ICANN

Moderator: Brenda Brewer
May 28, 2015
8:00 am CT

Coordinator: ...the recordings have started. You may proceed.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you. Hi everyone. This is the 50th meeting of the CWG on 28th of May at 11:00 UTC. Today's - chairing today's session is Jonathan. We're going to take attendance and the Adobe Connect room but we also have Olivier and Eduardo on audio only. If there's anyone else who's only on audio, please let us know now. Okay, turning it over to the chairs.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Grace. Hello everyone. Actually, Lise and I are co-located so we're together for these high (intensive) meetings and we spent a good - certainly all of this morning and some part of yesterday thinking carefully about how to try and make the most of the sessions.

It's a very early start for some of you I know. And it's a tough set of meetings that we've teed up for ourselves. Clearly we've got an objective to try and work through some of the final detail and, in fact, some of the thorny issues, and make sure we do that, not only recognizing the input of members and participants, but particularly recognizing some other key inputs that we've had

that's both - that's our historic work, all of the work that we've done to date that's built up a picture.

The professional advice we've had today, which is worked to complete that picture, and, of course, the public comment that's common. So we've got to synthesize - we've got to be very clear where we've come from, what work we've done in the past to synthesize all of that together with the public comments.

You should see in your right-hand portion of your screen, some key timelines in the notes beneath the agenda there. And these really highlight the key milestones we've got to deal with.

With clearly got to deal with the next couple of days and work our way systematically through the issues that we need to. And then we have a meeting on 2nd of June, Tuesday next week, and then a meeting on the Thursday, on the 4th of June, by which time we really need to have in place a final proposal so that we can review.

So if you think about what that means, it means we've really got to exit these couple of days with a substantial items covered off such that those who are offering the proposal, the staff for working with us to try and put that into the substantial proposal, have their marching orders, so to speak.

And then we send it out to the SOs and ACs for their review and preparation ahead of their meetings in Buenos Aires. We do have another meeting scheduled for the 9th of June and by that stage we should be thinking about our communications back into the SOs and ACs and more generally.

And we have a possibility of doing, during that - the course of that week, some additional Webinars which will probably make sense. We - thinking about the plan for these meetings, we have sent to you obviously the agenda for today's meeting plus a plan for the remaining meetings.

And as I said, the key objective here is to provide the substance for input to the final proposal and have that in as close to complete format as possible and really to support the staff and their preparation of the document.

I apologize if you're picking up any background noise. There's some construction noise here in the office I'm working from. So we also need to recognize any prior agreements and deal with any modifications of that, the particularly come in by the public comment.

And again, I encourage you to recognize where we have made prior agreements. And our objective is to absorb public comment, not to necessarily use this is an opportunity to reopen areas where we have agreed before.

And clearly, we've got to seek to close out all of the necessary open issues. In other words, the use of the work necessary is careful there because it's possible that a variety of items can be left for implementation but will need to be specific on what we need closed and what we feel can be dealt with by implement- through implementation.

So really sufficient closure on key items, effective coverage of the public comments and dealing with all items to a necessary level of detail. That's going to require us to operate in a disciplined focused way and to make sure we focus our conversation on one sort of subject at a time.

One of the things that struck both of us about the most recent call was there was an extraordinary high level of activity in the chat. And whilst in one sense that's encouraging because it means everyone is engaged, it almost - the chat almost took over from the main meeting which meant that there wasn't sufficient quality of focus on the discussion in the main meeting.

So I think the lesson for me there, and I have a request to you, is to contain the chat to being as necessary, really, questions on the main subject, so on-topic at the time, and ideally key supplementary points.

Certainly we've got some critical key documents that we need to be aware of and that's another concern that we have. And that's probably based on the pace with which we've worked but all of us have to be diligent and recognize those.

I probably flagged two for you. I mean there's a bunch of documents that have come out from all of the diligent work that Sidley had done that we've asked them to do and paid them good money to produce. And we owe it to ourselves to make sure we are as familiar with that as we possibly can be in order to discuss the key topics.

There's a 7th of May memo which dealt with the public benefit corporation versus LLC. There are a couple of key memos on the 13th of May. I think Grace will provide you with a link to all of those to remind you of where those are.

And then currently, we've got a very - a recently prepared color-coded response to the public comments that were sent out with the agenda. So these are some of the key points I wanted to make in the opening remarks.

I would also like to touch on the historic work we've done and where we've got to over the course of some of the recent meetings. I'll just pause for a moment and see if there're any comments or questions on those points so far. Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: I just wanted to register an objection to the chairs deciding that a path of communication should be closed and not (here). I mean, we can go elsewhere to have a chat if that's necessary but I do object to that as a way of top-down determining how we communicate. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Avri, noted, and that's fair enough, and it's not to close it, it's just to recognize - to ask for respect for the main thread of communication and to try and keep one thread so we have as coherent as possible a meeting.

There is no closing of that communication chat. Also, point noted but there's no intention to close the communication channel. It's just use it in - as - judiciously is probably an appropriate word. So just checking. Lise, did you have a point you wanted to make?

Lise Fuhr: No, I was just - as I mentioned to Avri in the chat, it's difficult for non-English speakers to follow too many (paths) and if you have the spoken dialogue, you have the written dialogue and you have the things shown in the Adobe room, it's not to close it down. It's to use it with care and think of the non-English speakers. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, thanks, Lise. So just then focusing in on a couple of items - key items from this sort of journey to date and where we've come from because for me that sets the scene very well. I try to really think about the background, and not all of us have had the opportunity to track all the detail.

And clearly going - if you think back, this has been a highly active period, possibly thinking back to the previous public comment period, some key -- which was December -- some key outcomes there were an overall satisfaction with the performance of IANA.

It's not to suggest it couldn't be improved, but overall satisfaction, a proposal to retain IANA within the ICANN function. We also got comments that we provided both too much and too little detail which is in some ways contradictory, but it meant we need to focus carefully on where the detail was in the main proposal and where could be put to the back.

And if you remember, one of the key things we pushed on was having legal advice on the structure and the fact that the proposal was weakened by that lack of advice.

We then moved on to Singapore, of course, in February where we ended with four different structures. I actually left the meeting with seven as we had some additional proposals put on the table.

But one of - whilst we went in there with the intention of offering a number of options to the community that could be commented on and discussed, we got criticized for being potentially having too many options and certainly without a doubt, that there was a lack of operational specifics and that we had overemphasized all of our structural considerations and not focused enough on our operational matters.

