ICANN

Moderator: Brenda Brewer
April 16, 2015
12:00 pm CT

Coordinator: the recording has now started.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you. Everyone it's the 41st meeting of the CWG and its 1703 UTC. Turn it over to Jonathan and me to chair.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay Grace thank you very much. It's Jonathan. Lise is in the (Hauge) I know attending a meeting and so she will assist. But I'll lead the meeting and so we'll work together. But in fact we have some divvied up the agenda anyway.

I committed to make a couple of opening remarks. But before we do that let's just make sure we record as present everyone in the Adobe Connect room and call for anyone who is not in the Adobe Connect room and only on telephone audio to make themselves known.

Seun Ojedeji: Yes, hello this is Seun. I'm on audio for now.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Seun. Okay so we are coming together shortly after our Monday and Tuesday meetings. And I know that the design teams have met in the

interim including an integrated meeting of three design teams which I was the - a guest chair on yesterday.

Clearly those were a pretty busy couple of days and they were particularly grueling for some on some time zones.

You may not have all had the opportunity to catch up on that so I'll just make a few remarks.

I'm not going to go into it a massive detail. Advancing down the list of attendees here most of you are pretty diligent about being in on those meetings.

We ran six two hour sessions so we have 12 hours of meetings all together. We tackled hard trying to bring the first the one - the priority one design teams to a head and did some very good work on doing that.

To the extent that there were outstanding items we flagged for those. And in the past well 48 hours or so since we finished up on Tuesday the design teams have continued to work and try and resolve outstanding items.

All of this as you know is clearly driving towards the objective of feeding in to a complete proposal which we are planning to put out in draft form for public comment in the next few days.

And in addition we concentrated on fleshing out further and working together with Sidley Austin who were diligent in accompanying us through those meetings further work on the structure elements of the proposal.

We concentrated strongly on the structural elements that have a - well the structural on a variant of the proposal that has a legal separation of an internal IANA and dealt with a so-called punch list of items that Sidley had raised for which the answers were required.

In the meantime there's been a Client Committee meeting and Greg will update us on that from Item 3 in the agenda.

So I think we've worked incredibly hard and are whilst there are there will inevitably be some incomplete points and some areas where we will seek input on the public comment we - one can see how a complete proposal is starting to come together.

And to that extent you will have seen Version 3.1 of the draft proposal. The reason it's a point one is that it's tried to the staff working on that tried to absorb the input from the Monday and Tuesday meetings but clearly have not had the opportunity to process those completely.

So I think the view is that you should do that as much for a structure an indication of direction rather than absolutely focus on the detail content.

When the next version comes out shortly it should be around this time tomorrow you should be able to see that content being fleshed out to include the latest work from the design teams. I think that's enough for now.

Let's move on to Item 2 where we will hear from Lise on the latest communication with the CCWG which follows from the meeting of the chairs last Friday and then the work of what we did on Monday and Tuesday.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Jonathan. It's Lise for the record. As you might is seen we sent a letter to the CCWG chairs very late last night European time and we have also sent it to our group.

And as in the covering note we wrote to them that our proposal will rely on their work in various key areas so that's why it's very important that they deliver their work in time.

So we kind of put a little pressure on the CCWG in order to deliver their proposals in time in a timely manner.

So our proposal is not going to be too affected by a late delivery by the CCWG.

And actually the letter was not the new object. It was more to give an update on what we think that the CCWG should provide us with and to add additional detail to the areas of dependency because we had a letter from I'm not sure one of the chairs co-chairs of the CCWG asking us for further detail.

So one of our primary issues was to provide the group with more detail.

And we know that our letter has been shared with the CCWG group. We haven't had a call with the chairs yet so we don't know their response to our letter.

But as I say the issues are not new so it's more a letter giving them further details. And that detail came out of our two intensive working days.

And the four areas to just recap it's the ICANN budget. It's the community empowerment mechanisms. It's review and redress mechanisms and it's the appeal mechanisms.

And while we were dealing with the three that we need and put in the appeal mechanisms are not to be looked at regarding the cc - ccs but the gTLDs are still interested in appeal mechanisms. But those are being worked on as part of the CCWG work at the moment.

So it was more the specific ccTLD appeal mechanism or IRP that does need to be looked at.

Any questions or remarks if you read the - our letter or our specification and our level requirements?

Jonathan Robinson: While we wait for any hands to come up I'll just make a comment just to be clear. If it wasn't from what you said already there's some the - this formulation of these lists comes - came obviously from Istanbul.

And then the detail was not something you and I constructed. The detail was built up over the days of Monday and Tuesday and then edited by you and I prior to sending across. So it was formed...

Lise Fuhr: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: ...during the course of.

Lise Fuhr: Yes. I agree. I didn't express it that precisely. And I'm glad that you're doing that because it's very important that this is coming out of our meeting for Monday and Tuesday.

Okay. Avri is asking so we didn't mention the use of the fundamental bylaws mechanism. And Marika says it's on the second page at the bottom.

Jonathan Robinson: So I should also flag one other point for the group because and, you know, I don't want to steal Greg's thunder from Item 3 but this list was transmitted to Sidley Austin via the clients list today.

So that joins up that loop and it really links to Avri's point. It was flagged in the instructions that I drafted on the back of our Monday and Tuesday meetings that was sent to the client list and I believe may have been copied to the CWG list but it was certainly on the client list which asks Sidley to give us help and work with us to institutionalize the linking between the work of our group and the CCWG.

So rest assured Avri and others that's very much front of mind for me because my sort of philosophical position is we've pushed this group hard and reasonably so to not include areas of work that could be adequately dealt with by the CCWG.

But in dropping those that potential work we need to trust that it will be fulfilled and fulfilled and completed by the CCWG.

And to that extent we can communicate it but we also need to institutionalize it. And this is important and understood.

Lise Fuhr: Well, it doesn't seem that there are any questions or remarks regarding this communication so I have nothing more to add. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Lise. We've possibly exhausted everyone from a combination of workload and questions but let's move on then to the update from the Client Committee.

