

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer  
April 14, 2015  
8:00 am CT**

Coordinator: Excuse me. The recordings have now been started.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you. Hi everyone. This is the 38th meeting of the CWG. It's seven UTC on April 14. And we'll do the roll call based on Adobe Connect.

But if there's anyone who's on the phone line, please speak up so we can note you in the notes. Okay, we're all set.

Jonathan Robinson: Great, thanks Grace. Hello everyone. And good morning from Brussels where Lise and I are co-chairs or co-located for the purposes of this high intensity set of meetings.

We thought we would just do a little recap on some of the key points from yesterday as part of getting this meeting - second day of meetings if you like - in particular meeting - moving again.

Clearly we're overall focused on pulling together the work of the group to develop the draft (unintelligible) order.

And what that means for us as a group is having the discipline to not open up substantial new threads - which probable means - almost certainly means no commissioning of new drafting teams or generally opening up new avenues if at all possible.

We ran two meetings on the existing design teams and all of their output yesterday. And that was a useful ability too. And we also ran a review of the (unintelligible) memo and the punch points that arose out the second.

If you recall, they ran a - simply ran a - prepared a memo for us. And on the back of the Q and A from the design team we then - from a Q and A from the group we then received from (Sidley) a set of punch points were effectively an opportunity to guide the work - or at least assisting guiding the root work.

From the design teams we were left with some open - some critical conclusions but also some further work to finalize the outputs. And today, what we will do in this meeting now is to try and capture those conclusions from the design teams and seek to deal with any loose ends running over from them.

In talking with this before the meeting, this is where I've really picked up on three - what we felt were three key issues that came out of yesterday.

One was, of course, this interrelationship between the design teams on the CSC - the escalation and the review and making sure that we work to thread those together.

The design team C, as you know, produced a narrow version of the CSC work. But the challenge with that is that there was some opportunity from the

escalation group to try and integrate with the CSC. And we need to marry those.

And also the design team end on reviews also had a set of hand offs that they wanted to all link that they want to make with the CSC.

A second key issue is that in and around the structural work. That's the work that's (unintelligible) underpinned by the input we've received from (Sidley) and the discussions we've made in and around the post transition IANA and the structuring which that will sit.

And an obvious objective there is to try and move towards a single variant of the proposal. And the current stage we've got - we've ended up with what we've called a single model that we're focusing in on with a couple of variants.

And we almost certainly need to bring that down into a single variant. And that's really when a bunch of secondary issues can be considered which - and the punch that this certainly the (Sidley) punch that certain (unintelligible) for dealing with some of those that may not be absolutely all incumbency. But it helps guide the conversation.

And then the third key issue is, of course, making sure that our dependency and linkage with the work of the CCWG is in place. And so what we're working on there is formulating additional detail on our request to the CCWG and also creating a checklist of dependencies.

That ultimately, when we make our proposal, we can be clear that our proposal is dependent on those contingencies - those dependencies.

So today is the three meetings. This is the first. And we'll focus really on bringing together those key elements of the design teams. It's more, I guess, technical operational focused.

But none of this can be as elegantly separated as we might like to think. Because as we know and talk about some of the detail that impacts on the structure and vice versa.

Over all, clearly the objective is to improve the conversions we've got on the content for the proposal - since we're aiming to drop a significant drop in less than a week and send that out for public comment.

There is one more CWG meeting scheduled for Thursday. But for the most part, where possible, we want pull together design team work today rather than waiting until Thursday.

So the structure we've got is we'll walk through the design teams - including the discussion of the open items from yesterday. And the working assumption really is that apart from these open issues that the work of the design team is agreed by the CWG.

So we really need you to flag if there is anything else that's open within the design team that hasn't been dealt with. And we'll walk through that design team by design team and make sure we deal with that.

Okay, so there's a hand up from Alan in the chat. Let's take the question or comment at this stage. And then move on to item two. Go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much - just an update on design team F. We have been doing a fair amount of work. We actually met. We'll be meeting again tomorrow.

Sometime during the day, preferably not in this session though, I can give a five minute recap of where we are - should you chose to do that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Alan. Let's take an update from you then when we come to the - when we come to taking that. And we'll do an update from you as well as design team L. So let's do that.

Okay, so let me check. I think we have a document that we can share with you. Yes that looks like it's coming up now - in terms of the open items.

If you'll recall from design team A, that there's a requirement ready to close the gap on - between the design teams proposed service level expectations and the current IANA SLA's.

And the design team was planning to meet yesterday and in fact did meet with the IANA staff and is working towards doing that and is fully aware of the Thursday deadline.

And we got a - we actually got an update from them - post their meeting at the third meeting yesterday. Are there any other comments or questions or issues relating to design team A?

All right, so I don't think that this - I agree Chuck with your point in the chat. I'm not sure there's much more we can do until we see the SLA, SLE's that - and ideally that there's a common view of.

Now moving on to design team C, clearly there was a couple of critical points that emerge out of the discussion there. The first was that the design team N that is on the review had a table of items that had implications or request of design team C.

And what we didn't check yesterday was whether design team C was prepared to accept those responsibilities that were essentially contained in that design team N table.

I know (Donna)'s not on. I see Staffan is on. Staffan, do you know if this is being discussed or agreed or is there any comment on this or Avri, if you had any conversations with design team C about their willingness to accept this or not.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you Jonathan, Staffan here. Now we've tried to start reasoning within the group by email. But we had no direct discussion from yesterday's impute.

We tried to figure out - well so how common is the escalations? And take in very - from the very - just the message in math. It's not that common as we might consider.

So we hope to get some idea of how common the escalations actually are. And what kind of escalations there are in real life. So we'll try to dig into that a bit.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, that's actually bullet two. But let's deal with that bullet two for now. And then we can come back to bullet one.

So the other point there was the questions, whether there were any other mechanisms that could help support that. I suppose and, in terms of dealing with that.

Its things like, whether or not mediation or an escalation to an independent review and whether - I guess this really goes to that question. I know this work in progress, Staffan.

So we're not necessarily expecting you to answer. But the issue there, I guess, was whether the design team C could act as a form of manager in that escalation process or have some role to play in that, especially if the volume is as light as it appears.

