

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
April 2, 2015
8:00 am CT**

Grace Abuhamad: Hi everyone. This is Grace. We're going to go ahead and get started. I've started the recordings, and today - just a quick recap. It's April 2. It's 11:03 UTC. Jonathan Robinson will be leading today's call, and we'll be doing a roll call based on the Adobe Connect room with - if anyone's on the audio line, please let me know now.

Greg Shatan: Hi this is Greg Shatan. I'm not yet in Adobe Connect.

Grace Abuhamad: Hi, Greg. Thank you.

Earlier we had noted Cheryl, but she's in the Adobe Connect room so we're all set. Jonathan, over to you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Grace. Welcome, everyone. Thanks to those of you particularly who've got up specifically earlier or had to stay up particularly late for this call.

We are going to spend an hour on the call I hope. The primary purpose of the call is to ensure that the design teams are working as planned and that they

have the opportunity to provide any specific updates since Istanbul and in particular to ask any questions or secure any information required to continue with their work.

We are mindful as chairs that the primary purpose of the group's work at the moment is in the design teams as we sort of hunker down after the good work we did in Istanbul to drive ourselves collectively towards considered content for the draft proposal.

And the background of course there is work being done by the lawyers, and the client committee will be meeting with the lawyers for an update from them later today. So we'll be able to inform you and/or you will be able to see the output from that meeting and make any comments or contributions either now during the course of this meeting, as appropriate, or subsequent to that.

Really as I said a moment ago, the overall thinking is driving towards the production of a draft proposal that will be in a fit state to go out for public comment. Our target date for all content for that is to be input by the 10th of April. That's just over one week from now.

I'm reminding you that we will be producing two variants of the proposal that have been referred to in various ways, but essentially one is a short form proposal that will be directly comparable and fit very easily alongside the existing proposal that have been put into the ICG in response to their RFP and those to - that short form proposal that will be then something that is more readily accessible by a broader audience and is directly comparable to the existing proposals, the objective being to make it as simple as possible for those not - for visibility and comparison and ultimately public comment, and indeed ultimately to facilitate the work of the ICG as well.

But in addition, we have done extensive work on detail, and that detail is appropriate to include in the report. That'll be included in a second variant of the proposal, which will be - have significant fleshed out detail in it. So that's the plan in addition to the fact that we propose to produce some communication materials to go alongside that.

But all of that should be familiar to you from what we discussed in Istanbul, so having sort of recaptured that, and for those of you that didn't have the benefit of either being at the meetings or listening in full to the detail, that's where we're headed.

So I'll pause there for a moment before we move onto item two, reminding you that we are going to work for an hour here and then let you get back to everything else that's going on. So let me just pause and see if there's any comment, question or input at this stage. Do you have a question or a comment related to the material for communications?

There's communication material being prepared by (Explain) that as Grace says on the list went out yesterday. It's draft form. It hasn't been specifically reviewed by this group, but it available to you as a kind of (unintelligible) and assistance with which to communicate with your groups and give them an update on the work that took place in Istanbul.

All right let's move onto item two which is the work of the design teams. And here we have the first point on the agenda which is standardization of design team content. And essentially there's a couple of things going on here. One, as we've prepared for the launch and commissioning and initiation of these design teams, we've attempted to standardize the way in which the proposals are written and prepared.

And more recently with some help from staff, we have sought to standardize the output from the design teams. This has a number of advance - just that that includes making them - just giving helpful direction to teams that are working in a very short time frame to have a format. That permits the group to readily review this content and prepare the content in a form and format that can be readily absorbed into the draft proposal.

I'm not 100% familiar with what's on the list at the moment so - and maybe I don't know if Marika you would like to make any comment on the standard form or if there's an example. I think we had an example of DTM that may have gone out already in that standard format with the summary structure. Go ahead, Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. So the document that's on the screen is the current template that is being used by Design Team M. It hasn't gone yet to the full list, but it's basically only onto the design team. But I can circulate it after this call.

So as Jonathan explained, indeed the idea is that the first part of the content, which you see here on the first page, is kind of the high level recommendation that is intended to be inserted in the short form proposal. And then the part that follow after that are the annexes that provide the additional details that are complementary to those recommendations that would go into the long form proposal.

So the idea is or we'd like to encourage all the design teams to maybe take a similar approach, as that would really facilitate as well integrating the content when once it has been finalized into the final proposal and to make sure as well that all the parts have a similar look and feel.

So as I said, we can share this example with the list after the call. Just note that this is still a work in progress. The Design Team M is still working on this, so maybe don't focus too much on what is in there but more the way it's laid out and the way it has been structured. So that was it.

