ICANN

Moderator: Brenda Brewer
April 23, 2015
9:00 am CT

Coordinator: Please go ahead. This call is now being recorded.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you very much. Okay. So we've got recordings. This is the ninth client

committee meeting and we have apologies from Lise but the rest of the CWG

client committee is here and the large majority - the CIDLI team is here with

Sharon and Josh on the phone. I'll turn it over to you, Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Grace. So as you know the draft report was circulated, published

for public comment last night. The - Grace will be sending a copy of the email

that was sent out to members of the CWG, you know, summarizing where we

are with helpful links.

This will allow CIDLI to see - to look at the announcement, too look at the

public comment page that has been set up and to see generally what the public

comment framework looks like. In addition it should be noted that the, you

know, as you know - probably know we prepared a template for public

comments to come into so to be put into for easy handling.

As mentioned, there are two Webinars taking place tomorrow at hours that are

somewhat ungodly for the United States but at least one of them is in the

business time for the eastern half of the U.S. So but those can be viewed afterwards. Other than participating in the live Q&A, you'll get the experience you would have had anyway. So recognizing that this - a CIDLI partner retreat going on in there - and still devotion to our work, viewing the Webinar on top of that seems to be - would be kind of cruel but ultimately worthwhile in copious free time.

I think that there clearly is some work that we need to do even as the public comment period is open and the draft is somewhat out of our hands at the moment. I believe there was a question raised just as we were beginning to go through this, you know, as we were kind of getting set as to how the public comment period would work and perhaps I can ask Jonathan and staff to give an overview of how they expect it to work in this instance. To some extent, you know, giving a generic overview since obviously CIDLI has not sat in this - inside the process before.

Jonathan Robinson: Greg, it's Jonathan. Were you asking about how the public comment process might work?

Greg Shatan: Yes. Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. Okay Grace go ahead first and then I'll come in after you.

Grace Abuhamad: Thanks. So I'll just give you from an ICANN public comment perspective how things work from our side. So we publish a document for public comment. The standard period is 40 days but in the case of some comments like this one there's a special request to reduce that time and that request has been endorsed. And so we have in our case a 28-day public comment period. So our - and during that time the - anyone can review the document that was released, published and submit their feedback to the public comment forum.

The forum is an email - essentially it's an email address that you submit your feedback to and then it gets posted publicly just like a mailing list archive would and has a little bit of a different organization but it's the same concept.

And then so the comments are posted publicly. What we usually do from a staff support side is we compile the comments as they come in and then put them into, you know, do some sort of a preliminary compilation, sometimes an analysis. It depends on the group and the, you know, willingness for the group to let staff do some of that work.

And then we submit that to the group and then this - the group is going - goes through and sort of considers the comments and considers what to adjust in the draft and things like that. In the case of the first public comment, we had a whole intensive weekend meeting, two days of meetings to go over the comments. And actually for the most part, the analysis was done by a few of the members who had volunteered to produce the analysis on the comments. And so that was the case for the first public comment. I'll let Jonathan come in with his plan for the second.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Grace. I mean I think that covers it. I mean I'm trying to sort of think about an agenda and put the draft report. And part of the draft report is clearly this public comment and structure and how we'll take it. And you made the point that there's a - in this instance one of the key things - the key differentiators is this - the fact that we've created a form and are going to strongly encourage submissions to the public comment to be organized around that submitting in that form.

And that's all related to the kind of time pressures that we need to work under. And so we ideally want structured input so that we can process it in a

structured way. And we'll have to do some - and we have a high intensity session as you said to deal with it afterwards.

So let's - if there are any questions or issues on that, I think that's - I mean I sort of felt this call was an opportunity for us to take stock and just make sure we shared our thoughts with you where we were and took any questions or comments or sort of loose ends from CIDLI and I've suggested two of them in points three and four that Grace has just put up there as to areas we might touch on, that is looking at annex L and the PTI Board.

If there's anything else from CIDLI that you feel are loose ends or you'd like to make sure we know and understand about the work at this stage, fire away. I suppose we're - it's also important to note that for this first week of the public comment we're taking a bit of a breather now. So the next meeting of the CWG is on the 30th but it is slightly unusually but our plan to continue to work during the period of public comment. And to the extent that comments come in, I think we'll probably be looking at those dynamically although generally like many of these things they tend to be back ended. So it may well be that the majority of comments come in towards the back end of the public comment.

