

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer  
April 30, 2015  
6:00 am CT**

Coordinator: Recordings have now been started. Please go ahead. Thank you.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you very much. Hi everyone this is the CWG meeting on April 30 at 11 UTC. We will do roll call based on the Adobe Connect room, but as usual if there is anyone who is only on the audio line, please let me know now. Okay it seems like everyone's in the Adobe Connect. I'll turn it over to the chairs. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Grace. It's Jonathan. I'll commence chairing and hand over to Lise for one or items later in the call. So welcome back, everyone, after a mini-break. I know there hasn't been a complete break. There's been various bits of work going on since the public comment commenced.

There's an agenda laid out you'll see in the top right, and we cover off some of the key items, including the outreach efforts that are going on, and Lise will talk to those in a little more detail. Obviously the status of the proposal and some of the open issues we need to cover. I think there's quite some work that's potentially going to go on through the client committee, and there's been a very helpful punch list or list of outstanding or significant items that need to

be dealt with that should be useful to touch on and pick up on. We've got a call with the accountability CCWG chairs on accountability later in the day, and so we'll touch on that.

So there's plenty to be picking up with and getting on with. We will need all of your help to do so. Just before I do that, is there any significant concerns or issues that have arisen that anyone's aware of out of the public comment? Is there anything we should be aware of as chairs or the group as a whole? Anything that anyone would like to raise at the outset?

Okay let's get on with the substance of the call then. I must say I wouldn't mind asking a question. I have to admit I haven't checked if there are any comments in there at this stage. Has anyone actually submitted any comments? I don't know if anyone from staff or anyone else has been tracking that closely enough. You'll have to let us know. I would expect that the bulk of the comments would come in after the, you know, towards the second half and back end of the year, but have we received any so far?

I see there are three comments. I will go and check those immediately after the call and see. Thanks, Grace and (Bernie), for that.

All right let's move onto item two, which will be led by Lise taking through and facilitating any discussion on the outreach and communications related work so far. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Jonathan. And I'd like talk to the great efforts and I'd like to go through A to D and then we can maybe have questions if you have any. And then I'd like you as members to talk about the E members outreach summary. As you well know, outreach is an important part of our work and it's part of

the NTIA requirement and also of the ICG requests. It's important that we track and do outreach, so.

And this I also a part that we as chairs of this group are prioritizing, so we think it's important to give you a quick update on this right now. Last week Jonathan and I did two webinars on the 24th of April, one in the early morning and another one in the afternoon. UTC time. We walked through a slide deck, which can be found on the website, and feel free to use those slides if you need those for outreach within your community.

And actually we got a lot of - not a lot of questions but we got some questions ranging from the structure of the model, the PTI board and also the correlation with the other proposals. And I think it's very helpful for us too to understand if there is any issues that the community doesn't understand. So these webinars are important in two ways. Of course as a way to educate and inform the communities or the global Internet society but also actually for us to understand if there is issues that we need to cover in more detail.

Furthermore, we will have some upcoming webinars. We're going to two more, one on the 6th and one on the 7th of May. And that was in order to give a possibility for the communities to ask more questions regarding the proposals when they've actually had the time to digest it. So it's going to be a lot of the same but hopefully we'll be able to give a little more details on some of the issues. We find that people have difficulties understanding.

Then we have done some outreach to IANA plan and (Crisp), and today Jonathan and I as co-chairs of this group, had a call with the (Crisp) team, and that was very helpful to talk about our proposal and how this might affect their community. And we actually were planning on having other calls with the

(Crisp) team, and we've also done some outreach to the IANA plan in order to have a call with those chairs too.

And we think it's important that these calls help us understand, actually both groups understand, our proposals, respective proposals and discuss the implications. And since it's a dialogue on both sides, we gather very important knowledge of any concerns from the respective groups. So it was very good and very helpful, and I think I also can talk for Jonathan regarding this, we had had a very fruitful conversation and we'll continue to have this.

Then we have the CCWG accountability coordination, and as we have said before, we continue to coordinate with CCWG chairs. We have a call today. We didn't have a call last week because the CCWG was very busy last week. They had their intensive working days during Thursday and Friday. Friday we normally have the calls. Today we have moved the calls because of there is a holiday in many countries tomorrow.

And it's furthermore very important to note that this coordination is not only being done by the chairs but we're so lucky to have this group. Many representatives from the CCWG group that's also a participant in our group. And as you see on the agenda, Cheryl will do a quick update on this connection later during this call.

This was a quick summary of the outreach to date from the different groups. Any questions? Jonathan, I can see your hand is up. Jonathan, go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Lise. Really just a comment. I suppose a general one. It feels to me like now is a stage where coordination might be more important than ever, both with respect to the other communities submitting proposals. And I feel our group has been very sensitive and appropriately so to the boundaries

between our work on names and the other community's work. But inevitably our proposal has implicit, if not explicit, impacts on the others.

And whilst it is technically the role of the ICG to synthesize and coordinate, I think we can help at minimum dispel any myths and enhanced clarification and possibly even go further than that and work to at least with better coordination such that when and if the ICG comes back for a request for clarification that that work may already be done.

So it just feels to me like it's very important and useful time to at least have the dialogue with the other proposers to the ICG and moreover to work closely with the CCWG on accountability. And I know we've emphasized that latter piece of work all along, but we will increasingly depend on it and need to be very careful how we work with them while the CCWG is slightly - the lack of synchronicity between their work and ours.

And if we are to achieve what we currently propose to, which is the potential for approval of our work in Buenos Aires, which is - has always been recognized to be an ambitious target, it will be critically dependent on the conditionality and the link to the CCWG. So just really emphasizing that element of it in addition to other communications and outreach work in addition to everything else that's going on with the webinars and so on.  
Thanks, Lise.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Jonathan. I agree. And I think it makes it easier at this stage actually to do this coordination with the group and having this kickoff of the coordination with the numbering and protocol at this stage during the public comment is ideal. So I agree, it's more important than ever now.

I see Chuck your hand is up. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lise. And thanks for the update on the webinars. I first want to say that I like the emphasis in these second two webinars on Q&A. I think that's really smart. In that regard, should the number of questions not take up the whole time --and I think that should be the first priority as planned --I would suggest that we be prepared to answer questions that are answerable from the public - early public comments that come.

I was just glancing at the first public comment and it's full of a lot of very good questions that could be answered in that webinar if there is time. Again I agree that the first priority should be letting the participants ask questions and respond to those as possible, but if time - there is time to spare, I think being prepared to answer some of the really good questions that come out of the public comment period between now and then would be a good idea. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Chuck. That's a very good idea, and I think it's easy to prepare, even though it takes time. But it's a good idea and it makes sense to kind of help the discussion that way if there's enough questions to fill up the time. Any other questions or comments on the first part of this?

If not I'd like to go to the last sub item. That's the outreach done by the members or participants of this group. So - and I know we have some communities that have done outreach, and please if you could give a summary of this, it would be good for the group to hear.