Staffan Jonson: Well, speaking for the group, I don't have that much to add on actually - since yesterday. So, of course, then we would need some kind of lead way to discuss this.

But I could, of course, explain my own views. But I guess if speaking for the group, I would need to talk with them more.

Jonathan Robinson: No problem then. And just be mindful then of - I mean we'll seek to get that updated view really by close of business on Wednesday - so a couple of days from now - in order to then deal with that and start to weave that into the draft proposal.

What about Bullet 1 with this issue with the output from design team N and their table that was associated with that?

Staffan Jonson: I would say it's much about the same issue there. We need some lead way to discuss this in the group to have something (unintelligible) to say - in order to make it a (unintelligible) proposal.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, thank you. And well, there's certainly - what might be helpful is that that's further communicated by design team N to the group. So maybe - I don't know if Avri - if you'd be willing to just flag that on email. Not now in the call, but to make sure that that's properly flagged with the group so that they're aware of that.

I see a couple of hands have come up, as well. So Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan. With regard to design team M, they're, you know, I think Staffan's right. That there needs to be a meeting of the minds between design team M and design team C. And maybe design team N, as well.

One of the problems when we have so many meetings so close together, there really isn't much time to - for the design teams to collaborate. So I don't think that's going to happen in any reasonable way until we get passed these intensive meetings.

One of things I didn't communicate very well yesterday - with regard to the customer complaint resolution process in Annex Y of design team M - was the changes that the design team M made with regard to design team C concerns.

And I think in looking at those, you know, it's related to the quest - very closely related to the question you asked just a little bit ago Jonathan.

In that, design team M is not so much looking at design team - or the CSC to serve as a dispute resolution provider as it is managing the escalation process in phase to. And then ultimately, the problem management process - the third process.

So, and we could probably talk about changes still yet that makes that even more true. But at some point, I think we're going to need that manager function.

If it's not the CSC - as pointed out yesterday - we're going to have to decide who that is. I think some significant work will need to be done in that regard.



One of the things that as I was thinking about this, I actually like the principal that design team C seem to place their number one principal.

And that is to - the way I view it is to keep the CSC role very minimal. But one problem I see with that, if you take that to the extreme, then that complexity that the CSC is avoiding, it's just shifted to somewhere else.

And therefore, it adds complexity because you have a new entity that needs to absorb the functions of that the CSC doesn't.

Now that said, I do think the CSC should be kept minimal. And my own personal view is I think that we can kind of reach a compromise between the two groups.

And I think design team M, as I said, because I think if the CSC doesn't provide at least a management function of the escalation processes. Then again, we've got to do some significant work too.

Jonathan Robinson: So Chuck...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks very much. Just a practical point, you're sound - your volume on your mic sounded a little bit low. You were a little bit faint. So just bare that in mind if you contribute again. And maybe you can do something to adjust that.

But notwithstanding, I think that's a very valuable contribution. And you and I haven't talked and discussed this at all. But it happens to - the analogy that's been in my mind, as well, which will be an analogy you're familiar with.

Is that of - and I realize one can't push this too far. But just in my mind because I'm so involved with the GNSO counsel. It makes me think of that a little - where the GNSO counsel's got a high profile but very constrained role as a manager of the policy function.

And I think, you know, you're thinking there is attractive to me anyway. And so I like that. And I realize your point about the constraints of time - is clearly a challenge.

One way of dealing with that might be to offer the - or even request that the DT M, N and C bring their discussions onto the main list so they can collaborate with one another rather than operating. Because it's - in some senses - I'm not sure that each is seeing each other's traffic.

Let me stop there for the moment and make sure I differ to the queue which is next up. We've got Martin in there.

Martin Boyle: Thanks Jonathan, Martin Boyle here. I'd just like to supplement what Staffan was saying about the reviews process - and certainly DTC in its work.

And so very firmly the role of the CSC as doing the monitoring and auditioning process that the NTI did and the community in general did against the various reporting requirements in the existing statements of work.

So while we haven't necessarily gone through all of those, certainly we have gone through a number of them. And I've come up with various sets of conclusions. And I've just scanned my eye over the annex table of reviews from design team N.

And I think the only two that led me to think that perhaps we just need to give some additional thought is on the review of the security audits process reports - where our current decisions - current discussion - said that that was probably more about making sure that the security audit process took place.

And that the report showed no signs for alarm. And if there were to make sure that the IANA functions operator was doing something about it because we have a certain concern about the CSC getting involved in information that might need to or perhaps ought to be kept confidential.

And the other one was on the review of the (unintelligible) end audit reports. But just looking through, I don't see any immediate problems on any of that list of table of reviews. But obviously, we are going to need to go back over and make sure we've answered them all one by one. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, thanks Martin. I was just making sure - just processing that and making sure I was clear on that point. So that needs a little more work to deal with that - Avri.

Avri Doria: Yes this is Avri speaking. I just want to back up with what Chuck said. But also and with what Martin said. The items that are in there are all derived with OW.

And if it isn't the CSC then I wouldn't know who. So, but having heard Martin, I feel less anxiety about this particular gap being filled, thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: So Staffan back to you.

Staffan Jonson: Well thank you. Just to add on to some of my previous comments. The CSC is - at least in my eyes - a function rather than an organization. And what difference is that?

Well in my eyes, at least, a function might be finable within an organization, having several compliments within it. So that's one important feature. We tend to regard the CSC as an organization which I wouldn't agree.

In my eyes, it's a function. So then even - or back in (unintelligible) we talked about several functions for this process. I do like the DTN in its agnostics. And it has an agnostic approach to institutional homes for its escalation process.

It's an escalation process that stands on its own, independent on what organization. So what we tend to come back to is so if not in the CSC what other organization?

And maybe that's the direction forward because the idea behind minimizing the CSC and its role is shifting complexity to somewhere else. It is to keep the CSC simple, predictable, et cetera, in the beginning.

So, and that is part of the design (unintelligible) actually, to put disputes somewhere else. So in order to get ahead of this we might consider what kind of organization.

If we put the disputes somewhere else - there are really enough of disputes and need to be in another organization. But what kind of disputes are we talking about here?