Ed McNicholas: This is Ed McNicholas from CIDLI. I just had a - I put a question in the chat but what was the order of magnitude of comments last time? Are we expecting dozens of comments or hundreds of comments or a handful of comments?

Greg Shatan: Well this is Greg. I think it's dozens, several dozens. This was one of the more heavily commented public comment periods that I've seen, though there have, you know, been others that have been heavily commented. So I think we had something like 70 or 80 comments but maybe staff has a better recollection or

can count the comments in the archive if the archive page can be found. The last time I went looking all of the archive - public comment archives seem to have been lost by the Web site.

But - and some of them were quite extensive and part of the problem we had was that they were all, you know, kind of free form narrative. So in terms of trying to align comments about similar parts or the - or similar issues required a lot of cutting and pasting and activity. And one of staff, Berry Cobb, I think nearly went mad trying to make a coherent public comment tool or, you know, it's kind of a summarized organization of the comments.

So the template that we're using this time asking people to at least put things in in buckets that conform to sections and subsections should allow for a better flow through to the public comment tool as was the intent. I mean clearly in terms of our timeline it's important for us to get a handle on those public comments quickly.

Given human nature and the shorter time period than the 40 days which has now become de rigueur, I would expect that the vast majority of the comments will come in on day 28. And some of the early comments will come from the fringe. I see Grace has found the archive for the December public comments. So you can see what happened there. Anything - Jonathan, I see your hand is up.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes Greg I suppose it's worth noting that the groups typically would take a structured process to this. They may well try and do some work on their own. I know the registry stakeholder group have been encouraged to look at the - to attend the Webinars which are taking place tomorrow and Grace has put up the explain slide deck from the Webinars that will be used for the Webinars. And that includes a - an explained schematic that's derived from the CIDLI

schematic. It's worth noting for CIDLI's point of view that we - it's been simplified in particular to try and focus in on what has been generated by this group. Your CIDLI diagram involved the GNSO and the CCNSO.

There were two issues with that. One is that it's not 100% settled quite how the relationship will work with the GNSO and the CCNSO but more importantly that the diagram to the right indicates what is new and what is uniquely added by this group.

And so we felt it was necessary to try and simplify the elements represented so it didn't look as though we were creating something significantly more complex. Holly it looks like I said something which you perhaps missed or wanted to - you said I'd mentioned something. If there's something that I need to go back to if you'd like to know about or understand.

Holly Gregory: Hi Jonathan. Sorry about that. I think I've got it now. So we're good.

Jonathan Robinson: Right. So I will just go out on a limb here and say I'm not 100% sure how we are going to work with you over these next three or four weeks. We intend to continue our work. There's certainly some loose ends and I think it'll be, you know, we need to further develop that proposal notwithstanding what comes through on the public comment. I haven't really had a breathing space to think through this and we as a client committee and we as a group haven't really talked about where and how we need your help.

So to some extent, you may be able to help us in how we need your help. I think we're - this is A, a unique situation for us and both - well in every sense of the word for us. So it's something we're - but certainly from my point of view two things that we could touch on Greg in this call would be annex L

and the PTI board. But, you know, again there may not be a lot to be said about them at this point.

Greg Shatan: Thanks Jonathan. I think it makes sense to touch on those since I think they were the - couple of the more unsettled areas that we had left open to us as the draft comment went out the door - rather the draft report went out the door. So I don't know if we can put something up on the screen that relates to annex L but I think the PTI board how - please go ahead.

Woman: Hi. I just - I wanted to, you know, say of course we're here to help you in any way we can. It would be helpful for us to have an understanding of what you see as what you need to accomplish in the next several weeks. I do think that there are probably some areas that, you know, we could go back and, you know, create a punch list for. But for ourselves where we think we need to do some more digging, we've been really doing a lot of this on a very past pace. So it will be interesting to hear your thoughts on what could be accomplished in the next several weeks.

Greg Shatan: Well I think on a high level, it may be, you know, I think instructive actually to have you kind of reflect - see if you can step back a bit as counsel from the process and it's kind of all been in kind of a wild mix master together especially over the last, you know, few days or ten days or so. So it may be useful just to generally step back and see where we have issues that you see where you see perhaps that there are legal - there's legal advice that perhaps has gotten lost or needs to be emphasized or kind of comes out of this.

