

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
March 27, 2015
9:30 am CT**

Jonathan Robinson: Hi Everyone, welcome back. Thanks for your patience. For those not here in person, the break took slightly longer. As you can imagine there were various conversations going on, we need to get some coffee, various things.

So we are ready to go again with the remainder of our afternoon session. We had let things run on in terms of our time table. But with the sense from many people that we have made some very good progress.

We will come back to design team updates as well as a timeline. Is there some way in which we can converge one or more of these solutions and really sort of be in a position to instruct Sidley to do some detailed work. Obviously together with us, they're not going to go off completely into a cave and not talk with us. But to work closely with us and do some detailed work on a variant. One of these variants. It would be one or more of these variants. So really that is the question.

Maybe I'll just put this out to you. Do you think we can work with one or more variants and set aside, essentially of the three that remain, can we set

aside one or more of those best we can make a clear path towards writing up a proposal containing our design team work and ultimately and ideally our detailed work we do here?

So, great, I've seen a few hands go up. I've got Olivia. Olivier. You can see I'm getting tired. Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Where is Olivia? Oliver Crepin-Leblond speaking. And, yes, I've grown to be a little concerned about the fact that it's been repeated many times that the U.S. Department of Commerce might have a problem with a Contract Co.

And so I would proposed that this gets kindly dropped to the side. And perhaps go even further and propose so the hybrid integrated model would be integrated with the internal solutions as well. So we end up with one large but very complete set of proposals.

Jonathan Robinson: I thought you were going in a different direction there for a moment. I thought having grown tired of that point you were going to then advocate for it strongly. Eduardo.

Eduardo Diaz: Thank you Mr. Chair. I just want to say that one way of looking at reducing this is looking at this flag of stability and you put this in that perspective. You know, the general solution was functional with the functional capability. If you look at that one it's - it creates less changes, which translates in continuity and stability.

And what I've heard through this conversation is what ICANN is doing now through the IANA operation is satisfactory to everyone. So that's my point

there so if we can look at from the best perspective stability and continuity and security. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. I mean, I certainly think that regardless of the outcome that taking that perspective a little bit away from what I would like to see or what you would like to see and saying, “Look these are some of the other lenses through which this might be viewed.” Greg.

Gregory Shatan: Thank you Jonathan. Greg Shatan for the record. If I felt that the Contract Co. model was by far the best model that we had/was the model we needed to have, I would be prepared to take it all the way to Larry Strickling and beyond.

I don't care in a sense about what they think if that were the best solution. I don't think it is. I certainly don't think I would die in a ditch for it. So given that I think that the integrated hybrid model, which is really the internal plus a subsidiary model to be more blunt about it, really is the place to go.

I think it solves for a lot of the different problems. It also says that we are placing a very strong bet on ourselves, on the CCWG and on ICANN to really have substantial enhanced accountability.

And if we lose that bet it has to be very publicly lost so Contract Co. in a sense is a hedge against that bet. So I'd rather put all my money on that because I think that is a strong message to send. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. I'm not sure if that was picked up on the remote mic but there was applause within the room. Jordan.

Jordan Carter: I think the answer to the question about what to do next depends on what you're trying to achieve. One approach would be to work on the elements that are common to these models, the escalation path, the representation of customers and so on as the first parts of work to get as much ready as possible early on to share with the community in consultation.

The opposite approach would be to say to do a small piece of work on more clearly specifying the things that differentiate between the two central proposals, and to then review those and apply the principles to them.

So I don't know which one from a workflow and decision-making is more important. Is it more important to get the bulk of the non-contentious things further developed, or do you want to focus on the contentious things to make a decision? So I think that process point applies.

Jonathan Robinson: It's a good point and I would say that in terms of the commonality if you - and certainly in terms of the design team work, we tried to work to the extent that it was possible independent of the models and build out on the commonality.

I'll stop there. That - that's certainly one point in that and I'll leave others to come in or comment. Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks Jonathan. Donna Austin who's speaking on behalf of the gTLD Registries that I'm sitting alongside here. I think our sense is that we don't - we have a sense of what the internal solutions are, that being the accountability mechanisms in the hybrid, but we would like to explore it more so that we do actually know what we're talking about or supporting or whatever.

I think Contract Co. - we have a pretty good understanding of that because we've discussed it for a long period of time now, so we'd like to understand the other two better.

If I could also - just also add too I think to Olivier's point I think that if we don't put forward a solution that is acceptable to the NTIA I think we've failed and that's a personal opinion.

So I think we do need to be cognizant of that. A number of us have had conversations which has led us to believe that things like Contract Co. is perhaps not workable, so we really do need to be cognizant.

If we want to succeed here and we don't want to miss this opportunity to move this on, then we really do need to take the NTIA's opinion into account.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Donna. James.

James Gannon: James Gannon. I'd like to agree with some of what Donna has said. I think that we need to look at the integrated hybrid model in more detail. I would like to propose that we ask Sidley to look at that.

I think it's a - we've made a hell of a lot of progress on it today and I think it's something that has had a lot of agreement in the room that it's a very viable proposal.

On the issue of the Contract Co. model I think that we need to stay within the written NTIA requirements that we've been given. I think we should ask Sidley to look at the Contract Co. model as well.

Sidley are a large company. I don't believe that it's going to be too stressful for them to look at two models. We went from 7:00 this morning to - we're now down to 3:00 and possibly asking them to look at two I think is a fair proposal.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks James. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. If I thought it was just Larry Strickling we had to convince that would be one thing, but there's strong indications it's not just Larry Strickling.

It's good parts of the U.S. Congress. I have real aversion to wasting a vast part of my life over the last four or five months, maybe a little bit longer because I really haven't had much other life in a lot of aspects other than this.

So I'd like to put something forward that we think we have some chance of getting accepted. I support basically what Greg said and I think I'd like to modify it a little bit in that there's a lot of similarity between the integrated model and the - I've lost track of - the hybrid integrated model or whatever the two are.

And I think I would like - I personally would like Sidley to look at the composite picture and there may well be something in the middle or there may be variations of it or there may be things that can be phased in over time, because again the critical path is getting something done now.