And moreover, that we had no legal advice in place still. So we exited Singapore in February with a commitment to some new working methods and you know that as well, the agile working methods of working with design teams and no longer working with the big sort of - big RFP groups focused on

specific parts of the proposal, a high intensity of meetings - two meetings per week, and a commitment to secure the legal advice as soon as possible.

And through that, we moved on ahead to the Istanbul meeting where we took those seven structures that we left Singapore with and worked through those pretty systematically including, I think, pretty - I think importantly with the physical presence of and support from the legal advisors which we had, by then, retained and started to get active input from.

And a combination of a very good spirit within the group, some effect of objective advice from the legal advisors and generally recognition of a need to make progress.

We exited Istanbul with a commitment to really focus our attention on a single structure and to start to work on critical detail to support that and to further develop the work of the design teams.

We came back to another set of high-intensity meetings where we worked on the integration and finalization wherever possible in the design teams and a decision taken on some of the design teams that were not absolutely necessary for the proposal, and started to review a Sidley - a punch list from Sidley of key items to be dealt with at that set of high-intensity meetings.

And that ended up being - producing the key content for the public comment period proposal that we've most recently gone through. Sidley has been with us along the way and almost all meetings and delivered a fundamental set of pieces of legal advice including input on the proposal itself.

But a whole series of memos - I won't walk you through all of them in detail but, you know, I've got dates and times in front of me and I think Grace will

provide you those via a link in the Adobe Connect room and you can see that that link in your - in the top right of your screen.

Oh, in fact, it's - yes, your link to it in the main client committee Wiki pages as well. And you can see a whole series of memos that deal with critical details and key, key definitions of areas we've worked on including some of the areas we've really grappled with like which particular form of company, board duties, costs, stress tests for the setup and so on.

And all of that led to us producing the document which we now need to analyze or the public comment period which we now really need to analyze in detail from the, you know, from 22nd of April to the 20th of May.

There's one document that we haven't dealt with and we will need to think about how we deal with that, and that's the draft term sheet that Sidley produced during the course of the public comment.

I suppose one of the things that struck me most strongly about the public comment period is that, well, there are many - but the key thing that I would highlight is that we continued our work during the course of the public comment.

And so to some extent, when we look - the me take a view of the public comments, we need to think how - we need to try and understand how any of those might've been influenced had they had some (call) for more detail or (call) for issues that we subsequently dealt with.

So that's a view that I worked on with Lise to try and take us on - remind us of the journey of how we got here. And I'm sorry to give you a sort of monotone tour of that but it felt important to us to levelset and make sure we

remind ourselves of all of the incredibly good work and substantial work that's gone on over 50 meetings and to try and keep the spirit of some of the more cooperative and effective meetings we've had in the current set of meetings.

So that's the scene we wanted to set in discussing this prior to beginning. Are there any comments or questions on that perspective or - and/or on the agenda as a whole or the timelines, the point that have been covered so far?

Eduardo Díaz: This is Eduardo. Can I talk?

Jonathan Robinson: Please go ahead, Eduardo.

Eduardo Díaz: I think, you know, the assessment that you made of the 50 meetings is good and I think we are - you know, we have done a lot of work. I just wanted to point out that in Istanbul, we came out with two sets of ideas.

One was to look into the affiliate work and also to - and that's where we decided to go with the - you know, the (possibility) that we just put it for public comment but also whenever this regarded the option of (offloading) IANA where it is right now, so I think, you know, one point which will decide if we're going to go with an affiliate or the other position.

Because - I am saying this also because there were a couple of public comments that (unintelligible). They would prefer to have it at the department within ICANN especially with a (PDI) if only, you know, the (unintelligible) to ICANN and - but it just wanted to point out that. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Eduardo. Let me just hand over to - let me just pass the mic straight onto Greg then. Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. This is Greg Shatan for the record. There was quite a useful thread in the email started, I think by Milton Mueller where think Milton looked at actually just that issue with regard to the - how the public comment looks at the concept of having a PTI, having a set entity as opposed to leaving IANA where it is.

And while there were a few comments that seemed to be not in favor of PTI and a few comments that seemed indicate that PTI should be, you know, significantly more separated from ICANN than the general idea, the vast majority of the comments seemed to treat PTI as a good idea and the right path to go down.

And on top of that, our draft proposal went down the path of PTI. So I think that while the idea of keeping IANA entirely within ICANN and not having PTI may technically be alive, I think rather than it being an open issue, I think it's time to just close it formally and bury it because both within the CWG and within the public comment, there is very strong support for the PTI concept.

So I would not say that it's something that is, you know, open for backtracking and, you know, having, you know, a (fulsome) discussion. I think that if we decide that anything isn't - if we start reopening things we may as well just go back to not just Istanbul but Frankfurt.

And I have some pleasant memories of Frankfurt, but not so pleasant memories of - I think I've had about 30 meetings since then and I don't want to lose that progress.

And I think that PTI and the decision to create PTI is one of the key milestones of that progress. And if we are at milestone 50 in terms of the book

meetings, I would like to be heading toward milestone 51, not milestone 12. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Greg. I think it's also important, while Eduardo makes a fair point about coming out of Istanbul, we did have another high intensity set of meetings where we made further progress and narrowed down our options which is what drove us to produce the document that you referred to, the draft document for public comment. So notwithstanding our group requirement to make progress, is also a fact of the work that we did in the previous high-intensity meetings. Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. This is Avri speaking. I probably would've written this in the chat but I think that we have to remember, if we (left the middle way) that we had found ourselves to unwind, then there's the opposite side of this discussion that immediately becomes operative again and we truly are back at the beginning. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Avri, and just to deal with the process rather than the substance on that one, I mean, again, to make that comment in the chat on-topic is not unreasonable.

So please, you know, if there is - if there's a pertinent and concise point to make in the chat, there's no intention to close it down. It's just really making sure it's used with due care. That's all.

Good. Okay, so those are our comments. Any other comments in and around the agenda or the plans? And I think I'll note here this overall timeline and milestones for you just to remind you that under item two, that's to drive here, is this document in time for formal review by the SOs and ACs in Buenos Aires such that it can then make its way via the appropriate course to the ICG

for their work that they'll have to do to integrate it with the other proposals, which don't forget, they will then produce, as I understand it, their intention is to produce an integrated proposal for public comment.

So, you know, to those that have made - have expressed concerns about public comment in our proposal, it's not the final opportunity to comment. There will be opportunity to comment via the ICG's work in addition.

Greg and Avri, just a note on your hands being up at this stage. Thank you. So I somewhat rapidly took us through items one, two, three and four in trying to set the timeline and milestones, the plan for this set of meetings in the level setting and capturing of the journey to date.