And as kind of as a just a general thought assignment so to speak. You know, if there's nothing to be thought of then, you know, that's fine as well. One other - one specific thing that I kind of put down and so I'm skipping my own

agenda edition but we did put together an FAQ the last time around. We may want some specific contributions to that but Jonathan I see your hand is up.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. First to Holly for a question and I'll come in after Holly, Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Holly?

Holly Gregory: I'm sorry. I didn't hear that. Could you say it again.

Greg Shatan: I was just - I'm not sure if that was an old hand or a new hand. I had mentioned the idea...

Holly Gregory: Oh no I do - yes. I have a hand up. We can certainly help you with FAQs. I do think it would be good to have a moment for counsel to go back and sort of, you know, look at the document again, think about places where we think we may have some concerns or weakness, think about whether that also highlights areas that may need fleshing out more in FAQs.

I wanted to circle with Josh and with Sharon to really have a moment to sit back and reflect. So I almost think of it as a punch list project, you know, walking around the house. The construction's been done. You know, what - where do we think we need some shoring up and where are some gaps that may be in the thick of things we didn't have a chance to look at as thoroughly or discuss with you as thoroughly as we would have liked.

Greg Shatan: I think that punch list point is very well taken. We did say that we have taken the previous punch list as far as it could go and at some point we'd come up with a new punch list. Maybe now is the time, you know, to review kind of the - this is a frozen document in a sense to take advantage of the fact that it's not in constant motion to look at it and see. There's almost nothing that goes

out that's ever perfect and this is certainly going to be no exception. So both conceptually and in detail I'm sure we have quite a bit and a chance for quiet contemplation perhaps on airplane flights would be I think valuable. Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes I'm strongly in favor of that. I think it's far from perfect. The document's got lots of loose, you know, rough edges and loose ends. So I think it very much well come certainly to you and a form of structured punch list perhaps by section of the document.

If there's another way of doing it frankly that's fine as well but I think that would - I think we need to structure our conversations with you. I think you've clearly been invaluable both for the expertise you bring as such but also for the objectivity you bring to even areas of the work that are our own. And my sense is we've managed to walk that delicate line between what is strictly - in a strict sense our own work to do and a willingness to listen to your objective perspective on this.

So I think to that extent we could really do with your help in looking over it and looking for clearly primarily issues of a legal nature where you think there are holes. And we've touched on all of these before and one of them is clearly as covered in annex L there will be areas of, you know, the structure in and around the post position entity and the affiliate and around the separation mechanisms in and around the integration with a dependency on the work of the CCWG. So I think a guide for how we polish up all of those rough edges would be very, very helpful and, you know, we have now effectively the breathing space of a week which in - given the pace we have been working at is quite a substantial period of time.

So it would be great to have your help on that and we'll sort of mutually reflect and try and build up our own punch list and then probably come back together and compare notes. I guess the question for you is whether it is - a question for you and us is whether it's sufficient for us to have the client committee meeting exactly seven days from now and/or whether you'd like to have a representative on our first meeting when we pick things up next week as our - which is it three or four hours before the client meetings. Thanks Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Jonathan. Martin why don't you go ahead but let's keep Jonathan's questions in mind.

Martin Sutton: Okay. This is Martin. I had one question. I think it will be for Jonathan. Is the document we prepared now is that - the level of detail is that also the level of detail that is enough to send it to the ICG? So my question is, is there a more - are there specific things in there where there is more detailed legal stuff necessary? I don't know the question we may be able to answer now but something we have to consider.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Martin. I accept it as something we need to consider a little further but and the short answer is I think broadly the detail is sufficient it's in terms of its substance. It's more in terms of the detail within that. Have we been sufficiently precise and of course once we reckon that we have been sufficiently precise or not we may need to flesh that out more. So it's - you're right. It is something to think about.

But my broad sense is that for the purposes of the proposal it is generally sufficiently detailed enough. But that doesn't mean we don't have work to do on polishing up the detail and there may be some missing detail as well. Thanks.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Jonathan and Martin. Holly?

