

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer  
April 30, 2015  
9:00 am CT**

Gregory Shatan: Thank you. Welcome to the Client Committee meeting for the 30th of April, the Client Committee of the CWG on IANA Stewardship Transition for the Names Function.

We have a short agenda and hopefully a short meeting given that we are in the public comment period. Begin by welcoming you and asking if there is anybody who is on the call but not in the Adobe Connect room.

Holly Gregory: Hi Greg, it's Holly Gregory. I'm on the phone. I'm waiting to get into the Adobe Connect but my - the host has not yet allowed me in.

Gregory Shatan: Okay well we'll look for you to show up imminently in that case.

Holly Gregory: Okay.

Gregory Shatan: So I think that we can move to the first item which is the punch list, which you can see in the middle of your screen. I don't think we need to give it a close reading but we should look through it and decide if - I think this

probably does need to be filled out since it asks for a responsible group and a status and has neither.

It questions whether any of these are going to be moved forward during the comment period, and also how we will identify the responsible group for this. And I would just ask and perhaps I'm now thinking back to - clearly to the prior punch list, but by a responsible group are we looking to the particular Design Team or just a division of flavor aptitudes, Sidley and the CWG?  
Sharon?

Sharon Flanagan: Thanks, Greg. I was thinking to the level of Design Team. I wasn't sure if the Design Teams were - if the intention was for them to continue on. It sounds like it is and so, you know, we could populate this with our understanding of which Design Team would be responsible for each item.

And then we can - certain places I think are more legal items and we can note that as such.

Gregory Shatan: Thanks, Sharon. Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Greg. I think two quick points here. One, I think it's a little ambiguous whether the Design Teams carry on or not and if so which ones? So we could put relevant Design Team/CWG as one component and/or Sidley or any other responsible group if we think another group's going to determine that.

For example, it's possible that we may need some help. And I haven't checked this completely and in detail but it may be that we might need help from an - some other - one of the other groups that are going to get proposal on an area or something like that.

I mean, strictly this should be our work I suppose so that's just a bit of an off the cuff example. Second point is the one thing we haven't commented on yet, and I'm not in a position to add anything right now, is whether the scope of this punch list is exhaustive.

Had a, you know, brief couple of glances over it this morning but that's the second point. Thanks.

Gregory Shatan: Thank you, Jonathan. I think that makes sense and I think that the Design Team concept initially was that they would have a short shelf life and that we would add new Design Teams as needed.

Some of the Design Teams certainly have continued to have at least a half-life as they haven't completed their work. But if we look at the first three items together, really the PTI, I'm not sure that we have a Design Team that is uniquely tasked to determine the PTI.

So the question is whether that would be work for the full group or for the - or for a new Design Team. I don't - if it's a new Design Team I don't think we can design it on this call clearly. Lise?

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Greg. I would prefer not to trade any new Design Teams. I think what we could do is if we continue to work with Design Teams on the issues that are already decided that's fine.

I think the rest we need to take in the group as such, and I would prefer that instead of having the group or the work divided into two small groups again. Thank you.

Gregory Shatan: Thanks. And certainly while that's kind of, you know, more a decision for the Chairs and the full group, I think that makes sense certainly as long as we have, you know, 80% of the time for the full group to focus on these issues and not have to take them away to small groups for buffing and polishing.

It's certainly a good way to work. So I think rather than having - so it seems like for the first three items which I would - meaning Items 1 through 5, first three groups, I think all would be - the responsible group would be the CWG as a whole with input from Sidley.

The IFR - I do believe we have a Design Team for that so I'm not sure if the intention is for that to continue or not. Any thoughts on that? I see no thoughts. Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Greg, I'm not sure what we're up to here. I mean, I see Sharon's put her hand up so I'll let her speak but I - it's a little new to me and it's something I literally just had a glance over and I - and my immediate thought was this is comprehensive.

We need some work to populate it and it'll be great to get that. Are you thinking of stepping through all the items now or are you just sort of having - just checking where we are and...?

Gregory Shatan: I thought it might make sense to step through the major groups. In other words kind of by - chunk by chunk, not the numbered - individual numbered items.

But we don't need to do that. We could take this and try to populate it on the list and by that I mean the full CWG list. I think the very next chunk is the CSC for which we, you know, do or have a Design Team which still seems to

be functional but the question is whether that would go back to that Design Team or a new one.

But again, you know, that may be a - it's not something we need to resolve on this call but I think it should be raised on this call. Sharon?

Sharon Flanagan: Thanks Greg. Yes so I think some of these are - clearly fit right within a Design Team so the IFR is - I think it's Design Team N. It's Avri's team, CSC's Designs Team C.

I think the next category is probably partially group and then Design Team A for 22, and then escalation and so on. So I think a lot of these do fall within a precise, already existing Design Teams and otherwise we can just default to the group.

