

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
April 2, 2015
10:00 am CT**

Coordinator: Your recording has been started. Speakers you may now begin.

Chuck Gomes: Good morning everyone or good afternoon or evening wherever you are. This is my third meeting today. This is Chuck Gomes. This is the Design Team Meeting for the second of April. Welcome to each of you.

It looks like we have Berry and Avri and Marilia and Staffan - Staffan we are glad you can join us today. Hopefully we will be able to pick up from what you missed on - or earlier in the week, when we met so thanks again everyone for joining.

We have a 90 minute meeting scheduled and we have a lot of progress. Berry, can you put up the agenda - did you see the agenda that I just sent really late?

Berry Cobb: Let me...

Chuck Gomes: If you could put that up in the right there. Did you see that?

Berry Cobb: I am getting my email now.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, if you can put that up on the right. I - let me ask while he is doing that has anyone - has everyone seen the document that Marika distributed? It is the one that is on the screen in Adobe right now. Did everyone receive that? You may find it helpful to have that on your screen or a printed copy or whatever is - you are most comfortable with but we will be having - that is where we are going to spend most of our time today but was wanting to make sure everybody received that.

I would like to if possible for the first thing on the screen and we are going to come back to this escalation mechanism's document which is the Drafting Team M proposal but I would like us to take a look at the scoping document, in particular the list of six questions that were in the scoping document if it is possible to put that on the screen first focusing on the issues section and the questions - I would appreciate that.

Okay, so the - let's take a look at the agenda hope - is there anybody that is not an Adobe Connect? Okay, good so I can just rely on the Adobe Connect for raising hands and so forth. Again, it is a small group so if you speak out instead of raising your hand it probably won't be a problem so I am not going to be real rigid on that.

The - any questions or suggest changes to the agenda? Okay, now let me ask one more question that will help me. Has anybody not have had the opportunity to look at the document that was on the screen before that Marika distributed. It will be back up on the screen like I said but has anybody not had a chance to at least quickly look over that proposal document? It would help me to know that - I will know how much time I need to give for looking at items - sounds - so speak up if you haven't looked at that yet.

Staffan Jonson: Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Staffan Jonson: This is Staffan.

Chuck Gomes: Yes Staffan.

Staffan Jonson: I have difficulties in hearing you at all so you were saying please. No I was - I had difficulties.

Chuck Gomes: Can you hear now?

Staffan Jonson: Yes, that is better - thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay, good, all right, sorry about that. So can I assume that everyone - is anybody not looked at that proposal document that Marika distributed? Everybody has - good that is kind of nice to know so I won't - I don't - I can assume that.

So what I want to do is look at these seven questions very briefly. The first one, what can an individual registry operator do if the - oh, I know what is happening here, I am sorry I didn't mute my speakers but they were on zero anyway so I guess that doesn't matter. Okay, I was getting a little bit of an echo.

So the first question is - "What can an individual registry operator do if IANA services is not provided in a timely or satisfactory manner?" I think we are covering that in what will be Annex Y of the proposal document and we will come back to that later so I think we are on target for that question.

Question B - "What can be done if there are multiple instances of untimely and/or satisfactory in our naming services?" I think that is covered in Annex Z which will be the problem escalation procedure that we talked about in our first meeting.

And then Question C - "What role, if any can existing registry organizations play?" That one we haven't talked about so all I want to do today is flag that. That is something we are going to have to come back to before we complete our proposal.

And then Question D - "What role should the CSC play?" I think we have got that covered and the way it stands right now that is included in all three of the annexes. There is some role for the CSC.

Question D, what - excuse me E - "If IANA naming services problems cannot be resolved at the CSC level how do we - how should we handle the - how should it be escalated?" and that is in Annex Z, the problem management one.

And then finally, "What role, if any do the SO's and AC's have in escalating services?" I think that is one we are going to have to come back to. I don't - we haven't dealt with that yet.

So I just wanted everybody to see that. Those - so two of the - I think all four out of the six questions we are covering already but there are two that we will have to come back to later I believe - Staffan go ahead.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you, yes. In question C and F they both kind of presuppose that this is taken within the ICANN's (unintelligible). In C for example it is assumed that the ICANN ccNSO or the register stakeholder group should have escalating

and in F other (unintelligible) and AC's but there is, however, especially in (CCLAN) the need for individual CC's standing outside all (unintelligible) ICANN. They also need an escalation part to go so we need to include them and that is all because if we don't we will have their views on this directly I think. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Totally agree Staffan thank you and we will need to deal with that when we get to those questions and of course the CSC Team - Draft Design Team C will have to deal with the composition of the CSC in that regard as well and depending on what role we go but yes, you are absolutely right and it is a very important that we don't forget that.

And even in some of our escalation procedures we are - like for example where we throw in the (unintelligible) and then - and we talked about this in our last meeting that you weren't able to attend - I - maybe you were able to attend that one, excuse me I am mixing up another design - I may be mixing up another design team I involved in but regardless, yes we have got to deal with that and certainly there always has to be - we always have to consider those that are not part of the ICANN world.

Okay so I don't think we need to spend any more time on the scoping document so if we can go bring back up the proposal document. Thank you very much - Berry, are you the one doing all of this for me or is it Brenda? Thanks Berry, okay - I appreciate you doing that.

The - so what you have in front of you right now, the first page of this document is the short form of the proposal and I think as all of you understand the short form will be fairly brief for all of the input we put in there, although we have a lot of input that goes in there from a lot of design teams and other information as well - any questions or comments on this short form? Is it safe

to assume - I will - unless you comment I will assume that this is okay for now. Obviously we can come back and change it later but this would be the short form of the proposal. If not, and then what follows then are of course the three annexes that are in significant detail.

So let's go then and let's go down to - in fact I think it is probably good if we give everybody the scrolling capability on their own. We want to go now to Annex X which is the root zone emergency process. Now in our call on earlier in the week we didn't have this detail, okay, and for Staffan's benefit I should introduce Marilia who is from the IANA team and she is on the call with us and she provided this detail. Now there has been some edits that I will talk about in a minute but let me go ahead and give Staffan the mike.

Staffan Jonson: Sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead.

Staffan Jonson: Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Staffan Jonson: May I - I have difficulties in hearing you. Could you please talk closer to the mike - I guess it is in your side. I am not sure of course but you are disappearing in sounds.