Staffan, go ahead.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you, Lise. Yes well as mentioned on the screen here, we had a - for CC community we had two similar webinars Tuesday at 17:00 hours UTC and Wednesday 6 am UTC by Paul Kane and myself. Both webinars were

attended by 15 to 20 people each. And the presentations made were partly based on your slides from April 24 and also we dug a bit deeper what a proposal indicates specifically for the CCs.

It was, in my view at least, good webinars, and we had some questions. I don't recall all of them but participants from those webinar had a variety of knowledge, starting from their different levels. So some were really eager to go into details and some were more generally being oriented about the proposal per se.

People in the community expressed some concern for related ACs and SOs and how they are being able to confirm proposal within current timeframe. So this was voiced in one of the meetings at least. And the idea to hold yet another and more detailed webinar in the future is probably a very good idea, and I guess it's in demand. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Staffan. I see Alan Greenberg your hand is up. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. At Large held a revenue - a review, a webinar, a little - about a week ago I think. I've lost track at this point. And Lise came and presented the core information very briefly and very well. And we then had presentations from a number of people in the community, including myself, focusing specific things.

This community has had a lot of prior exposure to the issues we're talking about. So it wasn't something done completely from scratch. And again I thought it went pretty well, and we will be following up with that as we go forward to try to extract information from the community and pull it together into a comment.

And in addition to that we are very actively encouraging people to submit their own comments either in parallel with it or - and in support of the statement At Large makes if they indeed support it or identifying places where they're (unintelligible). Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Alan. And I'm very happy to hear that you encouraged people to submit comments because I think the more we get the better, and it will give more weight to any proposal if it's been commented by a lot of people, so. And hopefully positive, but we'll see. Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes hi, this is Avri speaking. I just wanted to add one to the list of webinars. ICANN's global outreach group -- I'm sure I don't have their name right -- organized with NCSG a civil society webinar where we spent half the time introducing the CWG and half the time introducing the CCWGs. So it was much higher level and it used, you know, the slide decks that both of these groups have been working with. So we started outreach in that larger civil society sector as well. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Avri. Donna or - yes Donna go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Lise. So we had some initial discussion about, at least on a registry stakeholder group call last week. We do hope to do or host a webinar I think sometime next week, and we're going to open that webinar up to the registrar stakeholder group as well. So we'll do some close collaboration right there, I should hope. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Donna. Well it sounds good with cross collaboration. And I see that Elise has noted that GAC members have been following the CWG's webinars but will also have two GAC conferences on the 5th of May. That sounds good. And that's been transferred to the note too, yes. Good.



Okay. Donna, your hand is still up? Do you have any more to add? No? Any other questions or comments regarding the outreach? It doesn't look like it. Then I'll hand it back to you, Jonathan. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Lise. That's good to hear, and you'll see my point in the chat about those slides being very useful. It's useful collateral. If anyone wants to use them and needs to use them, they present good talking points. I'm pleased that the GAC is hosting those discussion webinars. That sounds good. I know it's a long way - it feels a long way ahead, but Lise and I will make ourselves to the GAC in Buenos Aires and well in advance of that if we are needed to help.

And in fact, with reason, with any other group, especially if you think, you know, it will make a difference, but we would obviously encourage members to take this upon themselves, as you sound like you've been admirably doing. And that's great that that has been going on. Because obviously we've run the two initial webinars, we'll run two more additional ones and we'll do our best, but we are spread thin. So it's really great that the members are picking up the baton here and doing the communications (unintelligible).

So item two, item - the next item on our agenda, item three, starts to really go back and look at the status of the proposal and the open issues. And I should say we'll come to this point that I mentioned earlier, but that punch list certainly is helpful from a kind of chair's perspective and that will - and I'd encourage the group as a whole to look at that between now and our next meeting and see the kind of landscape that that carves out.

But in the meantime we have a number of areas we can touch on here, and the first is we have a deadline if we are to submit something on the ICANN financial year '16 budget and operating plan. And you will note that shortly

before this call I sent something to the list, which was a proposed input into that, and that's now up on the screen in front of you. Chuck, thanks for your compliments and support on that.

I have to say that it was a team effort from significant Grace and Lise as well. So I shouldn't take all the credit but we're in shape. So any comments or issues on what we proposed to submit at this stage? I know you perhaps haven't had a chance to look at it.

Essentially there's a covering e-mail which acknowledges the design team's work together with ICANN Finance and recognizes that whilst this isn't a final piece of work and that it is subject to public comment and therefore potential (unintelligible), we recognize that there's a deadline for tomorrow to submit comments on the budget and feel it's appropriate to get that on record, including the attachment as sent around, which is essentially the content of our draft proposal.

So there's no material new content being offered. It is principally taking the work of the design team that is included in the draft proposal and submitting that as part of the public comment year on the financial year '16 work. Any comments or questions on that point?

Okay. Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: If I can unmute myself. Hello. Jonathan, can you hear me? Hello?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes go ahead, Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: I'm on muted. Okay sorry. I wasn't sure whether I was unmuted or not on this. Okay. Thanks very much, Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond

speaking. Just one quick comment on the language itself to the statement. The point one and it said the IANA functions operators comprehensive costs should be transparent for any future state of the IANA function. And I'm not quite sure what one means by future state. I wonder whether that's an ambiguous term. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: I'll...

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: State might not be the right word, it might be form or it might be status or it might be something else, but I'm not sure if state is correct. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. A fair comment, and maybe someone would like to respond from the design team or the craft of that language, but the key point is it's exactly as in the draft proposal, which what Chuck typed in the chat. So we could refine that for that final proposal, but whether we do now is a good point.

Okay, Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jonathan. And, Olivier, I don't think we need to read too much into what future states means. Obviously the proposal that's on the table right now for the PTI is subject to public comment and change as we go forward, so the state as described in the proposal may change somewhat. And the proposal also allow for other changes going forward as needed in their processes to make such changes, depending on events that happen going forward.

So I don't think I would overcomplicate what that means. As Jonathan said, I mean if we want to change it in this communication, I think that's fine, although I think it's more - it's pretty simple to just communicate what we have in our proposal at this particular point in time.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes I think the take the point that if it has to be crafted better, that's something that can be refined. But for the moment my suggestion is that we stick to - for consistency's sake we don't start editing what's in the proposal. And thanks, Olivier. I know you commented in the chat that it's not a big deal.

Let's work on refining this. There'll be opportunities to refine the work as we go forward, but for the moment I don't think it's going to be a material impact if we stick with the text, and the challenge if we start to modify the text, we could modify it in other areas as well and it just opens up something.

Okay. Good. Thanks, all. Thanks, Olivier. Point taken, but we'll stick with that and you obviously acknowledge that in the chat as well. Any other comments or points on this? Okay we'll get that off shortly and in any event before the deadline and close it before the deadline at 11 UTC side. That is tomorrow the 1st of May.