So we can - I think we can take a cut at that. In terms of the comment I made in the chat about prioritizing, my - first off I guess I should say this is - this was intended to be comprehensive.

So this - the only thing we didn't cover is the open point of the proposal, which I think is Section 4. Just to note it's all to come. We can put that on here and I know Cheryl spoke to it on the call earlier.

So it was intended to be comprehensive. I view the two critical path items or I call them gating items are the first hand full on - the PTI and then Annex L and all that relates to separation.

I feel like those are the ones that are probably full CWG projects and are going to require more in depth discussion. And the others - a lot of the others are fairly specific and probably can be decided pretty readily.

Gregory Shatan: Thanks, Sharon. Perhaps it would - it makes - may make sense for you to take this back and try to populate the responsible group and status. And maybe for the status just note priority in red block letters for those that are gating items as we like to say here in the States.

And for responsible group I would put question marks for the Design Teams given that the - there's not a complete presumption that Design Teams will continue, especially those that have kind of come to a resting point.

So - and Jonathan says, "Coloring them as such," so I think we could, you know, turn the whole - all the type red and bold for the priority items noted. And if there's anything that, you know, seems to be missing as this is intended to be comprehensive we should add it and then circulate it.

So I think that would be a way to go, that way we don't need to really step through the rest of this and we can have that discussion on the list and decide how to go forward, whether certain things need to go.

The intent of Design Teams will be dealt with by the Committee as a whole. So Jonathan you asked about DTX Red Team or whatever we're calling it. I assume we would include that. Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry, Greg, that's ambiguous. What I meant was it - your entire suggestion was sensible including putting the responsible group as you said and X was meant to be a variable rather than a specific Design Team.

So Design Team whatever slash CWG question mark. So we flagged that it was the responsibility of that Design Team but may be the responsibility of

the group and then we can review that. But - so I didn't mean to imply that it was Design Team X as such. Thanks.

Gregory Shatan: Okay. Thank you. I think that's clear and obviously anybody who knows about Design Team X needs to be taken out back and dealt with and with serious - so I think that kind of gives us a way forward with the punch list.

And then we can get a second draft, which we can put to the full list and then decide how to introduce, you know, the concept of deciding what the responsible group is actually going to be, to either remove the question mark for the Design Team or to remove the reference to the Design Team and deal with it in the Committee as a whole, or perhaps to create new Design Teams since I think the idea originally was for them to have short lives and to - and not to become too vested in a particular area over a long period of time.

So is there anything further on the punch list before we move forward? Thank you. Lise was there anything else that you had wanted to ask about?

Lise Fuhr: No I would just agree it would be nice to have the priorities. Thank you.

Gregory Shatan: Yes. Very good. I think we're all on the same page. Let's move then to the CCWG proposal. As indicated Sharon did note in her email one other item to add to the call, a discussion of the CCWG proposal.

And she goes on to say, "There is a discussion in that document of CWG requirements, which is based on the Co-Chairs' - our Co-Chairs' here memo from mid-April.

To the extent the CWG draft proposal has expanded these requirements or provided additional detail, do we want to specifically comment on this from the CWG perspective?" Sharon?

Sharon Flanagan: Thanks Greg. There is - specifically is one section within the CCWG report that recaps the requirements of CWG and it references back to that April 15 memo.

And my concern is that it might leave some gaps and that - or it may overemphasize aspects of the dependencies. And I think it would be helpful to weigh in and we can, you know, we're reviewing that document as we speak right now today and we can try to align it.

But I wanted to just understand your perspective and whether you thought that made sense and was appropriate to try to just sync up to the extent there were - have been changes since that Co-Chairs' memo.

Gregory Shatan: Well from my point of view that makes sense and I think it does make sense to align them, and perhaps to bring back to at least the Client Committee if not the full list your proposed changes so that we can review them for alignment I would say perhaps just to this group, assuming that there's nothing that requires large group's review.

And then, you know, we'll allow it to, you know, comment quickly and let that go back to the CCWG. And if we have any items certainly where we don't feel that they're meeting our needs, you know, we need to bring that up since they are now in the home stretch. Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Greg. I did have a checkmark up but then I thought it was actually better I articulate it properly. I think it's essential and I think it's absolutely



vital that we make sure these are properly aligned and that we respond and ascribe how that proposal has in any way diverged or how it needs to be converged with our latest thinking.

So I think that's essential for two reasons: one, because of the accuracy of the work and our - and the alignment of the two groups' work; and two, because - and this is probably the more material point.

When it comes to - when if we get to Buenos Aires when we are in a position to ask the chartering organizations to support our work or not, to the extent that there is any daylight or substantial daylight between what we envisage and what the CCWG or - envisages or to the extent that the CCWG's work can be seen to be discretionary in the areas where we rely on it, it will weaken our ability to get our work concluded.