Jonathan Robinson: And as you can see, the agenda item is the standardization of the content rather than the specific content of this DTM, Design Team M, on escalation mechanisms. Any comments or questions on this point?

Good. Well I think - go ahead, Staffan.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. I think this is a very good approach. That's all. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks for that. I - it feels right to me as well and it feels like we will by doing so we will create a sort of plug-and-play content format that we can start to weave into the draft proposal, which is clearly the intention of this work.

So let's go through the design teams. We don't need reports as such from the design team groups. We spent a good portion of Thursday last week, a week ago, going in detail. What we need here is - we'll do a fairly rapid pass over the different design teams, looking for either updates since a week ago or questions or issues arising from those.

And to the extent that the design team leads are here, great, if not it will be great if someone who is participating in that design team to just flag up any points by raising their hand. And if you do not believe there are or if there are issues, please let us know. In particular, it's quite obvious that some design teams are very active and other may be less so, so if you've got concerns about that also please feel free to flag it.

So if we could have the list of the design teams up now in the Adobe, it's probably a useful starting point. Avri asks if the group's output is a table and does that table need to be turned into text for the short form.

Avri, I don't know that we've got a rule per se that that is the case, but the principle is that if it can be captured in a short form in the form of a few sentences or paragraphs and then referred to in the appendix, that would be desirable. But, you know, it may be worth looking at the specific context of the particular design team to check that.

But the idea is to make the short form proposal as straightforward and digestible and conceptually accurate without having to go into all of the detail so that it's as broadly accessible as possible and comparable.

All right, Paul, let me turn to you -- thanks for being on the call -- and just see if there is any question, comment or update over the past week that you need assistance with either finalizing or something that's come up in the interim.

Paul Kane: Thank you, Jonathan. I'm not aware of anything specifically. I would very much welcome input to IANA staff to the working group. At the moment everything - no one has contacted me. It's all been very quiet. So I have nothing really to report. The document is as presented.

Yes I've also -- moving now to the escalation group, group M -- just to make sure to use your words, it's all sort of all mixed together. So I hope IANA staff will be reviewing it and I hope they will participate in the design team just to iron out any issues. But we're just trying to now move onto, as I mentioned in Istanbul. So that's my short update.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Paul. That sounds good. It does like it would be very useful to know what level of commitment or buy in there is to the SLAs as listed - or SLEs as listed in that and how that can be squared off with what should the work of Design Team A versus what is done currently.

Chuck, I know your hand is up but I'll go to Marika, who I think is responding directly to this point, and then I'll come back to you.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Just to know that we have already received internally feedback from our colleagues from the IANA staff, and I believe we do have some questions or concerns with regards to what has been proposed by Design Team A. I think that there's still, you know, formally still forthcoming, but I did already want to flag it here.

And I think it's also probably something for broader discussion maybe by the CWG whether you all think it is feasible to, you know, have those conversations between the IANA staff and Design Team A, or possibly the full working group, ongoing through those comments or whether that is something that is maybe parked for now and, you know, we're working on the basis what is currently required under the agreement with the NTIA as that I believe has been working quite well as well.

So maybe it's something where, you know, we can work with our colleagues to form a formal response back to the full working group so you can then further consider whether you believe it's something that can be resolved or agreed to within the short time frame that we have, you know, looking at producing content by the 10th of April or whether that's possibly an alternative path that can be pursued to make sure that, you know, due consideration is given to possible concerns or questions in relation to what has been proposed.

Paul Kane: If I may come back, I'm not - I don't - I'm not privy to anything. I understand it's an internal communication. IANA staff have had sight of the SLE since, well I'm looking at my notes here, the 26th of February and then again on the 6th of March.

I would be a little concerned if there is a significant deviation from the SLE proposed, but I do urge rather than spend ages trying to formulate a formal response, by all means have the IANA staff participate on the mailing list so that the whole of the design team and address any issues or, more accurately, give the facts that underline the SLE. Bear in mind the SLE is based on the current activity within the IANA as that was what was proposed.

I'm not - I'm in the dark. I don't really know what's going on, so what we have done is we've reviewed the current activity IANA delivers based on over 400 data points, and we've spent hours doing it. So please get them to get involved in the design team.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Paul. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jonathan, and thanks, Paul. In Istanbul we talked about an SLE for emergency updates. Paul, is the design team going to work on that?