So Greg I hope you're in a position to deliver that. We had a meeting earlier today which was attended by Greg, myself. And Lise said (Martin) had to send apologies.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Jonathan. Great Shatan for the record. Yes we had a fruitful meeting with counsel earlier today. And as Jonathan said, you know, we identified a number of documents and the points on which we are grateful for and require input from Sidley Austin one being of course the CWG CCWG dependencies list which is now in their hands.

We have also asked them to review particularly some of the output from really the combined DTCNM work when that settles just a little bit with regard to kind of governance best practices rules just to make sure that everything there is non-eyebrow raising.

And we expect a more, you know, general vetting which indeed there is now also in possession of the latest draft of the proposal though I expect they will not review that but rather review tomorrow's draft.

We are looking to them as well to essentially boil down their 4th of April memo into with appropriate updates and refinements to turn into a relatively brief description of the overall model and working pieces thereof which could function in an introductory capacity or summary capacity within the report.

Sidley is, you know, looking to be as helpful as they possibly can be. And their help is really critical. To call it help is to understate it extensively.

So we are as I said expecting, you know, several things from them. They are expecting a couple of things from us and they will be working closely with us throughout the coming days.

I think that's a fair summary of where we're at. I think that the punch list I believe may be updated once more but will probably be set aside unless it seems to have a great deal of further utility and to concentrate on the deliverables discussed and of course on the drafting of the report itself.

So if there are any questions about the Client Committee meeting I'm happy to respond to them.

Seeing no questions I will hand the reins back to Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Greg. I think I want to add to that. That sounds, that's useful. And of course just to remind you all that if you really want the fine detail there is a full recording of that hour long meeting from earlier today.

Right so we now have an opportunity to update from the design teams and just hear if there are any issues or concerns.

I want to check if yes, Lise asks me if we will check on the priority two items. We've had an email discussion about that earlier. Lise why don't you go ahead that and just give a quick update on that?

It actually relates in part directly to the point that Greg just made now in the sense that one of the issues was - that was put to priority two was the Design Team looking at which had concerns over conflict of interest and related points.

And indeed once we settle on the structure and bearing in mind in particular that the CSC has been very mindful of this and not wanting to be unduly involved in anything which has any, you know, keeping quite a distant position in terms of its brief, we discussed this in some detail with well not huge detail but made it clear to Sidley as per our decision to not pursue this is a design team but that we will expect and require some assistance from Sidley to confirm and or confirm there were no issues and/or suggest best practice mitigation of any such issues.

Lise I don't know if there is anything you would like to add there. Please feel free to come in at this stage.

Lise Fuhr: I'd just like to add that on - in the notes from the 38th meeting there is the explanation of our assessments of all the Design Teams.

It was just that I saw some people hadn't seen that. And just to remind you the explanations are in the notes.

So it's not that we haven't dealt with them but we found that they are covered otherwise all of them. So there was no need to do further work except from the .int where we were expecting input from the GAC. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Lise. I'll then move us on to the Design Team work. I'll just check if - see that I'm just going to check on audio then it's before Kane is on yet to give us an update on A. Paul are you on audio?

I don't hear from Paul yes so I think we will pick up on the outcome of that combine DTC, DTM, DTM call as per the agenda.

And this is Item 4 obviously. And what we had here was on the back of the Monday and Tuesday calls there have been some attempt by the Design Teams themselves to work collaboratively but they were - it was kind of doing two things at once. And all of them were working on their own scope and brief.

And so what became apparent during the course of Monday and Tuesday was that there was a need to do some integration work between the work produced by the Design Team on the CSC, the Customer Standing Committee, the work produced by the Design Team on the escalation and in particular what and if any role the CSC would have in that escalation process and how that synchronized with any other previous work that the Design Team on the CSC had done on escalation.

And in addition the Design Team N that had done some work on reviews and again the expectations and links with the work of the CSC and Design Team C.

I think we had a pretty productive call and were able to do some good work at integrating that.

And I know the list has been aligned, the email list has been pretty well aligned with a detailed discussion on that.

So it's - I've tracked that is closely as I might have liked. I think my sense is that we are relatively close to an integrated solution here but I welcome comments from anyone who is absolutely on the button here. That's probably people like Donna, Chuck or anyone from staff who's working on this. So please feel free to go ahead.

Donna thanks. Go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks Jonathan. Donna Austin.

I have just sent around a revised markup of the document that which was Design Team M's document, the escalation process.

So Chuck and I have had a conversation this morning with Sarah Falvey and Graeme Bunton was also on the call where we've agreed to some language.

So I think it was quite a large distribution list but it was sent to the - it wasn't sent to the CWG list at this point in time.

So if the respective design teams can have a look at the language and I think if everybody can agree that we're good to go then I think we've resolved our issues. Thanks Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Donna. And I should remark at the willingness to work together on this. I don't want to be trite about it but it was great to see people working on that. And Chuck in the chat confirms what Donna said.

So that was great. I mean I think we really came together quickly and worked hard to try to knit these - this work together. So that was very useful.

Any other comments or questions in relation to that work? Avri I don't know if any - if you'd like to add anything having been a team lead on M. No need to say things for the sake of it but if you do would like to make any comments feel free.

I see you agree in the chat. That's helpful from a Design Team introspective.

Olivier go ahead.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks so much Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And I may have missed this but has there been an actual summary of the actual outcome of the combined ETC DTM and DTN call?

Jonathan Robinson: Olivier I think that's what was - I think that is - that's live now as far as I understand and heard earlier and it will be coming to the CWG list shortly. I think we point out a note from that call.

And Grace just confirm with me because we could put that to the list. It's not 100% current since work has continued since then. But I believe a note was prepared on the back of that and so let me just hand over to Grace to confirm that.

Grace Abuhamad: Hi Jonathan. This is Grace. So to confirm yes, notes from that meeting were sent to the CWG mailing list. But then they edits on the document back and forth back and forth there's been about 20, 30 emails on that.