Then we go back to the definition of the (NATO) technical definition of disputes or of why the policy discussion. So I guess what I'm trying to sum up here is that the escalation process in itself is a good structure. We just need it to get to home.

And that is maybe yet another organization that is already being discussed. Thank you.

(Jonathan): Thanks Staffan. Chuck, you're back in the queue. Go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Yes can you hear me better this time?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, loud and clear, thanks Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: My mic was shifted a little bit. Okay, a suggestion. I don't know if we can find the time. I think probably has to be after today. But it's seems to me that if we were to arrange at least a 90 minute call, we could try in an hour. I'm not sure we can achieve enough in an hour.

But between the three design teams - - C, M and N - - that might be a way that we can put our heads together and do what Staffan was just suggesting. I think we know where the key issues are. And hopefully, you know, before our meeting on Thursday we'd be able to maybe have a meeting of the minds to see what changes we could make.

And even if we need to come up with another place where the escalation management function would reside, now I think that that, in itself, will probably result in the need for some additional work.

If we move that escalation management functions to another place. But we can maybe at least get to that point. And then we can hopefully work on that together.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck. That's a constructive suggestion. And I think we'll work with staff to try and set to that. It's a very good idea. And I think it may well be that between that an email conversations in the meantime. You can move this forward.

And I won't presume how. It's clear there're some principals of simplicity that the CSC set out to achieve. Yet there're some practical requirements. And whether those can be welded together or some other alternative is required.

I won't presume yet. It's a good idea to deal with that in a course. So let's plan to do that. And I think we'll ask Grace to come with a suggested time as soon as possible because she's familiar with the schedule of all of the other work going on. And we can see if that can't - if we can't unlock this issue.

So suspect there's not a whole lot more we can say on DTC now. I'm also mindful, of course, that it's a hostile hour for some, at least. And I'm sure we haven't got everyone on the call. So that's been a useful discussion. And there's a potential way forward.

On design team O we had now - as of a very dynamic update. I see Avri potentially feels hostile. We'll have to be careful how much we engage her then or with care.

I know it's rough. It's for everyone having this sequence of calls or it felt like it. It was perhaps the only way we'd really keep things moving forward. On design team O, we have the shared budget information.

Is there anything else that is open or it means we can't accept the recommendations. Because, as I said, if not, we'll be assuming that the recommendations of design team O are banked - if you like - and dealt with.

Okay, so then on design team N we have the notes saying, "We need to update the recommendations to reflect the periodic review of the IANA function to be triggered in."

I think we agreed not to use the word emergency. It's, you know, out of sequence with the regular reviews. That can be on ad hoc occasions or (unintelligible). Yes I think out of sequence with the regular reviews.

What is not clear yet is who will - which organization or entity can trigger such a review although we did have the prospect of the CSC. That wasn't agreed.

So we also have a key point here. And I think this relates to a point you made earlier in the chats. And I realize it's not the - all of that point Avri. But we agreed that the recommendations arising from a periodic review on neither limited nor prescribed.

What the means is there is one perspective place where a recommendation could be made for a RFP. And so whilst it's not prescribed, it's not forbidden either. So to those saying, "Where's the prospect of RFB?" That's one point.

And I see a hand from Avri. I hope it's not a hostile hand. But go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. And I'll try to keep my hostility down to a whisper. That was a part of my issue is that it makes total sense for this to be one its possibilities and to come up with others.

But we also need to develop that mechanism itself to say that it could trigger one without defining what one would be like, you know, how it would work, whatever seems like a gap in our report. That, you know, it's quite wide.

And I know you said, "No new work." And it made me feel very frustrated. Because last thing I did before going to sleep three hours ago was to write a draft of a template for doing that work.

So, you know, but I'm really concerned that that both what triggers it. But that's one thing but what it can trigger or, indeed, if anything else can trigger that how it's done.

But both of the solutions, structural solutions, we have on the table both the internal and the affiliate, both (unintelligible) of the affiliate I guess, have a notion of being able to trigger such a thing. So I think we have to define what such a thing looks like. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Avri, is it possible that we could work on that as part of the implications of the proposal? I mean is that something that could go into RFP4 as we work to develop RFP4. We've got perhaps a little bit more leeway there and that might be one way of dealing with it.

One - you know, we've got a couple of known conditions which might lead to an RFP, and it maybe that that is the right place to deal with it and that would.



Avri Doria: This is Avri again. I suppose that it could be done anywhere. In fact, when I was writing up that template and trying to find where to peg that into the document, that whole implantation section did look like one possibility. But, you know, as the Design Teams were just your proper (caded) mechanism for a way to get the work done.

I think it belongs in the earlier section of the document, but it doesn't matter to me where we actually do the work as long as we're not barred from doing it. That might have almost been (unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: Why don't we get that text that you worked on out on the list, have a look at it, and then we can look at how that might be integrated into the proposal on whether indeed it does look like it could fit into some RFP4 Section.

So Chris questions in the Chat whether we're talking about triggering a review, and we were talking about triggering a review Chris. So just to be clear, we have a periodic review which is what Design Team N has suggested. What we agreed yesterday that would be a no greater than five year intervals. It's guaranteed it's built in that it cannot occur at a period longer than five years.

We also talked about and have agreed the principle that an ad hoc review could take place in conditions of substantial concern over the operations. What we haven't agreed is what would trigger such a review.

And then third, what we've agreed is that we haven't bound or restricted the recommendation that might come out of that review, and therefore one recommendation could be that the provision of the IANA services is put out to tender, if you like, wire and RFP to provide that service.

And what Avri has talked about here is where in the proposal such detail on RFP might sit.

And then Avri points out that may have part of the review and - so the question is does it stand freely from the review section. Because one of the options would have been to put this into the Design Team that dealt with reviews. And the quick question is where in the document is there a place for dealing with an RFP type process.

So the current suggestion that comes out, the text that's been worked on comes out on the list, it may be possible that that can be threaded into the implications of the proposal as dealt with on RFP4, and that is a potential home.

I've got someone who's not on mute and there's movement or rustling in the background, so if you could just check if you're on mute please.

Alan Greenberg: Did we mute the speaker as well?