Let's move then onto see if we can get an update on the design team A. Now you'll recall that we were unable to secure agreement on the service level expectations prior to submitting the proposal and this work in progress. So I think there's an opportunity to I hope hear from Paul Kane, who's been leading that design team and it's been - I noticed that mailing list has been a little more active lately on the design team A. I'm copied in on that so that's useful to see. I'm tracking it, but I think from the group's point of view it would be useful to get an update and hear how that's progressing. Paul over to you.

Paul Kane: Thank you, Jonathan. Yes as you remember when we were in Istanbul we gave a presentation, or I gave a presentation, outlining one of the - or our proposed service level expectation document, which we all basically thought was in the right format. One of the conditions was we had to check if the timings of the prescriptive SLE were accurate.

One of the things we are now learning, we were originally told that the process flow that we had identified didn't accommodate those registry managers who liked to interact by fax or telephone, and so we have asked that IANA make available to us the current process flow metrics that they use. We had to submit, which I did on the 7th of April, a request to ICANN Legal via Elise's who's been very helpful, and request to obtain consent from NTIA for the workflow documents to be released.

NTIA as of last Friday had not received any request from ICANN Legal for the workflow document to be released, so I sent a note to Elise on Tuesday of this week requesting that - basically for an update. And Elise very kindly wrote back on Tuesday advising that they too would like to finalize the service level expectation documents and are awaiting all necessary authorizations to release the documents in question.

And on this occasion, she copied in someone called Samantha Eisner, who I believe works in ICANN Legal. So I believe ICANN or IANA staff are seeking ICANN Legal to clear the paperwork to submit to NTIA so we can look and have sight of the workflow documents relating to all aspects of root zone management.

That is an update really. But I also I would like - I would just like to stress, we first showed ICANN/ IANA our workflow - proposed workflow document back on the 26th of February 2015. So it's been sitting on the in tray for some time. There was a reminder sent actually again. We sent two of them on the 26th of February. So really the thing we are waiting on is the current workflow from IANA as to their practices.

And I want to emphasize the times that have been - were stipulated or are stipulated in our SLE document are those times that are actually delivered by ICANN/IANA today on average. One of the issues that may arise is that ICANN/IANA currently do not monitor their own ticketing system.

And so again in the e-mail on sent on Tuesday, I did highlight the necessity for ICANN to have the technical resources available, programming time, for them just to simply record and monitor their own ticketing system so they know the precise time they sent a message to a registry manager and the precise time the registry manager responded, only because that is as defined in the SLE document and it's helpful for them.

So it's really head's up to make sure that they can technically have the resources available to them. It's a trivial task to monitor a ticketing system. You know, a couple of days of programming time total, but it something that does need to be addressed. So I'm happy to open the floor for any questions from anyone, but that's an update as to where we are.

The proposal is to have, once we have the workflow documents or even part, not necessarily all of the issues if they're still having to be drafted, provided we have workflow documents from ICANN, the proposal is then to have a follow-up call to run through their workflow documents in conjunction with the SLE that was presented in Istanbul to CWG members to make sure that each descriptive step accurately describes step and accurately defines the time required for that step.

So the floor is open. Any questions?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Paul. And I note there's a couple of comments in the chat expressing some concern over what seems to be a very - well a slow process

in delivering the required information. It seems to me there's two points. One is this responsiveness and ability to produce the requisite information in order to work together, and then the second is moving on getting towards a common view of an agreement on what future SLEs might be.

And I know others previously expressed this as requirement really for the proposal and would ideally have liked to have seen these SLAs encapsulated in the draft proposal, in the event we did encapsulate them but by a reference from the wiki by memory.

Are there any other comments or questions or points anyone would like to make or ask of Paul? Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. This may well have been covered and I've missed it, but in the work of design team F it became obvious that there are -- this was discussed before; it wasn't a secret -- there a number of reports that IANA regularly makes to the NTIA that are deemed confidential reports. How are these going to be handled? Are these - are the subjects of which these reports include are these included in the SLEs? I'm not quite sure how these reports which are currently deemed to be secret are being handled in the new environment.

Paul Kane: So just to update you on the work that we have done up to date, all we have done to date is taken - we've interacted with registry managers, asked them the processes, the emails that they get from ICANN/IANA and their response times to get a dataset, which I forget precisely now, it was about 500 data points, going back about a year and half to be able to tabulate what's going on.

Once we have the workflow documents -- and Alan the documents that you refer to I assume will be in one of the work flow documents -- we will then be able to define an SLE for such documents.

But we probably have there's a hole in our knowledge. We know about day to day transactions. Please change your name server. Please update a DS record.

We don't know and we didn't cover those registries that wanted to interact via fax telephone or indeed these reports you're referring to Alan because to be candid you don't know anything about them.

It's only if and when ICANN IANA provide to us workflow documents will we be able to work with ICANN IANA to define suitable SLE for those particular tasks in hand.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. Thank you. It's partially a CS, a design team C question because we don't know at this point I presume to what extent some of these reports are confidential because they couldn't be sure with other registries and therefore perhaps can't be shared with the CSC or shouldn't be shared with the CSC. And so there's still work to be done there okay thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes it sounds like there's some unknowns that we still need to have visibility on. And until we can complete the work or know whether there are other implications. Go ahead (Bernie)?

(Bernie): Thank you sir. More directly to Alan's question on the confidential report I may not have all of them. But when I ran through them most of the confidential reports are because they list specific registry operator information and therefore those are not in great detail especially concerning if there have been issues and what kind of issues are appearing at what level.



So I think it's sensible from that point of view relative to the standard reports that are produced on specific issues that those are confidential and yes we will have to figure out how to handle that.

As far as what is being requested for the design Team A for the SLEs I am uncertain if there's any such type information that is included in there, rather that it's part of the process that is required between IANA and the NTIA per the contract. Thank you sir.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (Bernie). So it seems that it's reasonable to understand the workflow in the standard reports providing that there are no issues of commercial or specific confidentiality in those.

And I see a comment from Chuck in the chat suggesting that registry names and/or strings could be redacted. And that's a practical, useful practical suggestion also that (Lise) and I consider escalating this.

Well I hope that any - that that will be necessary but I think we should as (Lise) said in the chat certainly consider doing so. The information isn't forthcoming and the apparent logjam doesn't get broken. Other comments or questions for Paul and Design Team A?

Good. Well thanks Paul. I'm sorry it hasn't gone quite so efficiently as you and, you know, the design team would like. But it does sound like there's a willingness at least and we need to be assured that things are moving ahead. And we'll work with you as chairs to make sure that is the case.

Okay let's move on then to Design Team F on the root zone environment relationships. I forgive me I've a blank here as to who has been the lead on this Design Team S so I may need a quick nudge and a reminder. And if there

is any updates for any work that's been going on in the interim earning guidance required?

I think it's Alan Greenberg I think we're going to be calling on on this one. Is it, you know, yourself Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you. Design Team A has not done any work since we produced our final report. There are certainly a number of loose ends and that's a kind thing - a kind way of putting it. In particular there is one overlap I believe with Design Team C in terms of handling the very major issue of changes to the root zone architecture.