Those are between the 3-DTs, the members of the 3DTs.

So at this point those back and forth edits have not been on a public mailing list but I will be posting all the drafts at some point when I can find a good page for that on the wiki.

But the notes from the meeting and the recording were all sent to the CWG mailing list.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay, thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes great, thank you Grace. Go ahead Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Just to clarify what I think Donna already said is that the latest edits have been sent to that list of the three design teams to give them the opportunity to comment and confirm their agreement with the compromises that were reached because it was mainly between Donna and I and it really needs to involve the all the members of the other three design teams.

But as soon as that happens it'll be ready for the full list not that you wouldn't be able. There's no problem with you seeing all the exchanges but it'll take you quite a bit of time because there's been a lot of back and forth in the last few days.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck. And I'll confirm that since I think I'm a lurker on those lists. Olivier is that an old hand or a new hand?

Okay, very good. So I think that will start to then clearly that's as agreed by the design teams and that will start to come through on the - I guess that'll start to come through on the - in the draft of the documents as it sort of gets prepared.

So keep a close eye on that draft as well because that's going to be critical that the group buys into and supports the development of that draft.

Good. So I hope that we can turn to Paul Kane now. Paul are you on the audio? (Bernie) go ahead. Your hand is up.

(Bernie):   Paul has Skyped me he's dialing and now.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. So we'll skip Paul for the moment and we'll go to item 6 which is an update from Alan on Design Team F.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you Jonathan. Could I have the document displayed in the pod? And while that's happening we're working to deadline about as tight as one can imagine.

The document that you see here is not final by any means. And in fact the current summary recommendations and full recommendations they match in substance but they don't - they are far from matching in form and some wording needs to be changed.

And there are also a number of items that the design team still needs to discuss. But we've made very substantial progress in the last weeks since we've effectively started this process.

Just let me enlarge enough so I can see it. Okay the first part of the recommendations are the - essentially the fallout of no longer having the NTIA in the authorization path.

That was a recommendation from DT from Design Team D. And we looked at the implications of that. There are a number of implications some well understood, some far from understood.

The first one is that essentially a purely mechanical one. Right now the NTI, the VeriSign, the root zone maintainer is not allowed to implement any changes without authentic authorization from the NTIA. So we need to make some changes to make sure to take them out of the path.

In general that means altering the software so it's not - so the changes are effectively released prior without NTIA authorization.

There is a short-term fix that is essentially IANA could log on as the NTIA and authorize their own fixes.

That will cover us if the software cannot be changed in time for the transition or in fact if we prefer not to change it simultaneously just to minimize the number of things that will be changing on the same day. So that's a mechanical one.

There's then a contractual one that's identified in 1B that right now under the cooperative agreement with VeriSign they must wait for authorization from the NTIA.

It's very difficult for us for DTD, DTF to write exactly what we need to say here because we don't know what's going to happen with the cooperative agreement.

NTIA has said there will be a separate but parallel process. They have not addressed exactly what that is or how that is.

So in the various subparts of this recommendation we're trying to cover what might happen.

You know, essentially we may be in a position where there is no change in the cooperative agreement that NTIA maintains - retains that responsibility at least for short term and in which case the cooperative agreement will have to be changed to allow VeriSign to operate without approval without authorization.

If the cooperative agreement is changed and replaced by something -- and we don't know any of the details of that of course -- we have to make sure that VeriSign the root zone maintainer is bound to implement the changes that IANA sends to them.

And again we don't know how that could be done. It may require an agreement between IANA and the root zone maintainer. It may take some other form depending on how it's replaced.

So, you know, this is somewhat vague but trying to cover this all the scenarios that we can imagine.

The third part transferred from DTD is do we need to do anything given that there will no longer be authorization do we need to do anything not so much to replace - perhaps to replace it or to augment the process?

And we've identified a lot of possible things that can be done. It is both within IANA and in the overall process from the origin for requests from registries all the way through to pushing out of the root zone.

And we are still debating to some extent if any of that must be done prior to transition or if all of it should be done post-transition?

You know, it's clear that everyone is happy with the operation right now. It's not breaking. But do we need to do anything to make it more - essentially to make sure we don't have any failure problems or failures in the future.

The second set of recommendations is associated with other things that the NTIA does not associated directly with individual changes to the root zone.

Upon investigation the NTIA essentially gets involved in pretty much any decision that IANA makes right now. That ranges from the high end, you know, the implementation of DNSSEC.

And at the low end it's they give approval or not for the NTIA for IANA rather to change the details in a report they publish on a regular basis or to decide and approve whether a report can be published.

It includes - it might include changes in the processing internal to ICANN. You know, for instance the automation process program that IANA embarked upon a number of years ago clearly had to go through an extensive NTIA approval.

So we have a whole set of things ranging from very significant changes to the overall root zone architecture and the, you know, how it works to relatively minor changes of publishing a report that people have asked for.

And we are recommending a number of different things. To replace the substantive changes we believe there still must be an authorization process.

The - ultimately there will be input from a lot of people, presumably people who are very knowledgeable. But there has to be some entity, a group or something which says yes go ahead, no do not go ahead.

And I use the expression that will change in the final document but, you know, it should involve something like a council of elders.

That is we need to make sure that we have input into the process that understands the history, that understands the technology and can look at second and third order effects to any substantive change.

The next part type of requirement, the next type of change is relatively minor ones. And we're saying that IANA should not be subject to approval process for that. It should use its own internal management processes and as appropriate consult with the community or affected parties to make sure that it's not doing anything wrong.

That's essentially business as usual for any well-run organization.

And lastly we point out that the kind of changes we're talking about have very - have at times very significant budget implications.

And we're simply noting that as we go forward to make sure that the root zone can stay, root zone and its management can stay totally up to date that there be appropriate budget available to IANA to do some of these kinds of implementations.

The last item...

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Yes I'm just going to finish. I'll be finished in a moment or so and then I'll take questions if that's okay? The next two are essentially principles that we believe IANA should be following.