Jonathan Robinson: No. So just to be clear, what Avri - I mean I realize that you've probably formulated that in the Design Team type template. But I mean this is not - we haven't agreed to another Design Team. What we're trying to do is have a look at what's proposed here or the text and see if how we can deal with - yes, exactly.

So I just wanted to make it clear because you said you'd send out a template but it's not necessarily in that structure at this stage of the Design Team structure.

Thanks Avri.

I'm going to ask for a catch-all question on these Design Teams. Oh, I guess I'm just making myself - reminding myself of where we are in the agenda because now we have the opportunity to hear from Design Team L and F of course; yes. So that's the plan.

So let's hear from Matthew I think is in a position to give us an update on Design Team L and see where we stand as far as that's concerned.

Matthew Shears: Jonathan, can you hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, thanks Matthew.

Matthew Shears: Okay great.

All right, so Design Team L, as you can see, is the Design Team that was asked to specifically look at one clause in the existing NTI ICANN contract. And just so there is full understanding of what we're looking at, I've just pasted that clause into the Chat - and apologies for that.

But it's very important that people understand this bench focuses on one thing. That what we're looking at here is C.7.3 transition to success of contract.

And the first line is very important there. It says, "In the event the government selects a successor contractor, the contractor shall have a plan in place for transitioning each of the IANA Functions to ensure an orderly transition while maintaining continuity, security of operations." So we're looking very specifically at that transition plan which is a four-page plan.

And we were asked to do two things. One of which was to look at that plan and assess as to whether it's still needed or some variation of it is needed. And then to see how it should be evolved. And so that was really our mandate.

The Design Team recommends that there is a continuation of a transition framework for the IANA Functions. That based not only on the notion that there could be a transition to a successor/operator in the future, but also the importance as we've discussed occasionally of the notion of having in place a business continuity plan should some emergency or disaster or some other event occurred that required some kind of transitioning of the operations themselves.

So what we've done is we've looked closely at the existing plan, and we've made some modifications to it.

I think that the most important learning from this was that we did not try to recreate a plan or to try to redraft it in its entirety, but rather to focus on the existing plan and to evolve certain elements of it.

Now what we decided also is that it would be wise for us at this juncture in the process to recommend the continuation of a transition plan, but to a system that in the sense of the framework rather than a specific plan. We did this for a number of reasons one of which was that we felt that many elements of the existing plan could be carried through.

But we also felt that it would be difficult for us to put specific details on this transition plan while there are many dependencies and issues such as the model has not been selected and we don't know what the final ICG proposal to NTIA looks like and how that will be implemented or selected or implemented and put in place in the future.

So basically the idea was to say to recognize the existing plan is adequate. In the template, we've added some considerable detail. But as you can see from the recommendations there in front of you, that we ask much in the same way as the original NTIA ICANN contract asked that a very specific transition plan be as fully functional be developed within 18 months of the overall stewardship transition.

The other (unintelligible) as you can see in the recommendation, we suggested that there should be specific line item in the budget for funding of this plan and its development, and that obviously should a situation arise where there is a need to transition to a successor operator, that obviously that should not occur until such a plan is in place.

And obviously the fifth one is that both the incumbent and successor operator should be required to fully be engaged in that transition plan. So that's the basic recommendations.

There are some dependencies and some questions, and some of those dependencies, as I've mentioned, really depends on the final ICG proposal, depends on the model that this particular is dealing with; some of the dependencies also would like to work with Design Teams.

And one of which, of course, is DTM and DTN because whatever the results of a review or whatever the results of an escalation process there is, there will possibly be a transition again to a successor operator, and that transition needs to be managed in a way that shows continuity.

There is in the document in the existing plan -- the four page plan that exists in the current contract. There is also in there that refers to various elements of

the existing contract and that will need to be updated once the current proposal is formulized or probably even after it's been adopted so that all the various pieces within the plan that need to be within the proposal that need transitions or taken into account in a transition are done so.

So that's it. There are some, as I said, there are some changes that we've made to some of the actual transition actions that exists in the current plan. Most of those adjusted changes are about adding more detail, you know, element and components be transitioned or at least be the subject of discussion between incumbent and successor operators. And I think that pretty much covers it.

We've had a couple of outstanding questions. We've had Greg's feedback from David Conrad and the team came together very nicely on pulling this together.

So I think kind of to wrap the idea really is to continue to work with the existing transition plan slightly evolve, but ensure there is a commitment in the proposal going forward that a fuller plan that has more detail and more explicit requests of both the incumbents and successor operator actually be developed in the near future after the actual stewardship transition. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Matthew.

There's a question or comment from Chuck so I'll go straight to Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Matthew and thanks Jonathan.

First of all, I think the principles and recommendations and the framework that was distributed are very good.

At first thought, I thought, "Well why wait - why take 18 months to do it?" But the more I think about that I'm not sure that's an issue that we need to worry too much about. I think we have to be careful though that it be put on the backburner and just kind of put off.

So I think one of the things that would be very helpful is to focus on how we make sure this really happens and doesn't just get put on the backburner. So hopefully it'll never have to be used, but if there is a need it needs to be in place. And I fully support the team's emphasis on more detail in the plan; I think that's essential.

So has there been any thought with regard to who would develop this transition plan once we do get to the point where that 18 month period, or whatever period we decide, would be initiated? Because I think the less definition we have with regard to who is going to develop it and how it's going to be approved and so forth, the less likely the thing is going to be to get done once the clock starts ticking.

So I'm just curious whether the team has talked about that and what your thinking is in that regard. Thanks.

Matthew Shears: Jonathan, do you want me to address that?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, please go ahead Matthew.

Matthew Shears: Yes, I also see there are a couple of similar questions in the Chat.

The interesting thing about this particular transition plan, this one to a successor operator, is in the broader contract area of contingency and continuity of operations planning. So in a way, and as I kind of said upfront

but I probably should emphasize that, you know, the Design Team very much felt that this is a key part of any business continuity planning.

So certainly we have not actually and specifically who should develop the plan going forward but it would certainly make sense that for the notion of business continuity planning and this element of it should be part of the proposal going forward.

We did put in the DIDP for the current continuity plan, but the last I think the last status on that was that it was refused. But I understand they're starting to work on this to see if they can bring us up somehow.