So I think between them - sorry, between the options and their expertise we have a chance of coming up with something that we can agree with that will work and be acceptable. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Alan. Lise.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Jonathan. While talking a lot about the U.S. government and their input, I think we have got a lot of other input regarding the models. We sent out a first trial for proposal in December and got a lot of feedback on that one.

We have the guidance from joint Registries, from gTLDs and ccTLDs and we have the statement from the Registries and we keep on getting input to this. And I really think it's important whatever model is going to be drafted that you take all this input into account, and when we're going to have discussions with Sidley Austin that we also highlight whatever input we've received until now on the different issues, because it's a broad community we need consensus from and that's not only the U.S. government. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Lise. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Appreciate the input from everybody. These are my personal thoughts but I think if you ask Sidley to focus on the Contract Co. and the hybrid you're asking them to look at all three.

And I'd rather see them narrow it - down the focus, okay. So like Donna communicated I think the internal and the hybrid there - I think as we're - I personally would like to see them focus and not focus on Contract Company.

At the same time, although I may be leaning the other way myself, I wouldn't communicate that we've eliminated Contract Company yet.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck. Desiree.

Desiree Miloshevic: Thank you. I feel like we are making progress but also want to have the - Sidley here to help us. I would like to repeat what Lise has done: if you can make as wholesome a device as possible taking into the account the stewardship, the policies staying with the community and the operational functions.

So I would ideally like to see an answer of the two hybrid models integrated into one model, seeing where the legal documents are. Is it a trust? I don't mind how many options you come up with.

You can also be creative is what I'm trying to say, looking at the seven models where we started and picking up the best.

Jonathan Robinson: I put myself in the queue but I'm going to defer to Avri and Greg and then I'm going to come in after that. Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Yes. I mean, obviously I've been very much in favor of the hybrid model because I think it brings together the essential elements. And I would very much appreciate, you know, Sidley's help in figuring out how we fill in the gaps in that, how we actually establish those pieces to meet what we've set in the principles.

I believe that that hybrid model has attempted to start that but there are lots of empty spaces that says, "Fill in here once we get far enough to work on it further."

So I very much appreciate that idea. I agree with those that say, you know, "It's not that we're killing or canceling the Contract Co. It is put it in the background. It sits there."

It's certainly worth looking at from time to time because it may have ideas to contribute in terms of filling in some of the gaps of a hybrid model, because a hybrid model is indeed supposed to be hybrid and have the advantages of both, so thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes and just as a process point I'll come back. I've seen others come into queue and I will again defer to them. But we have a relatively short-term target to produce some form of coherent output.

That doesn't mean it necessarily has to contain only one model. But I think it'll make everyone's life a lot easier if it does contain something or - in and around a single model.

So where I think we are headed is giving Sidley the opportunity to do some detailed work on one or a variation of one model such that they can really help us push things forward.

If in the end it doesn't satisfy what we need and that requirement to satisfy what we need, let's not forget it's closely and inextricably linked with the work that's going on in the CCWG, which thankfully Sidley are also very involved with.

So one of the things I'm very keen to ask them to do in addition to working on developing the model or models that we need to work on is to really help us understand how we can institutionalize that link.

So I'd like to push as much of the accountability stuff across to the accountability group but with Sidley's help lock that in so that we can feel confident, because one of the themes - one of the underlying bubbling themes

that I've felt was here for a long time is a lack of confidence and trust in the -
in our ability to rely on that work.

So I've kind of said what I was going to say so I'm sorry I jumped ahead of
you Greg. But it sort of - feel - felt like a natural flow. I'll put - take myself
out of the queue and I'll let Greg speak now.

Gregory Shatan: Thank you Jonathan. I would echo a lot of what you say and also I think that -
I think we could put the Contract Co. on ice. It's a fairly well developed
model.

I think that it's mostly just work that needs to be taken care of. I think that the
integrated or integrated hybrid model or whatever we want to call it internal
with the subsidiary model still has weaknesses in mechanics and mechanisms.

There's a, you know, maybe some - an aura of good feeling around it now but
- and we can get some of the mechanics done by the CCWG. But I think that
can only happen with clear orders being given and their buy in to that and the
transparency and accountability with regard to getting that work done.

So I think that pushing the internal plus subsidiary model ahead, trying to
flesh it out, trying to have some mechanics, have some teeth developed is
really the way to go. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Greg. Jordan.

Jordan Carter: I think it's more accurate to describe what we're talking about in our proposal
as not two models, but one model with a bit that is two variables because if
you come back to the conversation we were having before about - let's lay on

ice the idea that the external model would assign the stewardship function away from ICANN.

And let's just assume hypothetically that it's Contract Co. or bylaws that provide the structure for deciding a change of the operator of the IANA functions, the contract out thing. Then almost everything is the same between the two models in that case.

You still need the escalation paths. You still need the composition of the customer services committee. You still need to know by what means you empower the community to make that call about assigning the function.

So I think that talking about two models, you know, a Venn diagram suggests two circles where there's only a little bit overlapping. But actually what we've got is two circles where almost everything is overlapping.

So if that's a reasonable contention then you focus on the legal advice for the next effort on the least developed model, which is the internal one.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Jordan. Thomas.

Thomas Schneider: Thank you. I think this is a very good and interesting debate. Listening to what people say about what we should take into account, I think the basic assumption is that the community in the end needs to have a consensus on the model.

Of course it's a reality that a part of the community - a significant part of this community is the U.S. government and is the U.S. Congress. Another significant part of that community is the - other global governments.

And when deciding about which way to go now, which parts to exclude and which to focus I think we should keep in mind and Chris has said this during the accountability group that remember this year there will be a big U.N. event in New York that will look at the developments and achievements of the ten years after the World Summit on the Information Society.

There will be a huge discussion about Internet governance, continuation of the IGF and other elements of this. And I just want to flag you that you - and that you keep in mind that you also need the support and I'm willing.