The first is transparency. To the extent that is allowed by, you know, agreements, security issues, business confidentiality issues IANA should operate in a transparent manner.

That is how they operate and to the extent practical the reports on the details of what they're doing should be open rather than closed unless there's a substantive reason for keeping it close.

And lastly the Design Team feels that as we're going from two, three entities in the process to two that the design team felt pretty strongly that that should not go to one.

And that is the two, the root zone maintainer and the IANA functions operator should not be merged into a single entity, that having multiple bodies in this process no matter how much robustness and checking you put into it's likely to be a better situation than simply having one.

And those are the main recommendations. And I'm open to questions.

You want me to handle the queue Jonathan?

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Yes I can - let me manage it just so there's no confusion.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Jonathan Robinson: There are a couple of hands of so let's go to Donna first of all. Donna, go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks Jonathan, Donna Austin. Thanks Alan. I just had a question in relation to I guess it's more to A. But I just want to note first of all that the CSC charter does in my mind cover this somewhat.

So I'd like to understand whether the CSC charter was actually looked at when you develop this because we have a provision in there that the CSC in consultation with registry operators is authorized to discuss with the IANA functions operator ways to enhance revisions of IANA's operational services to meet changing technology needs as a means to address performance issues or other unforeseen circumstances.

And in my mind, you know, the example that -- and we had some back and forth David Conrad on this (unintelligible) various orphan issues such as DNSSEC that you have identified.

So I just want to pack that that the CSE charter does in my mind cover that after some extent.

You mention a council of elders. And I don't really understand what that...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Donna Austin: ...refers to so...

Alan Greenberg: Okay, two things. Although I can't say we - I looked explicitly at the charter we do have - did have David Conrad and a number of other people who were, you know, up on what was being done within that design team.

The general feeling and our perception anyway was that yes ideas may come from the CSE but it's not the body that is going to take responsibility for authorizing the change.

And we believe on substantive changes. Somebody or something must be responsible for collecting the input from people who ever the really knowledgeable people are in the area and making a go no go decision.

There was a general feeling among some of our members that the CSE specifically did not want that level of decision-making although it may well have been the place that the idea originated or where the original discussions came from.

Now if that's wrong then I think we need to go back and look at that but that was certainly the impression that the people on DTF had.

I'll go on to the Council of Elders in a second but does that address what I'm saying or are we misunderstanding?

Donna Austin: So I think it's addressing what I'm understanding. I guess but I still think there's a little bit of a disconnect so it would be worthwhile just, you know, having a look at the actual language that we have in the charter.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Donna Austin: And I do have a question that might be a little bit controversial but why couldn't the ICANN board be the place to approve or authorize any changes?

Alan Greenberg: I didn't - I don't think we're saying it isn't. I - what we're saying is that the CWG before the proposal - our proposal is wrapped up should make a

recommendation on or should include a part of that as to who is it that makes the final go no go decision. It may well be the board or it might be some other entity that we create. So I, you know, yes is the answer to that.

The Council of Elders reference and it was something I put in and I said the wording will need to change but I put it in more as a tickler for me to talk about.

And we want to make sure that when really substantive changes are being made that we avail ourselves of the knowledge in the community as to how it should be implemented if it should be implemented and what the got yous what the effects could be of that whatever the change is.

And that was simply saying that we need to make sure the process includes a way of including the necessary expertise.

You know...

Jonathan Robinson: There's a constructive suggestion in the chat from Kurt, Alan. You might wish to respond to that as well.

Alan Greenberg: All right, then I have to find it. Yes Kurt the Council of Elders there is a tickler for me not to go into the final report. This was - if you looked at where the - when the report was - this was sent to the CWG it was sent in about 15 minutes before the start of the meeting.

We're as I said, we're working to deadline or past deadline unfortunately so that was just put in to make sure that I covered the issue.

Jonathan Robinson: All right and just there's a constructive suggestion there to tidy that up so that's useful. Donna are you satisfied that your questions or points have been dealt with or can be dealt with as we stand? And I'll just flag with anyone else if they want to respond to that as well and to Donna's point but...

Donna Austin: Yes I think so Jonathan. I think there's an understanding there that, you know, this isn't concrete yet so there's still a little a bit of, you know, room to sort out who does what.

Alan Greenberg: And I've got a note...

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Donna.

Alan Greenberg: And I should remind everybody.

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: No, I was just going to say I have a note that I personally will make sure I look at the charter. And if there seems to be a conflict I'll bring it up with the team.

Jonathan Robinson: Great, thank you and remind everyone that this work of these design teams is meant to be brought to CWG for (rewound) refinement and or acceptance. Martin go, ahead Martin Boyle.

Martin Boyle: Thanks Jonathan, Martin Boyle here. I just want to make very, very clear in my own mind that this Council of Elders or whatever is involved in the authorization is not actually authorizing each change change by change for the entrance into the root zone file.

But it is actually entirely related to things that are now associated with changing technology or changing architecture. Am I right there Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes certainly. The whole section number one of the recommendations is about changes to the root zone. Section Number 2 is changes to the environment essentially. And that could be anything from as radical as major changes to the architecture to in today's world approval of a new report to be published or changing the details of some report that is published.

It has nothing to do with changes to the root zone and the Whois database. That is covered by one and is a completely separate issue.

Design Team D determined that that will not be replaced and that is what, you know, we have not tried to overrule them or change that recommendation.

Martin Boyle: Okay thanks, that's very helpful confirmation. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: So Alan I have a remark that may be a remark or a question. But, you know, I mean you've introduced this concept and I understand it's a placeholder of this Council of Elders your design team.

But the one other sort of working principle we were working to was where possible we need - we should try and keep the introduction of new structure or structures or group of groups to a minimum.

So certainly that's a thought I would give back to the design team to where possible and clearly that depends on the scope of the other groups or whatever else is - we're working within our structure the role should be absorbed by an existing structural group unless it is clear that that role is not fit for purpose or

appropriately matched to the group and we really are stuck. But that's just something to think about there.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Number one, please delete those words from everyone's memory. I made a mistake by putting them in as a tickler to myself. I should have written them on my piece of paper.

