I'll admit that I'm difficult - I have difficulty at the moment knowing what there is in the review of IANA Functions in terms of documented these are the things we are reviewing against other than the SOW.

However in thinking about that, I'm thinking that this topic really pertains to the review of the IANA Function of which the SOW is definitely one. If there are other components that need to be reviewed as part of that, they need to be identified. I'm still at a loss to name them, but I'm assuming I'm wrong.

So that's where I'm at on it and I still think it's sort of a dependent function because we have to know what's in the SOW. But I think that there is work that we could do now, as we've kept talking about in a sense, in terms of figuring out.

If it isn't just the SOW that's defining function one measures against, then what are the other things that do need to be reviewed perhaps, but remembering this group is more about the method and the periodicity. So I think it can go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Avri, and you may need some help from the Chairs on that so feel free to reach out to us and we'll continue to work with you on that as well as any other input you receive from the group.

I notice also that this document, which I haven't - sort of reread in detail in respect to this group, but the document received from Chris Disspain this morning also has an element of a periodic review function in it and it's worth cross checking that to see if that provides relevant inspiration or comparative information.

Greg?

Greg Shatan: Greg Shatan.

I'm still somewhat confused on the scope of Design Team N. The detailed description of the scope of Design Team N talks about when and how to review the SOW itself; it doesn't talk about when and how to review the IANA Functions on a more periodic basis than perhaps the CSC will do.

So I think we're still - a few of the description needs to be changed or it has been changed and I haven't noticed it, but I think we still need a team - and maybe it's part of this team and maybe it's not - that will actually discuss how the IANA Functions will be reviewed on a periodic basis and not how the statement of work relating to the IANA Functions will be reviewed.

To put it in another way, the description Design Team N sounds like a contractual review team and not an operational review team. And it seems to me that we need both but that they're not really the same and should be separated. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, just to give a comment before going over to Avri, I mean I tend to agree with you Greg. And this is in many ways a repeat of the conversation we had on Tuesday and we simply haven't had the opportunity to resolve it. So we remake the points and they remain valid as to should this be extended and if not should there be another design team which is related to this through the periodic review or the functions. So broadly I agree with you, and this is I think the discussion we're having.

Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes, sorry; this is Avri speaking. I guess I'm the one that's still out of scope, so perhaps we do need to recatch this and others.

I still don't understand the operational review of functions that doesn't include a review of the SOW as part of it. I see them as related and part of an integrated whole. And what I've talked about is the need to figure out what else it is that's defining how you're doing this review so that you know its periodicity.

The periodicity issue of whether it's one review or several reviews, it seems to be all part of the issue and all part of a periodicity issue.

But that's why this needs volunteers to sort of work on the description and either figure out that we can do one periodicity review or we, you know, clone off yet another, you know, drafting team.

But at the moment, I think people that got views on it - I do have the document in a drive thing and it's a place that can be discussed to try and figure it out as opposed to having the same discussions.

But I admit I still see them as periodicity of similar function. There could be several reviews on several periods, but you do want the period thing (sic). So however/whatever complexity we have in reviews, I think it needs to be dealt with at least in one place and then it can clone. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Avri and that stimulated a couple of responses. First from Alan Greenberg and then Greg. So Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I think periodicity is one of the key issues where it's different. The review of what they're doing and how well they're doing clearly is something which should be done annually if not, you know, more frequently or, you know, some other relatively reasonable basis.

The concept of let's look at the whole shebang, let's go out to the community and ask for input, is something I think that would be done far less frequently than that.

So a change in the Statement of Work could be triggered by the periodic review of how they're doing, but on a more global sense, you know, situation of let's look at it as zero base review and look at everything regardless of whether we're having a problem with it or not would be done less frequently.

So they're clearly linked and one feeds the other. So you know, the design teams, we can handle it multiple ways. But we can't ignore the fact that they are linked. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Alan. Greg.

Greg Shatan: I think we're still kind of fumbling around on this. I think we still are not - I don't know what it is that isn't quite making it as clear as I'm trying to make it about the distinction I'm trying to make which is that the description that's their talks about reviewing the SOW itself from time to time.