This is why I'm here. I'm willing to like understand how I can contribute to consensus that includes governments. But keep that in mind. It's not just one government that is an important stakeholders. It's the others as well so - and I think let's say the path of what Jordan has said is - it seems very reasonable to me because that follows the logic, "What do we want to achieve?"

To what extent all models overlap because there's a consensus that this is achieved through these elements? And where we have variations of different elements, if that is brought into connections what should these mechanisms achieve?

Then you can basically put them next to each other and send this out for feedback. So you may not have to like decide on two models or one or the least one at this stage, but try to keep what you think may be consensual, may be in the best interest with a few variants.

But in the end it's one line of thinking of what we want to achieve so I think that was actually quite a good statement. Thank you very much.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Thomas. We are mindful of the GAC as both a chartering organization of the group and your position as Chair of the GAC. Elise you were - yes you are next in the queue.

Elise Lindeberg: Thank you. No I think we - we've come a long way and I think I can dive in and say that I agree with most of the points that have been said by the majority here.

And I did also agree with us calling it one model with variations and I think that goes also to what we communicate to the world out there, because in Singapore we heard a lot about, "Oh you have so many models.

You don't - no you don't regress. You came around with all these models." Now we have one with variations and the variations needs to be very care so we can take this into considerations and that's a good thing.

I'll have another question. I think it will come back to that but that is about the intensive work that you've put ahead of us on the first and the second. Just one thing I want to say to that is I think now we have a lot of work done.

We have a lot of ideas that have been given also to the legal firm to go through, and I think it will be premature to have two full days after this discussing it before we have more substance on what we are discussing, because otherwise we will just go around in the same process we have done now.

Jonathan Robinson: Elise let me address that head on because...

Elise Lindeberg: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: ...actually things have moved on and in a way we could've communicated that to you already but it just - we had it structured into the - we are not going to go ahead with the first and second as a - as an intensive period.

But we do need to organize another intensive period once we have this output.

Elise Lindeberg: I agree.

Jonathan Robinson: So we'll - I'll come back to you on that timeline but rest assured that that point is taken and in fact absorbed already.

Elise Lindeberg: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Alan and then I'll try and bring this session to some kind of summing up.

Alan Greenberg: I'll make it easy. I can't remember what I was going to say.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. So it feels that we have a pretty clear direction here. We are in a very good position it seems to me to instruct Sidley to get on with some detailed work in consultation with us on an ongoing basis.

It's primarily around one model and we are setting aside for the moment two out of these three models. But I am mindful of what Jordan said and what was supported by others that there are quite nuanced differences in frankly all three of these arguably.

But we really need to - and in fact Elise's point as well and even talking about a model with variations, I think we need to be very careful about our communications at this point.

And you're right because our communications - we came up and were very honest with everyone in Singapore. "We got four. We'd like to know what you think," and they said, "We think you're confused."

And so, you know, I'm paraphrasing it a little but - so, you know, that - and we thought we were doing our job by saying, "Look tell us what you think." So I think in asking the public or the community to tell us what they think, I think we - they are expecting us as experts and people who've done a lot of work in this to give them some pretty clear leadership and direction.

So I accept the point that we don't want to unduly or preemptively lock solutions or people's points out, but at the same time we do have to show - step up and show some leadership.

I think we're in a great position to do that. We've got, you know, world-class experts to help us do that. I'm - think there's going to be some detail in here that we're still going to have arguments about.

There's no doubt in my mind that, you know, the - so let's not kid ourselves. This is a great place. We've come a long way but we haven't iron out all the wrinkles.

There's no doubt in my mind so just to capture that I think we're - I think Sidley have probably got a pretty good idea. I don't think I need to summarize where they need to do their work.

But I do think I need to capture the - an element of that is making sure that of course our principles are understood and the GAC is a key signatory and contributor to those principles which - as are we all and second, that that

critical point in our charter, that linking to the work of the CCWG is enshrined in our thinking and enshrined in Sidley's thinking.

And again I'll reemphasize the fact that we, Lise and myself, are working very, very closely with Thomas, Leon and Mathieu and I think we might even come out of this giving them clearer direction which will suit us and clearer direction which will suit them as to what we need from them to support our solution.

And if we can get to that point I think we're in a really good place. So, you know, I think let's attempt to draw a line under this solution. We've come a tremendously long way and I know everyone's probably pretty tired.

But, you know, congratulations for working very, very well together on this and really being willing to go a little bit further than you might've been even when you arrived here 48 hours or so ago.

So would anyone like - Sidley would you like to make any remarks or ask any questions or are you happy with where we are and clear on...

Holly Gregroy: Yes I want to thank you. I think we have a clear understanding of the direction that you've given us and we will go back and, you know, work hard to put some meat on the bones.

I think it needs to be an iterative process and we'll take guidance from Jonathan about how we do that in a transparent way so that we're not proposing that we disappear for two weeks and then just come up with something.

We will have questions and need guidance and look to you all to do that. You know, that said we - we've got a heavy load ahead even with just the one with some variation. (Sharon)'s going on vacation but...

Sharon Flanagan: For three days.

Holly Gregory: Oh okay. No. So we greatly appreciate that and (Sharon) if you'd like to...

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great. Well thank you - both of you. So just to remind everyone here where we are in the agenda I - it's been pretty exhausting so far but I think we can push on with a little bit more work we need.

We've got to do an update on the status of the design teams and the development of those, and we've got to do some work on the timeline. I know there's a couple of hands up in the room, so let me just make sure that you haven't been overlooked and then we'll go on to those next parts in the agenda. So Elise your hand is up.

Elise Lindeberg: Thank you. Just to be the pain in the ass with the principles again then, could we then have a deadline or - that just set them so we have them to measure our models against them?

Just now I think they're almost done. I think we've done all the work. I don't know if something's missing there but we haven't had the discussion but I think we should have them set.

Jonathan Robinson: Can we agree that is an action to set a deadline for the principles piece?
And then I'll delegate that to my Co-Chair.