Chuck Gomes: I am not sure what is happening. I will try and talk louder but I am...

Staffan Jonson: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: ..talking directly into my mike.

Staffan Jonson: Okay thank you. So on a second I do like these pictures so there might be some need for a minor revision of them since - for example on the first line it says TLD contact called etc. etc. and the third bullet point it says "Call ICANN during business hour," and this would - I guess in order to make a point it should say "Call IANA functions operator during business hours," etc. so.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, let me talk about those things Staffan.

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: Because first of all you are absolutely right on those changes and Marika and I agreed on those changes but because the flow chart is in a document that is not is not easily editable a lot of the changes we are talking about haven't been made so let me very quickly go over.

Notice in the introductory paragraph there that the changes you are talking about have been proposed, okay have been made and also one with regard to Verisign okay - instead of say - naming Verisign I think it should say root zone maintainer, okay.

Staffan Jonson: Mm-hmm, yes.

Chuck Gomes: Instead of Verisign in case sometime in the future that changes. So we are totally on board with what you are suggesting there. Now when we get into the flowchart itself notice the yellow note that Marika put in there that terminology needs to be updated for IANA and Verisign and so forth and root zone maintainer.

Now one of the things and you will see a comment that I put in there that we have to - we are going to have to agree on some terminology because you will see in the table that RZM is there. I think that is (unintelligible) and Marilia I am going to ask you to confirm that - that RZM the way it is issued in the table means root zone manager. Is that right Marilia?

Marilia Hirano: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay good, that is what I thought and so we are going to have to be careful because sometimes root zone, RZM means root zone maintainer or at least some of us have used it that way so I think we have to avoid using RZM for root zone maintainer to minimize confusion and my suggestion and I am open to others is that we would just call it maintainer or something like that unless somebody has a better idea - Staffan go ahead. Is that an old hand?

Staffan Jonson: Yes, that is an old hand sorry.

Chuck Gomes: Oh okay good. Okay so any questions about the first, the introductory paragraph with the edits that are there?

So now then looking - starting to look at the flowchart itself I think it is pretty self-explanatory and I think it is organized very well so my complements Marilia to the IANA team for that.

Now I do want to explain something in case Marilia didn't get a chance to talk with Marika on this. The reason that we want to change where it says ICANN to the - to IANA is in - did you and Marika talk about that or will it be helpful for me to talk about that a little bit?

Marilia Hirano: No you go ahead and talk about it and let me see what you and Marika discussed...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Marilia Hirano: ...to see if they are the same.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, because I know that Elisa wanted to leave it at ICANN. The reason we don't want to do that in the CWG is because we are trying to make this generic independent of who the root zone manager is and - or the IANA functions operator as we refer to it in the CWG and that isn't because we don't think that ICANN will be the operator. In fact the plan is that ICANN would be the operator at the start - at the beginning after transition happens and the expectation is - is that ICANN would always be the operator but the total proposal of the CWG will allow for the possibility of separating that from ICANN at some future date based on certain criteria or even the wish that ICANN no longer wants to perform that.

So that is why we would rather see - replace the ICANN name with IANA in this flowchart and in the process itself. Does that make sense Marilia?

Marilia Hirano: Yes it makes the - if you are talking about calling it IANA, the IANA functions operator instead of ICANN - I think that was the suggestion that Elisa had made yesterday to Marika and the reason is IANA, a lot of people think that the way it is being - if you just say IANA root zone or the IANA emergency escalation procedure it may - it could make people understand as IANA as being a separate entity from ICANN and there is an organization called IANA where a department within ICANN and that is the reason why Elisa suggested to use IANA functions operator if - because she understands where you are coming from with the ICANN - using ICANN so if we can

switch from ICANN to the IANA functions operator she was completely fine with it - she suggested that.

Chuck Gomes: We can do that but I want you to keep in mind and if Elisa needs to talk about this further I am happy to talk to her on that but you can probably explain it sufficiently that what we are preparing here is a proposal for what things will look like after the transition happens, okay. So and IANA functions operator works fine in there, okay. Once the proposal is submitted and approved then it could be - I am not suggesting this will happen but it could be that the IANA would be a separate organization, for example a subsidiary or affiliate of ICANN but we don't need to worry about those things for what we are doing in this proposal. That will happen depending on what the final proposal is and whether it is approved by NTIA and then implemented.

So if - I have no problem changing and I don't - and if anybody else does please speak, up, changing ICANN in the flowchart to IFO. We are going to have to define what IFO is because I don't think, we want to put in a flowchart that needs to be fairly concise - we don't want to put the full word, full name IANA functions operator in there everywhere that ICANN appears.

So now let me ask you a practical question Marilia do you guys - is this flowchart something that Berry can change or Marika can change, edit or is that something we have to ask you guys to change for us?

Marilia Hirano: I have to check with - I believe it was - I am going to check with (Leo) if he has the original because he was part of the IANA team when this was submitted for proposal.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Marilia Hirano: When the proposal was submitted so I have to check if he still has the original to edit because this is the one that was taken from the PDF that is on the NTA website.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Marilia Hirano: I will check with him and I will talk - I will update Marika to see if him or if he knows who has the original flowchart.

Chuck Gomes: Okay I would appreciate you doing that so that - and if we can get the original so that we can make the edits ourselves and not have to ask you guys to do it that would be I think the preferred approach but if for some reason we can't then we are going to have to rely on you or someone on the IANA team to make the edits for us so if you could that - that would be much appreciated.

Marilia Hirano: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: And understanding that regardless of the - well let me pause a minute and ask this question. Does anybody see a problem with using IANA functions operator, IFO in place of ICANN in the flowchart? Nobody does, okay, then again Marilia if you can get us the software that this was done on as soon as possible then the ICANN staff that is supporting us can make the changes that need to be made. If not, if you could change all of the ICANN's to IFO and change Verisign to Maintainer in this diagram and get us a revised copy that would be fine.

I am hoping that you can get us the software and we don't - you don't have to have that responsibility. Not that I don't trust you to do it, I just don't - I am sure you are busy enough as it is so that would be very much appreciated.