It doesn't - and perhaps how often that review of the SOW documents should take place. It doesn't talk about how and what functions of the IANA Functions operator will be reviewed and who will review that; it only talks about kind of once you've established that in an SOW, how often will you come back to the SOW to deal with it.

So it seems to me there's still two different concepts. One is pulling out your wrenches and taking a look at the IANA Functions operator and operations to see if it's working or not on a longer-term basis than perhaps the CEC Team is, or maybe this is a review of all periodic reviews of the IANA Function.

And the other one is a review of a document, how often you come back to that document and decide whether the document is still working.

So I don't think - either the description needs to be essentially doubled, in other words the two tasks both need to be described because they're completely tasks and only one of the two has even begun to be described. Or there needs to be two teams. I don't think they're anymore linked than any other set of variables in this group.

So in a sense, you know, let's just say if I were speaking totally as a lawyer, there's not a lot I could contribute to how one should review the IANA Functions operations on a periodic basis and what the metrics should be and who should participate in that review.

But there's a lot that I could say about how often one should go back to a document that captures those issues and how he should go about reviewing that document to determine if it continues to be relevant and what changes should be made.

So I'm just getting a little frustrated that some people seem to see the split and others don't see the split.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: I see the split and I hear you, so there's certainly - and I think my sense is that others do too. The frustration is that the Design Team as currently described doesn't deal with the split.

So here's what I think we can do pragmatically. One, work on the description as Avri has suggested and capsulate both the review of the Statement of Work and the periodic review. And Chris's document that I referred to earlier may well help in that as well.

Second, we then need to sign off on whether that scope is a single design team or more than one design team. And I hope, and I'll check this with Avri, that that doesn't stop work continuing with how that Statement of Work might be reviewed, in other words the subset or the separate design team.

So it should be that we can work on both the description and the work to meet the current description in parallel such that we break any frustration and move on. So I hope that's helpful and a sort of way forward.

Yes agreed; the description as it stands, in response to your point in the Chat Greg, is very limited. It only deals with the review of the Statement of Work and comes directly from the draft proposal as stands. And we are talking about generally the prospect of a more broad review as well.

So I think it's an old hand Greg but I know I did but you short, so let me just pause and see if there's anything else you want to add, and thank you. And then Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Hi, thanks; Avri speaking. And I think that's a good approach. I'll certainly start taking a crack at defining the split. And I certainly see the split although I just see it as subordinate to an overall issue and don't understand sometimes why people don't necessarily see the umbrella.

But if - I totally agree. If in the description we get to the point of going, "Oh this really is two different efforts," and we can find volunteers for two

different efforts, then I very much agree that that's what we should do. So yes, I will take a crack at it and hopefully other people will too. I'll put the URL out so people can work on it. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Avri. James.

James Gannon: James again. I think one of the things as well here is we need to remember that design teams don't necessarily need to be singular in addressing a huge overarching issue.

Designs teams are meant to - or my understanding of them is they're meant to work on specific aspects. So while there maybe two, such as the periodic review of the IANA Functions, one very contractual and one overarching operational review. There can very easily be two or three or four design teams.

Design teams are not supposed to be about running things that address overarching issues. They're supposed to address very singular specific details.

Jonathan Robinson: James, which is why this needs input from the Chairs to sort of mediate, if you like, and agree a split a split at some point. But until - so I think we can work in parallel as I said on both working on the initial commission of this design team and the scope of what a broader or second design team could cover.

And hopefully that's not so there is a couple of suggestions these should be to design team.

So let's - and I'm more than happy and in fact we're - there's scope to propose a second design team or an additional design team so that's perfectly reasonable suggestion.

Which would you believe it is having gone through the updates apart from the Red Team is what Item 3C is really about.

It's saying well what other - what else have we missed?

So I see somehow this document just to flag this seems to although it lists Design Teams A to N at this point A to N at this point it does not seem to have the Red Team tagged on the end. Can I just ask a question Marika what happened to that or whether it was there?