Elise Lindeberg: Well received.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thanks very much Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking.
And for the avoidance of ambiguity could I please ask our colleagues from Sidley to provide us with details of what they understood their mandate to be now? Because we've all said okay, we've reached consensus. We're fine on this. We're going to do something and everyone says yes we are. But what is it that you now have understood for it to happen.

Woman: Yes.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: So that we're sure and we don't come out of this meeting with different views on how...

Woman: Right.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: ...the sling is - or swing is being manufactured.

Sharon Flanagan: So our understanding is we're looking at the internal model and then looking at two variants of that. One is where there is functional separation and the other where there is legal separation.

So in effect the second and third of the ones that remain - treating them as one model with different features. I mean because I agree with what - (Jordan), I think I agree with what you said, which is when you actually boil it down, they're actually quite similar with just the difference being a feature of - is there an actual entity around the IANA function.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: To make a point there, I mean I heard (Jordan). When he referred to that, he was also referring to the external as well saying he was actually in my mind at the time contrasting hybrid integrates with external and saying that actually even then much of them was the same. But yes.

Woman: Yes. But although I understood from the rest of the group...

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Exactly. That's right.

Sharon Flanagan: ...that there wasn't necessarily a desire to look at that one but that we should look at the variations. Okay. And as we do this I think - and one of the things that we will be looking at is as we try to drill down the piece that I referred to before, the accountability mechanisms, what we think that would like from an implementation standpoint.

What are the possibilities so that we can get more granular about that and you can then provide input about potential structures for that? And that's a whole separate workstream I think or part of this workstream.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Yes. So in so doing you help us to instruct or assist the CCWG with our requirements to support our kind of emerging consensus position.

Jonathan Robinson: Oliver, happy? Thank you. (Erick) has a hand up and then (Eduardo).

Erick Iriarte: (I think I would like to request) that the focus in the diversity of that ccTLD, gTLD situation and the diversity of the - sorry, the diversity of the ccTLDs related with the (unintelligible) before (unintelligible) and the ccTLDs delegated after (unintelligible).

That situation is special because these ccTLDs will see proposal - the final proposal, you know, related to protect them especially in the case of the ccTLDs (unintelligible) on diversity from their own government and their own religion will be complicated except any kind of proposal that could (be) affect that right (unintelligible) related where (CC1591).

Jonathan Robinson: Good. So I think we got that as an overarching point earlier and (Grace) has definitely captured that as part of the notes from the meeting. (Eduardo).

Eduardo Diaz: Yes. This is a question about timelines. Are you going to go over your expectation to when we expect to get things? Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So let's call that session to a close. We'll try and work through the next two sessions as quickly as possible. I understand it's late. I understand would like to move on.

So we'll briefly try and recapture under Lise's leadership where we are with the design teams and make sure everyone's clear on that. And then we'll come onto the overall timelines for the group.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Jonathan. (Grace), can we have the document regarding the design teams on the screen?

Well Jonathan and I sat down with - thank you Sidley. So thank you Holly and Sharon for being here. Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. A round of applause for Holly.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Great work and good to have you. But let's go on with the design teams. I don't know if you can - yes. You can read it on the screen. That's good.

I'd like to go through this real quickly but - and you're of course welcome to ask questions if you have any comments or if you think we have forgotten anything. Just raise your hand and tell us because we trying to - actually what we tried to do was to see, okay, the current status; what are the remaining issues to be address?

And then we tried to set a deadline for every design team and that's very important since we're reaching our deadline for public comment very fast even though we might have a new timeline, but.

Okay. Regarding the Design Team A, that's the SLE. I see that (Paul)'s not in the room right now. But as far as we're concerned, this is provisionally completed. We have links to Design Teams C and D.

Well we have remaining issues is we have the SLEs for emergencies that needs to be dealt with and that's going to be dealt with by DTM. And we have this to be subject to confirmation with the IANA staff and the root zone maintainer.

So that's why we don't have an actual deadline for this but we really would like to have this done by 10th of April still. Preferably before that but we'll see.

We have DTB; that's the IAP for ccTLDs. That's in progress. As Alan said, there's a survey out. And we put the deadline as 10th of April because you need to do - well, to do analysis of the survey and get this done.

Okay. We have DTC, that's the CSC Group. That's in progress. And well the dependencies are to J, H and A, D and M. And well, we think there needs to be input from DTH and to determine whether CSC has a role in oversight of .int.

Well, this development of specific escalation path that needs to be done; management of period reviews of IANA functions and the IANA statement needs to be looked at.

And closely incorporate SLA SLE inputs from Design Team A. And well, this could be decided if we're going to have the management of IDN repository issues and to consider input that's received during this meeting. Well, especially regarding the consistent charter and indemnification of the members of the actual CSC. So that's also a very important issue.

This group has a lot of work to do. And see Donna and (Stephan) you look very worried. But we'll see how - if you can reach the 10th of April because we can see it's a lot of work.

We have Design Team D that's authorization and that's provisionally completed. The dependency is (R) to Design Team F. And we need - that needs to consider whether additional verification step needs to be put in place. So - and this is to be done by DTF.

So the - no. Yes. Sorry. Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sorry Lise. Cheryl Langdon-Orr. Just a point there. You are now specifically changing our purpose to ensure that the verification

recommendations that were part of the D charter are now moved to F because we need to be clear if that's the case.

Lise Fuhr: That's the idea is to move it to F. So if that's not a...

Alan Greenberg: As leader of Design Team F this is news to me.

Lise Fuhr: Yes. It's news - well, this is the update for you Alan.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible) take a vote (unintelligible).

Lise Fuhr: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Don't worry.

Lise Fuhr: So Alan, you don't think it belongs in F. Is that what you're saying? And Donna, sorry, I didn't see your hand. I'll get back to you.

Alan Greenberg: To be candid, I have a meeting scheduled after this one to find out what does belong in F. And so I was not quite aware of the details. But there's enough of a rats nest in it that I wasn't sure I wanted this one. But maybe Cheryl and I need to talk. Is it okay if we decide where it goes?

Lise Fuhr: It is a very good idea if you and Cheryl talk about it. And whatever you decide, just get back to us. I don't mind if it...