It may be worth just, Grace, just putting up the plan for the high-intensity meetings, the item three portion just so that we can have a quick look at that and see. This isn't fully fleshed out and by all means, those of you who would like to contribute to that, feel free to send mail to the list on that and will do our best to take note of that.

Okay, it's come up in the notes. All right, I see it in the notes here. That's fine. So you see here in the notes on the right, plan for rest of meetings. So the intention is to look at a set of different areas and these aren't all-encompassing, but try to map out together with Lise with some of the key areas are they need to be dealt with.

The overarching structure, clearly that's the concept of PTI and the accountability mechanisms that back - support that up in meeting 51. Meeting 52 is available to work through systematically elements of the public comment detail.

Meeting 53, an item that we will most certainly need to cover is the scope of PTI. Meeting 54, something which we spent some time thinking about and discussing, board composition. And meeting 55, capturing any open issues including implementation.

And so if implementation is something we will need to think about and what we can reasonably put into implementation and what our - how we constrain that and ensure that implementation via our implementation instructions will meet what we - what are our expectations.

Okay, here we can switch now and start to look at some substance which will be great to have as much of your input and comments and involvement. We clearly talked about the mechanics and under item five of the public comments of the last period, what we - what had been done by staff to try and capture that in systematically organize that.

And I know some of you, probably most notably (Chuck), but others included, have spent some significant time responding to that staff work in helping to move that along.

There's also been some independent analysis of it which is helpful and I know a few of you responded very positively to the comments that - the analysis that Milton had done.

So let me hand over to Bernie here to talk through with you the draft compilation, possibly make reference (unintelligible) the comment that (people) have done and see - at start to take (unintelligible). Bernie, let me hand over to you for this.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you, Jonathan. Hello everyone. This is your revised deck that was sent out about an hour ago, I guess, more or less. Sorry about that but we are working on many fronts at the same time.

We are now sitting at 54 responses, 15 from the ccTLD community, eight from (ALAC society) academe, eight from the private sector, six no affiliation 13 technical ecosystem meaning the subgroups within ICANN and four from government.

The process is still essentially the same slide. We categorized these after reading every single one of them and tried to find the main points and saw where things were lining up. And we color coded them.

The one with the most responses the IFRT basically 48% versus none against so the general concept in the IFRT is fine.

The execution as proposed as we see a 17 versus 21. So there are many rejections where the registry operator did not agree with the proposed composition amongst them. So that's one of the issues that we're going to have to deal with.

The next slide the PTI model, 46 support as proposed. After I had an initial exchange with (Milton) at the end of the week last week I agreed to redo the numbers to split them.

Nineteen percent did not support as proposed recommending a complete - sorry but the, English there, a completely separate PTI and 15% did not support as proposed recommending there be no separation from jazz.

Many of those hinted they could live with it under certain circumstances and provided input on other parts of the proposal. Now Milton I think classified these in a different way. But I think at the end of the day they - the end result ends up about being the same.

And there is significant support for PTI which is why we're seeing this in green right now. So although we may not agree on exactly how to classify them I think at the end of the day we're pretty close on where we end up with them.

The CSC 42% support versus 6% against, several questions about where the CSC would be housed and questions about the IFRT reviewing the work of the CSC.

There were some concerns about the CSC being part of the IFRT and very well put comment from the ALAC regarding that if the CFC is the main tool for keeping an eye on the PTI that it would only make sense for the IFR T to review it at the same time.

Next slide so again green, no issues here. The composition of the PTI board is an insider board still neck and neck at 27% for, 27% against.

As noted in the previous slide many of those rejecting PTI concept would acquiesce with a ICANN selected insider board for PTI accountability reasons. Almost everyone wants a small board. And most of those again want some or all multi-stakeholder selected board members for the PTI board.

Jonathan Robinson: Let me I just I wonder if it doesn't make sense to just pause slightly at each slide and see if there is any common or question? It doesn't have to be too tedious but just seeing if anyone did.

For example previously I on the previous slide I note the point about the question on the IFRT review and the work of the CSC. Now I have a pretty clear memory that we - I thought we had said we would not limit the scope of the IANA Functions Review Team. So I'm not sure I understand that point in that IFR had - could potentially review any element of the...

Bernie Turcotte: No. I'm not saying the IFRT was limited. I'm saying there were comments that were made specifically in certain cases if I remember correctly they were concerned about the fact that the CSC was being considered to be part of the IFRT and if they were charged with reviewing the CSC that might be a conflict. So it turns around that.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. But perhaps that's on to the point but Alan go ahead if you want to add to that or...

Alan Greenberg: Yes. Just for clarity in the view of the ALAC the ability to review the CFC which is a major cog in the wheel is absolutely critical.

And the silence on that could be presumed to say yes of course they can review it. But since the only mention the CSC was in providing the major input into the review that was not obvious and we believed it has to be made explicit.

And it's not something that the review team could do. It's a mandatory part of what it must do. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Alan. Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: This is Avri speaking. So just to clarify this is not about the IFRT reviewing CSC materials reports and whatever. This is about the IRT reviewing the CSC as an operating committee. Is that correct? Thanks.

Bernie Turcotte: Yes. I believe that is correct Avri.

Jonathan Robinson: Chuck go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan. This to me is a good example of I think what happened throughout the public comments of constructing suggestions that it's just a matter of us, you know, reviewing them like we're doing now and making some adjustments or being - adding some specificity to our plan.

                  And I think that's typical of the public comments as a whole in finding - I know that with regard to the Design Team M and O issues I found the comments very constructive and helpful to help us make our proposal better. And I think the ALAC comments here are an example of that. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck, agreed. Let me handover back to Bernie then.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you sir. Next slide, a composition of PTI board as I said still neck and neck. And I think we've been in the middle of that and discussing it. And I'll be glad to take questions but I think everyone is aware of where we are with that one. I'm not seeing any questions so we'll move on. NTIA authorization role just to be clear this is split into parts.

                  Basically there is the NTIA rule for authorizing changes to the root zone, i.e., servers for a specific TLD, et cetera. And the recommendation has come back on that that not be continued post-transition. So no approval for specific changes to the content of the root zone as is the case currently.

For approving changes to the root zone environment -- and this is out of a result of DTF there was agreement that for significant changes there needs to be a continued approval for those changes. IANA can't simply go ahead and make those.

So we've got 23% support with some concerns but no outright rejections. And I'll be glad to take questions if there are any on that. Not seeing any moving on to the next slide, root zone maintainer role 17% of respondents had concerns about the transition of the root zone maintainer role.

Given there is no information available about this many concerned that this could prevent the transition. The note here reads that this does not affect the CWG proposal given it's outside the scope of the CWG.