So I think it has to probably be seen in a bigger context and bigger framing. And as I said, I don't think we've actually explicitly considered who should do it but certainly it should probably fall to the operator -- the incumbent operator.

The reason for the 18 months to answer Chuck and Mark is that that was the time period that NTI had asked ICANN to develop the same plan. So we thought it was a reasonable timeframe within which to address it.

But I do actually very much take your point Chuck that we do need to make sure this happens, and we might want to be more explicit in the recommendations or draft an additional recommendation that there is a commitment to getting this done and that it doesn't, as you say, go on the backburner. Thanks.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks.



Jonathan Robinson: Okay, so really those were a couple of good questions which were, as you know, to Matthew's thought in the Chat, and really there's two issues; one, who is responsible, and two, in what timeframe. I notice that there are a couple of suggestions in the Chat as to who might help with it or who might do it. In addition, I believe IANA developed the original transition plan.

Certainly one option would be to try and invoke any existing organs and capabilities we have along the lines of what Chris has suggested. Perhaps IANA together with the CSC possibly with some other expertise -- community expertise or otherwise.

In terms of the commitment to do so, I do think that's - there's a key thread that runs through a lot of our work. And that is any sort of binding commitments that go with the proposal.

So I think this in part one to add to our list with the lawyers and the work of the ccWG because the question is if it wasn't developed then what. Because that's the only way you can have some kind of binding commitment; it's all very well.

So I think that certainly needs - that's if you like a loose end that needs to be tied up. It's the who and by when and what commitment underpins that.

Matthew Shears: I would also encourage any of the other members of the Design Team to jump in if they want to add anything.

Jonathan Robinson: Well I note that Sharon has very helpfully stayed awake for this call and has pointed out in the Chat that this could work. Assuming we went for a contract between ICANN and IANA, this could be something that could be contemplated in the contract as it is in the NTIA contract, so it could become

part of the formal framework. So that's certainly a way in which we could do it, and that makes sense.

And yes, thanks noted to Matthew and James who had to leave the Design Team unfortunately early and others who contributed to this.

Matthew Shears: Jonathan, I'm not sure I have much more to add but I think some excellent points have been raised.

In terms of the commitment to actually undertaking the plan, we can certainly write that in as an additional recommendation, but as you say, it seems it also needs to be a part of a bigger kind of commitment list if you will.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, thanks Matthew. And there's no doubt that your team - but I think that does sound like what's been suggested and requested; that the Design Team recommends that this is formally, although there is some kind of substance to that commitment -- that 18 month commitment. And you can't, from the Design Team perspective, presuppose for example, what model they're in is going to be chosen.

But I think that's a good point that you can recommend that A, that it's formally committed to both in particular in terms of a timeframe, but potentially also in terms of responsible parties. So that's helpful. Thank you Matthew and team.

Let's move on and hear from Design Team F where Alan Greenberg has offered to give us some form of update and move that along a little.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you Jonathan.

We will really be providing two levels of input. The first is formal recommendations; they will be relatively short. As recommended by Design Team D, the NTIA approval function on routine DNS Root Zone changes is going away. And the actual implementation of that is relatively simple and we'll be going into that in just a little bit of detail.

I need to do some interactions with IANA to verify some details before trying to describe it, but it's not a particularly complex thing. Along the way - sorry - that's part number one.

Part number two is there are other aspects of NTIA involvement that have happened are poorly documented and do need to be replaced, and specifically NTIA has been involved in any of the major technical/structural/architectural changes associated with Root Zone management. Examples are DNS SEC deployment of IPv6.

As I said, this is not well documented so trying to replace it is something that we're not going to be able to use more than vague words for. But NTIA has taken part in the process themselves. They have involved other groups NIST, the National Institutes of Standards and Technology which is part of the Department of Commerce, has been a resource that has been used on things like DNS SEC. And we're going to have to functionally replace the NTIA to make sure that we still are making decisions that are made essentially properly.

Related to that, the NTIA has acted essentially as the authority making decisions of go/no go, and it's not quite clear how we're going to replace that part of the relationship but it's one of the things we're talking about.

Along the way, we have discovered - not discovered because most of these are well known. We've identified a number of potential deficiencies in the overall Root Zone management process.

Some of these might conceivable be exacerbated with the lack of NTIA authorization, not that the NTIA has actually caught any errors, but the presence of the NTIA in the loop might well have inhibited errors in some unusual circumstances.

And we are going to be recommending further work be done; some of it perhaps to be included in the full transition plan, some of it post transition to try to identify and minimize these gaps at the same time as not altering the timeliness of the Root Zone management functions. Because clearly customers and explicitly the Internet users are happy with the current performance and we don't want changes and tinkering to, you know, impact that in a negative way.

So that's where we stand right now. I'm in the process of writing some of this up. We will have another meeting tomorrow, and I think by Thursday or the very early Friday meetings, we will have something substantive to provide. Thank you.

I'm hearing nothing. I don't know if...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: I was just waiting to see if - Chris had his hand up previously and I wondered if there was...

Chris Disspain: I posted my question in the Chat Room Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Oh thanks Chris.

Alan Greenberg: I'm afraid I don't quite understand that question Chris.

Chris Disspain: Well Alan - sorry, excuse me. If it's okay, I'll try and explain Alan.

What I was asking was you used DNS SEC as an example like (unintelligible) et cetera. I'm wondering whether we can think of any examples that would fit into that sort of basket that would not normally just sit within the policy functions of the C's and the G's.

In other words, is the answer to the question that we already have the mechanisms in place by using the ccNSO and the GNSO to set the policy for the adoption of any new mechanisms and the like? It's a question I'm not (unintelligible), I'm just asking.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, I'm far from the right one to answer the question but I'll do my best.

I suspect the answer is no. certainly the decision points have - both the technical decisions taken and the timing of them has involved a significant number of people making lots of different contributions. But including real, you know, experts in the particular field we are looking at.

That isn't to say those people could not be invoked by some working group of the gTLD or the ccTLD, but that's not necessarily a natural home for it; at least that's my take.

I'll certainly raise that issue with the group and look at whether that can happen. But my gut feeling is no, that wouldn't be a natural fit.

Lise Fuhr: Chris?