Alan Greenberg: (Okay).

Lise Fuhr: I don't mind if it - in one or the other group. It's just that it needs to be done.

Alan Greenberg: Somebody needs to do it.

Lise Fuhr: Yes.

Alan Greenberg: Noted.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you. Okay. Sorry Donna. And I know I walked very quickly through CSC, so go ahead Donna.

Donna Austin: It's okay. Donna Austin for the record. So I guess my question is I understand that composition and charter should be - I reasonably understand how it can move forward with that.

Indemnification I'm not so sure about. I don't know whether that's something we need legal assistance with or I don't know how the rest of my team feel but I'm just not sure how we will deal with that.

Lise Fuhr: Well, it's a very good point. But if you need legal assistance, we'll have to look at that. And - but I think it's an important issue that really belongs in...

((Crosstalk))

Lise Fuhr: ...team.

((Crosstalk))

Lise Fuhr: Someone needs to mute their mic please. Okay. So we have the next - that's DTE. That's SSAC or SAC 69. And that's completed as far as it's referred to - it's part of the (red) team. So we're going to share the SAC 69 analysis with

the (red) team and this SAC analysis is going to be done by staff. And then it goes on to the (red) team.

F and that the relationship between NTIA, IANA and the root zone maintainer; that's not started yet. Alan volunteered in - well, we - yes. Was volunteering. He's - he agrees. Well, it has a close dependency with D. And outstanding issues is to complete a scoping document, review of recommendations from A and D as a starting point. And we still like 10th of April to be the deadline for this one.

So these were all Priority 1s. We still think we need to finish those and put them in. So we'll still have outstanding design teams that haven't been decided on yet. I think we decided on having a new one on the budget. Is that lower down? Yes it is.

So we have the current priorities Tuesdays as (two). So that's to be started. We have DTL that's a transition. It's ongoing. That's James Gannon's team. Yes. James...

Man: Just a quick question.

Lise Fuhr: Yes.

Man: And is that April 10 for what's going into the short form proposal or the long form proposal including the appendix data?

Lise Fuhr: It was actually for the long form proposal. It's whole Monty. I'm sorry - we have to push for this because actually when we released the first proposal we had, we got criticized for not being detailed enough. And I think a lot of this will interest people that are deep into the issues.

Man: Yes. No. There's no issue with it. Just beware that we are externally waiting for some stuff that may mean that we're incomplete. We will have stuff to give you but maybe not everything to give you.

Lise Fuhr: And if you're stuck because of not receiving material, just let us know so we can update and maybe help you get any material that you need. So the sooner we know that you are having problem with this. I know that you've asked for some documents, so.

Well, but the outstanding issues are related to the transfer of IANA.org. It's IANA functions registry data. It's the root zone automation system. It's historical data relating to IANA requests. It's a secure notification system. And the root case (K) transition process and management of transition process. Are there any more on this? No. Okay.

We go to DTM and that's Chuck's team. That's escalation. That's got dependencies to A and C. And there is to consider input received during this meeting. It has to review DTA and DTC recommendations in relation to escalation and confirm the roles.

Finalize proposed escalation mechanisms for a CWG review and confirm. Yes. Actually from James Gannon. Is that an old hand James or is it new on? It's an old one. Okay. Donna, go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks Lise. So I guess I have a question about the timing and interdependencies. And I'm not sure whether our team is waiting on Chuck or whether Chuck's waiting on us. So I'm just a little bit confused because I think the escalation stuff will eventually end up in the CSC work but I'm not 100% sure whether that's the case or not.

Lise Fuhr: Chuck, want to answer that?

Chuck Gomes: In my mind, and I could be wrong, the dependencies aren't so much that we're waiting on you or that you necessarily need to wait on us but we need to be kept aware of what each is doing related to our respective areas. At least that's my perception. So I don't think it's a dependency that holds up either one of us. Do you agree with that? Is there something we're going to do that you're depending on?

Donna Austin: I don't know Chuck. So I guess what I'm not clear on is whether the result of Chuck's work will fit in the CSC or whether it's a standalone.

Jonathan Robinson: I would imagine that it probably overlaps to some extent. But there's a point when things need to escalate beyond the CSC. And I would imagine that scope is - I expect that scope is covered by Chuck's team. So it's - if we're going to go with Venn diagram analogy, then some of the escalation probably takes place within the CSC but then it gets beyond it.

Chuck Gomes: The CSC as you saw yesterday obviously plays a big part in what we're doing. But it starts out before the CSC, the process, and then it's going to end after the CSC if it goes on to accountability mechanisms from the CWG. But there's certainly - we're interrelated so we need to keep communicating.

Lise Fuhr: And actually maybe we should have put on the accountability work on this one too because there is a linkage through all escalation beyond the CSC, might go to the accountability or whatever.

So I think it's important that we have the escalation that's included. There's some escalation in the SLA SLE Group. We have the CSC and you have an overall escalation too, so.

Chuck Gomes: And the bottom line I think is that when we deliver our proposal for public comment, I suspect it's quite likely that CCWG won't be finished with theirs either. So we're going to have to revisit some of the things in our proposal based on that kind of feedback that we'll get later.

Jonathan Robinson: And that's perfectly understandable and as long as we mention it, I don't think there'll be any problem, so. This is just the way it has to be having those two processes. Thank you. Any other questions for (EM) escalation? No.

DTN review. That's Avri's design team and that's in progress. Also very dependent on A and C. The SLA SLE and the CSC groups. It has to review another design team's recommendations. Other - as well as input received from direct customers in order - in relation to reviews. There's been a lot of writing in the guidance document and the statements from the registry. This is also 10th of April.

We have a new group, DTO, on the budget - IANA budget as we discussed that it needs to have a completed a scoping document. It has to consider requirements in relation to IANA budget reporting. And this could maybe transmit it to the accountability group who's also looking at the budget. And we're looking for a lead on this, so. Olivier, that sounds good.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Lise, I can't lead it. I can be part of it but I can't lead it. I have not spare time.