The NTIA Q&A for the original announcement of the transition work states that this will be the transition of the root zone maintainer will be the subject of a separate process.

And I don't think anyone has seen anything about that. And probably this is the result of that of some creating some nervousness in the community. Let's also remember that SSAC 69 actually lists this as one that's seven key questions. I believe it's Number 7.

So although not directly for us definitely was brought up quite a bit in the public consultation. And I'll be glad to take questions if there are any but I don't know how I could expand on this. Not seeing any we'll move on and apologies for the noise.

PTI budget, 17% of respondents supported the budget transparency for PTI with none against. So it's like I guess being against motherhood and apple pie as they say in the United States.

There was a - I added it although it wasn't above 10% threshold, 8% of respondents were recommending that the CWG implement a mechanism to make sure PTI funding beyond the annual budget cycle commitments in ICANN. So there was a lot of concern I would say about ensuring that the PTI is properly funded to do what it can.

There's another angle to this from the work DTF has done and from the ALAC to ensure there is sufficient funding for IANA to do the necessary development and experimentation to keep the root zone evolving so it can properly service the whole community. I'll take questions if there are any.

Jonathan Robinson: But I mean I suppose it's Jonathan speaking. I think the one point is that whilst we don't want to necessarily go into a deep dive you and staff colleagues have a deep dive at this stage.

You and staff colleagues have probably spent more time on this than anyone else analyzing and collating and organizing.

So if there is a point that someone would like to ask just to clarify I mean I think you've done a good job. But just to make it clear that most of these don't, you know, they tell a story at face value.

But if there were questions around the substance that someone would like to understand better is to feel free to ask as well. I think it's perhaps useful to get as much to make this as educational as well. Thanks Bernie.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay. I think we have a question from Olivier in the chat.

We are taking these statistics as exact science. For example when there is opposition to one of the points what percentage of silent agree with the proposal? Do we derive this from those results?

Olivier I'm not claiming this is a deep and a valid statistical analysis that complies with all the standards I would apply to it as a mathematician. As stated in the title this is simply a compilation of major trends to try and inform the group about the things that staff saw when going through this.

We realize that the 100 plus page document that details this which we had to produce to meet the requirements of ICANN public consultations and do our job properly was not necessarily the tool that everyone was going to go for.

So we tried to summarize it the best we could to give indications. And I hope that answers your question.

Yes and I agree sample size is small.

Lise Fuhr: Can I...

Jonathan Robinson: I've got Alan next and then Lise. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I'll make a comment that I think addresses part of what Olivier was saying. I personally have said a number of times that I believe that PTI especially if it's a public benefit corporation should be funded to the extent of several years of funds in a reserve so that ICANN could disappear and it could keep on going for a good amount of time.

We didn't think of that about saying it when the ALAC wrote its comment and it was explicitly asked so we were silent.

If, you know, it comes up in the discussion we are very strongly for it. So this can only say what - can only reflect what people actually said. And in many cases we admitted things for expediency or just forgetting. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Lise?

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Jonathan. I just want to mention under the sample size is small that we have to recognize that some of the answers are like the registry registrar answer is covering quite a lot of companies and organizations.

So it's not the actual sample size. It's more you would have communities that are answering as a whole. So we have to take that into account too. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, agreed and with some of the other points as well there is - there's clearly an issue with how best to quantify this as well as provide qualitative responses.

And don't forget one of the qualitative responses we will provide is by modifying our proposal in response to those including potentially the point that Alan's made about perhaps our proposal could speak to that that we would like to see at minimum one year's satisfactory funding. But, you know, we can recognize that some or all of us thought that it was useful to think about multi-your funding as well. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan. I want to reinforce what Lise and you both said with regard to sample size. I commented in - on the email list on this as well.

We really - most of the comments were from groups that involve dozens and probably more people. And so I think we need to quit focusing so much on counting each comment as from one individual. That is really a false assumption so very good point Lise.

And I want to come back to what Alan said on the budget. Hopefully not very late today Design Team O will be sending some recommendation in response to about five or six public comments that were related to the budget one of them kind of related to the multiyear funding although it didn't say it exactly the same way as Alan but that those recommended responses to the public comments from Design Team O will of course be sent to the full group for consideration.

And Alan that'll be a good point to - for us to look at that and again another example of some good constructive feedback that's coming out of the public comment period. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck. Back to you Bernie.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you sir. Next slide, jurisdiction of PTI incorporation, so we have 13% of respondents had concerns about the jurisdiction and incorporation of PTI and many suggested a neutral jurisdiction.

Bringing it back to Lise and Chuck's point, a significant part of that 13% were individuals and not groups. If you look at the group responses the concerns about this were very minimal. And additionally the majority of respondents discuss incorporation of PTI in the USA as a fact without making the statement that this was a requirement.

So I'm calling this one green. There's obviously a number of people who do have a concern about this. And I think we wanted to flag it to make sure we were transparent about listening to people.

But I think the reality is that there is a pretty solid majority of people who feel they are comfortable with the TI incorporation being in the same country as the ICANN incorporation. I'll be glad to take questions.

Jonathan Robinson: Well Bernie there is a point from (Gary) which I think is a fair point. I mean a couple of people have made the point about the percentages and numbers.

Personally I don't feel too strongly about that. I think it's something to think about. But I do like the idea of saying percentage silent so you get a feel for and it's difficult to know what silent means, didn't consider it, didn't feel strongly. But nevertheless it's no bad - it gives a feel for how many simply didn't respond.

And I think you've done some work Bernie on group versus individual. Has the group - has the CWG seen that?

Bernie Turcotte: No. That was just for our own...

Jonathan Robinson: Okay.

Bernie Turcotte: ...edification as it were so yes. Any other questions? I'm not seeing any so I will carry on. Escalation mechanisms 13% of respondents supported the proposed escalation mechanisms and 2% were against.

Jonathan Robinson: There's a question from Greg.

Bernie Turcotte: Sorry. I'm not sure it's a question...

Greg Shatan: Thank you Jonathan. Back to the previous slide where you said - I'm trying to recall it. Many suggested a neutral jurisdiction. I'm assuming that's the many of the 13%. So it's actually a many of the few. So they - what is that like 7% suggested a neutral jurisdiction on pack set? The use of the word many starts to conjure up ideas of a majority of something. So it's - does it...

Bernie Turcotte: I...

((Crosstalk))

Bernie Turcotte: Okay I can answer that in the following. I think most people who have jurisdiction concerns referred to a neutral jurisdiction. Does that answer your question?