Holly Gregory: Yes. So look I think that we probably want to stay connected in this interim period. And so, you know, if there are calls that it would help us to understand how things are progressing. We would be happy to be on those calls. We find it sometimes easier to just sort of keep our eye to the ground with you folks even if there isn't something that we specifically need to do at the moment so that we're not having to, you know, get educated again quickly. So it's a long way of saying that we would like to be invited to the calls that you are speaking of.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Holly. I think that's helpful. And do you think that the client committee meeting a week from today is a good time, like giving us enough time for reflection?

Holly Gregory: I think it makes sense to try to keep that committee - that meeting yes.

Greg Shatan: I would tend to agree. I think that yes. If there's anyone who thinks otherwise.

Jonathan Robinson: So Greg and Holly just to respond to that Greg and Holly. I mean I think what Holly was suggesting Greg in case it was missed was that one or more members of the CIDLI team would attend our CWG and, you know, the 1100 UTC in addition to us holding the client committee meeting.

Greg Shatan: Yes. Absolutely.

Holly Gregory: Yes.

Greg Shatan: So just note that and make sure they're invited to that and receive the necessary invitation which will look a lot like previous invitations. But so I think that covers that point for the moment. A couple of other, you know, with regard to annex L directly which is on page 72 of the document and we do have scroll control, I think perhaps this is one rather than to have a significant discussion about it now but rather to flag I think for particular review in the interim period. Jonathan? Or is Holly is that a new hand or before I get to Jonathan? Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes Greg I think your sentiment is exactly right. I think we've covered the principle that we want to reflect and review and I think by just simply mentioning that annex L is probably the - one of the areas with the loosest loose ends or the roughest edges. It's just - it's sufficient to have mentioned that now. I'm not sure we need to go into any more detail. You are right. And I think just to shortcut things I think the PTI board is the same. It's invoked a lot of discussion.

My sense - and I don't want to preempt things but my sense is that we are probably - we have a - we seem to have a broadish acceptance of a minimalist board. It's just a question of whether that quite how minimal that board is. And that's going to need some discussion. But critically in order to have that discussion, we -- and this is a CWG job -- need to know if there is a function that that board has to perform. And I think my intention of putting it on the agenda was just to make sure that CIDLI were aware this was an ongoing live issue. It's not an explosive or a problematic issue.

Frankly I think we've had a pretty wholesome discussion on it but it is a live issue. And I'm probably less worried at the moment than I am. Worried is not the right word but I think it's less hard work perhaps to resolve although that may be - I may regret saying that than annex L. But both - the two examples

of areas where can definitely flag it we'll need to do more work with or without CIDLI's help. Thanks.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Jonathan. I have a point but I will hold and I'll call on Sharon.

Sharon Flanagan: Thanks Greg. So on the PTI board, it would be helpful for us to understand what the best way is to provide input on that. It - of course there is a more of a CWG question of the desire of, you know, small board, larger board, minimal function, broader function. That's really a client decision. But in terms of the input you need from us, we wanted to just understand what the best way to provide that is, whether it's to just answer questions on a call or whether you want something in writing. So what do you think is most useful to you on that?

Greg Shatan: I'll give my view first which is actually what I was holding on. So I'm glad you asked the question. The - I think in this case something in writing, a short memo would be helpful that first lays out kind of what the view of the - both the statutory and best practice minimum is for a board in terms of size and role and into also in terms of independence in the situation where it is controlled by a single member.

You know, so effectively, you know, a de facto subsidiary or close to it. And give an indication, kind of, of the range of what could happen. And I think that will help because there's been some assertions made about what the Board should be from a not just from a cultural practical standpoint but what the margins are that we're dealing with.

So I think it would be helpful for the - for CIDLI to kind of put up the walls and the ceiling around our - around what we're doing. The CWG needs to make certain choices and I think that I would welcome, you know, some

advice about those choices as well as we look at how multi-stakeholder we want it to be, how active, what, you know, things we wanted to do other than the minimum that's its fiduciary duty to take on and, you know, what the, you know, some thoughts on that.

I wouldn't want it to be a - and you could probably go on at great length about that but I think it needs to just really be a table setting document so that we don't spend time figuring out what the general things are or worse yet misinventing the rules around or the parameters in which we're working and there's, you know, always been some level of misinvention going on even as recently as today about this object - this issue. So that would be helpful and I think it would kind of help guide the discussion that we have about. Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes Greg I think I agree with you and I thought we asked for that before and maybe we've already got it. It's - what - because it's really - it's a question of what is the minimum required from a statutory and point of view and then second what our options are. I thought we had already covered that. You - that's not to counter the point that misconceptions may exist but if we haven't, capturing that in crisp one page or, you know, short format would be useful.