Paul Kane: So yes I have -- I'll just dig out the e-mail -- I've reached out to IANA staff asking them to basically prescribe how it is they conduct an emergency update or emergency transaction. And if I can - basically I was referred to a very broad brush document. I will once again go back to the IANA and ask for specific information. We understood from (David Conrad) that from start to end, it's a four-hour window, which is great and admirable.

But thank you for the reminder, Chuck. I will go back to the list and just get more information from them. I'll try to get the design team to do it. I don't want to be the point person, but yes thank you for the reminder. I will chase it again.

Jonathan Robinson: Paul, I think it would be helpful in doing that is to make sure that the staff working on this project who aren't necessarily IANA people, the staff who are supporting the group, were copied in on any of that kind of correspondence, which gives them an opportunity to follow up internally as well and assist in the way that they can. That would be useful if at least Grace and Marika could be copied in.

Paul Kane: Okay.

Jonathan Robinson: So it feels to me like there's a service level expectation put forward by the customer. There's a service level that has been, to the best of my knowledge, adhered to or at least in existence, a service level agreement that exists to date. There's two issues really. One is have we got all the perimeters we need, and to that extent, Chuck's point is the perspective addition of one or more additional perimeters. And second, what is a reasonable basis to go forward on, and we need the supplier to come back to us and indicate whether or not the service level expectations are reasonable or not.

It is my feeling that this structure is sufficient to potentially go ahead with publication of a draft proposal, but that a final proposal should contain a mutually agreed set of service level expectations. So ideally the draft proposal should contain the scope, the number of service levels we can expect to see met, and indication of the aspiration there, and that should be, certainly in my view at least, finalized in the final proposal.

Is that a new hand? Would you like to make a comment or, Paul, would you like to come back on that?

Paul Kane: Just for clarification, I want to emphasize within the group, you use the term aspirational, I have tried to steer the group away from aspirational at this juncture and just focus on what the IANA is supposed to be delivering based on real world facts.

Some members of the group from an aspirational perspective want to basically require the IANA to deliver to the same standard that ICANN requires it (unintelligible). I personally do not feel that's appropriate at this juncture because what I would rather focus on are facts.

So I want to be very careful that we don't go to the retrograde step of an out-of-date service level agreement that IANA has with NTIA. NTIA recognized themselves that it was rather broad, which is why we focused on facts. The point is well made, and I'm trying to stay away from aspirational because that's something that would happen at a later date close to transition.

Jonathan Robinson: Got it. Thanks, Paul. There's an agreement in place, which is outdated. There's an expectation which is being set, which in the view of the design team is reasonable, but we need a response from the IANA on this. And long term, there may be an aspiration for further improvements on the service level expectation, but that's not a, as I hear you say it, in the - an expectation pre-transition. So I think that that help me and I hope that helps the group. Thank you, Paul, yes.

All right, Chuck, did you have an additional point?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. With regard to the emergency update process for the root zone, I just wanted to note for Paul and for everybody else that Annex X, what is now Annex X in the Design Team M current document that was on the screen earlier and that Marika's going to distribute to the whole list, shows the current emergency escalation process as it is.

And as far as I can tell in the information we've been provided from an IANA representative and drafted from Team M is that there is no actual SLE at this time. They do target for four hours, but there's not an actual SLE. So people can look at that Annex X if you want to see what that is as far as the procedures are. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Chuck. I'll keep us moving them given the objective to have a relatively short call today. So Design Team B, any questions, updates or issues since Istanbul?

Allan MacGillivray: Jonathan, it's Allan from Design Team B. You'll recall the survey of ccTLDs. The survey is still in the field. We have given them until tomorrow, April 3, to reply. So there's really no update. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Allan. That's helpful in and of itself. Design Team C, I suspect this is Staffan but go ahead Design Team C.

Staffan Jonson: Okay thank you, Jonathan. Yes I hope (Donna) is asleep. I don't find her in the list. So let's see what we can report. In Design Team Consumer Standing Committee, there is mainly work on the way, revision of proposal and implementing remarks made in Istanbul.

One main issue now is to connect DTC with DTM as my - regarding escalation specifically. We do have two hours this afternoon or 14:00 UTC

DTC and 15:00 UTC DTM. And I hope we can connect escalation between the groups here. So if no one else in the group has anything to report, I think that's about it. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Staffan. Go ahead, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yes I just wanted to let Staffan know that the Design Team M latest version is what's going to be distributed by Marika to the group. It's a still a work in progress, but note that you'll have that shortly.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. And that was what was flashed up earlier I think then in - as an example of the format so that's very useful both from the point of view as an illustration and content for discussion. Good. Thanks, Staffan and Chuck.