So for those reasons, both simply because it's technically correct but also in terms of the overall success of the project and the on time if you like delivery of the project, I think that precision and accurate linking of the work is absolutely vital and I think it's - as I've said on a number of occasions I think it's extremely helpful to get Sidley's assistance on nailing that down. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Greg, are you on mute?

Gregory Shatan: Sorry I was talking to myself and not to the rest of the group -- thank you Lise -- saying I think that that's all very sensible. As Sharon notes in the chat timing is tight, really measured in hours.

The CCWG is keen to turn another draft and essentially is - the legal team in the CCWG has begged for them not to turn a draft until the legal comments go in so that the drafts can be aligned rather than parallel.

So we just need to keep an eye and turn it back as quickly as possible and Sidley I would say that, you know, feel free to nag if you don't have the comments when you need them and if ultimately they can't get back in time put something into the reservation.

But I would hope that unless we are all, you know, completely out of pocket that at least one of the CC - of the CWG side folks here will be able to provide a review and comment for you.

I think that takes care of the CCWG dependency input issue unless anyone has any further comments on that. Seeing none I'll move toward All Other Business.

Just wanted to check briefly with Sidley to see if there are any other pipeline items that they are working on for this group. I'm not sure that there are but it - just wanted to ask if there - Sharon?

Sharon Flanagan: Thanks Greg. The only other thing we're working on is that update to the legal structure memo, and that's just something I think for us to have in the background.

We're not going to circulate that again until it's needed but we talked about having that ready at a time when we might want to use it again. But other than that I think we're all up to date on the deliverables to you.

Gregory Shatan: Great. Thank you Sharon and I think it will be helpful to have that current. It will definitely aid us as we move forward. One other item I wanted to bring up in All Other Business - just a brief note that it appears that the IATF is having

some issues in introducing the separability concept into its - into renewing its MOU with ICANN for the protocol parameters function.

I don't know. We don't really need to discuss this at the moment and it may be a tempest in a teapot, but it does make life interesting on the separability front.

It's not particularly a legal point except that as we think about MOUs and agreements and also think about whether and when an MOU or agreement is going to be dealt with, it's fair to note that it will not necessarily be just a ministerial exercise. Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Greg I think I just wanted to get a - just for the sake of being precise just understand where we were with the update of it - just not published at this stage or is it sort of ongoing just work in progress ticking in the background as and when?

Gregory Shatan: Sharon I think that's a question for you.

Sharon Flanagan: Thanks. Can you just recap what the document is we're referring to as being potentially published or out there?

Gregory Shatan: And are we talking about the update to the...

((Crosstalk))

Sharon Flanagan: Can you repeat that?

Gregory Shatan: Jonathan why don't you go ahead and repeat that? I see you're on mute at the moment.

Jonathan Robinson: I'll come off. We - I thought we were referring to an under the AOB and I thought you came in on that Sharon to say that there was - we had an original sort of legal memo from you that was the overarching structure and so on.

And we had a reasonably extensive discussion last time about whether or not to keep that up to date. I think we agreed to keep it up to date providing it wasn't a substantial amount of work and I was just checking on the status of that.

Is that currently up to date but unpublished or is it sort of ongoing background work in progress just keeping it up to date? Thanks.

Sharon Flanagan: Thanks Jonathan. That's still on our plate to do. We've been busy with the other projects and put that kind of on the back burner, but we can turn to that.

Gregory Shatan: Thank you Sharon and I think that should be circulated to the Client Committee when it's done.

Sharon Flanagan: Okay. Will do.

Gregory Shatan: Any other "other" business? Seeing none just to briefly recap the action items as they are in the notes, first is to develop a second draft of the punch list, adding references in the relevant columns and indicating priority items by making them red and bold or otherwise very noticeable.

Second is to - is for Sibley to show us what they are - the hunt of revising the CCWG proposal with regard to the CWG dependency, and for the CWG Client Committee members to respond with great speed and giving comments

on that so that the mumbling engine that is the CCWG can continue to move forward.

Third action item and I should probably add it to the notes is for Sibley to update the legal structure memo and to provide - onto the second action item I should actually say Sibley/Client Committee since it's - we have the responsibility of looking at what they are doing and their comments on the CCWG so that's for the second action item rather than the third one. Thank you.

With that unless there is any other business we can adjourn. Last call - fair warning for any other business. Hearing none I will adjourn this call at 27 minutes after the hour, keeping this very efficient even on the truncated 30 minutes that we hoped to get to.

I hope this is a record for short calls but just in case we're getting close to losing the record I will stop talking now. Thank you and goodbye.

Sharon Flanagan: Bye everyone.

Lise Fuhr: Bye everyone.

END