It's - this, you know, minimum may be some examples and where we - and the options and what the consequence of those options are. But I still think it's up to us to decide what function we expect that to perform. But you're right. That may help frame things as in when we then go to composition post function.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Jonathan. I'll call on Holly.

Holly Gregory: I'm going to defer to Sharon because I'm sure that she's about to address the point I was going to address which is about the work we've done to date on those issues.

Sharon Flanagan: Thanks Holly. So the only comment I was going to make is that we did address in the original memo we did address the minimum duties of a board. So we did include some discussion of that. But we can certainly do something, you know, more in depth if that's - it seems like that's a source of questions. We can do something that's more - a little more detailed. But we did provide in terms of just the black letter law what are the minimum duties of a board. That was provided in prior work from us. And so we can say more or we can just direct people to that discussion.

Greg Shatan: Sharon was that with the subsidiary concept in mind or is - are we thinking about the ICANN board when we were - when that was written?

Sharon Flanagan: That was with - Greg that was with the subsidiary in mind. So that was with the - that was in our long form memo I think of April 4 where we went into more detail on how you could constitute the Board in terms of whether fully independent or fully ICANN or a hybrid. And then we talked about whether it's a non-profit or whether it's an LFT, what the duties would look like for each of those. But if it's helpful to put that all together in the document where it's all in one place we can certainly do that.

Greg Shatan: Yes I think a document excerpting that and reflecting, you know, noting its origin in the prior work would be helpful just to act as a specific conversation starter or conversation definer for that. So, you know, if I'm not remembering everything that's come across the transom then I'm sure others aren't either. So I think that would be helpful and kind of focus us and ask that people kind of read that before they come back to the discussion of PTI and start asserting things that just aren't on so to speak. So I think that covers the PTI board issue. Is there anything further on that anyone would like to bring up?

Sharon Flanagan: The only thing I would say Greg is on that is that the other question in terms of the various emails that you forwarded to us there was just a handful of questions that came out of that. One was about the Board and what the minimum duties are. The other question that came up was the cost issue. And so if we could just put that all in one place we can - it's really all about creating a new entity and a subsidiary both the Board and just the administrative cost of that.

So we can - I don't think we can really tell you how much it's going to cost but I think Chuck's comment in the chat that ICANN's finance should really advise on that. But we can tell you what the general requirements are. And certainly we still stand by the advice we gave which we think it's minimal to maintain a subsidiary. Obviously, large corporations have 150 or more subsidiaries. So it is not a big expense to maintain a subsidiary. But we can outline some of the requirements of that.

Greg Shatan: Certainly and I think that would be helpful. And I think part of it is just to demystify that, you know, for those of us who've been involved either as a client or as a lawyer in the glories of corporate housekeeping. They'll know that your advice was correct but for those who - for whom this is a black box and for those who would like to try to cast the maximum amount of shade on subjects or on goals that they disagree with, it's helpful to put things out in the open in, you know, not in absurdly lengthy fashion but at least to unpack the concept of this is what happens.

And I put together a rather quick and probably very cludgy paragraph full of brackets. You know, we don't need to use that at all but I think that's kind of the level of what people need to understand what we're talking about here.

We're not talking about something that's elaborate or requires, you know, committees all year round to be working on things. This is fairly - this is really ministerial stuff and just a little bit more clarity. And if there's any other questions that, you know, you think are worth answering at the same time that came up around the issue of forming and managing and governing PTI per se you might as well kind of put them in this - in the same place because I think that will - I think even more than annex L is kind of an open spot which people can start imagining all sorts of things to fill it. I would rather not have that imagination go completely wild. So I think that covers that and thank you Sharon for remembering the question on cost.

And I think that actually segues nicely into the next point on the agenda which is open deliverables or open deliverables question mark, whether there is anything else that we have asked you to do that you have not completed. Sharon?

Sharon Flanagan: So Greg the one - we had that question about our legal memo, the four page memo on the structure and whether you'd like us to bring that current. And I saw Greg your comment that you thought it would be a good idea to bring it current. So if the committee agrees, we will go ahead and do that work.