                     Yes. I guess well, part of it. I guess the other thing is what is meant by a neutral jurisdiction? I'm not sure that any jurisdiction is neutral. Everywhere is somewhere.

Bernie Turcotte: I - and I can answer that also in that people use exactly those words in several cases and did not specify it anymore. Some of them used by name Switzerland as the possible example but in many cases it was not specified beyond that.

Greg Shatan: Okay, thank you. So I guess the rest want Camelot or Brigadoon or something like that. Okay thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, a couple of points. I mean one thing the question is whether this slide is modified in a further iteration which it sounds like it needs to be. And

second is (Branden) point that we consider adding to our document itself which to describe any motivation for why US jurisdiction is adequate. And I think we've had some help from Sidley on this in the past. That is my memory. So I think we certainly have some information on that. Yes.

Bernie Turcotte: All right there's a little bit of activity in the chat and but I don't see any further questions so shall I continue? We were on escalation mechanisms before returning. I don't know if there are any questions or thoughts on this at this point?

I am not seeing anything so I'll say we'll move on. Linkage between the proposals for the three communities, 12% of respondents have concerns that there was no clear linkage between the three proposals. A note is comments by the IAB and the (Crisp) team did not raise any significant issues with the CWG proposal.

And I guess some of the concerns trying to read between the lines of those that had concerns was the notion of PTI and the possibility that it would force the IAB or the address registries to have to work with PTI which is not the case. I think we've answered that quite clearly.

So and also there was a preponderance or a majority of those that had concerns with that were individuals versus organizations. And in some cases I think maybe it was certainly it seemed to be people that had not been following the entire process and still raise the concerns.

Again I personally I think they've been addressed. The only reason it's in sort of an orange shade here is just that it's a concern from our community that responded.

All right and we have stuff on this says however believe that the (Crisp) comments should be read between the lines possibly. Turn it over to our chair Alan.

Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Yes, just a quick comment. That whole - the whole issue being covered here was covered exceedingly well in a very short footnote on one of the pages. Not everyone reads footnotes.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Alan. Okay continue Bernie.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you. Not seeing anything else I'll carry on. Public comment on the completed proposal, 15% of respondents formally requested a public consultation on the completed proposal which would include details of the linkage with the CCWG proposal many suggesting that this public consultation should be held simultaneously with the next CWG public consultation.

And the two notes there are most respondents noted that they could not properly comment on the proposal because it was incomplete or made this comment regarding specific sections of the proposal.

And there were also a non-negligible number of complaints that the consultation period was too short and did not provide the translated materials in time. So I will be glad to take questions or comments at this time.

I see Elise is typing and I will give it a second. Proposed separation mechanisms, 4% of respondents supported the proposed separation mechanism while 13% were against.

Many of those against were concerned that there was not enough information available or were seeking lower thresholds. Again I think there was - it's just pointing in a general direction about the feelings that were presented and that the - there is definitely a thirst even if people weren't against it for more information.

And I think as we stated starting this session the CWG did continue its work while the public consultation was ongoing. As a matter of fact for some of us it seemed ages ago when we actually launch the public consultation and a lot has happened since so that was that.

Jonathan Robinson: Avri's got her hand up.

Bernie Turcotte: Avri?

Avri Doria: Yes. This is Avri speaking. I just wanted to say that I think this is completely a reasonable comment. We waited until the very, very and to actually start talking about that. In fact a long time it seemed like a topic that had sort of been dropped or forgotten.

So, you know, we only crammed some of it in at the very end. So I'm not at all surprised. I would've been rather dismayed if we had gotten back a green slide on a very partial proposal. So I think this is totally in line with what was in the report. Thank you.

Thank you Avri. And thank you for all of the hard work you're doing on that as we know. Any other comments or thoughts on this?

Jonathan Robinson: Well just it's Jonathan. I think this is a point that it's - Avri is absolutely right. It's not illogical that this has happened in this way. It's perfectly reasonable. The challenge for us is to address it through the work we've done in the interim and make sure that the proposal is coherent and cohesive as a whole.

What I've argued with people if they've challenge on that in the interim is that the essence of the proposal, the substance is there to be seen of a separate entity, a plan to separate in extreme various other key points.

The fundamentals are in place but some detail was missing which means it's perfectly reasonable that people should say there's is not enough information but it's not unreasonable that we hope can still produce a cohesive and coherent final proposal that doesn't contain major surprises. Go ahead Bernie.

Bernie Turcotte: Thank you sir. Moving on. Updating of SLE's prior to transition. Thirteen in response in favor, 10% again. Reponses seemed quite polarized. They were very clear I mean there was not a lot of middle ground for those people that made a specific comment on this.

They were either clearly for or clearly against. Several respondents who did not response on this point noted that given the user community satisfaction with the current IFO that the CWG should change as little operational elements as possible.

So that's indirectly part of that but there were not a huge number of those comments. So and the split seemed to carry pretty much across any kind of division you were to look at in the data but was also very interesting.

So that is the status on that one. And maybe as some background information I'm uncertain if (Paul Kane) is on the call but no I don't see him. DTA is continuing to work diligently on SLE's with IANA and we have certainly not thrown in the towel and work is progressing.

So that's...

Jonathan Robinson: I'm just going to - there's an open mike so it would be great if I could encourage everyone to close their mikes. Thank you that's better.

Bernie Turcotte: So I see a note from (Alyss), (Linda Burke), will it be possible to identify the slides, who is behind responses statistics and we can look at providing the background for the information I don't think there's any secrets here.

Jonathan Robinson: Isn't that covered in the detail summary? I mean essentially this is a high level capture of the major points but in the - which document is it? Grace go ahead.

Grace Abuhamad: Yes so we - this is Grace. So we provided a summary that it's 200 pages long and essentially that's why we have this sort of the summary version that Bernie has in the presentation here that he's presenting to you now is based off of that long document that we built which goes through the detail of every comment.

And I believe at this point only Chuck has put in comments on that document but that's available for the detail of who is proposing what and what the exact comment is.

So we have that information out there. I'll recirculate that to the list if it's lost.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Grace. I would say one other thought that strikes me Bernie is that when we use words I mean it goes back to (Greg's) previous point about many and several.

It may be better to just remove anything like that and just put X percent or X percent or X of the percent rather than - I just think it makes it entirely neutral then and factual which may be a small improvement on it but yes.

Bernie Turcotte: Okay thank you sir, noted. All right next we've got the end of the presentation. So we've come to the end of the major trends as we presented them and I think that sort of gives us a general direction about where we are. And I'll turn it back to our chair, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Good well thanks I note a couple of thanks you's in the comments. I mean there's been some extensive work notwithstanding the fact that it was a holiday weekend for I think most of the staff on working through this.