Design Team D on the authorization function.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Jonathan. Cheryl Langdon-Orr here. I'm delighted to say that as we had provisionally completed our work in Istanbul, we've had no need to go further, strangely enough, but to remind everybody that it was our recommendation, which was agreed with, that there will be no -- I repeat, no -- authorization function, but that the matter of validation which is part of our charter work, has been hived off provisionally, pardon the pun, to Design Team F, but regardless of whether it's F or not, to another design team. And a number of us from D have now gone onto populate F. And that's it for me. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Cheryl. I think that's useful again for those who were not necessarily following all of the detail at Istanbul to be brought up to speed with where we are.

E is of course the review of (SAC) 69 and that will now be rolled into the work of the red team which cross checks the proposal against key requirements as a form of stress testing, and so I will move us onto then an update from Alan Greenberg. Well I don't see Alan on the call regarding Design Team F. Is anyone - is Alan - am I missing Alan, and/or is anyone else able to give any input as to the status or position of Design Team F? Bernie, go ahead.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you, sir. We completed a detailed recommendation for the scoping document of F yesterday, and we have our members, so I believe that once we get approval for F, we'll be ready to get underway. I spoke with Alan yesterday and he is hoping to get underway as soon as we get the authorization and have some deliverables for the due date of the 10th. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Bernie. Next priority one design team I think is L, if I've done the list justice. So I don't know if there's anything. We did have reasonable discussion of this in Istanbul. I don't know if there's anything to update or require any input from the group on in relation to Design Team L.

Matthew Shears, go ahead, Matthew.

Matthew Shears: Thanks, Jonathan. I don't have a particular update but just to say we have a new member, Graeme Bunton from Tucows has joined the group, and we also spent last - on the Friday of that week, we spent a good amount of time with (David Conrad), which has helped us immensely in terms of taking the work

forward. But I'm afraid I can't really give you more than that and give an update unless one of the team members has (unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Matthew. Bernie, if I could ask you to take your hand down, and then I'll go to Christopher Wilkinson. Christopher?

Christopher Wilkinson: Hi, good morning, good afternoon. Just to mention that Design Team L has taken a very narrow interpretation of their mandate, or our mandate. I have had and still have significant reservations about the feasibility of the kind of separation mechanism that we're discussing, but in its wisdom the design team has decided to reject all the comments and drafting that I've offered to the document. These considerations would clearly still be relevant but I think we should all recognize that this is a design team designing a separation mechanism. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: I'm watching the hands. Thanks, Christopher. We discussed this a little in Istanbul. I'm not sure if you had the opportunity to participate, but it certainly came up to some extent. Go ahead if you'd like to respond to that.

Paul Kane: May I take two minutes just to respond to Christopher?

Jonathan Robinson: Paul, go ahead.

Paul Kane: Thank you, Christopher. I'm afraid, sir, I'm not familiar with the submissions you raised and I'm not on that working group, but just by means of a two-second update with the work that was done in Istanbul, we received a very interesting presentation from the retained lawyers, who fundamentally suggested that it is possible to have an affiliated company or a subsidiary company of ICANN corporate that could potentially act as effectively the steward that would enable in the event of certain criteria being met, the

escalation process being fulfilled and still no resolution, were effectively the stewardship role to start a mechanism of separation, more or less on a predefined basis.

So I'm not aware of the comments you raised, but the issue of separation -- I sincerely hope it's not necessary -- but the issue of separation is being dealt with by the group as a whole. I hope that belays any concerns you have.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Paul. Matthew?

Matthew Shears: Yes thanks, Jonathan. I think that this is, you know, what - I think that in a sense (Christopher) is absolutely right of course that we have taken a very narrow and technical focus in terms of this particular design team, but from the perspective of most of the participants in the design team, that was very deliberate.

This is about looking at a transition plan that exists in the current contract and ensure that it's fit for purpose in the new situation going forward post transition. It is effectively, and I think as we discussed in Istanbul, largely, if you will, a kind of disaster transition plan if something horrible were to happen that meant that the contract would have to be moved to another operator. So it's more about that continuity of service rather than a separation plan, as we have been talking about in terms of internal/external models, et cetera. So hopefully that helps a little bit.

Jonathan Robinson: It certainly helps me, Matthew. Thank you. And just to make a point and just ever sensitive to the extent to which our work is being watched and how certain terms can be used or not, the sort of contemporary -- which you touched in -- the contemporary terminology that I'm aware of that sort of

replaced the concept of disaster recovery was a more euphemistic but equally accurate business continuity phrase.