Lise Fuhr: Spare time is a luxury no one has at this moment.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Lise Fuhr: No. No. No. Okay. We will leave that for now and we'll find a lead for it. But it's noted that Olivier wants to be a part of this group, not a lead. Thank you.

Woman: (As well as) Chuck.

Lise Fuhr: And Chuck. Chuck, you also volunteering to be a part of the group?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Lise Fuhr: Yes, I know. I knew you guys are deeply into this. That's good. And we have the (red) team. And...

Chuck Gomes: Sorry. But going back to the budget design team. Just because somebody hasn't been a part of the ICANN budgeting process, it might actually be good to have some fresh eyes in there too. So if somebody's interested in that, I would strongly encourage them to volunteer.

Jonathan Robinson: So - and bring your point from yesterday Chuck. It's Jonathan. That deal - talking about a very short-term piece of work and then this one longer term. And there's a requirement for a short-term specification about what we want out of this budgeting cycle. So just reminding us all that - I know you don't need reminding of it. But yes.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. That's a good point made by you Chuck. We - you don't need to be a part of the budget group already. Thank you.

Well, and the last design team is the (red) team. And actually we decided to have staff to review the RFP forward and SAC 69 and put together an initial outline to facilitate the (red) team's work. So I have this done and...

Jonathan Robinson: Comment on that (red) team. I know we've already done the SAC 69 first pass. We need to do the RFP forward with a mindful that of a balancing between - there's a sense yesterday that people really want to make sure there was something going on in the (red) team in the stress testing that we weren't leaving that behind. So we will push on and make some progress with that and then bring it back to the group so that's not being neglected.

Lise Fuhr: And we're also mindful that Cheryl is doing the stress testing part of the accountability group and is trying to have that related to this group. So yes. So that's very good. Thank you. So any other questions regarding this? No. Don't see any hands up. That's the advantage of having this this late at the day, you know. Everyone is tired and makes life easier. No. Yes, we will.

So and - so I'll end this session no and thank all the design teams for the very good work you've been doing. And hopefully continue the momentum we're having and meeting the deadline. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay Lise. So thanks very much. That looks like we're into the very last session of the day, which allows us to look over the timeline. I think - I should say that Lise and I intend to issue a Chairs notes coming out of this. So this is not our last session. We'll get a special bonus session on the end of all of this.

So we've worked up a - or we've in fact to be fair asked Berry Cobb from staff to work up a revised version of the timetable, which you'll be familiar with or at least partly familiar with. Thanks (Grace). That looks like about the right

kind of scale. Let's just check what it looks like in the room. Yes. Okay.
(Grace) is going to un-sync it so you can magnify it.

But in essence you can see a key change with - start - if you focus on mid February, you get the red dot, which is the ICANN meeting. At that point we collapse, if you like, the RFP teams into - and re-emerge them out into design teams. We at or about that time worked on securing the legal advice and commenced work on that draft proposal Version 2.0.

All of that's been ongoing in parallel. And as you know we've now received our initial legal input. Got decent work underway with the design teams. Reduced a couple of variance of the draft proposal. And have been -- we're at the green dot now or where the vertical gray arrow is in late March.

What we have changed which is significant from previously is we have pushed out the public comment and extended the public comment. I think it was 21 days commencing 6 of April. There's a couple of reasons why we've done that but it was at least in part recognizing what was going on in the CCWG and our intention to work in parallel with them. I think to be fair and not to shift all of the "blame" the responsibility for any shift onto them -- we would have really struggled - if not found it impossible to produce a draft by the 6th of April even if we just reflect on the discussion we had with Tidley. I mean they're going to find this timeline and we are going to find this timeline stretching in any event. So to go to Elise's earlier point in terms of that intensive work period we've shifted that now to the 1st and 2nd of April. Not quite two weeks but almost to the 13th and 14th of April so our intention there will be to take the output from the design teams that is all coming on or before the 10th of April and pull that together over an intensive couple of days. And then we can put all of that together with some work on the legal advice or the legal input on the structure and try and pull that all together into a draft that

can be sent out for public comment in the 30 days commencing the 20th of April. But it's essentially six days past the 14th of April to pull that all together into another version of the draft proposal.

And you'll note then that there is another intensive work period on the 30th, 31st of May which waits and takes the public comment and deals with that. We did touch on talking about this what type of public comment we might need to undertake and given the intensity of this process I think we're going to have to produce a pretty structured mechanism for public comment.

I think if we just go straight out with free form public comment we're going to have a nightmare trying to pull that together. So we intend to and we've got some ideas about producing a very structured form of public comment which would - well -- it's not necessarily being a survey as such will direct public comment or channel public comment and input via questions and along structural line similar to that of that proposal. So that's our idea there.

And that will enable us to do the rapid (unintelligible) of it in the run up towards sending it out to sending it out to the chartering organizations at least two weeks prior to the Buenos Aires meeting. So those are the highlights really of the time table as we've envisioned it. And I see that it stimulated at least few hands if those are old hands but I think they're new. So -- Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thanks very much -- Jonathan. I (unintelligible) and I'd like to draw your attention to an e-mail that Greg Shatton has shared with the CWG list regarding the length of the public comment periods that has now changed from plus 21 days to a full 40 day period. It's showing as 30 days on here. I'm not sure whether there is an option for us to go for 30 days. I think the minimum is 40. And that's part of the recommendations of the ATRD2.

Jonathan Robinson: And so Alan did you want to respond?

Alan Greenberg: Yeah. I can speak to that 'cause the question was put to David all of a little while. I can't remember exactly when...

David Conrad: ...the 42 days is officially for PDP's and things like that. That's the change in policy. Whatever the timing used to be it used to be for everything. He says we have some discretion for changing it under duress. On the other hand, 42 days was the amount of time that was realistically allocated to expect people to be able to come up with good comments. So we shorten it at our danger. It's only 40 days by the way. Forty days sorry.

Jonathan Robinson: Good points and I mean there's a certain practical reality here if we did -- for example -- push it out to 40 days we would condense the time before the public meeting that the SO's and AC's had to deal with it. So there's a balance to be struck here.