So good work guys and it's up to us to now work with you to develop this further. Chuck your hand is up go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan. I just wanted to go back in the presentation to the comments of the slide that talked about the request for another public comment period.

I think that we're going to see, continue to see that kind of request going forward probably in the SOAC responses in their approval process as well as in Buenos Aires.

And I'd like to point out that I, you know, a lot of people said that if there is another public comment period it should be concurrent with the second CCWG comment period.

But I disagree with that a little bit because if we have it concurrent with - and I'm not suggesting we have to have one okay, but it's going to come up again so we need to think it through okay.

But if we have one we really need to have it after, a little bit after the second CCWG public comment period because we need to really know what the final accountability recommendations are.

So as that topic comes up I just want us - and it will okay. So we need to be prepared for that. We don't need to make any decisions now and I'm not suggestion that.

But concurrence with the CCWG doesn't quite work for us because we won't know during that second public comment period what the final recommendations of the CCWG will be. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck. I think Lise is going to come in now with some thoughts here as well.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Jonathan. I agree with you Chuck it's going to be - actually the proposal that we are going to submit to the chartering organizations are going to go to the ICG and they're going to do a merge of this with the other proposals and then there will be a second public comment period on that in regard to accountability group.

There will also be a second public comment on their proposal and we are, we have agreed on making our proposal conditional. So this is not going to be the final say on the proposal linked to the other groups.

So I think we would have a second opportunity to comment on it. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay it's Jonathan. James just to your point obviously you're entitled to your view on whether we need a public comment on a final proposal or not but I didn't hear Chuck say that.

I think he said if there was to be one he had a concern about making it coincident with this CCWG which frankly I would echo also because of the logistical point.

I think I heard informally at least something that was problematic having the two run concurrently at present and so that's also an issue. But certainly our current objective remains to try and produce a solid coherent proposal that's adequate for review and ideally supportive of the chartering organizations.

Notwithstanding the fact that they may make elements and I don't want to pre-suppose this but I can imagine that some might make say might seek forms of conditionality in their approval.

They may approve subject to our, subject to the accountability mechanisms being adequately put in place. But I think we've talked really carefully about that and we've had some help with Sidley and I think we will expect to get some further help from Sidley who are both advising the CCWG and advising us on how best on a number of areas but including how best to integrate and link the work.

So that's what gives me a lot of faith is the ongoing work that we've done with the CCWG together with the fact that Sidley have been watching our collective backs if you like to make sure these things are properly interlinked.

Yes and that's exactly - so to the point in the chat about comment periods or otherwise I mean clearly that's the prerogative of those groups and I wouldn't presume to say anything about that.

Right, we - what it appears is when you look at the public comments as Chuck has helpfully pointed out a number of them make very pragmatic and sensible potential updates to the work of the design teams that has ultimately been absorbed into the CWG's thinking overall.

So in point 5C on our agenda I think what the thinking of the chairs here was there is an opportunity here for to flag that print point with the group. It may make our task a great deal easier if the design teams are able to preview the public comments insofar as they pertain to the work of the design teams.

And I think that's what the color coding is all about. Let me just check that with staff. I need to ask someone from staff. Could someone help me out there as to what the color coding is? Is that...

Marika Konings: Yes so this is Marika. So what we tried to do in those items that we have identified as action items or items forwarded to CWG to consider further we color coded them to reflect what topics or issues they related to reflecting the design team.

So I think as well it says in the beginning basically the calls that we do. So those issues that were deemed appropriate for the full CWG to consider were highlighted in blue.
Those that are specifically related to the IANA budgets were flagged as light green for DTO and anything related to the IFR has not been (unintelligible). Anything related to the CSG which line is orange, anything related to the SLE's which line is in gray for (referencing) A.

And anything for DTM escalation mechanisms in yellow and anything related to original organization was (unintelligible) in pink. Of course I mean I think (unintelligible) as well that sometimes in some of those comments are multiple elements so it may not be solely for that design team.

I think it gives you an idea of which areas are covered in the comment and may also hopefully facilitate the respective design teams to look at those issues and then identify or flag what they believe are issues that may have been already addressed considered over our (unintelligible) conversations as necessary.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Marika. I note that Avri said it was difficult to hear so I'll just try and just (prasey) that for a moment. Essentially we've got a document that's name is Grace can you help me there or Marika?

Grace Abuhamad: It's the CWG review tool action items.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, so the CWG review tool action items and that covers really as Marika was saying there's a color coding to that that highlights the relationship to the different design teams in various colors including the full CWG.

If it's perceived by staff to be the work of the full CWG it's in blue for example. And if it's in another color it relates to one or more specific design teams.

So in principle we could go through them all as the CWG because ultimately the design team work goes to the CWG but some of them may be in quotes "no brainer's."

They may be relatively easy for the design teams to deal with and simply absorb and say that's a practical suggestion we didn't think of that or it makes no particular impact on our thinking.

So I guess the question is it's possibly worth going through and checking with the design teams now if anyone has done so or intends to deal with these. And so I'd like to do a little walk through there and just have a word with you and see if anyone is able to provide any comments on that.

So on the list on the header page of that document in fact it refers to design team O first, which is in light green. Chuck go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan. I referred to this a little bit earlier in a previous comment but design team O met yesterday or at least those of us who could and I think we're close to finalizing our recommendations in response to the comments that were action items for us.

That should be - those recommendations should be sent to the full CWG I would think in the next few hours and so that's an update from design team O.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck for that update and for your diligence in getting on that right away. Does that - can I just understand that in a little more if I possibly should have already but does that mean the likely outcome coming from that is that those are uncontroversial to observe or are some of them going to be quite difficult and require discussion by the CWG?

Is it your general - can you just give a general sense of how readily or not those can be absorbed and do you think with or without controversy added to the final proposal?

Chuck Gomes: Well let me give me - this is Chuck. Let me give my personal assistance. I don't think that the ones for design team O are very controversial. Obviously that will have to be judged by the full working group.

But I encourage people once we send them out to look at them and see if you're in agreement. In one case at least it will require a little bit more work and we'll have to decide whether that work needs to be done before the proposal is submitted to the SO's and AC's and whether it could be done, you know, after that happens and before the proposal to the ICG or at some other point.

So I don't think they're terribly controversial. I again in most cases they were pretty constructive in fact I guess in all cases they were very constructive for design team O.

And so it wasn't really too hard for us yesterday to take a look at those and take advantage of the input we received. And probably Marika has something to add to that so I'll stop.