There are two parts to it. One is who are going to designate and we the CWG designate as doing those authorizations?

And as Donna pointed out it might be the ICANN board. It might be some other entity we put up it might, you know, I'm not - not having fully fleshed out all of the component parts the CWG is recommending.

We were did not - the Design Team have certainly did not feel capable of saying it is X or Y in the current picture. So it might be some entity we already have.

It could conceivably be an entity if as we go forward in the proposal we feel that the power does not - should not rest with one of our existing ones, maybe it is a new group. We're certainly not proposing that.

The reference that we're now not talking about was not necessarily to the group that authorizes it but the group that participates in the decision process.

And it wasn't meant to be a formal new body we're creating. And as I said I apologize for putting the words in. It was just to make sure the when decisions are made we draw upon the right communities.

Just as the NTIA might have gone to the National Institute of Standards and Technology to get input on cryptographic techniques we need to make sure we draw upon the right resources.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. I think you've made that point clear. That's helpful. Thanks Alan.

Good. So I don't see any more hands up. I see a reasonably vigorous discussion in the chat but I don't see any hands coming up to ask further questions or issues of you.

And so I think we should take the opportunity then to move to Item 6 in the agenda which is to hear an update from Paul Kane on the work of Design Team A and to question or contribute to that.

Paul Kane: Thank you Jonathan. Just checking if you can hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes Paul.

Paul Kane: Can you hear me? Great. So thank you very much. Following our last telephone meeting where ICANN IANA did participate and as I mentioned then they were very kindly review the SLE document that the group has proposed.

We have just received initial feedback from IANA. And the group is taking those comments on board and will be reviewing those comments.

And we're hoping to have a further conversation with IANA early next week when I'm back in the UK and my colleagues have any chance to digest the comments the IANA have made.

Taking a cursory look at the comments there's nothing particularly substantive. There is something with regarding to the distinction between hostile or assignments of ccTLDs and non-hostile.

We've only focused on non-hostile. Our emphasis is on stable operation. So we do have a question over that but we'll be taking that up with IANA I hope early next week. There's my very brief update.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Paul. And thanks for making the special effort to join us. I think the critical issue is going to be what with what level of confidence we can put in and how do we describe the SLEs at the state at which we want to go after the document for public comment.

I - my sense is that you and the IANA, the Design Team and the IANA contacts you're working with understand. And we'd love to get something settled so both parties can agree on as a reasonable basis for the draft proposal.

And so in the draft that's come out in the interim I think we'll have a placeholder of the SLE as proposed now. But we'll have to make sure we get clearance for take-off so to speak when we do want to publish the draft proposal or otherwise we'll have to caveat them with some other form of language.

Paul Kane: Look the point is taken. And rest assured we are trying hard as we have been for many months now to bring this matter to conclusion.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Paul. Any questions or comments for Paul?

All right it looks like you're off the hook for Design Team A for the present Paul. By all means stay with us on the call or I'm not sure how urgent your next move is but, you know, thank you very much.

Paul Kane: Thank you so much Jonathan. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: All right next up is - on the agenda is Item 7. It's categorized as Design Team X although I don't think it's strictly a design team so just to continue to make that clear for the record.

And we have an opportunity for any comment or input from Avri at this stage.

Avri Doria: Hi. Yes, this is Avri. And I just put the URL in the chat. Basically I sent a ETX - not proposal but use in the template ETs to the full list since then. And there's really two issues.

One the DTM reviews does sort of call out a next step. But without that next step having been created there's sort of a nervousness in some of the DTN folks to put that out.

So the URL is there. It's been started. The - there have been some contributions to it. It has a ways to go.

And basically what we're trying to develop I believe -- and, you know, it's still early in trying to do it and it's very ad hoc because there's nothing, you know, official about what we're doing -- we're just trying to create a proposal I believe -- is a - something that serves as the separation mechanism.

The first thought is that it would be bylaws. We have talked about that many times in the past that there be a bylaw. When we used to talk about it we used

to call it a golden bylaw. But now we're talking about the fundamental bylaws that under certain triggered conditions would call up a separation mechanism.

Don't even want to call it an RFP mechanism because other things could come out of it other than RFP to sort of step back and didn't want to prejudice, you know, how that mechanism works out.

So at the moment trying to define in more detail how that could get triggered, how it would work and what it's responsibilities would be.

There's still a long way to go. The drive document is there. A couple of us are contributing to it. I have inflicted co-editorship on (Stephanie) and (Matthew) as was done in BTN.

They haven't beaten me up for inflicting it on them. So I'm assuming it's okay. It is as all the drive documents have been open for anyone to suggest text or to make comments on what's there.

And until such time as this becomes an official activity I figured we would, you know, keep chipping away at it. And that's about it at the moment.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Avri....

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: I could go into detail on what's in there but...

Jonathan Robinson: No, I just think it undermines it a little bit to call it unofficial activity. I think you're making a good effort to try to fill a hole in a perceived gap in the proposal at this stage.

So and I think anyone who is able to contribute to it and bring it along the effort is welcome. And so I think we shouldn't undermine your good efforts here because it's a recognized piece of work that needs - seems to be need - a gap that needs to be filled.

Any sort of questions are input or willing volunteers to assist here? Holding out for a couple of people that may be typing and put into their - the chats.

Yes I s- there's a point here that's the work of DTX looks key to the overall work. So in a sense it - that's true. I think the one of the criticisms perhaps of this group is that we focus too strongly on the possibility of separation while for many that was an important ultimate endpoint.

We do if to the extent that it's part of our proposal which it's the separate ability is clearly in our principles we need to articulate how and under what circumstance that will take place. And that's where this work is.

My slight concern is that this - that the how realistic it is to get something complete in time for a draft proposal going out for public comment and therefore what of this we're able to include in the public in the draft for public comment.

Olivier go ahead.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks so much Jonathan, Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And I'm intrigued by the reason why this was called a separation process and not kept in RFP process. Does that mean the current operator would be prevented from bidding in the RFP?