David Conrad: There's also the issue of translation. The translation will never get a long time if we want to allow people with the other versions to have any time to respond. We need to factor it in and I don't know how quickly we translation can get it done for us.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. (Paul) did you want to respond on this specific point.

(Paul Kane): Thank you very much. My debut room is not working. With the CCT the community was obviously globally diverse and just a touch on the last point. Translation is important. I think if one sends -- awaiting document the CCT community there would be little engagement because they won't understand it. So any messaging relating to the product that would come out of this group

needs to be succinct - almost like a cheat sheet with respect to why it's important to convey their views. That's just a high level comment.

Jonathan Robinson: Let me deal with that directly and I think you've nudged us just a little bit further from where we were. What we intended to do was produce as I said yesterday - a short form document which was a comprehensive to the RFP but comprehensive in that it answered every question in the RFP but answered it in as short a form as we could possibly get away with to convey the essence of how we're responding.

In addition -- that would be supplemented be substantially expanded version of exactly the same document. A long form response -- if you like. And in addition that would be supplemented by a much more communications oriented cheat sheet if you like info graphic if you like. I think the one thing that I hadn't thought about and we need to think about is whether that cheat sheet - that short form - communication. Very short form communication. That essential points communication contains some of the overarching question for public comment and whether we do that because that's not what we had been thinking of. So that's a new idea that we need to think about and it's potentially a good idea and it's worth thinking about how we deal with that. Okay -- Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. I just want to share a couple of lessons learned in the (unintelligible) working group comment period. We used a very structured approach and I think that was really good. But we found out we needed to be clearer in some communications on it. For example -- with the structured approach for groups to respond it's a little more difficult because they have to organize their responses and then somebody has to answer them. And so we provided a PDF file of the survey that we used.

Unfortunately -- and this happened in my own stakeholder group - the PDF results that were compiled were sent as a PDF rather than entering them in a survey. So we need to be -- if a survey -- or some sort of online tool is used we need to be explicitly clear that the only way - Smith - the comments is through that otherwise you lose all the advantages of the system that's doing that. And by the way I fully support to structured approach.

I think it makes the analysis not only much easier but I think much more accurate as well if it's designed right. So just a pointer on that. Be real clear on it. You may not want to give people the opportunity to give a free form approach depending on the structured approach that you offer because that makes your task much harder. Just some thoughts on that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck. Let's go straight to (Eduardo) for any...

Eduardo Diaz: Just curious about that three angle that has the number three and brings out some risk factors lacks of consensus had to do with the 17 days that it goes to all the chartering in organizations. To see if the proposal is accepted by them. Is that what that is?

Grace Abuhamad: Yes. This is Grace from Staff. What we did is originally when we put out the timeline we had identified four risk factors and we sort of eliminated three of them but one still remains which is the lack of consensus as a risk factor. And that would be -- as you said (Eduardo) -- during the 17 days in which the SOAC's are considering the proposal. And that will remain a risk factor I think until we can access the public comment results and even maybe beyond that.

Jonathan Robinson: I suppose it's very similar to some of the other comments around translation but have we looked at whether the chartering organization will sign

off on the short form document without necessarily the long form having been produced and translated before they can sign off -- for example -- the CCNSO will they - are they amenable? Has this been approached? Has it been assessed?

Jonathan Robinson: Actually -- that's a good point and you would have seen we've just received a letter from the CCNSO. I think to some extent it is up to the members to go back to their groups and so I really appreciate you raising that. We are relying on the member - the chairs can do some networking and contact with the groups and some but we've all got our hands full. So I guess it's a delicate balance. What we don't want you to do is just go back to your groups and say what would you like and come back and tell us.

We need you to influence your groups appropriately as well and get them to - in the way that Thomas was talking about the GAC is going to - it's a degree of two way here. It's got to go both ways. The groups have to tell us what's their requirements are and at the same time they have to be respectful that we've worked extremely hard and are doing our best within their set of constraints to meet their requirements.

Now -- originally one of those constraints was we were mindful that the GAC -- in particular -- might need to meet in person or would be to meet in person - let's now soften it. They would need to meet in person in Buenos Aires in order to consider this. It now turns out that the CCNSO are telling us that they will need to meet in person or the CC's will need to meet in person and the CNSO has written to us and specifically.

So I think -- we would really appreciate a two way conversation on this. And to some extent like I say pushing back on your organization and say to them look - and I'll do that with the GNSO. I'll get the council and say look and

we've been doing that. Hammering it home. Each council meeting the last two or three times here's an update. Here's what we're doing. Here's what's going on. This is going to come to you. We won't to defer on this. So really explaining to people what's required and hopefully others of you will be able to do so similarly. Jordan?

Jordan Carter: Thanks -- Jonathan. I was going to make the same point so I think from the diagram that the idea is that SRAC sign off is being that it's happening at the ends of the ICANN meeting not before it so at the beginning it. I presume that's designed to be in keeping with the requirements for organizations like the CCNSO have done.

I guess it's down to at least to the others of us and often (unintelligible) land to make sure that they understand that there's only going to be a 17 day turnaround on that decision. And I don't know if you've had any discussion in the CCNSO council about the 17 day turnaround is viable or not. So I think that's something maybe with checking if it already hasn't been checked.

Lise Fuhr: I'd like to answer the 17 days. I haven't discussed it with the CCNSO but I will make sure that we do so. What I understood was that it's more the face-to-face meeting that's important. So it's not the 17 days that's the issue it's that they'd like to be able to discuss this with the members of the CCNSO that's a very diverse group. So it's important to have everyone understand and be able to comprehend what this is all about. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. Looks like we've come back to Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thanks very much Jonathan. In order to get a cap while speaking and may I ask that those briefing materials such as slight deck be made available ahead of the opening of the common periods. So as for ICANN and

so they seize and maybe even other communities could share it and could use it if it were to run their own webinars and so on on this topic. That would be very helpful indeed.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. Good point and take it on board. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: It's kind of along the same line as Olivier. With regard to the SOAC sponsors approval. To the extent that we're able to feed them near complete documents and then follow up with Claire Redline ahead of time. We should really try to do that.