Greg Shatan: I certainly agree. Jonathan, Martin, I just think that having a fairly well written but slightly obsolete document is just going to do us no good and we might as well use this time to make sure that it kind of matches up with the draft report. Jonathan?

Josh Hofheimer: Hey Greg. This is Josh. Sorry I'm on mobile so I can't.

Greg Shatan: Sure. Josh why don't I let you go first and then I'll go to Jonathan.

Josh Hofheimer: Okay. So the only (unintelligible) I had was is it a useful exercise to bring that current based on what went out in the proposal or should we announce as being - should that be deferred perhaps and announced as we're current based on that (unintelligible) is back and how the model revolves based on public comments.

Greg Shatan: I think it should keep pace with our current work so that rather than kind of missing out on an iteration that matches up with the current proposal, we should have a state or stage or version that matches our other current proposal. And then we can work from that to the next level and from that to the next level so that it kind of reflects the rest points or the kind of the breaks between movements if this were a symphony. Not to compare our work to Beethoven but I think we do want to kind of have it match up. I just think it would be helpful now and it may be helpful, you know, as a reference document as we go forward in the next couple of weeks. Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Greg I'm sympathetic to Josh's sentiment here and I think we need to be careful. I think we're not - we need to not do work for its own sake. I think it's - we have a document out there. We've agreed on a period of reflection. So my temptation would be let's just think about this for a week. We've agreed on a punch list. It maybe that it's the right approach is - and we've agreed on that we need some help to frame even it's recapturing existing information to frame the discussion around the PTI Board. I would say let's just wait a few days as we think about this and then decide what we really need. And so it may be - you may be correct. I'm not necessarily going against that but I think we should just hold off for a little, make sure we're very - we've become as clear as possible on where we need help and then agree that at next week's client committee meeting. And we're not in a desperate rush now that we've got this little bit of breathing space. So I think our initial inclination was to

reflect a little and that's what I would suggest we do. So that's my sort of counter proposal if you like.

Greg Shatan: Thanks Jonathan. I guess part of this depends in my mind on how much work we're actually talking about. You know, my thinking was that that document was already fairly close to current and that it wouldn't take more than an hour or two total to make it current. But if this is a daylong project or a ten hour project then I would not want that to be done. That's I think too much work to be done for less than concrete needs.

So I guess, you know, part of it is a question. I know sometimes when I drop projects and I have - my last draft isn't quite up to where we were in the project and then the project gets picked up again I kick myself that I didn't, you know, take that last hour or two to just kind of bring things to where they all were at the same time. So maybe I'm just kind of reflecting on that in my own experience.

So really I guess it's a question of order of magnitude too. If it's a de minimus thing to do then it may be worth doing. If it is - will involve some kind of serious reflection and the like and, you know, looking at the documents in a way that you wouldn't do it then I think I would hold off. So I guess part of it I maybe give you some leeway to see if this is just a de minimus thing and something that might be a natural thing to do as you reflect or not. So I guess in a sense I'm - I don't want to make this a make work project to create this interim draft.

So kind of to some extent leave it to counsel to decide how to do it. And I see, you know, Sharon's saying it's probably a couple of hours. My inclination would be to - for you to do it if you wish, if you think it will be helpful and if becomes a distraction to put it aside. I see some typing going on. Sharon?

Sharon Flanagan: Greg I think it's worth doing. I don't think it'll take much time. I personally would like to have it current just for the reasons you mentioned. And if it feels like it's going to take more time than that I think we can revisit the decision.

Greg Shatan: Yes. I think that makes sense. Certainly if it's something that starts to take on a life of its own then it needs to be quietly shelved. So let's take that approach. I think that kind of combines the suggestions that were made. And Jonathan I see support from Martin that it be done as well. And so I think that takes care of that if Jonathan has no objections. So I think we have come up with a plan subject to it becoming an outsized project for that just to be done.

Going briefly back to the agenda and mindful we're now in the last nine minutes of the call. I brought up FAQ but don't know whether we're in fact planning to do an FAQ. I think to some extent the Webinar last time generated some of the Qs to which we supplied As well as, you know, I think we had some effort to self generate some Qs. I don't know if that's a plan to do this time. I see Jonathan is leaving. I don't know if you know Grace. I see your hand is up Grace. Perfect. Thank you.