Chris Disspain: Yes (Unintelligible), I can hear you but I'm not running the meeting.

Lise Fuhr: No, I'm sorry.

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead.

Lise Fuhr: I realize I was out of order, but just on that question.

The other thing that came up in the DTS discussions was making sure that someone has budget authority to go make a decision to investigate some of these questions because some of them are complex and take some significant analysis. And that needs to be part of somebody's authority to even raise some of them.

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you, I didn't mention that.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, any more questions or comments or issues arising for Alan?

Alan Greenberg: I'll just make one more comment. The other areas we were looking at, a lot of them focus on robustness; that is the ability to be absolutely sure that the changes that are going through are the ones that were requested and not any others, and we're moving where possible either the opportunity for either accidental or malicious change as requests pass through the process to ultimately get into the Zone file that is distributed.

Jonathan Robinson: So Alan, just thinking about the logistics here, I mean we are running a CWG call on Thursday. There was one originally on Friday which we haven't

cancelled simply as a kind of placeholder really. Our intention is to try and close this out by Thursday so just bear that in mind please; that's the deadline.

If absolutely necessary, we can run something on Friday but that's really...

Alan Greenberg: That's the 1900 UTC on Thursday?

Jonathan Robinson: Correct.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, yes. That's certainly a target within our view. I hadn't realized we were planning on cancelling the ridiculously early morning time for the other ones -  
- from my perspective.

But yes, if we're going to have it ready for that one, we're likely to have it ready for the Thursday one before also.

Jonathan Robinson: Right. Well I mean just to be crystal clear on that, the Thursday was intended to replace Friday. We didn't remove Friday simply because of the intensity with which we're working and we felt it was better to leave it in there from kind of a logistical and planning point of view in case it was necessary, but we're hoping not to use it.

Alan Greenberg: I am hoping, but can't guarantee obviously, that coming out of our meeting tomorrow, which unfortunately was scheduled such that some of the key players are not going to be there, which is why I'm hedging a little bit that we'll have something firmer at that point. You know, I'm not guarantee the wording is perfect, but something that can at least can note the gist of what we're talking about.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, thanks very much; that's great. So that's probably all we can say on Design Team F and the associated logistics with that.

We actually covered DTL - did we cover DTL? Am I - I think we covered DTL that's the Business Continuity and Transition Plan. So we've actually - we went into that as part of the overall Design Team.

So I think that gives us the opportunity to move on to Design Team - sorry - yes, second order or Priority 2 Design Teams and Item 4. And this was something that came up on the last call I think.

Lise Fuhr: Yes, during the call last Tuesday, I promised you that Jonathan and I would access the Priority 2 Design Teams. And well, as a main rule, we (unintelligible) Priority 2 Design Teams as not as urgent as needed for the proposal in the beginning, and now we've done a reassessment of those.

And I'd like to go through those with you now. And you can ask questions regarding our assessment.

But the first one is Design Team G; that's the IANA Intellectual Property Rights including the IANA Trademark and Domain Name.

And well, this is an issue that's not only for the naming community, that's also coming up in the numbers and protocol communities. And as such, we recommend that it's not dealt with by Design Team but it's dealt with through coordination with the other groups as necessary.

Well we have a dialogue at the moment with CRISP Team Chairs, so we will have a discussion regarding this. And to the extent that we have an issue



regarding IPR that are naming specific, we will get input from the legal advisors.

So this means that Design Team G is to be concluded/dealt with other ways than in the Design Team and not put in the actual proposal at the moment.

Is there any questions for this?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, this is Jonathan. A comment from me just to be clear.

We have a call scheduled - we haven't got an open dialogue apart from a couple of emails so far with the Chairs of the CRISP Team, but we have a call scheduled I think shortly to - I think really it's probably driven by two things.

I think the list saw that - well, it's primarily driven by - I think we copied the request or the comments from I think led by (Azumey), an email from (Azumey) relating to requesting an update and just understanding really - I think my sense is that there concern is to make sure that they understand the implications or potential implications or simply understand the work that the naming community is doing so that there is prospect of, at minimum, of common understanding and to the extent that it's relevant coordination.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Jonathan. Any questions or remarks or DTG? Doesn't look like.

I'll move on to Design Team H. That's .INT Operations. That was proposed by Elise Lindeberg. She's not at the call as far as I know. But as we understand, this is actually being dealt with by the GAC and we're waiting for - they're waiting on this issue.

I'd like to ask if there are any questions or remarks regarding DTH. No?

Okay, we'll move on to DTI is the Competition Policy and Conflicts of Interest. And actually Jonathan and I consider that this issue is adequately addressed by DTC, and we also note that the legal input that has provided guidance with regard to anti-trust requirements (unintelligible).

And we think if necessary, we can seek further legal input on this, and on best practices, governance guidance on this issue. So we don't find that it's necessarily dealt with in a specific Design Team as this area is being dealt with in other Design Teams and with the input we're getting from our legal advisors at the moment.

Any questions for DTI; Competition Policy and Conflicts with Interest? No.

Then we have DTJ, that's the CSC/MRT Confidentiality and the Perception of Conflicts of Interest. And like the other issue regarding Competition Policy and Conflicts of Interest, we also find that this is being addressed by DTC and our legal advisors. So this is also an issue that we don't think should be dealt with by a specific design team as it's being dealt with otherwise at the moment.

Any questions for CSC, Confidentiality and the Perception of Conflicts of Interest? No.

Okay, we have the last one; that's DTK, that's the OFAC Licensing. Actually this too is being dealt with by ICANN as a whole. So ICANN is having a process for handling this. So it's not an issue that needs to be raised specific for IANA as long as it stays with ICANN.

So we have some wording proposed from the ICANN Staff on this and we'll put it in the proposal. So it's not needed to have a specific Design Team on this as it's an issue that is being taken care of by ICANN at the moment.

I see Alan Greenberg, your hand is up. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, just a quick question. On the cases where you say this is being handled by an existing Design Team, I'm presuming the Design Team leader for those groups have acknowledged that and say it's within their capabilities and scope? Or is that what this discussion right now is to ensure.