Jonathan Robinson: Well before Marika comes in Chuck I'll just say one other thing and that's a really interesting point. And I did make it in the preamble remarks as I know you made some reference to the work of the DTO earlier but it's worth capturing I think.

We need to decide or we will need to recognize what work and what I's need to be dotted and T's crossed that need to go into the final proposal and what if anything from either the current work, you now, outputs of the current work or indeed suggestions from the public comment get put into an implementation bucket.

Now I saw Avri's comment much earlier in the chat and it's clearly nuanced it's not going to be that easy. But one of the things that Lise and I have talked with staff about, about the next iteration, you know, the final proposal is that in section 4, which is really designed to deal with the implications of the proposal, we thought it might be useful to put into that implications of the proposal a list of implementation issues as well like a checklist of implementation issues.

And I suspect that's something that could be very useful to do in any event but perhaps in design team O or any other design teams or any other members of the group or participants reviewing these public comments you could be thinking in addition about whether or not that they changes you are proposing to make based on current work or public comment input can be put into an implementation bucket as opposed to unnecessary components of the proposal.

And in fact it's a broad test. What if anything is absolutely necessary for the proposal and what can be saved for another day in essence? All right Marika let me hand over to you.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika and just to add to that because what we are looking for from a staff perspective is also to be able to provide a response to the commenters in the public comment review tool.

Basically we flag those specific items as, you know, what we didn't feel was reportable, providing a response because either, you know, it was an issue that hadn't been discussed or still open for discussion or still being worked on.

So I think as well once Chuck shares his feedback or the DTO responses I think we hope as well that those could be then the potential basis for what staff can include eventually in the public comment review tool.

So we also have a public record that shows how the public comments were dealt with and responded to. So maybe that's also something that design teams can take into account as they, you know, review the comments that are relevant to their work so they provide staff with the guidance on a response that would be appropriate to provide to the commenter.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Marika that's helpful. Okay good so that's some mechanics of how we work. Lise go ahead.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Jonathan. I'm just going to respond to James Gannon's question in the chat saying that the implementation issues need to be solved so that we can provide a timeline for the ICG.

And actually it's part of what we are trying to do by having an implementation list but we have to be aware that our proposal goes into ICG and is going to be worked together with (Crispin) and IANA plans proposals.

So we would have issues of implementation that we cannot foresee and so what we're thinking of is to make a list so they're aware of we see those implementation issues that are important and precedent in our proposal and then they will merge these with the other proposals. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Lise that's a good point and in some ways that's what started us off thinking about this implementation list, this required. And while noted James about the fact that this is that we do need to provide a timeline as best as possible, which is not without its challenges.

And as I think Lise was saying some of that - yes exactly some can't be foreseen since they are integrated implementation issues rather than solely in our preserve. James go ahead.

James Gannon: This is to clarify my comment. I think if we're going to look at certain issues and say okay these are implementation issues I think we need to be extremely clear and divide those issues into implementation issues for the CWG and implementation issues that happen after the ICG's pulling together of the three proposals because I don't feel that it's going to be good if we go to the ICG, say we have this booklet of implementation issues but then the ICG comes back and says well these ones you guys have to deal with.

Okay the ones that need to be dealt with after the proposals come together but I think there needs to be a clear delineation between those two types of implementation issues.

Jonathan Robinson: Just thinking about that James yes it's food for thought. Well let's keep an eye on that and if you can keep an eye on that as we build them. I let's say I hadn't made that subtle distinction which is why I'm thinking about it.

I had figured that they were implementations for whomever was going the implementation whether or whenever they were being done. If these parts of our proposal need to be implemented these details will need to be flushed out in implementation.

Now of course it's possible that the ICG might throw out one or more components of our proposal in which case the implementation of that path becomes moot.

But to the extent that it needs to be implemented and is retained by the ICG that is kind of how I had it in mind rather than breaking it down into implementation pre and post ICG.

I sort of thought we handed over our proposal and said look here's our complete proposal. I suppose there's one other point to reflect on and I think if you went through the other proposal with which we are submitted alongside they probably have a range of implementation issues or details that still need work on but are substantially enough to give a form and an understanding of what's intended.

So arguably we're already more detailed than either of the other two and more complete but I better not say that too loudly in case someone from one of those other groups is listening in on the call. James go ahead.

James Gannon: A quick followup. I think we need - I agree with your framing of it however we need to understand that Larry Strickling in the NTIA have come to ourselves and the ICG and have asked us for an implementation timeline.

And, you know, (Elisa) sent an email on Wednesday asking for a rough timeline by the 9th of June. So if we're there looking at saying okay we have implementation issues that we're going to put into an implementation booklet until the ICG has looked at the proposal we won't be able to give that implementation timeline to the NTIA.

We won't be able to give them that information that they've asked us to without having someone not all of them but some of the implementation issues sorted (now).

Jonathan Robinson: All right fair point. So suffice it to say it is there's a couple of open points here. One is the building up of that implementation list. Two, is how that does or doesn't affect any timeline we give back to the NTIA by the ICG in response to the letter from the NTIA.

And then finally it's, you know, to the extent that we flag matters as matters of implementation do they make our proposal incomplete in some ways such that it's likely to bounce back from the ICG.

To (Andrew's) point in the chat about the ICG plan and them not going to throw anything out. I take your point it was probably a loose phrasing on my part but nevertheless there is - they have an integration job and by integrating the proposals it's possible that elements of the proposal get modified or substituted for something that's I don't know it's difficult I can't really predict it but you're right throughout was probably a careless use of phrase.

And we've endeavored to as we've said to many people including both the other two proposals and the ICG chairs in conversations at least that I have had with the ICG chairs and others.

We have endeavored to make our proposal consistent with the other proposals and both freestanding and self-consistent but also consistent with the other proposals.

So having heard from Chuck on design team O do any of the other design team leads or participants have any updates as to whether or not they think they can in essence assist the group by going through the color coded items and perhaps more rapidly than the group as a whole might be able to deal with those?

Possibly even between calls, you know, between calls over the course of today and simply jumping on a call for half an hour which we could help with or half an hour or an hour.

I know it's a big ask but or in fact maybe some discussions have taken place on list or in other ways. Any comments from any of the design team leads or participants O, N, C, A, M, F? Any of you on those different areas had a chance to deal with other elements of this. Go ahead Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan. On design team M I initiated a discussion on our design team M list on I think there were three comments specifically related to us and those comments also kind of tied in with design team C.

So whatever we end up coming up with on design team M will be communicated to design team C as well. But I can't predict whether that will happen on list before our six intensive meetings are over but as soon as it happens I will obviously communicate it.