And I think that's what -- and you touched on it, you used the word continuity -- and I think that's right. This is about in the event that for whatever reason a form of transition is required, that there is a formal separation of transition, an additional transition is required, it has at least been talked about and that the business continuity aspect had been dealt with in line with what is in place to date.

Go ahead, Jaap.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes, I want to join Matthew here as well. It is - what the work group really looks at the item mechanics of what do you need to do if you have ask for the operations. Whether or not this is happening because of separation of that account or whatever, that is not really the subject of this design team, and it just about the mechanic. And it might be that the - that it's not necessary to do that at all, but I mean at least the plan is there. And it's to look at what current plan is just in case IANA needs to move, it has to transfer the operation to somewhere else.

And the nature of the comments (Christopher) made had to do whether or not the separation is good enough or we need the visible details why to separate. But that's not really the task to come in this society. It has been from the beginning been about the mechanics, the movements you have to make, not about the why it should be separated.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Jaap. I'm mindful of the requirement to review and be very functional about the purpose of this call and make sure we cover the other

issues from the design teams but also cognizant that Avri's hand has gone up.
So Avri go ahead and then I'll move us on to design team (N).

Avri Doria: Yes this is Avri speaking. Just a quick question and I think I do understand.
So this basically is a plan that even organizationally everything's saying the same but Washington, D.C. fell into a sinkhole how we would reestablish in some other, the physical plant and connections in some other locations, correct? I'm not part of it. I'm just trying to make sure I understand the difference and that this is really staying structurally everything the same but the building fell down.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Okay go ahead Jaap. You go ahead.

Jaap Akkerhuis: That might be one of the reasons. Why the operation has to change is not really part of the subject. It's just how do we do that if you moved back office from (Bonn) or (unintelligible). That's basically it.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Jaap. So it's the requirement that needs to be fulfilled independent of the overarching scenario. It's looking through at what detail needs to be covered up.

Let me move on to Design Team (M) and see if there is any update, question or issues arising out of the work of design team (M).

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan. This is Chuck. Let me just say that I think we're making good progress. We have a lot of work to do but we're still targeting completion by the 10th.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck. Jaap I think that's an old hand so I won't - unless you tell me otherwise that's okay.

So Design Team N - N for November - any comment, question, or required input there?

Avri Doria: Hi this is Avri. I don't think so. We were - or I was - you know, woken up from a few days' slumber from (DTEN) and we got back into it yesterday. We're still working to the same plan we had and hoping to make it by the 10th.

Jonathan Robinson: Great, thank you Avri. That's good to hear. I think we might be circling back to Chuck as we go on to the work of Design Team O.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks again Jonathan. Chuck speaking and I'm optimistic that Design Team O, even though we haven't existed very long, will be ready by the 10th.

Jonathan Robinson: Good to hear, thank you. So I suspect there's not much to be said about the red team work. We covered work was required there, but I see a couple of hands have shot up. So go ahead first of all Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Jonathan. Greg Shatan. I'm not sure if this applies physically to the red team, but just as I was listening it occurs to me I'm not quite sure where one aspect of our work is being covered, which is the way of escalation and ultimately separation.

In other words, what are the triggers that causes an escalation mechanism to be taken up? And what causes ultimately separation to be viable or to be taken up after all prior escalations have failed?

It looks to me like both the escalation separation teams are dealing with mechanics or mechanisms but not with the triggering events. And I'm not sure that to the extent that this serves, that SLEs are a trigger, I'm not sure that the DTA is dealing with, you know, what the triggers would be or not. And I don't think SLEs would necessarily be the only trigger.

So the shorter question is where are we dealing with the why of escalation and separation? What are the triggers?

Jonathan Robinson: Well my short answer certainly I wouldn't expect that to be part of Design Team A, but Paul your hand went up, so (unintelligible) on that or other...

Paul Kane: As we're all familiar with, standard SLEs specify normal operation, what happened in the event of a breach. As discussed in Istanbul, the concept of having financial penalties for breach is not really applicable. And so what we're thinking of are merit points and demerit points for service.

The quick answer is the SLE can describe the service level expected. And one can accumulate points both good and bad points which might cancel each other out.

But at the end of the day we envisage handing the matter over to the CSC as part of the escalation. And that's why I've just recently joined (M) to make sure there's joined up thinking. But the bottom line is it's not in my mind within the purview of the SLE group, Group A, to determine at what point separation or whatever happens.