Avri Doria: This is Avri if I can respond? No.

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: There was - right there was nothing implicit in calling the separation. The reason it started as one of the earlier conversations that were had on that in one of the earlier meetings was that whole notion of if we go with the affiliate and if the affiliate either gathered more members or were to spin out is that prohibited?

And want to answer the question no, that wasn't prohibited and so started thinking of it as separation. But you're right if it's an RFP. So it was just, you know, that's the name of it at the moment.

Okay, maybe there was something a little weird looking at, you know, GTX with an abbreviation of SM. But that was just the name that came up.

But if it's a better name that could be changed, suggestions for changing it is just as good.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Avri. But I'm going to go out on a limb here and perhaps supports this name and give you some thoughts.

I think we've come a long way from where we once were. And my understanding of kind of the principle we're working to here is there's no doubt that in anyone's mind that the operator post-transition is ICANN. You know, but in some new structure that IANA will remain within ICANN.

One of the concerns was that the primary or overarching concern has been that what if the current operator and immediately post-transition success operator fails to perform, what remedies exist?

And my understanding is we are not in a position where we are considering periodic RFPs per se but rather that we are considering a bunch of remedies to ensure that the performance remains good, that there is continuous improvement and that there is periodic review and opportunity for special review and that there are overarching accountability mechanisms built into the ICANN structure.

With all of those protections in place in effect we've got a contract that remains with the current operator unless there are significant operational or accountability concerns.

And so to that extent this document is accurately named and usefully describes where I believe the group to be at.

So we have many protections against failures of operational or other institutional failures. And that has been the focus of the group.

So that feels to me like it would be inappropriate to name it RFP in that context but rather to define that this is one piece of the jigsaw which defines how we would deal with a separation and should there be significant performance or other concerns.

Go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes and hi. If I can add one more thing, it was my intention and I think it's already started to be in some of the writing that that separation mechanism would be some group of people that were doing something.

And one of the things they could say was no separation or they could say new RFP and current operator can apply or that but those things would be, you know, possible responses, outcomes of such a mechanism that just because everything raises the flag to that mechanism does still at that point does not necessitate either an RFP or actual, you know, further separation it just opens the door to those discussions. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Understood. And whilst I wouldn't advocate necessarily removing the current operator from bidding it feels to me given what I articulated earlier that there's almost like a presumptive renewal unless there is a significant operating or other problem.

And to that extent the (unintelligible) would be pretty curious that - it's an incumbent or existing operator would then reapply. Because the primary basis on which one is undertaking a move to separate is because there has been some significant failure.

But I will say...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: I'm not sure it needs to be explicitly excluded from being a possibility.

Avri Doria: Yes. I put my hand again. The only thing I'd add for example we saw in the last NTIA, you know, RFP where being forced to do it a second time kind of ups the operator's, you know, adherence to some of the conditions.

So it is conceivable in such a situation where, you know, seeing the things got to the nuclear precipice that the operator, you know, came back with such an incredible the organization that dealt with all those issues, et cetera, that it would be something that people would want to consider.

I'm just being very open about kind of the range of possibilities in my thinking. And, you know, I'm not sure what other people in the working on the documents will think but yes. I agree with you. It probably wouldn't happen.

Jonathan Robinson: Olivier so a stimulating question good point and thanks Avri for your help and working in answering that. Kurt?

Kurt Pritz: Thanks for letting me take a minute of this group's time. I had typed a whole paragraph into the chat and then my screen went blank for a second and everything was deleted.

So I agree with Jonathan's points and Avri, so I can contribute comments separately. Briefly some of them would be that I think instead of terming it exhaustion of escalation steps I think this is really the next escalation steps. So this is really that's really kind of a knit.

Second, I think you should make the point in this document that the escalation process needs to be clear and objective so that it's obvious to everyone when a step needs to be taken up the escalation process including the last one it's really self-evident.

So our goal should be for that escalation process to be crystal clear and objective.

And third given that, you know, I sort of have a problem with getting the agreement of the supporting organizations.

I think first that it would take it while. And if IANA is truly failing -- and I don't think it well -- but this is the, you know, this is the low percentage occurrence.

If ICANN - if IANA is truly failing I think it's an emergency. And with a clear objective procedure would indicate that a change is required.

So for timing I am against it. And secondly it turns what's an objective measurement up the escalation path really into what will be a politicized question.

And so I'm concerned about having SO NAC approval for that rather than a mechanized process.

And then yes and my fourth point is, you know, I agree with Jonathan that if IANA is failing then it's really a separation and it's not a, you know, it's not a (unintelligible).

And I think excluding ICANN from being part of that rebidding makes it a much more serious step. And so we're actually less likely to do RFPs if ICANN's excluded so I see that as kind of a benefit for maintaining the current operator.

But I'm sorry I took of so much of everybody's time and I'm happy to put this in writing if you tell me where to put it.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Kurt. Thanks for that input. And there is a link to the document so it's either come in on the list or live editing of the document as appropriate.

Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks very much Jonathan, Olivier speaking. And another question I had is the triggers for the separation mechanism.

I haven't seen anything that might mention the current IANA operator bankruptcy.

Jonathan Robinson: Good point. Is this - was this is covered anywhere in this - does the document cover triggers per se? We - I just want - I'm just looking to see right now. I'm not that - I see the triggers, yes. Yes I - so that's reasonable. Yes I won't say anymore.

Grace Abuhamad: Sorry everyone there's a line dropped. We're going to fix it.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes thanks. Thank you. All right let's - I think that's probably as far as we can take this for now. So I think we're going to come to - and the next item to an action plan leading to a public comment which will have implied deadlines in it.

And so I'm going to walk you through now where we believe we are Lise and I together with the assistance of staff.

In fact I think it's something Lise you may be willing to take on as walking the group through this but I'm not sure how readily you are able to come back?

Lise Fuhr: Yes. I will - just a second I will have a view. Okay the action plan going from now? Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: I can make.