Now on the emergency process, the flowchart itself does anyone have any comments on it with understanding that the edits will be made? So on the emergency process as it is then it would - we are not proposing making any changes to that and is it - is anybody not comfortable with that?

Okay, then going down you can see the next part of the - of Annex X just defines each of the elements in the flowchart - that is all that this next part does. Now again there are some edits that are needed in this, same kind of edits for ICANN, for Verisign of - and so forth and in some cases like if you look at step six, the description where it says "The call center has the emergency roster of ICANN's IANA functions staff."

Obviously we don't want to press - replace - we can leave - we can just remove ICANN's or the - we can - and just leave it as IANA but it sounds like Elisa would rather not have IANA in there in which case we can just make it the IFO's Function Staff okay, so I think the edits that need to be made are fairly straightforward so that is what all of those are - any questions or comments on the descriptions? I went over them in detail and they seem to be okay. Paul, glad you joined us - go ahead.

Paul Kane: Thank you very much Chuck. Apologies for just joining and I have listened to your last call and I am just trying to come up to speed quite rapidly. The - I can't comment on any substance because I am more in listening mode.

With respect to emergencies you have just touched on following existing procedures. We don't know or I don't know what the existing procedures are but I am looking at the document and it seems to have a very prescriptive and may be helpful if I could read it approach because I love prescription. What isn't clear is how long emergency procedures take. I am sort of speaking in two capacities, one as the need on the SLE group but also the second one is as

a CC registry manager who has never had cause to use an emergency procedure but it would be good for the TLD community both C's and G's to know prescriptively what is there and how long each step should take so they can reassure customers in the event of there being a crisis, you know, normal service will be resumed within - we understood from (David Conrad) four hours is the window but it would be could if we could have a prescriptive approach.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, Paul. Chuck again and let me let Marilia respond to that. Since you listened to the last call you know that she is on the IANA team and she has been kind enough to join our calls so that we have someone on the calls - Marilia could you respond to that?

Marilia Hirano: Sure it is very difficult to be prescriptive on the time. We have tried for hours and as David said four hours is usually - that it could be the case but as in emergencies it depends on what is going on. It also depends if we - when we resolve the emergency, when we start working on it we work with Verisign and NTIA so it depends on how long things take on their end as well. So that is - it is difficult to define an exact time because it is - depending on - it is a case - it is on a case by case basis so we do strive for - to resolve it within hours and not based...

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Marilia now I want to give you one bit of information that you may not have. The - when NTIA transitions out as it stands right now the CWG is going to recommend that authorization function that NTIA performs disappears. It won't be there anymore okay and there is another draft design team that is doing some work on some of that stuff but I just wanted to give you a heads up on that.

But we will still have the communication that is needed between the root zone maintainer and the IANA service functions operator so that is just information to you be aware of in terms of what it looks like where the proposal may end up, the final proposal.

So Marilia let me ask you a question. This doesn't really relate to this design team per se but it - to one that Paul is leading actually. Design Team A is working on service level expectations. What if - I mean if the CWG came back with a service level expectation of four hours for the emergency procedures - is that a - too high a level of - can you even comment on that?

Marilia Hirano: I can't - from what I have discussed with Kim and I think Kim is talking to the design team - it is A- right, I get - I get them...

Chuck Gomes: Yes, it is Design Team A, yes.

Marilia Hirano: Yes and I think he is involved in that. He would be the best person to go to for that question because he is the one who is involved in solving the emergencies with Verisign and NTIA right now so he probably has more background on the types of emergencies that we have gotten recently and the timeframe it took to resolve them.

From my understanding speaking with him yesterday we do - and with (Niala) who is the manager of the IANA customer service here, we do strive and most of the emergencies are able to be resolved within hours. Now if it is four or more that is a question that was an iffy one because it depends on the situation and if we set ourselves for four and we have a very serious emergency or there is issues - the customer can't provide the information that we need to fix the issue or, you know, it depends on a multitude of things and parties to resolve.

Chuck Gomes: We understand that so - and it is not this design team's task to set - to recommend SLE's so we are not going to cover that further on this call but Paul...

Paul Kane: Just, if I may.

Chuck Gomes: ...we will just work that with (Kim) and that particular thing okay which...

Paul Kane: I just wanted to...

Chuck Gomes: ...I know you were already doing so that is fine.

Paul Kane: If I may?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, you may, go ahead.

Paul Kane: So just to reassure everyone and I am not prescribing specific times at this juncture and I think you have just highlighted one area and I don't want to mix the two. What would be helpful for all parties concerned is to know what steps an emergency procedure would take and that means it is helpful to IANA staff, it is helpful to the registry operator to know this is what is going to be expected of me when I hit the emergency button and I sincerely hope and based on the limited information we have been able to glean there have not been that many emergency scenarios fortunately. So it is really just to prescribe the emergency steps and then we can define a reasonable expectation as to what - when things should happen, obviously excluding times for the registry manager to come back but that is - I am mixing the two groups.

From this group, the escalation group it would be good if everything is prescribed along the lines that you are already starting looking at your workflow which is very helpful - that is - it is really good so that is what I am after if that is possible.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Paul much appreciated. So back to this - again I don't think we need to go through the steps in detail. Is anybody not comfortable, do you think there is anything else we need to do with this part of the emergency escalation process?

Okay, very good so I think we are okay on that and excuse me while I flip through some things here and make sure that I cover everything. Okay, so then we go to Annex Y, okay, which is what we really worked on a lot in our meeting the other day and it is basically divided into two steps now. So this looks a little bit different than what we talked about the other day because of the feedback we were able to get from Marilia and the IANA team and so we probably need to talk about this a little bit - in a little bit more detail.

Now in terms of format we may want to adjust the format somewhat and we can talk about that today so that we go ahead and get this closer to finalization but basically what this does is it kind of combines the processes we were talking about for escalation in Istanbul with the existing procedures and we eliminated at least at the first part the CEO step, okay and we can talk about that. It doesn't mean it has to stay that way so but where this is at right now - step one is basically internal to the IANA functions operator and the - so we have in step one then the steps that actually happen now with the IANA functions operator with IANA as part of ICANN.

So - and those steps start off with an email as you can see right under step one there start off with an email and then if the problem can be - now am I correct

Marilia that sometimes the customer service rep may be able to close the ticket right then - is that - does that happen sometimes?