Lise Fuhr: This is what this discussion is to ensure. So if anyone - and that's why we paused to have the comments or questions.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Am I not being clear about that? Does anyone want to chime in on any of the prior Design Teams? Alan, your hand is still up. Is that an old hand? Okay, I don't see any other questions.

Martin Boyle, go ahead.

Martin Boyle: Thanks Lise; Martin Boyle here.

If I understood that right then, your troll over the Priority 2s put the Competition Policy and Conflicts of Interest and the Confidentiality and Perception of Conflicts of Interest into work that the Design Team C needs to be produce at least a few lines explaining how it's going to address that.

Am I right?

Lise Fuhr: Actually Martin, you're partly right because Design Team C has already, as we see it, covered Conflict of Interest. Some of the issues are being dealt with here and other issues are being dealt with in our legal advice. So it's partly belonging to C and partly covered by the legal advice.

And I think Jonathan wants to chime in.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, I just think it's worth noting in that context that the reasons for selecting Sidley were complicated. They responded to a brief and came back with a variety of responses and competencies as did others.

But one of those was extensive experience in governance and governance-related issues. And these points are really governance-related points.

So I think the point being here is that the CSC has made - and the Design Team C has made some attempt to deal with these issues and included that in the current recommendations which may be adequate. But in addition to the extent that they are not, and as the structure that emerges, we will expect to subject that to a corporate governance review through the lens of the expertise of Sidley and work with them to enhance any elements that need doing so.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Jonathan. Any other questions? Martin, go ahead.

Martin Boyle: So essentially just to make sure that I fully understand this, you're not actually expecting Design Team C to produce anything extra in relation to this. And so that would only then come up if Austin Sidley turned around and say, "Well there are issues associated with this." So that we don't need to do a crash core or anything to resolve anything; we've already done that work.

Lise Fuhr: That's correct Martin even though we'd like to put more work on you, but no you don't need to do anymore.

Martin Boyle: That's music to my ears; thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Hi everyone. So the next item is Item 4. Lise and I were just confused as to who was going to take the next - or Item 5 - who was going to take the next item.

Really this is the implications of the Post-Transition Proposal Section 4 of our proposal. And as you know, we've had - and that's something which is in draft at the moment and something which we've lent on the Staff somewhat heavily to try and help us flesh out.

To some extent, this is clearly based on the model we choose and so there are limits to how far we can go with this as we've always said. So that being said, we have done work like run the initial report against the SAC69 Report.

And so I'd encourage you, the important thing here from the group's point of view is to review - I'm just going to check with Staff because I think to the best of my knowledge we've already sent around a draft of the current version of Section 4.

Grace, go ahead.

Grace Abuhamad: Hi Jonathan, this is Grace for the record.

Yes, so what we did is we took what was DTE, the SAC69 Overlap and Analysis, and we incorporated that into Section 4. We also looked at the

results of the RFP4 work that had been done before we released the first draft for public comment in December.

And then we also incorporated some stress tests that the ccWG and the Accountability is looking at, although we're going to be working with Cheryl and Avri, I believe, to further elaborate on which stress tests need to be included and how they need to be developed. And I think we've been in contact with Cheryl on this, and I think that's mainly just a question of finalizing some things on the Accountability side and feeding them back into the CWG.

So there's coordination, but we're lucky that in the case for the stress test that both Cheryl and Avri are on both groups, so we have good coordination there.

But yes, all of this was included in the Draft B.3 Version 3 that was sent out - how long ago - on April 2 I believe. So it's there, and any comments or feedback/additions to the outline are welcome. And we're just trying to build it out as we go.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Grace. Any comments or questions in and around the implications? We've touched on it in a couple of other points earlier today.

I'm trying to understand Cheryl's comment here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If you like, I can speak to that briefly.

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead Cheryl; yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Great, thanks. Just to what Grace is outlining, within the existing draft in Version 3 of our document, there's listed some half a dozen stress tests that

have been identified as relevant to our work. That was in fact two more but they did not a problem, then the ccWG had identified on behalf of what it thought we would be interested in. And the ccWG stress test working party has simply noted those two additional ones and will ensure that the stress tests are run in a way that looks specifically for IANA aspects.

Does that help?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Cheryl. That's okay; that's helpful.

All right, I think that probably deals with that item on the agenda. And I note that there is a request from Chuck for a couple of additional questions so that makes sense to cover those now then. Let's go to those.

Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan, I appreciate that. And the two items are a little bit related.

First of all, I don't know if any of you had time to even see it, but I forwarded shortly before this call started, the analysis of the IANA costs that the Finance Team and Xavier in particular promised to have by end of the day California time yesterday.

So that analysis I just wanted to very quickly point out that it has two parts; there are two documents. One of them is a Word document that breaks out the IANA costs with the exception - please read the preamble of that table there that points out it does not include capital costs, okay. And that's stated in the last sentence of the preamble.

But it is an analysis by the finance team of all of the costs of the IANA services in the Fiscal Year 15 Budget that obviously that year hasn't finished yet; it'll finish June 30. And coming to a total of \$6.3 million.

And please note the preparatory comments that Xavier put in there. Obviously these figures would change depending on what model we go with and so forth, so wanted to call your attention to that Word document.

But also one of the categories in the Word document is the support function's allocation. And that has to do with various costs of different ICANN support functions that contribute towards the overall IANA services. And a fairly detailed list of those is included in a spreadsheet that is also attached that breaks those out in detail.

So I won't go through those; I didn't intend to do that. But I did want to point out that that is available, I think it's something we all wanted. Because the ICANN budget, the way costs are captured, do not make it possible to just look at a function and see what the total costs are.

So very much appreciate Xavier and his team for doing this. And these documents I think may even become more useful to us as we begin to look at specific solutions and the impact that they may have from a cost perspective.

Now the tie to my second point is with regard to these costs, what are we going to do with regard to going forward in these? We can use this information I think to look at other solutions - the solutions, as we begin to narrow down our thinking and hopefully begin to reach consensus. So this data should be very useful in that regard.



So I do want to just make sure everybody is aware of those. It's just two one-page documents so it's not very difficult to take a look at. And if people have questions, please ask them in that regard.

Now I haven't totally expressed my second point because I have forgotten it. So I will pause there and you can turn to Olivier and hopefully I'll think of it.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck. Thanks for flagging that, thanks for bringing it to our attention and for assisting in getting the information in the first place.