Lise Fuhr: Yes, now I was just finding the document that we have there late. So that's late. That was just why I was being a little slow in answering you. Sorry.

Yes we have this meeting today. And hopefully by Friday morning I will be able to publish a draft for the group.

And that will give you the weekend. And I know it's a very tight schedule but we'll give you from Friday, the 17th of April until Monday, 20th of April Midnight UTC. It's says 3959 3359 UTC but it's midnight UTC to give your comments and questions for this document.

Then the plan was that we should - then the plan was that we should have a draft out for Monday the 20th of April. But instead of sending it out we would like to dedicate Tuesday for the review of all the comments and would like to see if there are any objections on posting the proposals out for public comment from the group.

So we would like you to have a look and see even though there might be things that could benefit from minor changes are you ready to go with the document as it is?

And then we would publish the proposal on Wednesday on the 22nd. And of course this will reduce the public comment period with two days.

So instead of 30 days we will only give people 28 days to have a look at it. But we really recommend this in order to give all the group a chance to review the draft. And then we hope that everyone is confident in the draft that we're sending out on.

And then we will have a call on the 23 of April where we would further discuss the draft. And we like to encourage all members to reach out to the communities and have a discussion on how to do this.

And then the plan is that on Friday, the 24 of April Jonathan and I will do Webinars and public briefing on the proposal. The first one is on 600 UTC. And the last one is at 1400 UTC.

So that is the plan going forward at the moment. I'm just seeing that it says that Jonathan does the 600 UTC and I do the 1400. And it's actually the other way around but no matter what we will do those Webinars.

Any questions for this slight change in plans or any concerns about the taking two days off? I'd also like to add that we work with - explain to develop the graphic of the model so that's based on the Sidley graphic.

And we'll try and illustrate a summary so that could help the text. And as we have said before we're going to send out a short version and the long version with all the annexes and all the details.

And but we're trying to fit one version that looks slightly like the numbering and the protocols version of their proposals in order to make it easier to combine those three proposals for the ICG.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Lise. So, you know, that - the crux, you know, a couple of key crunch points obviously that we delay publication from 20th to 22nd carve two days out of the proposed 30 day public comment period which makes it a four full working week of the comment period 28 days.

And the rest remains more or less as is. As Lise says those Webinars are swapped around which is not - that's not a big deal. It's way for me having to do one too early in the morning.

And that's it really that's in a nutshell. Any comments, questions or points to raise on this?

I think there's no matter of surprise apart from the fact that we've reduced - we've pushed out by a couple of days where the 20th just seemed somewhat too difficult.

And, you know, providing then coming out of this just so everyone has got a very clear view going forward which I think you have at the end of the public comment period we will receive the public comments in and we'll need to turn those around relatively fast before producing a final draft, final proposal ahead of the Buenos Aires meeting.

So and Seun makes a point too that he doesn't see an action item announced yesterday's timeline well Seun true.

We probably do need to communicate that but there's really just a two day shift in it and I hope that's clear. Technically you're right there's a change but it's a relatively minor change.

Lise Fuhr: Jonathan I see (Elise) is mentioning in the chat that she thinks that we should have one Webinar a bit later so people can read the draft.

And I'd like to - well we actually considered that and we thought it would be - have the danger of not giving people enough time to comment on the proposal.

But I don't know if we should do one later. What are your thoughts on this Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: A really good point. I suppose it depends on the purpose of the Webinar. And I can see I think what we were thinking about was use it as an opportunity to inform people up front and have an opportunity to make that information.

I suspect if (Elise) is thinking about it in more on the Q&A side and less on the - you know, more on the interaction and less on the sort of pushing out the information. I can see then an argument for why it would be tempting to have it - have one a little later.

So I guess there's no reason why we couldn't have one a week or so into the public comment period. So we can look at that (Elise). It's a good point.

I mean there's really two options. We either shift one of the existing upfront Webinars out but they have a particular target and that's to educate readers of the document very much up front.

And I take your point that there may be use in having a Q&A Webinar that we could call it may be even slightly different, a Q&A session where the content

up front was much less and we did a Q&A. And that's what (Elise) has suggested.

So let's look into that. I think that is a good idea and it might be something we could do ten days, two weeks in where people have an opportunity to both hear the introductory Webinars, read the proposal.

And just to be crystal clear on the format of this proposal. The short form will be as - will resemble as closely as possible the existing numbers and protocol parameters to the extent that it can and respond directly to the RFP.

It's not strictly true that it will be separated. It will have a significant number of appendices. But it can't - it could be separated, not quite how we format that. But in principle it could be separated from the appendices and stand on its own two feet. But ultimately any curious reader will want to look at one or more appendices to see that.

And then third we will ask explain to provide a high level graphical communications tool to really educate someone coming in who would like so it would be correct to describe that as an executive summary but rather something that would communicate in short form what's actually being said in the proposal.

Okay. So and there is a further requests from (Constantino) to make sure that we do communicate that.

So I think certainly we should try and find a way. I mean I guess we can do that on this from the wiki and by whatever other means we can just to make sure that it's still there that's there's a two day delay.

Kurt asked if there's an explain graphic coming out of this meeting. Perhaps not exactly this meeting but in there will be an explain output to support the document that goes out for public comment.

And Chuck makes the point that one could necessarily separate out the short form and that was really why I was hesitating.

It's meant to be something for an expert user to compare, cross compare but ultimately the detail. So when I say yes we will publish them together Chuck rest assured.

All right let's move to Item 9 then where we deal with any updates should there be anything on the principles or cover off any other items that we have failed to cover off so far?

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Jonathan. It's Lise for the record.

((Crosstalk))

Lise Fuhr: Excuse me?

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead Lise. (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Lise Fuhr: Okay sorry. Yes it's Lise for the record. Yes as far as I know and I would have to consult Martin Boyle on this because we have had some email exchange today regarding this, this one-liner issue in the preamble is for the principles that needs to be settled. All others have been solved. So we're very close to concluding on those principles.