And design - I think it was Design Team C made some recommendations. They overlap with what we are doing. And you recall I asked the question how do we decide who is going to go forward? Is this a committee of the whole of the whole CWG? Is it going to be pushed onto Design Team C or F or C for that matter to continue the work?

And the response from the chairs at that point is we'll have to decide that. So as a result we haven't done a lot of extra work since then but we do need to go to decide how to go forward on that.

So from as chair of DTF I'm waiting for either the charge to take responsibility for those that - for the actions where there is overlap and try to see it through with appropriate consultation or know it's in somebody else's hands.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Alan. My immediate thought is I think it would be helpful then to articulate or list out what the areas are.

If it is only that single point or if we could capture where there are loose ends and all of us probably took the foot off the pedal as far as this work is concerned a little over the last few days. We've worked hard up until the preparation of the proposal for public comment.

So if you could help us by getting that captured where the - where what the outstanding issues are we can work with you and then make that decision as you say as to whether that's further work to be required of Design Team f or in conjunction with another design team or indeed as committee as a whole.

Alan Greenberg: Well I can certainly do that.

Jonathan Robinson: (Unintelligible) Alan if you're willing to do that?

Alan Greenberg: I'm certainly willing to do that given that their accountability session about 4-1/2 hours ago in the middle of my night. I'm not prepared to reel off the list right now.

The only explicit overlap is in handling major - rather significant changes in the structure of the root zone features. This is, you know, examples are DNS SEC and IPv6. But those are the easy examples. There's a relatively large, much larger number of things that have been done on a routine basis.

And there are also a significant number of internal things to ICANN to IANA, their process management, their software. They use the automation tools which have gone through that process as well.

So that's really the major one. And I think at this point it needs a small group of people to come up with a recommendation and then bounce off of the

whole group I would suggest that is a better way than trying to merge together two design teams and find a way forward in that.

And I'm not trying to claim responsibility for that function but I think we need a decision.

Jonathan Robinson: So...

Alan Greenberg: I think the design team...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Yes thank you Alan. So if you could in a sense create a formal handover and scope it out that would be very helpful and then we can pick that up and agree with you were to take this from here, obviously an appropriate amount of rest.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I'll see what - yes okay.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks very much Alan. All right the next item on the agenda and this is a discussion on the PTI board which is clearly an open item I'll make a couple of remarks on that.

I noticed that there's been some discussion recently on the mailing list about this including the point that it's a form needs to follow function. In other words we need to decide what the board with the role of the board is before deciding who is on it.

I suppose I'm thinking this through and trying to think, you know, of the origins of this and I - from my perspective and discuss this at least a little bit the board seems to derive from or clearly does derive from the fact that we have a separate legal entity which in and of itself is derived from in part the need for separate ability arguably in part for the need to have an entity to contract with.

And so the board really is a consequence of this requirement rather than us having as a group specified other functional needs. So there's clearly a minimum legal function which (unintelligible) easy to fulfill them. We have a good memo that's come out recently via Sidley which is helpful in scoping that out.

And I suppose that point I would say is if we do go for more than the minimum legal function we obviously need to be -- and we discussed this previously -- we need to be mindful of any accountability and complexity the consequences that might then start to come out of that. And so therefore if we have any additional functions or needs we should articulate and discuss those and be clear as to whether they are required.

And one thought I have is that we may want to consider the composition of a sort of minimum board if you like and then reserve the right to increase that if additional requirements are there.

I guess one other point that comes from the Sidley memo I suppose that minimum may be less in the event of a Delaware corporation and a California not for profit. And that sort of really comes through as one of the items on the punch list that we need to define the nature of the corporation. So it sort of touches on a number of areas.

We touched on this very briefly in the chairing conversation with the (Crisp) chairs today. And they have noted that there have been some discussion on our lists about the possibility of inclusion of other IANA or other proposals IANA users of the IANA functions beyond names being potentially involved at this level.

So there's some - there's a thread that may go on the other groups as they start to digest our proposal. And they may come back to us on the public comment or via some other communications on this.

So just be mindful that in one scenario it's what we think. In another it may be that there is some input from the other groups that we'll have to be aware of as well. Right and so let me throw this open for discussion or comment and just be mindful to think about function before form if possible. Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. A number of questions come to mind. One of them you just referred to. It has been discussed at various levels whether the other entities, the RARs and the IETF contract directly with PTI or with ICANN.

And there have been some people who have been advocating that they contract directly with PTI. Clearly in my mind if they contract directly with one or both or contact directly with PTI the PTI board is going to be taking on more responsibility because it's the PTI board that they would be going to if there is indeed a problem in carrying out their contract or if they see performance problems or things like that.

And we cannot I don't think we can ignore that. So we're getting close to the point where we really need to decide who do we want these groups to contract with and are they willing to?

They're certainly willing to contract with ICANN because that is what - that's status quo. If we're trying to move them to contract directly with PTI then the PTI board and management is going to have to be able to be capable of doing that. So that's one of the criteria.

The other question is really in a reverse one. If the PTI board is really the legal minimum who is doing - who is handling the other things and what are the communication paths that we have in order for that to be done?

Certainly the PTI board can contract out many of its things, you know, legally or through other - some other mechanism but I think we need to understand that prior to deciding what the composition of the board is. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Alan and you'll note that the action agenda relevant - relative to what was sent out was slightly modified. It says 3-D PTI board rather than PTI board composition specifically to refer to the fact that it's not all about the composition staff role and function.

Just one quick comment on your point, I agree with the sort of essence of your point on the other entities names numbers and also how they may interact.

I just think I'm not sure I agree with quite the way you articulated it when you said who do we want to contract with IANA or ICANN?

One of the subtleties here is that we - those groups need to digest our proposal and think about what it might mean from their point of view and think about how they might like to either retain or modify the way in which they work.

And I think that's part of the discussion that took place this morning where we would - were (Lise) and I were informing and educating and offering input

into so the chairs could better understand proposal and then take it to their groups to discuss in an informed way.

Let me pass over to Sharon who's...

Alan Greenberg: Jonathan just for clarity if I implied that it was purely our decision chalk it up to the mouth networking will after three hours sleep.

Jonathan Robinson: I - my - no problem Alan. I did...

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Jonathan Robinson: ...understand that. I just wanted to make sure...

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: ...that it wasn't on record that we would decide because...

Alan Greenberg: And I thank you for that.

Jonathan Robinson: ...(unintelligible) yes I've got it. Thank you. Good. Thank you.

Sharon Flanagan: Jonathan, Sharon. Are you turning it over to me?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. Please go ahead.

Sharon Flanagan: Okay thank you. So to answer Alan's question the first question is whether the contracts with the IRRs and the IETF should be directly with PTI or remain at ICANN.



And I think the answer to that is that to maximize separate ability meaning the ability to separate in the future the asset should all be sitting at the PTI level to the extent possible and that would include the contracts. And then on the second question which is if the PTI board has the mandate of the statutory minimum who is really handling the functions of the PTI?