All we can do is give metrics under which the CSC may determine, having gone through all the escalation parts, that something happened. So we can

give a measure that would assist and justify but we can't - I don't think it would be appropriate for A to do much else.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Paul. Lise did you want to comment at this point?

Lise Fuhr: Well I didn't want to comment on this point but I have a comment to it, having listened to Greg here. I think part of the triggers need to be solved after the legal counsel of how we have the actual model of the stewardship. So I think it's a thing that we need to revisit after we have had the discussions with our legal advisors.

And I had another point. I can wait with that to after this discussion, so go ahead with this and I'll raise my hand again.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Lise. Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes hi, thanks. Avri speaking. Actually I was very taken by Greg's point because one of the things we've talked in general -- and (unintelligible) I think also talked to Lise's point -- in some sense we're working (unintelligible) with varieties of internal model now and all of those internal models will need some sort of enduring bylaw.

And that enduring bylaw will need some sort of trigger or something to catch. It might be a reasonable exercise perhaps for some not yet existing design team - and it may be two, not one - to actually start figuring out, you know, what that bylaw could look like.

And, you know, even though the notion of enduring by laws is not ours but is the CCWG's, but, you know, what that would look like, and start having at least the first (unintelligible) because we may not have a whole lot of time to

do deep thinking on the how you get from the CSC saying something has to be done or some other trigger event to actually triggering a bylaw mechanism.

But the notion of internal solution almost always requires a bylaw to effect that final separation. So it might be working on sooner but of course defer to, you know, the fact that you can't nail it down until you've got the legal and the finalization of the path taken. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Let me just make sure I understand before going back to Greg where I think we're going. I mean it seems to me like we've got for example in roots that might get us to a point. And that will be a certain point of escalation, perhaps in Design Team M or a certain part of point of frustration. And I mean that in a technical sense rather than in an emotional sense for the CSC for example.

And those points will then need to invoke a switch, a step, a trigger, at the final stage of their process at which point it triggers the need for some form of separation at the end of the path.

The concern I have with it, I feel this is an important point but potentially premature subject to at least a one third iteration of input from IDLI. So that's my sense of things. But Greg, come back.

Greg Shatan: Thanks Jonathan. Greg Shatan again. I don't think this is really a legal issue. It's really a factual issue. It's a question of what are the occurrences, as you say, the frustrations, or the demerits or other negative events occurring that would trigger escalations and ultimately separation.

These triggers can be designated by us. There are no particular legal requirements that I'm aware of, and I do a lot of technology transactions work

that are kind of designated as a matter of law. So it's really a question of, you know, what do the customers or the community consider to be the negative events or failures to act that trigger escalations and ultimately separation, not to...

So in a sense I think it does overarch several of the teams that are dealing with mechanics. But we're not dealing with what allows those mechanics to be invoked. So, you know, (DTA) is covering it to an extent that, you know, certain level of demerits, you know, could trigger at least a referral to CSC or CSC taking up an issue. But that's only one aspect.

Typically you might find a list in a contract where there are escalation and breach mechanisms. You may find a list that could be anywhere from 2 or 3 to 15 or 20. The list can sometimes be very broad or it can be very specific. Not an issue in this case, but say failure of payment or failure to submit a required report.

So while, you know, ultimately there is, you know, I'm sure Sidley could be - you know, give some valued input. I really think this is more something where they would need to vet what we think are the right kinds of factual triggers.

I can see that this might be better done when we have the mechanisms laid out so it's not necessarily something that's overdue. But I think it's something that should be designated as a design team subject matter and we should think about how to - and who to write up a template or a proposal for it. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Greg, point well taken. I'm mindful of the time. It's a point you've made. I would just encourage anyone else - from my perspective it feels like there's other preparatory work to be done to see how big this gap is that needs filling.

So I'd encourage anyone else in the queue to either make a brief point or if you're satisfied that this is adequately raised go ahead. And then we will switch over to dealing with the remainder of the agenda. So go ahead
Stephane.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you Jonathan. Well this might turn out to a very long discussion so I'll try to keep it very brief. But you do have a point Greg. And I hope we've made it clear, or if we didn't we will in the next written proposal from the CSC or Design Team C. What would triggers an escalation process is maybe not actually the problem.

As discussed in our proposal this last week, CSC will be a starting point to trigger an escalation. They must be in some cases and defined as mainly reasons for triggering an escalation process that might be contained as definable so to say, to be closed and able to control.