Marilia Hirano: Yes, if we receive something that they are able to respond right away, yes, then they will - mm-hmm.

Chuck Gomes: So if that doesn't happen then it is escalated to the function liaison which is (Kim) right now and if it doesn't happen there - if it is not resolved there then it - and this all happens within the - by the IANA team then they would escalate it to the program manager which is Elisa and then there is the option of forwarding it on to the ombudsman within ICANN because ICANN operates the function and that is an optional step that the operator, the registry operator, can actually initiate on its own if it wants to.

Now any - let me stop there - any questions or comments on that? Now the rest of the text there comes right from the, and I will get right to you Staffan let me finish my thought here. The rest of the text going down to step two is really from the what you can see is the process on the IANA website now with a few modifications with regard to terminology and to fit this. So let me stop there - Staffan you no longer have your hand raised - go ahead.

Staffan Jonson: Yes, thank you - well just a minor comment as something similar of what I said before that if you have a point C saying ICANN ombudsman it presupposes that it is within the ICANN and we all believe it is but just like Elisa had ideas about what it should be called it may - should be amended like other things, like the (unintelligible) indicated (unintelligible) as well. Maybe it should say IANA functions operator ombudsman or something similar so just to make a point of it again, yes.

Chuck Gomes: So Berry will capture that so we can call it IANA functions operator ombudsman or equivalent service, something like that.

Now a question for you Staffan and this is Paul you can talk to this too from a ccTLD perspective the - would the ccTLD's that are not members of the ccNSO and really don't want to have a relationship with ICANN would they have a problem using the ombudsman function? And I don't know who...

Man: That is - let's ask Paul.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead - speak up.

Man: Let's ask Paul please.

Chuck Gomes: Okay Paul.

Paul Kane: I have to say bearing in mind many cc's are not familiar at all with ICANN - I would - this is guessing, I do not know, this is ill-informed. They may have a problem with the ombudsman but I would just welcome, and I apologize again, why would something go to the ombudsmen, not the CSC - because the ombudsmen is not particularly quick at making determinations whereas the CSC will have inbuilt expertise because predominately they work closely with IANA and may be able to come up with a constructive solution to bridge the impasse.

And I want to emphasize my experience of working with IANA for, you know, 20 odd years there has never been a problem but I appreciate we are entering new territory now but I think it is a valid point. They may have problems with the ombudsman but why is the CSC not being involved because we want to get this, you know, industry driven as much as possible.

Chuck Gomes: Well first of all the CSC is involved but the idea was - the thinking was that the try and use the ombudsman as kind of a mediator to see if maybe some solution can be obtained before even escalating it to the CSC but understand this - the design team so far has, and I think the IANA looks at this the same way, looks at the ombudsmen role as an optional role.

Did I characterize that correctly Marilia? Is it optional within the IANA processes now? The way it is worded on the side it seems that way.

Marilia Hirano: Yes it is optional and that is something that we emphasize. Whenever it gets to the point that the customer, the requester says we are - I am still not satisfied we don't send a request directly to the ombudsman we go to the requester and we say okay this - these are another - this is another option you have if you want to take this further and then we guide them through the website that - for the ombudsman page that they can go to if they want to go further in it and then we stay out of it, we don't follow up on that. That is between the requester and the ombudsman if they want to go that route. It is completely optional and up to them to take that step.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Marilia that is helpful and Paul one of the things that might be helpful for us because it may depend on how we word things in this. If you could find out, get a general sense of whether the registry operators that we are talking about here that aren't a part of ICANN whether they would have a problem using the ombudsman if - on an optional basis and all I am getting at is we want to be sensitive in terms of the way we word this. We don't want to annoy people by suggesting the ombudsman but I am assuming that - and Berry maybe you can follow up on this, I am assuming that anybody can use the ombudsman if it is an issue with regard to services that ICANN is performing.

Now if at some point in the future ICANN wasn't performing it which we all know - we think - which we all think is unlikely we, you know, any new operator could develop a similar process so I think that would be easy to require upon a new operator but let's not spend a lot of time on that.

So Paul if you would just get a feel for that and it mainly just effects how we word our proposal with regard to that optional step.

Paul Kane: So I am happy to go and see what folks would do. I would just suggest in Item C, ICANN ombudsman or CSC or other - just put a placeholder in.

Chuck Gomes: Well we are going to get - we have CSC - you are going to see CSC come up in a minute...

Paul Kane: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...okay, when we scroll down. So this is - step one is pretty much internal to the IANA and plus the ombudsman there okay.

So let's jump down to step two - all that other stuff is and then you have the contact information. By the way for your information on the - everybody on this call I suggested to Lisa Fuhr one of the co-chairs of the CWG that we could remove the contacts that aren't related to the naming functions. She was inclined to leave them there. Do any of you have any thoughts on that - I mean I don't think they cause any harm.

Okay, no thoughts out there...

Staffan Jonson: No harm (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: ...yes or Staffan go ahead.

Staffan Jonson: Well let's leave them I agree. I can't see - I can't foresee all possibilities but it might be with RIR community or the standard community so they might as well stay. No problem with it.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Staffan. Okay Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes hi, if they don't hurt the design to take them out or to at least, you know, make them dim so they are not there I think anything in our proposed - in the CWG's proposals that make the RIR's or IATF think that there is work they have to do or something they have to review makes them uncomfortable.

So if we do include them there we should like dim them out or something but if it doesn't hurt to take them out I would say take them out.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, well obviously we have different viewpoints on that and I can go either way. I am kind of with Avri I think it would be better not to have them here but one of our co-chairs thought they should be there - Staffan thinks they should be there. The - that is something we can fix later. I can't imagine having those there would be a problem to the RIR's or others but you never know so let's come back to that one. That is certainly an easy fix later on as we do that.

So - but I did want to at least get the - get opinions and we have mixed views so we know that and that is something we will have to deal with down the road maybe with the broader CWG on that so.

Now if the internal steps - well before we go to step two let me ask Marilia something else. So we know that there is an overall goal of to get all of this done within four hours and there is a statement that you actually try to do it as quickly as possible so I am sure there is lots of time where it is much less than four hours but is there - I mean is there a trigger mechanism with regard to - so if the customer service rep. can't solve it, do they - is it immediately then escalated to (Kim)?