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. I just - I'm sending action item. I'll add it to the next version and I can make a note in the description then that it's one that may get merged with Design Team there E.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. Okay great. So let's get Red Team on there. There's a prospect of Design Team O coming on there. And in fact so that concludes really the review of the design teams. And that really puts us onto 3B which was an opportunity for myself or Lise to make any remarks on the sort of management if you like of the design teams.

I've made quite a lot of remarks as we've gone through including this issue of so I think I'll hold off and see if Lise you would like to make any other comments at this point -- I know you've got to leave soon -- on in relation to the design teams. And I know we're talking on a regular basis anyway so feel free to make any comment now.

Lise Fuhr: Oh, thank you Jonathan. It's Lise Fuhr for the record. Oh sorry. I don't have any further comments. I only have a very short comment on the guidance we received from Chris Despain and a lot of others this morning.

I don't know if going to touch upon it but I'll just use the short pause to say that I hope the people instead of sending it like this big chunk will get those things into the design team.

And while I think there's a lot of good stuff in the guidance I think the different groups should use I would prefer to have it implemented in the group on a regular basis and not as a guide and comment at the end. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Lise, good points. And that notwithstanding the fact that here's a big chunk they're covering no clearly says that is hoped to be used as reference for the design team.

So I would encourage design team leads and/or participants to have a look. But I take your point Lise so we'd love to have and I think I replied that to Chris anyway saying and reminding him that and anyone else frankly for that matter that participation there is welcome in the group at any time either in the main group or by the design teams.

So yes that's consistent with those two are consistent.

And then finally on 3C then there is a requirement to think about any other areas. And that may come up through the review of SAC 69 through anything that comes out through a prospective red team But as per the discussion today regarding provisional Design Team O please recall that this - you're welcome to propose or suggest anything in respect of potentially missing design teams as necessary.

All right and Greg I know that you said you take a stab at attempted design team on periodic review of the IANA functions.

And I'm sure you will cross reference in as you take up any work that, you know, the statement of work design team and probably any input now received from the registries and any other historic work that's been done there in RFP 3 or otherwise so that'll be great.

Let's look at that as a proposal for a prospective proposal for a design team. And with that let me hand over to you Greg for any comments or updates in relation to the work with the client committee.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Jonathan, Greg Shatan again. The - since our last discussion the Sidley team has produced a first draft of a document responsive to many of the 12 questions and many sub questions that were framed up and put into the legal scoping document which were essentially crowd sourced from this group early in that legal searching process.

That document has now been posted at the client list. It is certainly preliminary draft and, you know, is kind of prepared alongside Sidley getting to understand better and better what we're working on, how we're working, what our concerns are, where some of those questions kind of came from in terms of concerns and even kind of ICANN history. So, you know, it should be viewed as a work in progress.

Also has attempted to is not attempted to be a kind of scholarly or definitive legal document on these questions but more of an FAQ in a sense.

And so there's not a lot of, you know, citations or even any citations to a particular section of the California code or to sections of two cases or treatises or the like.

Nonetheless even at a fairly high level FAQ it runs too close to 20 pages to single space to answer our questions with the questions embedded.

So it is a substantial document. And Sidley was working hard to get it prepared in advance of a client committee call that we have an hour after the end of the scheduled end of this call.

So I, you know, want to credit them for having, you know, worked hard. And I saw the document was sent out at 1:44 AM New York time although I will say it was sent out by a California lawyer so it was only sent at quarter to 11:00 PM his time but obviously nonetheless signifying a willingness to sprint along with this and that's, you know, a very good thing.

As you've also seen on the client list they have suggested, you know, some additional discussion of looking at how we're working and on kind of trying to sort out, you know, the most important critical points in their view for any proposal that we work on so looking forward to discussing this further on our client call, the client committee call later today.

So if there are any questions I see there's a question whether the documents are posted in the wiki? I, you know, staff I suppose may do so. I think it was only posted to the client committee list of about an hour ago so it will be posted there in due course. I see a question from Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes thank you very much Greg. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Can you hear me?

Greg Shatan: Yes.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay thank you. I've asked the question before but I've been monitoring the complaint committee mailing list and thanks for this update but where is the work taking place?