So the idea of composition or institution or the (sign) of the CSC is in that matter to have a very controlled and foreseeable process of starting escalation process. And this combined with written instructions for the CSC is mandated to do what it is not mandated to do is the general idea for how escalation process will work. But I'm not sure if I answered your question right but that is at least a start. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Staffan. We have to - we're going to need to extend the call by a few minutes to cover up the remaining issues but I am conscious that we've given people the time that we need to try and work too. Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. One of the Design Team M's issues is if problems cannot be solved, how and to whom should they be escalated? So we certainly

can't go any further until we get the results of (M). So, you know, that's a given.

At some point it's clear it's going to be shifted over to the accountability side because actual decisions to separate are going to have to be forced by the community and that's an accountability issue and will have to be built into the bylaws as someone said.

There's probably some in-between ground of other issues. Separability could be triggered because ICANN simply decides it doesn't want to do this anymore and needs to divest itself of it. So, you know, there are multiple triggers.

But until we have the legal advice on the accountability issues, until we have (M) locked in, I don't think it's our work right now to decide exactly what the mechanism is, do we need another design team, and what's it called until we have those small details which are not details. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Alan. I'll just remind you and everyone else that separation can have various forms. It needn't necessarily be - I mean divest implies a quite substantial separation. It may be that we're talking about the use of one or more outsource providers (unintelligible).

Alan Greenberg: Noted. I was just giving a range of things that are outside of our list right now.

Jonathan Robinson: Right. Thanks Alan. And I need to note my own point, which is to move us through the agenda and try and complete the work of this call at least. So I think this is a point well-made and raised by Greg but it's the size of the GAC is not yet fully evident, pending further work.

So we have a draft proposal in work. We have a work in progress, which is Item 3. The schedule moving forward envisages us capturing all of the output from the design teams by the end of the day on the 10th April. It involves a short time to digest that over the weekend and then to process that with a hard couple of days' work on the Monday and Tuesday 13th and 14th of April.

So that is the plan. And on the back of that then to consolidate that all into the draft in preparation for publication for public comment.

As part of this, which is what Item 3B seeks to flag, it is critical that members of this group, members of the CWG - and you know who you are - all need to make sure that their groups whom they represent, unless something stops the participants doing it, it is the direct responsibility of the members to ensure that groups are fully informed and apprised of the work of the group such that in particular the charting organizations but in general the community as a whole is properly and fully informed of the work and the thought and the effort that's gone into some of this because we won't be able to afford to loop back on topics where we've done significant work and keep going through them.

At some point we'll have to move forward. So I'm going to - please do feel free to raise your hand but I am mindful of the time and I'm going to nudge us through.

So in a sense, Item 4, the communication materials from XPLANE are designed to assist with doing and undertaking the work of Point 3B. So let me call if there are any questions or comments in and around the drive to produce a draft proposal, the need to communicate and work with member groups, and the supporting material prepared by XPLANE.

And I'll admit here I haven't gone through that in any detail. I've skimmed over the material from XPLANE. I think it could be useful if I was to have to present to a group. It would be useful as an aide-mémoire to pick key points from it. I think that is how it is intended.

Doesn't absolutely factual account of all of the detail, but it's a useful basis to have graphical talking points. Any thoughts, questions or points in and around Items 3A, 3B, and 4 on the agenda?

Thank you for your point in the comment. I think that's a very good point. I think a summary schedule would be useful so if we could capture that staff as an action to publish a summary schedule with key dates and points, especially in the run-up to the public comment but also we could cover our highlights as they currently stand right up until Buenos Aires I would think.

Grace Abuhamad: Hey Jonathan this is Grace.

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead Grace.

Grace Abuhamad: So I just wanted to note that we'll be sending out calendar invites for all the upcoming calls very shortly. We just wanted to make sure that we had looked at a comprehensive schedule. And I'll circulate one to the list before we do that. Is it okay to just do a quick update on the XPLANE graphics at this time?

Jonathan Robinson: Please do Grace. Go ahead.

Grace Abuhamad: Okay so I just wanted to let everyone know that there are essentially three XPLANE documents that we're circulating. The first is on the screen right now. It's a handout, and you received this handout before the face-to-face

meeting on Wednesday. And then there was a printout for those who were in the room on Thursday.

And what we've done with this handout is since the meeting we've updated a few things and added a cover page. So this new version that you're seeing on the screen right now was circulated to me last night. And I'll make sure to get to the list today.

In addition to this document, there are two other documents - one that summarizes a day one design team discussion. And sort of it's a visualization of the discussions. It's not meant to be a summary per se but it's just to give everyone an idea of what was discussed and how the discussions kind of took place. So that's - day one is design teams.