But Martin please chime in and give your view if I'm correct in stating that it's a slight wording in the preamble that is the outstanding issue now?

Martin Boyle. Are you there?

Martin Boyle: Sorry. I'll try again. I was...

Lise Fuhr: Oh you were on mute. Okay.

Martin Boyle: Yes. I was muted in two separate places on this stupid phone. Yes you're perfectly right Lise. The draft, the quote final draft that we put out had got a modified first paragraph to it and that's come in for comments from two people.

And therefore I've gone back to the person who proposed the revised paragraph in sharper text to seek him to withdraw his proposal so that we can go back to the original text.

The original text is text that everybody has seen before and nobody had commented on before so I would not see that as being an issue.

All the other comments and modifications that we have seen ad nauseam over a number of weeks have been - have received no further comments and therefore I think we can just go whittle all of those.

And I think unfortunately we got caught up in the snowballs of the intensive work a couple of days and the design teams which meant most people treating this as a lesser priority. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Martin. Well I think what we could do is actually then try and send those principles out those annex to this and highlight the - well we can try and I know we can have the discussion with the persons tomorrow maybe and then finalize it and send those out to the group together with the other draft. Thank you.

I - and Jonathan I don't think we have any more.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes great. Thank you I noticed that Alan Greenberg would like to bring up a point under any other business. Go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I'm not sure if DTF is the only one but there are a number of items that we're leaving for future work.

Now the CWG obviously could decide to keep DTF live for another month or so and we could work on it or some other process has to be chartered to look at these kinds of questions, the ones that we're leaving unanswered because there's no time in this phase to look at them. And they require substantive discussion with perhaps larger communities.

So I'm - I'd just like some guidance as to how we're going to deal with that. And there may well be ones from other design teams. I'm not sure.

I'll come back to those in a moment. I see Chuck's hand shot up possibly in response to that so let me let Chuck speak and I'll come back to the that.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan. Yes I want to follow up with Alan. And certainly the Design Team M identified that more work would need to be done.

There is a mediation optional step in there. And I suspect that -- and I don't want to speak for Avri -- but I suspect - and I wouldn't be surprised let me say it that way, I wouldn't be surprised in regard to the role of the IANA review functions, IANA Review Team that we may need to look at that and see if there are any holes that need to be filled in terms of implementation details. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: So thanks Alan. Thanks Chuck. I mean I certainly think having discussed this with Lise that our expectation is that work will continue during the course of the public comment on filling out details.

So the challenge here really is to capture the material (ports) and to get those into the document that goes out for public comment so there can be no doubt of the intention.

Now I don't think we can realistically get every single - well we know we can't. It's self-evident that we can't get all of the detail in.

The question is is it sufficiently clear what the intention of the group is and the level of detail such that we can have a document out for public comment and work in parallel with it? And that's the delicate balancing act.

So that's what I think is the intention and I still need to confirm that. Our intention is to continue working to fill out fine detail during the course of the public common period. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you. I guess the substance of my question was not would we continue working. We obviously have to. The question is what structure's that going to take?

Do we dissolve the design teams that are leaving unanswered questions as we originally said that they are going to really be short-lived things and create something else to do it, perhaps a wider group if it needs more consultation.

Or do we simply say the design teams will keep that task and work over the next month or so to affect those? That was really the substance of what I was asking.

That's a good question Alan and I get it now. Lise are you going to provide your thoughts on that?

Lise Fuhr: Yes because I think it would be nice to actually have the proposal in front of you before we decide on how to go on with the further work.

And as we say we might have a call on next Thursday. And I think that could be a call where we could conclude on some of those things.

And because if to me I kind of think - I think that the design teams were a good way to do it. But we might consider otherwise when we see what is missing in the final draft. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Lise. I'll add that I'm pretty much with you on that. And it may be that there's a combined solution.

Some design teams that have only just got going may need, you know, that have started late, much later may need to continue for a while in order to round off their efforts and the judgment call will be which ones to close down and consider as substantially complete. Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes just too here I wasn't asking for a ruling today. I just wanted to make sure it's on our to do list that there is work to be done and we need to decide who's going to do it. That's all.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Alan and it was a good question and a good point you raised. All right I am seeing us 90 minutes into a call in a week that's been usually busy and apparently finishing what we can or need to do for the moment.

So let me just make sure I - let me go - (Eduardo) the question here on legal versus functional, your question is will legal versus functional be answered after the public comment period?

I think we go into the public common period with legal and see how strong. If there are strong views against that we may need to respond. And we need to make clear the basis on which that has advantages and perhaps issues that where there are and give the opportunity to get feedback on that.

Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes Jonathan just following onto that. Then we need to be clear in the report that we're asking that question.

Jonathan Robinson: I agree. And that's always an interesting point where we flag points that we want specific input.

And that might be something to look at. As the document takes shape it's for anyone to give any input on where we think there could be specific areas over and above the opportunity to provide general input.

And by the way I think we have covered this before. But just to remind everyone we will do our best to seek structured input as opposed to free form input so that the input is directly targeted.

And I guess the group needs to think about as we are now where if anywhere we highlight that the group feels that there is a requirement for specific as opposed to general guidance or general offers for public input. So it's a good point.

And I note on that slightly lighter note but nevertheless Grace has highlighted that the updated attendance spreadsheets are available.

And we have Greg Shatan to be recognized for outstanding performance in attending the highest number of meetings followed by (Graham Bunton). So that's the award for attendance.

And I think it's more than just attendance. There has been some outstanding contributions. But that goes much more broadly than just those two so good.

Let's - we did our best to make sure we could find at least one meeting that was sufficiently anti-social and bracketed by others that we couldn't have you attending all of our meetings Greg. So sorry that we did knock you out of that one.

All right thanks everyone. Let's bring it to a close and work hard on producing this document. We really appreciate the ongoing collaborative and cooperative spirit to get this document in shape for next week.

Woman: Thanks everyone. Bye.

Woman: Goodbye everyone.

Man: Bye all.

Jonathan Robinson: Bye all.

Man: Thank you.

                           END