And the answer to that is indirectly its ICANN. Because by virtue of being the member or the owner of the PTI if it's an LLC and then by virtue of appointing the directors of PTI they would control and be then making those decisions.

And that's why the accountability of ICANN is really where you get at all the checks and balances. It's at that level in a single place rather than trying to replicate accountability mechanisms at ICANN and then again at its subsidiary level which, you know, if you think of a large multinational company you really are - you're focused if you're a public shareholder for example you're focus on the parent the ultimate entity being accountable. You don't look at various subsidiaries around the world. You look at the top level.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Sharon. I'll go straight on to others in the queue then. Paul Kane.  
Paul?

Paul Kane: Thank you very much. A couple of days ago I held as ccTLD registry manager's telephone conference with respect to the work of the CWG and the proposals specifically trying to solicit comments from the ccTLD community.

Who and how the PTI board members were selected is considered a major issue if the board members were selected by ICANN itself, ICANN corporate as it were.

I have to say I was of the opinion -- and I would welcome clarification -- that it was the supporting organizations that selected the board members of the PTI in the same way as they select the board members to ICANN corporate. So could you clarify your understanding as to how the board members would be selected please?

Jonathan Robinson: Paul I will speak to that and then let - and I will call for other responses as well. But I think to be absolutely sure we have not yet decided how the members will be selected. And this is part of the discussion.

And it is evident that this is an area of sensitivity and interest which is why we need to discuss it. But it's also evident that it may be - and so it may not be quite as significant as it first appears because having the separate legal entity create the capability or possibility ultimately for separation what we referred to as separate ability and in the event that operation occurred certainly of the legal entity itself by a form of divestiture the role and function and independence of the board would become significant.

To the extent that it is a wholly owned and at least in concept a wholly owned subsidiary although it is technically an affiliate it is much less significant which is why we have to have this discussion make sure we have a common understanding.

And on the basis of that understanding and any perceived or needed function of the board other than - and that's when we - that's the basis on which we should discuss the composition of the board.

Now I would like to just point everyone to the recent Sidley memo which deals with this in some detail at least from a legal point of view as to the role and function of the board from a legal necessities point of view.

Let me stop there. I thought the question was addressed to me Paul but it may have been addressed. Anyway I've given you my thoughts on that. I see (Lise)'s hand is up so I'm going to let (Lise) respond as well if she would like to before coming back from Alan.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Jonathan. It's Lise Fuhr for the record. I agree with you we haven't actually decided on it but we have decided on a set of premises for this model. And that was to keep it light weight and not too complicate it.

So I think it's important to have this in mind whenever we are going to decide on what to propose that we don't want to create another layer or that's needed for accountability requirements. So here we have decided on this legal separation in order to have the advantages of having a contract and the possibility of later separation.

So for me personally it's not - it shouldn't be an issue the composition of the PTI board shouldn't be too big. And it shouldn't be a multi-stakeholder composition. It should be only functional board that is focusing on the technical issues because the political part is actually the ICANN board. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Lise. And I'll just note Suzanne Wolf's comment in the chat about the IETF and the ability to terminate their contract has in the past been the critical accountability to their community decision about parameters registries. Let me go next to Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. First of all comment to in response to Sharon's comment as Jonathan pointed out and as I thought I had pointed out but perhaps didn't the IETF and the IRRs have a decision they have to make.

They might well feel more comfortable dealing with ICANN and the entity they know, an entity where the IETF for instance already has someone on the board.

And with, you know, and organize they're familiar with linkages between people than with PTI a brand-new entity where they may not have a lot of contact knowledge or faith.

So that's their choice to some extent. And we may like a direct link with PTI and to get out of the loop but that's not necessarily something that's intuitively obvious it will happen that way.

But the real question is if indeed it is a stripped-down board then there are things in the memo that we saw that boards do that they are not doing or they are subcontracting somewhere and that has to be explained.

So I don't think we can have it both ways. I don't think we can say it's a stripped down board that does nothing but it is a legal entity full in control of its destiny. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: I see Sharon's hand's gone up in response to that Alan so I'm going to go to Sharon rather than respond myself. Go ahead Sharon and then I will come to you Greg.

Sharon Flanagan: Thanks Jonathan. So in response to that question from Alan on the responsibilities of PTI board just to be clear the statutory, the legally required responsibilities will need to be there if it is a California nonprofit corporation.

As we've said there's more flexibility if it were a limited liability company instead. But let's just assume it's a corporation. So those responsibilities are still there.

My only point was that by virtue if it's ICANN who appoints the members of that board in effect it's ICANN who's making those decisions right because they're putting on officers of ICANN who would be, you know, responsible.

For example there's a requirement to do financial statements. That still would have to happen. And it would happen under the direction of the PTI board but that they would be likely an ICANN person and they would be doing it probably at wearing - at times wearing an ICANN hat.

So those responsibilities still need to occur. It's just that it's really more a question of who's directing that person ultimately.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Sharon. Greg?

Greg Shatan: Thank you Jonathan. Greg Shatan. Just briefly I think regardless of the functions of the PTI board and may want to consider that there will be some symbolic weight to how the PTI board is chosen and even to who sits on it. So I think that needs to be considered as well. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Greg. And just to help from a chair's point of view I don't think it's appropriate or timely to conclude this discussion. As appropriate and time it is to initiate and have this discussion and continue what we've discussed before I certainly don't want to see us force a conclusion in this meeting.

I think this is at least in part if not almost in whole about sharing our perspectives and actual understanding of what is required, what may be

possible and what we might desire based on various parameters perception, need and otherwise.

So I'm very keen to have the discussion but not force us to any form of premature conclusion. And I just again reiterate that some of this might be dependent on how others including the other communities making their proposals start to react and respond to this because whilst it may be not necessary for any change in their envisaged or historic relationships with ICANN or post-transition IANA this may create an opportunity that they wish to proactively take advantage of or that I am not seeing right now.

So it for me it feels like this has got a - this is work in progress is what I would say. I'll go to Avri next.

Avri Doria: Okay thanks. Hi. This is Avri speaking. I just wanted to bring up one thing in terms of the (accountability) of this discussion is that this is something that I believe we're also going to get feedback from the next 27 days' worth of review.

So I certainly wouldn't see us being able to close this since it was open when we went into review until after we had the results. But I think it's really good that we discuss it in detail, you know, in the meantime. So thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Avri. And to facilitate that discussion is again I'm notwithstanding the points on symbolism which worry me because to some extent symbolism is about politics and op ticks.

And in many ways I would love us to concentrate first and foremost on what function functions we see this board performing and what functions that it might perform that are not covered elsewhere by the IANA review function,

the CSC or any other area of functional performance and including if we have accountability concerns one (unintelligible) are not covered at main ICANN board level through the work of the CCWG on accountability.