And then the day two document looks at the different, the discussions around the models and how the group narrowed down from seven to three - or to two - three, four, then two then one, etcetera.

And so there's also a sort of a visualization of the pros and cons discussion and I think that's meant to help the group with sort of tracking how that conversation went. The handout for day two was based on the notes that were taken live in the Adobe Connect room during the meeting with the PowerPoint.

So I've circulated day one and day two handouts to the list. I circulated those yesterday or early this morning if you're in European time. And I'd like to receive any comments that the group has any reviews you can do that on the list. I just would like to know so that the sooner we get the comments in the sooner we can kind of circulate a more formalized package to the community.

Right now these are just on the Wiki and they're on the mailing list so they're not - you know, they're still in the public domain but they haven't been finalized. So thank you. That's all. I just wanted to make sure everyone knew that we're looking for comments.

Woman: Okay.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Grace. I will reiterate that. Anyone who is able to provide input on these documents it would be helpful. I would think - my suggestion is that - and it's consistent with what Chuck has put in the chat, is that the first two documents are really for the use of "experts."

In other words they're very familiar with the work of the group and they provide in that sense expert material to be discussed and shared with very interested parties.

The third document which you've just put up now is particularly useful and has a capacity to stand alone. So my suggestion to you is that we leave them on the Wiki as is and circulate very broadly the final document but not necessarily the initial two because they are almost sketch and incomplete or just - they're not - they don't have a stand-alone capability.

In my view they need to be used in the hands of those who are specialists in the work of the group. So that would be my suggestion as to how to use these materials.

Yes, and it seems that there are others in the group. It's not that they are - they should be private to the group but used in the hands of members of the group. And then the third one has more of a stand-alone capability. Great. And it seems that they were useful at least in the ALAC update to that group.

All right, let's move on then into any other business. I have a couple of items I'd like to mention but I will pause to see if others do first. So let's open up AOB and try and wrap this up in the next four or five minutes. Okay, we're on our way to - okay Lise your hand is up. Go ahead.

Lise Fuhr: Sorry, I just had to get off mute. I have an issue about the principles because I will send out the principles as (Martin) has almost finished on the list and we will conclude those on Friday the 10th if there's no other objections to the text that's in the principle.

So I think it's important that you have a look at these and it seems that everyone has agreed on the issue, so don't re-open new issues. But we will send out the principles as we think they are almost completed for a final conclusion by the group, thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Lise. A couple of other points I wanted to make is Lise and I met with the - well one of the co-chairs of the CCWG - and exchanged an update there this morning on issues in and around timeline and closeness of working and particularly effective coordination in and around legal advice.

And to that extent it's good to hear that they will be leaning heavily on Sidley notwithstanding the fact that they have two law firms working with them. So that's useful.

Certainly they would like as much guidance as possible. And I think it's incumbent on us to come back to them with further guidance on, you know, the conditionality of our work on Work Stream 1.

In addition, there is - oh there's one other point I wanted to make. It's something that's come up in the CCWG where they have been asked to input into an organization called the GAO. And there's been some discussion on the list about that.

In fact Lise and I were asked to give input into the GAO. They've apparently been talking very widely to various members and they interviewed us about our work in the group. I think it's an oversight that we neglected to mention that to the group before, to the CWG before I (unintelligible).

We took it as relatively routine and gave them an update on the work of the group in response to a series of questions they had. But for the record we did receive similar requests and gave an update. So I apologize for the untimely nature of that communication and that that did take place. I can give you the exact date if it's required. Lise your hand is up?

Lise Fuhr: Yes I just saw in the chat that (Christopher) asked about the other design teams. And what I think we will do (Christopher) is Jonathan and I will have a look at the priority two design teams and assess if they're necessary for the transition or not and if other groups are working on those.

So we will do an assessment and get back to the group regarding these. But at the moment we find that it's a lot of work with the priority one design teams and these need to be completed first. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. I think that's it. Just to remind you that we will meet with the - the plan committee will meet with Sidley and seek an update and then the group will be updated accordingly and make sure we've got a clear understanding or that they come back to us on their understanding of the group's instructions coming out of Istanbul, understand their time scales.

And in particular from my point of view I think we should also be ensuring that they articulate and we understand their understanding of the links between our work and that of the CCWG on accountability.

So I think that that wraps things up. Unless there are any other hands that come up within the next few seconds I'll take it that we've covered the work that we needed for now. Obviously there's lots of work going on in the design teams and it probably remains to thank you for that and keep up the good work.

All right, thank you everyone. We'll be in touch on the list and our meeting on Tuesday next week. Thanks a lot.

END