Jonathan Robinson: Grace was just reminding me of course that all our documents are public so again without wanting to duck the responsibility I think it's important that we push that responsibility on our members. That's the role of our member to bring that back to your groups. You know where the documents are. And keep to the best of your ability informing and updating your membership respectively. Greg?

Greg Shatan: Thanks Jon. Along the same lines but even kind of one step earlier than Chuck. I think it's incumbent as we're working on with our groups on public comment periods and presume it will get public comments from the chartering organizations or at least from the organizations the GNSO itself will not comment but the stakeholder groups and constituency would. That should be viewed as the first step toward the SOAC chartering organization approvals. GNSO may have our own challenges because of the quadripartite nature of the organization of depth a partite but I think that kind of -- need to view that whole is kind of a tunnel starting with the public comment period. And going down to a procedural mundanity one of the issues that we had with the public comment tool in the policy and implementation working group was and difficulty of circulating drafts within groups.

You know -- that's how we ended up with a similar PDF situation at least internally as then people think how do I mark the PDF of the draft so I don't know if there's a tool that can be used among groups. If you're the person writing the comment for yourself -- you don't have to circulate it but I need to circulate it among a couple of hundred people who then need to circulate it back to their organizations cause we have organizations that have a hundred people on the committee. You know -- if we're doing a really formal comment so there needs to be something that allows that process for aggregation and comment.

Grace Abuhamad: So Greg that a good point. I think what we'll do as staff is look into the different options available. We'll look at what happened with policy and implementation and sort of work on that and the what we may end up doing is providing people with a PDF or word doc even just so that people can see and prepare their comments and then afterwards have that response that they are putting into the tool. But we'll work on that.

Greg Shatan: Something like a word document. You know -- Google forms type of output or something.

Jonathan Robinson: So policy implementation was one that Chuck referred to. A GNSO working group that I understood a public comment by and attempt to -- more sort of to ultimate it or structure mechanism and it's some lessons learned. And so we'll take those and move it on. Alan Greenberg?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you Jonathan. Just to put the screws on it a bit tighter I have an ALAC meeting next Tuesday. If there are any slide decks or anything else I can use for presentation ready by then that would be appreciated. I'll give you the exact times so you can know what your window is.

Jonathan Robinson: As you can imagine I had a much quieter time than you lately. So I think we expect to get some -- we're pretty fair statement that Grace will help by compiling some documents. We've got Elaine helping us with some explanatory materials. And so hopefully we're in reasonable shape to help you.

Alan Greenberg: I did to the extent possible and if that ended up being nothing we'll fake it anything will be appreciated.

Jonathan Robinson: Faking it's what's causes the problems. We'll have to give you something. All right. Elise?

Elise Lindeberg: Yes. Thank you. And I just to urge - I have question. Can you make the information that we now can send out after this meeting like the shared statement and some material. Not massive. Because what I keep hearing when I send it to the GAC is like this, this too much Elise. And then I have to go and pick up the essential pieces and I want something to be conveyed from all of us that's the same message in a way to the community after these meetings. So if it could be easier for you also but -- of course -- it's difficult to make - yeah. Something large - very small. I know.

The main half but something that is yeah. Maybe illustrations and also that explains what I think we need to do now -- explains the bridge between what was good forward in December and that we have an illusion in the group and that what we now have is this. But I see the link is that I see the things is that things are changing and progressed by that. We don't get a lot of questions. Where is the MRT now? Where is this now? Where is that now?

Jonathan Robinson: I think we can do something there. As you know when we came into this meeting - it feels like weeks ago - but it was probably only days ago -- we had a short PDF that we had prepared for this group's purpose but it was always the intention that would be developed and updated based on the work of this and would be potentially usable as communications materials outside. So that a professionally prepared piece of communication materials that we'll work on developing and updating. So it may not be a one page although there may some - I won't preempt a little bit but we will work to get you...

(Grace): I'm not asking for one page.

Jonathan Robinson: No.

(Grace): But I'm sure but I'm not asking for 50.

Jonathan Robinson: No understood. And certainly things like the current version of the draft proposal is way too unwieldy for that kind of purpose. And that's been recognized in various ways. So thank you. Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thanks Jonathan. (unintelligible) And will we have a copy of the explained drawings?

Jonathan Robinson: That you will have and they should be on either of the e-mail lists and/or the WIKI so they're there.

All right. So magically we are at thirty minutes past the hour which is about our planned stop time today. And it feels like we might have reached a natural point in the proceedings. Wonderful. Well -- then I'm not going to attempt to capture too much but it's fair - we've got a very productive couple of days and I sense that you all feel that.

Thank you very much. Immensely constructive approach. I think all of you are staying over so hopefully you'll have a slightly more relaxing time. If you are buried in your design team work or whatever else you plan to do Friday evening. But thanks very much. I really appreciate both the hard work and the sort of tone of the work. So it's been great working with you all and obviously I think we should acknowledge the huge support obviously that we get from ICANN staff. Clearly they are paid to do the job but many of them work beyond... yeah.

That's what I was going to say. I was just going to recognize that. With Grace next to me and others. And that to you for explaining for your imaginative and constructive work and even missing your dinner last night to help us out in getting things going. So Lise?

Lise Fuhr: I'd like to echo what Jonathan is saying that I think it's great to see what you do here. What you do in your spare time because I know many of you have optionary day jobs and ICANN is not what life is about so thank you for contributing but I think we'll end up with a proposal that's very good and I think this is really one of the projects where we all make a difference. So thank you again.

Jonathan Robinson: Well done everyone. Let's call that meeting to a close. Is there any housekeeping issues that we need or any other key points.

Lise Fuhr: One thing is we won't be having a meeting on Tuesday next week but we will resume on Thursday and Brenda will send out all the information.

Jonathan Robinson: Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you Jonathan. (unintelligible) I wanted to thank our co-chairs for being great cat herders these past 48 hours.

Lise Fuhr: There is a request for a group photo so everyone could you join up here.

END