So I'd love to see a discussion on list and any future discussions of this as to, you know, what we might get out of other than symbolic or value which is of course a point but what functional benefits we could get out of we might require, not get out or we might require from such a board.

Okay well we have the memo. I'd encourage you all to read and reread that memo which I have done and intend to do and just to really think through what the functions and performance of that board might be and what if anything else we might need from it.

And also some of this is covered by the Sidley punch list which again I'd encourage you to read because, you know, there's - the most obvious bifurcation or discussion or point is first I think - and I may be wrong. There may be something else. But it feels to me like the decision in and around California not-for-profit or LLC.

And, you know, things like that are also sub topics that will need to be considered. Alan go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you. I think one of the substantive questions that well bringing it into focus is a scenario, you know, a scenario what happens when there is a problem?

IANA is not functioning well. Who calls the new IANA CEO or executive director or whatever, you know, into their office and says let's have a talk it's not working? Is that the chair of the PTI board? Is it ICANN? That's the kind

of when I say - when I ask what - who is going to be handling the issues whatever the issues are that's the kind of scenario.

Is the PTI board just, you know, a figurehead and but will be dealing with the ICANN CEO, talking to the IANA CEO or whatever the title is and resulting it at that level or is indeed that board going to have to take responsibility for a problem within the corporation? And I want an answer now but that's the kind of thing I think that will help us focus on what resources do we need in the board. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: I agree Alan. And I think and that touches on the other areas of our work. It's about ensuring that the function continues to perform adequately.

And in the event that it doesn't perform adequately how do the escalations work? So in a sense you touch on a form of stress test and again if are willing to do that? I mean we walked through mentally and collectively how such performance issues and escalations might work given our current proposal.

And to the extent that they break down we modify and refine and develop our current proposal. And if that has implications in doing that work for the PTI board then so be it. But I think that's a helpful way of looking at it. And I see support also from Sharon suggesting that that agreement that that scenario planning will help advise the decision.

So that's a helpful discussion. I think I suggest we leave it at that point given the time we are in the call, encourage you all to go back and read through the chat. I'm not going to try and summarize peoples comments. There's been quite some discussion on this.



And so I think when the notes from the meeting come out let's go through that. Let's keep thoughtful and considerate on this rather - and there - and try and work with one another's viewpoints and move it along. Thank you.

The next item that's clearly of substance and not yet dealt with that we put on to the agenda was Section 4 and the implications of the proposal.

And interestingly enough we've sort of swayed into that to some extent by talking about scenario planning.

But let me hand over to Cheryl to talk a little bit about Section 4 and related points so that that can stimulate any further discussion as necessary. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Jonathan, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And yes Section 4 in our document does refer and has listed in some minimal detail and cross references to the stress testing that is done and particularly outlined in greater detail by the CCWG.

Just very briefly we need to remember that we can't apply the stress tests scenarios that we have and there's some 26 of those in five different contingency categories.

The definitive group till this - the work that we're doing in the CWG and indeed the work that the CCWG continues to do have finally defined the mechanisms and structures that they're going to be using in the cases. CCWG obviously for accountability, and of course in our case, as we've already put into our current for comment document that whatever comes back from the community is also going to come into play here.

The stress tests as they are now and they're up to version I believe 10.3 at this stage - I'm sure we'll hit 11 before too long - are basically a snapshot of mechanisms which we've considered and gone through as a set of hypothetical as group exercises and as regularly reviewed group exercises. And particularly a subset of these 26 are very much related - some to a list where it seems like certainly are all related to the transition of the IANA stewardship with - from a naming function point of view.

Specifically then - and I encourage you to look at the stress test documents which are available from the Wiki, and of course listed in their own document, but also will be coming out in isolated Version 9 it will be by now from the CCWG shortly, and of course in their to be published on the fourth of May document for public comment.

The stress test - so you have pens and paper ready to take notes I'm sure, in particular that we'll need to be looking at are stress tests #1 and 2, #10 and 11, #14 and 15, 16 and 17, stress tests 19, 22, 24 and 25. And I have a terrible temptation, but it is rather late here to get a lot of calls, to say bingo at that point in my presentation. But I'll try not to be too flippant. In other words there are quite a number of stress tests that are specifically related to our work and our interest in our CWG.

Now Avri Doria in particular, but others worked hard on the - usual RSP 4 group and who are also operating in the accountability and CCWG and specifically the stress test working party obviously of CWG, have looked quite intensively to insure ourselves that we believe we have got as many of the concerns and scenarios that had been discussed and brought forward to us to date covered in this group.

It was a question I believe in the ALAC call by Louis Crepin-LeBlond questioning whether or not the CWG has done enough work on the stress test, excuse me. And my answer to him or anyone else have in that concern is an unequivocal yes, absolutely. The stress test working party has got us covered very, very well indeed, and we will continue to do so.

But just before we ask them for conversation, I just want to point out that of the five particular categories that we've looked at with these 26 scenarios that we've run through, we're particularly well covered in the category that talks about the failure of accountability to expel stakeholders which is I think very important because there's a scenario test, #14, 15 and 25. We're quite well covered in the category which talks about generic or general failure of accountability. In our case that's the stress tests #10 and 22. And forgive me if I miss one or two of these while I'm trying to rattle them off.

We've also got the stress test category which is looking at legal and legislative action with stress test scenario #19. And indeed also the category which is - and I've just now had a complete mental blank on the other category. Isn't that terrible when you do that? Anyway we have those categories well covered.

If however we believe - and this is I suppose work that we should be doing as a committee as we move through this next phase of our work - if we happen to believe that there are some - a category that we need that hasn't been covered, of course the stress test working party will be more than happy to pick up on that. And indeed if we believe there's any particular scenarios that we haven't covered, we'd be equally happy to look at that.

But in the document coming out of the CCWG, there is also a I think very useful outline for you of failure to meet operational obligations. That's the one

I wasn't thinking of. My apologies for that. Like Alan, it has been a long day or several days. And that's where we go through in our document in a way that describes to the reader for the public comment as to how they can apply their own stress test analysis to any scenario that concerns them.

And of course any of those that we think needs to be specifically pointed out and explored from a CWG point of view, particularly after we have our mechanisms and community powers in a far more concrete way, is work yet to be done, but work that I think we can do in a timely manner.

I think that should be it for me, and I'll open for questions.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Cheryl. Any questions, comments or input relating to Section 4 tests - implied tests of the proposal and the interlinking with that work that Cheryl described? Lise?

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Jonathan. I would just like to ask you Cheryl, because we've had a lot of questions regarding do we cover enough of the stress test that's within the accountability group, and are we taking into account the stress test that should be done within the CWG? What is your impression of this being in both groups? Do you think we need to be more aggressive on this, or what is your sense? Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, thank you Lise - Cheryl for the record - very simple answer. No, I don't think we need to be any more aggressive. And yes, I think we have absolutely - Avri and I in particular went through literally absolutely every single stress test and scenario option that was explored by the RSP 4 work and every single - every single one of those continue (unintelligible) specifically some of those stress tests verbatim in the list.