Marilia Hirano: Are you - so now you are talking about the complaints because the complaint is not within hours - a complaint...

Chuck Gomes: Oh I am sorry I forgot we had - I had moved to the complaint system. Excuse that. So, yes, the complaint. Is it immediately gone - is it immediately forwarded to (Kim) if the complaint - if the customer service rep can't resolve the complaint?

Marilia Hirano: Yes. We do...

Chuck Gomes: (Unintelligible) a timeline for that.

Marilia Hirano: Well we acknowledge that receipt of that complaint within a business day and we - the - it's two business days for them to get a response.

Even if it is - if it's from (Kim) if the customer service rep cannot address the issue then (Kim) would take it. They would send it to Kim immediately once they look at it and they say okay this is (Kim)'s territory. (Kim) can you please take this one.

And then he has two business days to respond to that issue even if it is okay. This is very - this is more complex, I will need more time but he needs to

acknowledge that and tell them that - tell the requester that he's is looking into it either address it or tell them what the steps will be to resolve it.

Chuck Gomes: And is it two days for him to respond and say hey I need more time or two days...

Marilia Hirano: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Two business days, yes.

Yes okay. So and then if and two business days he will either try to resolve it or forward it on to a lease is that right?

Marilia Hirano: Yes. Yes and sometimes it could be that he could resolve that he just himself he just needs more time so he would let them know.

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Marilia Hirano: So he would set the expectation with a request on how long it would take even if it is him resolving it.

Chuck Gomes: Yes. And let's keep in mind as I forgot a moment ago that what we're talking about here is customer service complaints. We're not talking about issues that need fast resolution?

Marilia Hirano: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Okay? And so then step - going then to step two if the issue is not resolved through those previous steps in step one then the - here is where the CSC can get involved in this?

And involving the CSC first trying to mediate the problem and then if that doesn't happen then these are the steps that we presented in Istanbul. The CSC could involve a mediator.

If we leave that in there we're probably going to have to do some work on okay who will be the mediator and how does that work and who pays for that and there's some - quite a few implementation issues if we go that route.

And then see if it's not addressed if it can't be mediated then the CSC can make a decision as to whether they think is this part of a recurring problem and or, you know, a persistent problem, a critical problem of customer service or whatever?

And then they make the decision, the CSC makes a decision as to whether or not this should be escalated to the problem management procedure which is in Annex Z.

Any questions on that? Any suggested changes for right now are we okay with this process as it looks other than some minor edits?

Okay. Do you think we should leave the - for keeping in mind that we're talking about customer service complaints, not urgent issues that need resolutions, do you think it's overkill and may be too costly to involve an external mediator?

Keep in mind we want to keep the process as cost effective as possible as well not only for the sake of the IANA service providers cost but from the complainers cost as well?

Paul Kane: So just by means of background when there were problems at the IANA mainly confusion between ICANN corporate once the IANA function operator deduces things NTIA were willing to act as I'm not going to say a mediator be just a wise counsel for all parties locking all parties in a room and having the matter addressed.

That was not an external part. I suppose you could say NTIA is external. But their wisdom was very welcome in terms of removing the confusion between ICANN corporate and IANA functions operator employed by ICANN.

Having an external party needs that party to be up to speed and familiar with the workings. And that may be a challenge in any event.

So I don't think cost should be an impediment. I think rapid resolution of the issue should be the goal.

And I want to emphasize in the last - well ten years to my knowledge there have not been many issues that have required clarification from the IANA staff and then remedies implemented by the IANA staff and in recent past even fewer still.

But that has tended to be how the industry has worked in the past. There have been people from the community who have been called upon to act as mediators rather than external parties acting as mediators.

But we have had the benefit of NTIA being the contacting party being there to offer counsel if required to break any log jams.

So I don't know. I see benefit but it all depends what the rest of CSC do, sorry CWG do.

Chuck Gomes: So I thanks Paul. So I think CSC would replace the role that NTIA plays now so they could try and facilitate understanding or solution or whatever the case may be.

So CSC replaces NTIA's role. We're adding a new step that I don't think was ever used or never intended to be used in Step B there which is the CSC could involve a were talking about I guess a professional mediator.

And so Paul you think it's okay to leave that step in there? This was a step that was proposed by the guidance paper that Chris Despain and other registries developed in that.

And we have put this in the case where it's a customer complaint, not an emergency issue. So are you supportive of leaving step 2B in there Paul?

Paul Kane: I don't want to make waves. And I see there's benefit in keeping it. But also if there is something fundamentally wrong with the way in which the IANA or ICANN is performing having an external party it's almost like washing your laundry in public.

And that does not bode well because it undermines the very fabric of what we're trying to do which is an efficient operation.

So to answer your question I suppose keep it in just to keep it in. But I - do I like it in? I don't. Is it necessary, it might be. So I don't like washing stuff in public. I'm a private operator and so I prefer resolving problems privately.

But Chris's - Chris Despain's approach was, you know, that's one step towards the nuclear option. And I don't want the nuclear option to be exercised. but it all depends as I say how the CWG work it out.

So answer your question keep it in for now and it might be kicked out later.

Chuck Gomes: What if we were to - let me throw something out and then I'm going to come to Staffan and Avri and request your opinions on this.

What if we were to change that the CSC may involve a mediator, in other words build some flexibility in there because there may be some cases where that makes sense from a cost perspective? There may be cases where it doesn't.

Should we maybe change that to may involve a mediator? And then I'll turn it over not only to that question but just generally whether we should leave Step 2B in there to Avri and Staffan. One of you want to respond first?

Staffan Jonson: Stephan here. I might answer. Well apparently my registry supported Chris written proposal even though it was how shall we put it, opposed to more formal processes.

So I guess if I were in my .SC hat I should support it. However I do like the idea of May. It is possible way so is voluntary. It's yet another tool to resolve a problem and I think that is probably the best way to forward.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Stephan. Avri?

Avri Doria: May is good.

Chuck Gomes: You're on - it looks like you went on mute again. Okay.

Avri Doria: All I said was May is good.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. So you're okay with that. Okay good.

All right so we go to Step 2C. If the issue is not addressed the CSO considers whether to go to the - a problem management. That's I think anybody have any objections with that? That seems to make sense.