Grace Abuhamad: Hey Greg so I think we - we'll, you know, we did that sort of last time with the questions and answers out of the Webinar. We kind of play it by ear and captured it. And I think we'll do the same thing this time. We'll capture the questions that come out of the Webinar and then whether or not, you know, I'm sure we'll have to answer them but whether or not we need CIDLI's input on every single question is something we can determine based on the kind of questions that are asked. You never know with these...

Greg Shatan: Right.

Grace Abuhamad: ...if it's going to be about process, if it's going to be about timeline or if it's going to be very specific about some of the structures and things like that in which case we would need more help from CIDLI. So I think probably play it by ear is my suggestion at this point.

Greg Shatan: I think that sounds good. So we at least - the issue is teed up and if it becomes real it won't be a surprise. Last thing I have on the agenda is bylaw amendments. I think I recall perhaps some and again it might have been in the CCWG keeping a kind of tally of where bylaw amendments would be needed to accomplish what we're trying to accomplish and kind of having that all in one place would be helpful perhaps as the quiet review of the frozen document. As that for public comment goes on, some note could be made of where it appears that a bylaw amendment will be needed to accomplish what we want to accomplish. Sharon?

Sharon Flanagan: Thanks Greg. We can - yes what we can do is add that to the punch list. I think we have the raw material for it. I think in part it's in our legal structure, the short legal structure memo but we can put that in the punch list because it is an - ultimately it's an action item to implement.

Greg Shatan: Absolutely and I think that it may be that as this takes shape, you know, going to the Board and to the ICG that, you know, we put in some more implementation details and that that would be one I think that would be key. That along with the contract with PTI and there is, you know, some stuff clearly in the report already about what would be in that contract. But I think as a kind of deep - something kind of be over the horizon to think about not to start necessarily on now is what would be going into that contract with PTI and which elements of the report, you know, funnel into that document which doesn't exist. But I wouldn't actively work on that yet. So just kind of put a

pin in that one. Anything else? I'll say that this is now the all other business part of the call. Does anybody else have any other business?

It appears that we have no other business and/or that we are falling over. I will note that the quarterly stakeholder call for ICANN which is the ICANN version perhaps of a quarterly shareholder call is taking place in five minutes. I think you have the information if you want to, you know, go in live. I think this is another thing that can be viewed out of sync as well, time shifted as the betamax case would put it. So come back to it later. This has not been something ICANN has done since the dawn of time. It's a relatively recent result - a relatively recent thing I think. I believe it was a Fadi innovation and it's certainly, you know, useful but obviously you guys have many other demands and this is just one to put in the hopper.

Other than that, I think we've established kind of what our calendar is for next week. We will have the client committee call same time next week. There will be the scheduled meeting of the IANNA committee coming at for what me will be 7:00 am, me and Holly, those of us on the east coast, those on the west coast, 4:00 am. Apologies.

So with that, I will allow you to go back to your other work and perhaps begin storing up sleep in anticipation that some of you might actually on the west coast participate in the 4:00 am call. I thank you all for your - first for your incredible work up to date in this group and that has been spectacular. It's been, you know, a true pleasure to work on those so far with the entire CIDLI team.

And I know I speak for Jonathan, Martin, Elisa and really the whole CWG. Even at the times when it's been a little bit fractious, it's just it's the multi-stakeholder model has been described as slow and messy. I think you've seen

some of that. This would be considered breakneck speed within the multi-stakeholder process and you certainly have kept up with all of the mishigas to use that term of art that goes into working within the ICANN world. So thank you very, very much. And with that unless there's anything further I will bring this call to a close. And thank you.

Holly Gregory: Well thank you, Greg, for the kind words. We really appreciate it. We've enjoyed working with you and are continuing to work with you and hope to continue to enjoy it. But it's been a real learning experience and I have to say one of the more fascinating projects I've worked on in the last period of time that I can recall.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Holly and thank you Sharon for your note in the chat. I'm glad that it's been your pleasure and I'm glad that your idea of pleasure is as bizarre as ours. Thank you all and have a great day.

Holly Gregory: Thanks.

Greg Shatan: Bye-bye all.

Man: Bye.

END