So no, I don't think we have been not doing missing out or not covering anything. And I can absolutely attest to the fact that everything that has ever been brought up within the CWG conversations, particularly in the more vigorous work in the RSP 4 group Singapore meeting has been covered, and in many cases has contributed verbatim scenarios that the CCWG work is looking at.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Lise. Thanks Cheryl. Looking at there are - doesn't appear that there are any more comments and issues at this point. So we'll look forward to continuing the work along those lines. Let's see what else that takes. I know there's a couple of - Lise and Olivier who have reassured and encouraged by that. So that's good.

Really at the moment I think Item F seeks to just flush out if there are any other issues that we aren't covering elsewhere that are alive and open to be dealt with in reviewing the proposal and developing the proposal during the course of the public comment. So if 3F, any other issues? Okay, well no doubt people will continue to raise them as in when they arise on this.

I think it's timely now to move on to an update from the client committee and the work of the client committee. There is a scheduled meeting today at 1400 UTC. And there's always a delicate balance between making sure the client committee is adequately informed by this group because the client committee is really a vehicle to work closely with the (unintelligible) channel this group's instructions and work with the law firm. So let's make sure there's an update and that there any issues relating to that update are discussed by this group ahead of that client committee meeting later today.

Greg, would you like to take this item forward and provide us with an update?

Greg Shatan: Thank you Jonathan, and Greg Shatan for the record. As noted we will be meeting an hour after this meeting, and the first Item A, the memo on PTI board and costs. As we've seen from the discussion that just ended or I should say perhaps took a hiatus, and this one will pick up again, the session of PTI board responsibilities and costs is very timely, and a helpful memo. And clearly, you know, as we need further guidance on the board, we can turn to Sidley.

We should first turn to the memo to see if the question has been answered since there are cost savings in the checking for ourselves if answers if have been given before asking council to point them out to us. I think it's a very helpful and detailed memo. So that's the first item that has been circulated to this whole list.

Second, yesterday Sidley supplied us with a new punch list of open items. That will be discussed on today's client committee call, and then revised as necessary and provided to the sole lists as well - those areas for you. Anybody can find it on the client committee list. Fortunately it's not too long a punch list.

Third, we have, you know, continued to monitor through various methods the dependencies with the CCWG - very helpful that Sidley is council to both the CWG and CCWG. That provides a natural bridge as well and also active in the CCWG and its legal sub-team and a number of us are active in the CCWG overall as Alan referred to a four hour sleep break, or maybe three hour sleep break between the 1 to 3am call Eastern time and this 7 to 9am call of our group. So the CCWG dependencies are being monitored. And I think, you

know, practical efforts are being made to keep us aligned both on the legal issues and overall.

That is basically it for the client committee. I don't think we have any major outstanding items or requests into Sidley. So we're, you know, in good shape in terms of getting information from them. But we will obviously report anything that arises from our client committee call at 1400 UTC. Thank you and back to you Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Greg. It's clearly - the punch list is quite comprehensive. And I've been going, just insight that I encourage people to read through that and check that it is fully comprehensive and start to think about any news and points that need to be taken into account in dealing with those.

Good. Well we'll progress on to that this afternoon. Now in terms of the next point which I think we largely covered, but it's important to have as a placeholder is our relationship with the CCWG accountability. I suspect that as we work through the details including some of the issues we've talked about, work our way through the punch list, carefully consider the role and scope of the PTI board. There will need to be ongoing and active work with the accountability group. So and of course as I said, there's something planned for later today.

Avri, I think you are either officially or unofficially - and you can remind me - our group's liaison with the CCWG accountability, and your hand is up. So why don't I hand over to you for any comments or points you would like to make in this respect?

Avri Doria: Thanks. Whether it's officially or unofficially, I have no idea. I think I sometimes get called back, but I don't know. And I don't worry about it too much.

What I wanted to bring up was two issues that got discussed at the meeting last night or this morning - whichever it was. One of them had to do with the - and this is just bringing up an issue so that's it on both tables - the issue of the IANA function review bylaw - the AOC type review that we're putting into.

The AOC type reviews in general are not going in as fundamental bylaws. We have defined this one as a fundamental bylaw. Now that may not be a problem because it may be possible to tag individual bylaws as fundamental or not fundamental. So it wouldn't be by section, it would be by specific bylaw. There's no certainty on that yet. So it's a pending issue that I just wanted to alert on.

The other issue - and this is one where I also had it under any other business later and (unintelligible) is that we have not been clear yet on the separation process function and whether that needs a separate mechanism, and therefore a separate bylaw. But in any case it would either affect the IANA function review bylaw because we would include that separation process functionality in there, or there would be a separate bylaw.

The question came up if it's a separate bylaw, is that something that goes through that process, goes through CCWG process? Or is it a bylaw that we would present ourselves? And I gave my opinion that I thought it would be something this group would submit itself because it wasn't specifically the same kind of accountability mechanism they were dealing with. But I hadn't the faintest idea and it wasn't something that had been discussed because we hadn't quite gotten there yet. It's something that's mentioned but not decided.



So I just wanted to make sure that those were both, you know, on the table as issues - not major issues, not crisis issues, probably not even punch list issues, but issues that were on the table to be resolved. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Avri, that's a good point. And I note that the comment in relation to that in the Chat from Sharon indicating that (unintelligible) and have a AOC non-fundamental and AFIR as fundamental. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. And I am certainly not an official liaison between the two groups. One of the issues that has come up there is we specified in telling the CCWG what we were looking for. We used words like a veto over budget. They are - have at various times treated that as an absolute mandatory requirement which to some extent controls how they get accountability because of the whole issue of whether it's a membership organization or not, which has other implications.

And it certainly wasn't clear to some members of the CCWG if they had the discretion to say - to come back and say but what if we can't get absolute veto? What if we can do something that's not quite as strong? So I think in your discussions between the two chairs, there needs to be some clarity as to how much flexibility we might be willing to provide to them to pick different solutions.

I'm not trying to dictate the answer, but I think that discussion needs to happen. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Sorry. I just heard that the Johnson is not in the room, so I have to take over for him. So sorry for this line change.

Okay, yes. I don't know if we need more discussion on this, or you want to move on. This is the last topic of course. Sharon, go ahead.

Sharon Flanagan: One comment I wanted to make on that is Alan is right on the issue of the budget being important because it in part drives what the accountability mechanism is for ICANN, whether there's a membership structure or not. But I just wanted to also point out that for the CWG model, it's not just budget, but it's also the whole IFR function and ultimate ability to separate. That is in effect a power or veto that would need to reside with members in order to be fully operational.