They don't have to send it to the - escalate to the problem management process but they can if it makes sense.

So are we okay then? So we changed. So Berry you got the change and we'll change add May to 2B or there - yes go ahead Paul.

Paul Kane: So again I want to emphasize I don't know where the CWG group is going to come out. But what we were discussing in Istanbul was having effectively the stewardship role held in this affiliated company.

That's unless the CSC is effectively the affiliated company. I don't know. But the point is the steward also needs to be informed.

The management of ICANN needs to be informed because it's the ICANN staff that are performing the operation.

But it would be sensible if one goes down an affiliated root, affiliated company route within ICANN where the steward is the function what the affiliated company does.

It'd be sensible that the affiliated company is advised that there are - there is a critical problem with the service received from the IANA.

Again unlikely I hope but it's a matter of process.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Paul. And my understanding is, is that what we're doing in this design team should be - should work whether it's an affiliated organization, or whether it's not an affiliated organization. Whatever the CWG solution is our escalation steps should fit any of those models.

And is there anything in what we're proposing that you think wouldn't fit the different models that we would then need to fix?

Okay anything else on Annex Y? Okay that takes less than two Annex Z which is the problem management escalation process.

Berry Cobb: Chuck, it's Berry.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead Berry. Oh I am sorry. I don't have my window here scrolled up so I can see so I was ignoring you because I didn't see your hand. Go ahead Berry, my apologies.

Berry Cobb: No worries. I'd just like to draw the group's attention and I guess this is really something to consider as we collaborate with the Design Team C CSC group.

You know, if we look at step one and assuming that ombudsman was bypassed in this escalation perspective and then understanding the internal IANA escalation component I think in the current state granted that there's not a whole - there's not a large amount of these types of transactions that are flowing through.

But conceivably in this new step one, step two aspect the internal escalations could go as long as may be what three or four days and really -- correct me if I'm wrong -- and if it's still not resolved within that third or fourth day you're - we've escalated into step two.

So that's a very short runway for the seat for it to get to the CSC. And I think that this is something that is probably still not fully baked in Design Team C as to how that group is constituted, what is it all that they're doing?

So I guess the point is, is to be in the fourth or fifth day of an escalation there is going to need to be consideration as to how that is accounted for within the CSC, how is it, you know, how is that effort going to be staffed and those kinds of things. So I just wanted to draw your attention to that in terms of a timescale perspective.

Chuck Gomes: Yes we - I like the fact that the Design Team C has to sorry about that. Anyway Staffan I know you're on Design Team C so would you jump in please?

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. Yes I - Berry was raising what I was about to say that I may be the goalkeeper for this issue Design Team C as well so I haven't had time to show the Design Team C this proposal yet.

So and there is - it's like a different structure for CSC escalation being done there. And I have to do - put them side-by-side and do an analysis if there are some challenges and some friction within between the models and then we need to resolve them.

So it might take some time from us but I'm - it's important and it's a good thing that Berry raises that might be issues within the design teams here.

Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: And Staffan and Berry both because I think you're both involved in C.

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: If we can rely on you, either or both of you to let us know if there is something we're doing that might not work in terms of what they're doing that would be great help.

And feel free now as you know from the CWG call earlier today that everybody has been provided this particular proposal for Design Team M because it's being used kind of is an example for format.

So but encourage, feel free to encourage the Design Team C to look at what we're doing and to see if there are any disconnects and so that we can fix those because obviously we only have what, a little over a week to finish this so okay?

Staffan Jonson: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: So let's go to Z, the problem management escalation process. This again is highly dependent on Design Team C and their work.

I don't think there's anything new from what we did last week on this one. Is there any discussion on this? Is that an old hand Staffan or a new one?

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Staffan Jonson: That's an old one.

Chuck Gomes: So okay, so anything on this one? This one may be okay.

Now we may have to fill in more details on some of this like for example if we do how much implementation information do we need in our proposal or is that something that can be done after the proposal goes forward and before actual transition happens.

Those are the kinds of things we'll probably have to dig into a little bit next week and at least say how we recommend they be handled a mediator and then the independent appeals.

Now I do believe that - of course I think this applies to all of these and it came up in the call this morning, the whole idea of triggers, what triggers one step to the next I think we're going to probably have to come back and look at that a little bit more. Although some of those decisions may be made by other design teams or the CWG as a whole things like that.

But with regard to this process right here annex - in Annex Z I think we're going to also have to maybe add some steps for example what - with regard to what the CCWG comes up with.

Like for example -- and then I'll go to just on this -- but with regard to spilling the board if that's one of the things that comes out to - of CCWG is that so if for some reason the binding appeals mechanism doesn't work and we get to a point where the option of spilling the board if that comes out of CCWG is needed is that a step six?

Does separation, the possibility of separation come in and as a Step 7? So we're going to have to talk about that. I'm not saying we have to resolve that right now but let's talk about those a little bit right now. Staffan it's your turn.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. It was also discussed today. I don't recall if it's the Design Team C or the CWG or the IANA. But during the day I heard discussions about what the CSC and practical reasons might be able to produce informal.

If you see for example in this problem management in the second row that says periodic audits and who should do those periodic audits should it be within the CC or outside of it? And that might also be an issue that we'll have to come back to. So periodic audits, who does them and are they within CSC remit or not? That's yet another issue that is open. Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Right. Thanks Staffan.

So what are those on the call think with regard to how does the - some of these big scale accountability mechanisms like spilling the board and ultimately even separation, should they be a part of the escalation process that we put forward understanding that the triggers are probably going to have to be decided by others by the broader community and so forth but what do you think?

Staffan is that an old hand?

Staffan Jonson: Well I can take the floor again...

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead and take it.

Staffan Jonson: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Go ahead and take it and then we'll go to Paul.

Staffan Jonson: As assumed in other, for example in the CSC the Design Team CSC was discussing this and we just have to presuppose some aspects.

We have to put a placeholder in saying that supposing that that will be an MRT for an example we do this, we propose this and that.

So we need to have some - have to take into account some interdependencies which we can't refuse. But since we need to go ahead we just have to write them in within the text. That's all we can do.

And so maybe we should do it here as well assuming the last step of escalation process while assuming this and that, assuming that there is an MRT, assuming that there is an appeals process, et cetera, then we could do things.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. So before I go to Paul Staffan let me make sure I understand.