Does it take place by direct email or primarily on the call that you have with the client committee because I've seen very little interaction if at all on the client mailing list?

Greg Shatan: Well the work at this point is primarily taking place inside Sidley Austin. We instructed them. We had the call, you know, a small amount of traffic kind of instructing them. And then they've I think understood the instructions and the - this first deliverable that they're working on.

And they have been as single-mindedly as possible working on it so there are no there is no flurry of emails going on behind the scenes in direct communication.

It's rather that, you know, given the, you know, hope as we hoped the document was reasonably clear and could be, you know, answered up to a point and you know there was no point at which they got thought to themselves that they needed to come back to us to say okay on Question 6 what the heck does this mean?

So they work is being done. And as there is more interaction that interaction will take place on the client committee list. It will kind of, you know, make sure that the Sidley folks are comfortable exchanging kind of raw documents and thoughts on the client committee list.

Those of us who have worked around ICANN for a long time are used to kind of the transparency even as they can sometimes be a little bit like exposing the sausage making in a sausage factory.

So, you know, we'll just get them used to the fact I know that they were saying - at one point they said this document is going to be kind of rough and there are a couple places where, you know, we're just kind of we would just work through the rough patches.

So definitely is going to need something to come back. So, you know, we kind of hate to show this as a work product to the world.

So we'll get them over that and I, you know, told them that it's just important to say how rough something is when it's rough and that we will, you know, hopefully as a group not sit around and nitpick something on, you know, Page 17 where something, you know, isn't expressed just the way with somebody who's been dealing with ICANN since they were in diapers would deal with it.

So that's - now I'll kind of make sure that they're - they understand that this is the place for the raw input. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes thanks Olivier for that question. Thanks Greg for the answer.

I would add that we will - the intention is to pick this up with him at the client committee meeting this afternoon European time at least, two hours - yes, two hours from now.

And two I for one would have been uncomfortable going into that meeting when the obvious thing to discuss would be that document without having been out on the list at least the client committee list if not the whole CWG list which is why it's out there.

And second that certainly one of the things I want to explore with them a little now and is - at our next meeting is how this might - where do we go next with this?

This is what Greg initially characterized before we even engaged (unintelligible) as advice. But it's not what - it's not formal written opinion which a law firm might issue.

So it's a question of how we know process this advice, how we consult with Sidley on this advice, how that's been worked through by the CWG and how we then work with this? And we're in new territory here as to how we work with them with - and none of us have this experience of working in this way.

If various of us have experience either being lawyers, instructing outside council or working within the regular ICANN frameworks but not exactly this.

So its work in progress, help us to get it right. I certainly want to raise process and the mechanics of how we work with them. And of course they'll be bringing this document or an updated version of it to Istanbul and being represented in Istanbul. And we have the discussion with the whole group and Sidley at Istanbul.

Any other comments or questions in relation to the legal advice and/or the work of the client committee in managing that? All right let's move on then to

the Item 5 which deals with the face to face meeting in Istanbul next week and any logistics and issues.

You will have seen that there was - is an outline agenda that's being published and circulated with the group very recently. And so there's a sense of how the meeting might go.

My feeling is that this is going to be very much a work in progress right up until probably Tuesday, Wednesday even as we process the outputs of the design teams, perhaps get a further update from Sidley and the other relevant factors here put on the draft document.

So whilst I'm all in favor of locking down in agenda I don't think it's in my view it's - and I talked with Lise about this earlier today. In our view it's in the best interest of the group to not nail down the agenda too hard whilst work is still in progress.

Grace I know you were going to say some things about logistics and other issues. Please go ahead now and we'll see if there are any comments or questions on either the agenda, participation, timing or any other points?

Grace Abuhamad: Thanks Jonathan. I don't have much to add except maybe answer any questions that the group has. We has 17 members or their alternates attending the meeting.

Both SSAC nonmembers (Yap) and (Robert) have sent apologies. But since there are no SSAC participants in the CWG they were not able to send alternates.

And we have in addition to that 16 participants in the group who are attending a few of them will also be attending the CCWG meeting so there is going to be some overlap that'll be positive, you know, bringing conversation back to the CWG.