Otherwise the only way to make that work is through board recall which is maybe more of a Draconian kind of a mechanism. So I just wanted to note that it's budget, but it's also the IFR functional review and the IFR and the ultimate separation that is dependent too.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Thanks. That's some useful points to raise and keep an eye on here. And just to check - Brenden, your point in the Chat is a great point that has been conveyed. I think you mean has that been conveyed to the CCWG. I think that that's a - yes, great - agreed. I think this is an important point, and hopefully between the commonality of Sidley with Avri as liaison, myself and Lise are aware of this. We should be able to do this. So maybe we could just capture that as an action for the chairs to discuss this with the co-chairs in our meeting later today. Thank you Marika for capturing that.

Good. Well that's useful to flush that out. Any other points or issues in an around the work with the CCWG? All right. This clearly, one of the implicit points throughout all of this is - remains and will remain issues of timelines, both the timelines of this group and as I noted much earlier in the Chat, the pressures that that puts on the charting and other organizations tracking this

work. And in addition the issue of coordination of timelines between this group - our group, CWG and that of the work group - group worked on accountability.

All right. Well I think that covers the substance of our agenda. I have a couple other points I'd like to raise on the AOB. And as I do that I encourage anyone else that if they do have something they'd like to discuss.

The first one is I think there is a question really over the frequency of meetings and whether we can step back for the present to one meeting per week, or whether we need to - whether we have sufficient work to work at the pace of two meetings per week. And I'd welcome any comments to guide Lise and I in our planning on that. So that's certainly one point that you may wish to have - specific issues both ways.

It's challenging and intense having two meetings per week, but obviously necessary if there's sufficient substance. I wonder whether we do right now during the course of the public comment need to go at that frequency, or whether we could settle down to one a week for the next two or three weeks. So that's question one.

And a second point - okay, let me let Avri respond first to that one and see if there's any comments on that. Go ahead Avri.

Avri Doria: This is Avri, yes. One thought I had on that is we've seen through here there's a certain number of things we need to do more digging down detail work on. And when I bring up another ALB, you know, in terms of the separation function discussion, I'm going to be asking that another work item be looked at in detail.

So perhaps the one general meeting with the other meeting spot open and available for specific like single or double topic intense discussions as warranted might be a middle path one could take because two full team meetings a week. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Very practical suggestion, but good suggestion Avri. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan - Chuck Gomes. It's easier to cancel meetings than it is to reschedule them - a principle that came out of the policy and implementation work meeting yesterday. So my inclination would be to leave the two meetings scheduled, but by the day before- earlier enough the day before so that all the time zones are respected - that if we don't have specific action items or if it looks like it's better like Avri suggested to use that time for some design team meetings or some other work that's needed, that that be announced at that point in time. But at the same time, if we - if issues do come up that need to be discussed with the full working group, we have the meeting slot ready for that as needed.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck. That's an also equally sensible suggestion - in fact a variation on the same theme. So, you know, that feels like a good idea. Let's keep the placeholder of both meetings, but on condition that we consider cancelling the meeting no later than 24 hours prior, subject to necessary content or lack of it.

Good. I had one other point, and that was that - it was something that came up in a conversation with Lise and I think Chuck possibly in terms of the work that was done on the finance work. What it feels appropriate to do is to send a note to the ICANN finance function, highlighting the plan as currently exists about for public comment including in fact the recent work, although I don't think are material costs flagged in there, from Sidley in and round the PTI,

and pass that across and ask at least that there are any initial considerations about cost implications in relation to the ongoing budget to run this function.

Now to the best of my knowledge that request is separate to the comment that we proposed to make on the FY16 budget as such. This is more a communication from this group to the finance function indicating that it would be useful to have any feedback on the cost implications as currently envisioned. Chuck, I see your hand is up. Go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan. I think you - what you just said is exactly right. The public comments are good and important, but they don't specific - I mean they generally ask for some more detail on the fiscal year '16 budget, but they don't specifically ask the finance team to start analyzing cost impacts with regard to the proposal that's on the table right now.

And as you said, I think the Sidley memo on the board requirements is a good one that will help Xavier and his team begin to scope out cost impacts on the model that we're heading towards right now. So I think it's a good idea to request the finance team to start analyzing the cost impacts, even if they can't put specific numbers to them yet, but just identifying where there will be cost impacts would help us going forward as we get more detail. So I support your suggestion 100%.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck - that's helpful. And so Marika, you've captured it pretty accurately in the notes. But if you could just convert it into an action, that would be great.

Good. Are there any other items that anyone would like to raise under any other business? Any other comments or points? Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes, hi. I've obviously alluded to this twice already. But really I want to know how we should go about finishing the work of annex L separation review and annex F the IFR that either leads into that. Or I think as you suggested Jonathan, why don't they just do the separation review in addition to deciding?

So that's a whole discussion that we just opened up as we were closing the document down for this review. So, you know, whether it's using some time in that second meeting slot, we're not really using DTs anymore. So I just wanted to make sure that, you know, we figure out how to continue the deep dive on that.

Obviously again like with the earlier issue, no decision could be made until after we had seen what feedback we got because we did ask questions about it. So certainly it wouldn't finish until then. But, you know, there's even the deep dive that hasn't been done yet on the issue. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So that's - thanks Avri - that's a good point. It's another sort of action item or point for consideration is how we continue that work and insure that that doesn't just sit as a loose end. You're right, it did pick up some momentum just prior to closing down the document that we submitted for public comment. So it is a further loose end that we need work on.

And while we can continue that on list, I think it's useful to bring it into the group as a whole. I'll chat through that with Lise, and feel free to make any suggestions while along the lines of what we asked Alan to do earlier, even if you just create a little (unintelligible) for us that says as far as I'm concerned these are the unresolved or open points in the set of bullet points. That might be helpful. And then we can cross check that against the punch list and make

sure that we as chairs and staff assisting us in managing this process have the loose ends covered. So thanks for that.

Avri Doria: Will do.

Jonathan Robinson: Avri, can I just check your - you'd be willing to do that? Just provide us with a sort of mini list there...

Avri Doria: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: Wonderful. Thank you. Lise?

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Jonathan. I think it's a very good idea to have Avri make that list. But I - while I thought that the design teams F and A were going to work with their proposals, I might be wrong regarding the separation mechanism. I see that as a whole group part that we need to look at because we didn't really have a design team for that. But that was just my first impression. We can get back to the group regarding this. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, good Lise - thanks. We agree. Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Yes. This is Avri speaking again. I was kind of thinking that it was a more a mainline issue at this point. I mean we could go, you know, back into - and we were sort of doing it in the other - the VPN design team. And that's one of the reasons for the sort of seeming connectivity between the two. But I would suggest that it really is a mainstream discussion as opposed to doing it twice at this point in the process.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Avri. And Lise comment in the Chat. She's okay with that. Now I'll close the loop with her and be sure to talk with the group as well and make sure we're all aligned on that.

Okay. I think that brings us to a close. I don't see any other points or hands being raised. It's just ten minutes before the hour. And thank you. It's a useful meeting and scopes things out and gets us warmed up to continue with our work again. So thanks everyone for your contributions, and in particular those of you who got up or stayed up at particularly antisocial hours.

Thanks a lot everyone. Talk to you soon.

Group: Bye.

END