So you think we ought to put placeholders in for a Step 6 and a Step 7 like for example Step 6 spill the board and Step 7 possible separation in this problem management process?

Staffan Jonson: Yes as Avri proposed we could have them thinned down or made in gray or something just potential escalation steps depending on the, for example the...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Staffan Jonson: ...for example the CCWG, et cetera.

But that's a way of showing that we actually thought about this but we had no information so this - you might - the ICG might strike it out later on but why not put place holders in place?

Chuck Gomes: Thank you, that's helpful. Paul, your turn. I'm coming to you next Avri even though your hand's not up.

Paul Kane: I am very uncomfortable with spilling the ICANN board, sacking the ICANN board or a subunit of ICANN as failure to deliver the required level of service.

So I would prefer that one went through the process having assuming the affiliate company is the steward having the RFP process triggered as part of the escalation process to identify suitable candidates, suitable companies to run the IANA before one spills the board.

In the event of ICANN winning the RFP there's no exclusion. If ICANN recognizes they've been stupid and says yes okay we will back down as they have done before sort of late 90s when they were particularly stupid than ICANN IANA should win the contract again.

If - so I would far rather the option of having another contractor listed rather than - and was given a higher priority than spilling the board which at the end of the day won't necessarily fix the problem.

So I'm in favor of the graying it out. I like Avri's idea, Staffan's idea graying the optional. But I would prefer a trigger to find a contractor who can deliver the required level of service takes priority over spilling the board.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Paul. Now as you know it's not our responsibility, not even the CWG's responsibility with regard to deciding whether spilling the board or some portion of the board will be in accountability mechanisms.

But it probably would be in our responsibilities to suggest whether such an option or an RFP might be an escalation step.

So but as far as defining whether spilling the board will even be an accountability option another whole working group is working on that. So thanks for that feedback Paul. Let's go to Avri.

Avri Doria: Hi. Thanks Avri speaking. I figured I'd put up my hands since you said you're going to call on me anyway...

Chuck Gomes: Right, I was.

Avri Doria: ...so I'd be active for that.

I actually very much agree with what Paul said. And it's one of the pieces that is missing. And it's one of those that I think we may need to think about though it requires a bit of help from the CCWG.

And that's that this is one of the places where in the past we've talked about a bylaws mechanism.

And a bylaws mechanism, one of those enduring bylaws that we used to call Golden bylaws but the enduring bylaws that the cc - that you have a mechanism that this gets escalated to somehow - and I'm not quite sure exactly what triggers, but that basically triggers a bylaw that says do an RFP

and probably goes into detail about how that gets set up and how that gets done.

And then the kind of places - and this is sort of my perception. And I'm not sure how holy it has yet been adopted in to CWG, spill the board mechanism only comes after some mechanism like you call on the bylaws mechanism for an RFP and outboard which can always say no. And then you have to escalate above that do an RFP.

So I - I think I'm agreeing with Paul -- and of course he'll tell me if I got it wrong -- that you definitely have that do an RFP hopefully enshrined in an enduring bylaw -- and in fact we can even recommend that bylaw -- we can't recommend the enduring mechanism. But that's what's getting done in the CCWG.

But we can certainly recommend a bylaw that says when such and such happens a process will be initiated to do an RFP - blah, blah, blah.

And then if the CWGs has its notion of enduring bylaws. And this would be one. The enduring bylaw meaning one that the board cannot change accept by some overwhelming ability, you know, supermajority, unanimity -- something.

And then whether the CWG puts in a what is being totally recalcitrant you can spill it although we're going to come up with a different name than spill that is their mechanism not ours.

But I do think that prior one can indeed be ours.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.

Avri Doria: Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. This has been a great discussion. So maybe I have an idea to put in front of you and get your reaction to.

So maybe our Step 6 should be something like use of bylaws mechanisms and then put a parentheses that refer to the CCWG. Does that work?

Is that maybe a Step 6? If the independent review doesn't work - it seems like it should if it's binding.

But if it doesn't solve the problem is Step 6 maybe by a fundamental - I think they're calling him at least what I've seen -- you know better than I do Avri because I think you're participating in that -- but they're calling it a fundamental bylaw kicks into place here or just we can just put bylaws mechanisms there.

Anyway I'll let all of you comment on that but let's go to Paul.

Paul Kane: So my understanding and I'm not a lawyer, but my understanding is the bylaw approach is going to recognize or potentially can recognize the authority of affiliated company as the steward for the IANA functions a little like NTIA is today being steward.

So I'm not sure if it's within the bylaws of ICANN is necessary but certainly the remit of the affiliated company should be - limited remit of the affiliated company should be defined.

Namely once the RFP option has been triggered then the affiliated company wakes up and does its thing.

I'm very wary - very worried about trying to fire or sack the board because ICANN does other things other than the IANA function.

And particularly for the gTLD community it would be very undermining of gTLDs if the authority under which they operate their gTLDs namely the board have been fired. I think it would be very destabilizing to our market.

That's possibly another group. It's possibly the CWG group. But irrespective we should have an escalation. We should have our RFP in it albeit I think the affiliated company should be the one that's, you know, the ultimate is trigger the affiliate company to start the RFP.

But we don't know if were using an affiliated company.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Paul. Let me jump right to Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes. I guess I see that one slightly differently. I see that the bylaw is triggered for an RFP is actually having - whether it's iPad or whether it's the conjoined SOAC or it whatever it is doing the IFP and very much like we had an MRT doing the RFP.

And in a sense they would be firing the affiliate because the affiliate in both of the models we seem to have is the IANA and it's not that activated contract CO type of notion.

But it was basically breaking IANA out into an affiliate. And what a corporation often does when it's affiliate is no longer doing the job well it decides to replace the affiliate with some other vendor.

And just as the IETF or the RIRs can decide that they don't want them to be a vendor anymore for ICANN services they want to fire it and get a new vendor.

Now in terms of the CCWG I think they see the replace the entire board mechanism as a solution for many possible ills. And in fact I think the IANA cause is a minor one in their minds. It's one of them but it has many other possible triggers to it.

And in fact one of the things they're talking about now is what kind of thing would trigger that mechanism? How do you trigger that mechanism? And how do you pre-build an interim structure that gets ICANN over that hump until a new board is put in?