If there's any - Sidley will be there. Despain will also be present to help with some of the facilitation and graphics and visualization that we may need coming out of the meeting. And of course your dutiful staff support will be there. So if there are any questions please, you know, feel free to raise them now.

I'll be sending along with (Brenda)'s help calendar invites to the group with all the information for remote participation, et cetera, so that everyone can participate and know exactly what time each session will be at.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Grace. Anyone feel free to pick this up now or on list if there are any issues or matters that need to be dealt with.

I had a feeling there was an earlier action that I wanted to capture when we're talking about the design teams but it's gone from me at the moment so I'll - there are a list of actions from meeting already at this point I see there.

Okay, all right. So that deals with face to face. Are there any other items? Olivier, go ahead.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you Jonathan, Olivier speaking. And just a quick question to make sure the design team list is both on the wiki but also sent out regularly with updates by email. The staff is updating both separately then in parallel are they?

Grace Abuhamad: That's correct Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay super. That's all. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Any other business or items anyone would like to raise? Well I think I'm not going to work through overview of the actions in detail. I will leave those to be as these come out very shortly after the meeting. I think it will be a little laborious to go through them now.

But suffice it to say please check close as they come out and in particular to see if your name is located next to any of them. Olivier is that a new hand?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes thank you Jonathan, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. It is a new hand. And since we're discussing the logistics and the agenda for the face to face some of us have other conference calls taking place that we need to schedule.

And I wondered whether there would be a likelihood of any evening face to face meetings like we had in Frankfurt that were added whilst we were on-site and so whether one could expect evening conference call in local time or perhaps totally blank out those two days?

Jonathan Robinson: Good question Olivier. Actually the draft agenda puts a placeholder for prospective evenings. Frankly having worked everyone hard through a nine hour day the prospect of evening sessions are not appealing.

But on the other hand having flown 20 people around the world to be in proximity with one another and mindful of the eyes of the world on us and the pressure that as we have to produce an output I think my judgment would be to say if at all possible keep the evenings free and don't accept other requests

for those both Thursday and Friday night. So that's my thought on that Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay thanks. I'll lament to the polls accordingly. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: I'm sorry. I know I've seen requests for various participation in various things and I mean you've heard what I said about a moment ago. I'd really rather we be relaxed and got to know one another talked informally. But we do need to put a placeholder in there if we feel it's necessary. James?

James Gannon: James Gannon. And there are a number of breakouts obviously for the design teams. I'm just wondering how the logistics of that is going to work for people who are participating remotely. So are they going to have independent rooms and independent Adobe sessions or what's the logistics of us those who aren't able to in person?

Jonathan Robinson: Another good question James, thanks. Currently those aren't envisioned as breakout sessions detail work on design teams. I mean ideally what we would be doing is at this point integrating the work of the design teams as published on Monday into the proposal.

To the extent that they are able, that is able to be done we will seek to do that in those sessions. So there's some form to be managed around those sessions at this stage. And that's why I said there's a bit degree of fluidity.

But it's not currently envisioned that there will be breakouts that net remote participation. It's generally envisioned that we will work as a committee of the whole in progressing this but there are some challenges but that's the way it is at this stage.

James Gannon: Perfect. I just (unintelligible) that if it goes on the day occurred under our breakout teams it would be valuable to try and make sure that there's some facility re-planned to have remote participation for that.

Jonathan Robinson: Oh good. Thank you James. It's a fair point. And we'll take that on board. All right I think that brings us to the end of the meeting which buys back around 45 minutes of each of your and my day, so good. Thank you very much and keep at it, keep up the good work on list and in the design team breakout calls.

Look forward to working with you over the next few days of course heading into next week. A reminder, there is no meeting scheduled for Tuesday next week. We decided we elected not to go ahead with our meeting on Tuesday next week mindful of the fact that many if not all of you will be traveling at or around that time.

So please be diligent about working both in the design teams and on list in the absence of more of any other teleconferences. Okay. Thanks everyone for participating today and in general. Sign off at this point...

Woman: Thanks Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: ...and we can stop the recording.

Woman: Thanks Jonathan.

END