I agree with you. I think it's useful as a piece of information that links into our thinking about future scenarios and structural considerations in knowing and understanding the current cost base and what the implications of any change might be.

Let's see if you come up with a second point following. In the meantime, we will go to Olivier. Olivier, go ahead.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks very much Jonathan; Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking.

And unfortunately much to my disappointment, I'm unable to read Chuck's mind; I can barely read mine at this time.

Anyway, I was just going to add that Xavier, we did ask Xavier to make an estimate or rather a guesstimate of the additional costs to be incurred should economies of scale not be in place. And his response was that it probably wouldn't be a wise thing for him to make a guesstimate or - well he certainly couldn't do such a thing.

And that's why he provided details of how much the direct costs of shared resources are within the budget because this of course is a probe in fact, but a guesstimate is not a probe-in-fact. And of course such estimates might change because a guesstimate today of those costs might not be the same as a guesstimate ten year or five year from now. So that's why this number is not in there.

And therefore, anyone would have to know that having an entirely separate structure would obviously not be able to make advantage - take advantage of those economies of scale and there would be additional costs. But these are not estimable at this time.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, thanks. And I think I understand that the point being if this were separate, the costs would (unintelligible) be higher, but it's not possible to predict.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: You cannot estimate those in the same way as we've got the numbers that are given here at the moment.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Olivier. Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks and this is Chuck. I still haven't thought of my second point. Late night for me and that's worse than early morning for me, so that's what you're seeing - or hearing. But I wanted to follow on with what Olivier said there.

What Xavier pointed out to us in our Design Team O work with him was that even in a model where it's a subsidiary or affiliate where you can take advantage of a lot of the services, the common services like HR and stuff like that that ICANN has, even in that type of model, he pointed out to us there will be some added costs. And that's just a general statement.

And in our last call with him, I asked that the transcript - that a couple of experts from the transcripts of Xavier's points be pulled out and made available as needed for the Design Team - excuse me, for the full CWG. I don't know necessarily that we need to provide those now, but he made some good points that maybe at some point in the future, we may want to refer back too.

So I'm just communicating now that those should be available if we want to - if the rest of the team wants to hear what he had to say because I thought it was quite useful and constructive to where we're headed as a full CWG. And thought - you may not want to listen to the whole meeting we had with him, but particular thoughts I thought were particularly relevant to all of us.

Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, great. So Chuck, we'll try and pull out that information. Maybe even send the transcript - copy of the transcript to the list with the relevant points; cut and paste from the transcript or something to try and - or get some help from Staff to try and do that.

If, I think, somehow the Chairs are uniquely empowered to now give you back a little bit of your life that you didn't think you had for whatever purpose, which might include sleeping, eating or any other activity you need. So I think we'll take advantage of that now subject to hearing from Olivier.

But let's just briefly hear from Olivier and then I'll try and wrap this up with some very brief closing remarks. Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks very much for this Jonathan. Olivier speaking.

Just a note thing - a question from Avri in the Chat. Do we have a growth curve for the last few year? No we don't, and actually that might be a good interesting point.

I don't know what Chuck thinks of this but we might wish to return to Xavier and ask if we can have the figures for the previous years as well, or see if there's been any significant growth in the operational cost for this or the costs of these provided. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: And I'll leave you to discuss offline whether you feel that's absolutely necessary. I'm mindful of the fact that they have - the Finance function has had to generate some of this data manually. It may be that there's a variance in the top three cost items or something. So I'll leave you to discuss that and see whether that's a request that you think is valuable and worth making from the Design Team O perspective.

So that's a good progress. There are still some open items in and around the Design Teams, but I do feel like we're moving towards bringing some of these to some sensible conclusions which is great. And I hope those of you who have been so diligent working on this can start to feel how a proposal will emerge from this.

We're going to pick up on the structural issues and other matters, and there's quite some work for both the CWG and then looking back into working with Sidley as necessary.

So I expect we haven't absolutely finalized but I expect the structure of the forthcoming calls will be to look at key questions for the CWG including which of the variants of the model we think - which variant we feel is starting

to stand out, and then the implications of the choice of that variant and starting to work through on the structural issues.

Chuck, just deferring to you since your hand is up and then we'll wrap things up.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Sorry, my brain finally kicked in.

The second item was with regard to the questions or interpretations that Matthew provided from the ccWG that Lise forwarded just before this call - at least I think it was just before this call, it was for me. And there were a couple of them that I responded to on the list.

The first one had to do with the financial detail that we needed. And my impression is is that we've already provided that. So it's not clear to me what more they want. And I think that the analysis that we now have with regard to the Fiscal Year 15 IANA budget costs, you know, provides an example of the level of detail that we need.

So I guess my question back to Matthew is is haven't we already provided that, or if not, what more are they looking for? So I definitely think that's already answered.

And also, the other point I made in that was is that the comment was made that the Independent Appeals Panel is a dead issue going forward and I strongly disagree with that. I think for right now it's dead for the ccTLDs, but as I pointed out in one of our calls yesterday, I think it's still very much alive with regard to the gTLDs.

So the way that was worded - and that was two of the four items that he talked about. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Chuck. I think it's very relevant to discuss these questions from Matthew. And I think one of the issues regarding the budget is actually to be more specific than we were in our proposed text for the proposal -- for the draft. I don't think we're specific enough.

And I would like to take this with you off list and try and discuss it, because I'm not sure what Matthew needs. But I was thinking reading this that we might need to be more specific on and actually the rationale behind our recommendation.

That was one issue. The other one was regarding the Independent Appeals Panel. And I agree with you; it's only faded out for the CCs. And I think it's perfectly correct to give him that answer. But it's very important for the CC and that was what Design Team B was about, that this is not a wish that we want the ccWG to solve this at the moment because it's been referred to be dealt with by the ccNSO. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, well I think that's probably a wrap as you say, so for now we're done. We'll pick this up again at 10 UTC in a little over an hour; an hour and 20 minutes from now. So I hope that gives you some form of break depending on which time zone you're in and what else is going on.

We'll look forward to talking with you in an hour and 20 minutes from now. Thanks.

END