So the CCWG on accountability has definitely taken this as a very serious nuclear last day last possible solution when nothing else has worked type of mechanism as I understand it.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Avri. Chuck again. A question for you, Is the idea of an RFP a re-compete of the affiliate or whatever anything like that even being considered in the CCWG?

Avri Doria: No. What's being considered in the CCWG is the creation of what I'm calling the enduring bylaws which is I think one of the names that Sidley gave them, constitutional bylaws they also call them.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Avri Doria: I think fundamental and golden were our terms for them.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Avri Doria: But so they're discussing the general notion of for those things that we want to make sure the board can't easily change how do we do that?

And so what I'm saying is that we should consider using one of those mechanisms to initiate an RFP process or at least that's one possibility we should consider.

And just, so just knowing that such a mechanism will exist that I, you know, I can't speak for the CCWG but if I was a betting person I would bet that there's going to be an enduring bylaws mechanism.

And you - we can use it for any number of bylaws we want to put in that category. And so I think this might be one. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. So what I'd like us to try and come up with before we end this call - and we're coming up on the end of our call -- is what do we put in the problem management process at the end there after Step 5 that will reflect what happens if the independent appeals process doesn't get resolution?

Should we put the - use an enduring bylaws to initiate an RFP process? How do we bring the RFP process into this or is it our responsibility to do that?

It's not clear in my mind. I do believe and this was discussed in Istanbul. I do believe that this particular part of our process, the problem management

process does need to have something that goes a little bit further than the independent appeals panel. Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes. I believe that it is something that we should suggest because I don't see any other group. It's one of the things that came up in that morning meeting.

I don't see any other group that is working on that last step, that step where we say ICANN, the people at ICANN community however we want to get designated has decided that IANA as it is currently functioning needs to be RFP.

And it's something that could be triggered for example by what Paul was talking about I think earlier in this meeting or maybe it was an early meeting that holds a merit system that other triggers that could trigger that.

It could be, you know, an IRP a - an IRP suggested we do an RFP but it could happen. But I do believe it's something we should (sink) a trial balloon up for in our solution.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you. So would it work -- and I'm just thinking out loud here -- this is Chuck again. Would it work to put in Step 6 use applicable CCWG accountability mechanisms to initiate an RFP or similar process?

Staffan Jonson: Staffan here.

Avri Doria: Well possibly, you know, use a bylaw process.

Chuck Gomes: Staffan go ahead and then we'll go to Avri.

Staffan Jonson: Actually Berry Cobb initiated something similar in the chat saying initiate RFP process and in brackets mechanism not yet to be defined. So the idea has come from two places at once.

Chuck Gomes: And Paul has - wants it to be less prescriptive. But let me go to Avri and then we'll come back to - oh wait a second, okay so I guess you weren't - Paul you weren't talking about - you like actually Berry's prescription, okay got that in the chat.

Avri go ahead. You started to say something and it's...

Avri Doria: No I'm fine with (unintelligible) right. I am fine with - this is Avri. I'm fine with what Berry suggested. I, you know, I just think that we do need to think of it as being in the bylaws but, you know, mechanism yet to be defined can include that.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so you're okay with that, so Berry that would be Number 6. I have one question on that to get people's opinion on and that is should we see initiate an RFP or similar process build in some flexibility?

I don't know. One of the awkwardness of what we're doing is we don't have the legal advice on the affiliate mechanism and so forth that we asked for in Istanbul. And it's understandable we don't have that yet.

And we don't know what the CCWG's going to recommend. Is it okay to just leave it as RFP or should we be a little more flexible and say RFP or similar process?

Is it okay the way it is? Not hearing anything on that. So let's just put in what Berry must add a Step 6 that would show - would say initiate RFP process and then brackets mechanism yet to be defined okay?

Is that all right? So Berry are you comfortable with doing a red line of first of all accept the changes that are in it right now and then do a redline of the things we agreed to today which aren't very many? There's this one and I'm trying to think. Are there any other changes?

I think basically what we accomplished today is we're - there seems to be a good comfort level with this process as it's outline right now.

And oh it looks like so Berry it looks like you're going to have to contact the IANA and ask of them, follow - just follow-up and make sure that we - that we're going to either get the original of that emergency flowchart or that they'll make the changes because really it's apparently dropped off.

Berry Cobb: Yes Chuck she had to leave early. And so she has the first action to see if they can find the soft copies to the flowcharts else I believe that we can re-create them so that we can edit the...

Chuck Gomes: Oh yes.

Berry Cobb: ...appropriate rules.

Secondarily we just need to confirm that anyone can use the ombudsman. I believe that is correct. I don't think that there is any standing or gating factor of who can initiate a request with the ombudsman but we'll check.

Third action is staff will update Step 2 about 2B that the CSC may involve a mediator versus what's listed there now.

Fourth action Staffan will take the Step 2 of escalating the CSC back to that design team to discuss how, you know, the staffing or how the effort required to accept an escalation in approximately a three to five day time frame may look for them.

Then lastly the last action staff will add a Step 6 here as I mentioned in the chat with that exact - with that language.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you Berry. And the last thing we need to schedule our next meeting. Has anybody - I don't think everybody has responded to the Doodle poll that was sent out.

So please do that so that by hopefully the end of the day today we can schedule a call where hopefully everyone can make it early next week because we may need two or three calls next week to be able to wrap this up.

Maybe not, but it's possible. So since we have to deliver our final proposal on Friday if you have not responded to the Doodle poll on - in our draft design Team M list please do that today.

And then Brenda you and I can consult. Is Brenda still on? Brenda and I can pick one of the earliest times we can next week to have our next meeting. Any questions?

Okay thanks. I think it was a productive call. I think we have a good basis for our proposal going for it.

On our next call what we'll try and figure out is what areas do we now need to add more detail or at least a plan for getting detail. And then we of course need to answer those other two questions in the scoping document. Berry go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Oh I'm sorry, old hand.

Chuck Gomes: Old hand, okay. I think we're done, went a couple minutes over. Thanks a lot everyone. We'll talk again early next week. Meeting adjourned and recording can be stopped.

Paul Kane: Thank you all.

Avri Doria: Bye.

END