And again will be dependent on some feedback from design team C as well. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck. Just highlight the challenges of running all these threads in parallel. Donna you're next go ahead.

Donna Austin: Thanks Jonathan, Donna Austin. So to be honest this is the first time I've looked at this table so I certainly haven't had an opportunity to review and see what input we can provide back. But certainly I can start a conversation on our list and DTC list.

I think one of the concerns in terms of getting feedback is that we're split between Europe and North America so that makes coordination a little bit challenging but we certainly - I'll start a conversation on the list and we'll see how it goes.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Donna appreciate the challenges and the willingness to see if there's things that - and you know, even if it's knocking over one or more items and just saying, "Look, that's a no brainer; that's easy to deal with." But let's see where you get to in understanding the challenges.

Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I just very briefly looked at the color-coded chart, and to be honest, I'm a little bit confused why some of those things are labeled - are in pink for DTF. But I certainly will go through them and try to give some sort of assessment whether anything will come formally from DTF in the timeframe we're talking about is not likely.

Jonathan Robinson: Marika, go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. And maybe just to respond to Alan because indeed, it was a very quick thing we tried to do after the last call. So, you know, please feel free to point out indeed if we've assigned a common (unintelligible) that doesn't belong there or should be for another Design Team.

And as said, I note as well in certain items there's probably like a link between two and especially DTC and DTM like we've seen in the past. Again, if you go through these and you notice an issue that isn't for your Design Team but should be for the CWG or for another Design Team, please feel free to deflag that accordingly and we can update as needed.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. It may just be work aversion on my part.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, thanks Alan, thanks Marika. And I'm glad to see Marika wasn't simply mischievously assigning work to you Alan.

Alan Greenberg: We have a long history.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, good. Okay, Avri go ahead.

Avri Doria: Thank you; Avri speaking.

In terms of DTM, I think some of the explanatory (unintelligible) begun a discussion on the list about how we're going to handle it. Some of the explanatory can possibly be done in a parallel separate track.

In terms of some of the major issues like number of people in the SFRT or when we get to the other one, the AR or the Separation Cross-Community Working Group or whatever name we're giving it, the FR or whatever, that one - first of all, we had decided that most of the discussions would be done main list. And second, it has some of the same issues of proportionality and multistakeholder that I think are issues that the Design Team cannot handle, and those have to be handled in a control list.

But certainly any of the explanatory stuff around the edge, you know, we could make progress off the main discussion.

Jonathan Robinson: Good, thanks Avri. I hope we didn't lose you there.

Chuck, go ahead; you're next.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan. In response I guess kind of to Alan's comments that it probably realistic for Design Team F, for example, to get their responses done over the next two days, I said the same thing with regard to Design Team Man: I'm not sure we'll get it done.

But we have two calls next week. And I think if the Design Team input can be provided before one of those meetings so that the full working group can deliberate as needed, that would still meet our needs in terms of the target we're shooting for.

If I'm wrong on that, let me know Jonathan. But ideally, it would be nice if it came during our intensive meetings, but that's kind of unrealistic because all of us are involved in the intensive meetings and a lot of other things going on in the next two days. So I hope that's a reasonable suggestion.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, of course. It would be hard to say it's not reasonable Chuck. Thank you and agreed; we can do our best to deal with it in that way. And it's really as soon as possible that we close off.

And clearly our objective over these next two days is to lock down as many loose ends and open items as we can so that they don't roll over into next week, but perfectly understood.

Jaap, go ahead.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes, thank you Jonathan. This is Jaap speaking for the record.

Although it's not mentioned in this list, I mean I do have a question about Design Team E. I mean it never really started with but there was some action

item there for the stuff and that's to prepare final proposal with the SAC69. And I did (unintelligible) to (Unintelligible) about it.

But just for the time being, I mean are there any plans for this is going to happen. It will actually help SSAC tremendously in doing the signoff.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, go ahead Grace.

Grace Abuhamad: Hi Jaap. So we did - Staff provided a review of the SAC69 document a few months ago. I'm going to go through and find that document and send it back to the mailing list. It's on the Wiki but I need to go back and find it.

But we did provide a review on the 23rd of March; there you go. Marika is helping me. So we'll circulate the list shortly.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Okay. I will take a look already and just see if this is where SAC is looking for.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, great. And I think there is a supplementary point on that, and that is that it is intended to use that as part of our stress testing, right. That was the objective was to then finally review against that document, the final proposal, against that. So that's the intention there.

So to the extent that the...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead Jaap.

Jaap Akkerhuis: I vaguely remember something like that as well. But I just wanted to make sure that it doesn't fall from the agenda.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, so I think that the intention was that as we focused on the concept of the implications of the proposal, we utilize that as a valuable input to understand the implications of the proposal and make sure we had done it.

So I think, by all means, go back and check that and see what do you think that it is. In terms of assurance to SAC colleagues, it's very much in our thinking and part of our work to date, so that's the case there.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Okay, so that will help in speed of signing off as well.

Jonathan Robinson: Wonderful; that's good to know. Thank you.

So I think that was the main objective of this point was to take a tour through those main Design Teams and relate points to understand the color coding of the Review Tool.

That probably covers what we needed to or intended to at least or plan to for this call. Is there anything else that anyone would like to raise under Any Other Business? Any other point that anyone would like to raise?

Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan. What is the plan with regard to sending at least a work-in-progress version of the Review Tool or posting it so that commoners can see where we're at at this point and the responses to their comments.

Again, like we talked about on the call on Tuesday, there are a lot of the responses that Staff has proposed are that, "Hey, we encourage you to participate in the ccWG comment period." And that comment period, as everyone knows, ends a week from now.

And so the sooner we get that posted, I think the better even though it's still a work in progress, and (unintelligible).

Grace Abuhamad: Thanks Chuck. So I think we're going to do our, you know - what we can do as part of this is make sure that we send it directly to the ccWG chairs so that at least they have the information in the case that the document isn't posted in time for the commenters to see their response and resend their comments, right.

But we're ready to post whatever we get signoff from the CWG, so we can post the document. It's just that at this point I don't think, you know, at least my understanding from the way that we've been working on it is that the document is not ready to be posted at this stage.

So I don't know if the CWG feels differently, but I think we may need to have more review on the Staff comments and things like that before it's posted as a finalized document.

Jonathan Robinson: Well okay, so that's a really interesting question is do we - I mean this is substantially authored by Staff. Some of us have seen it in quite some detail; some of us probably haven't even looked at it yet. There's a spectrum of attention we've given to this. The Design Teams are starting to work through the color-coded areas.

What do people feel about posting this? And when we say posting it, what do we mean -- presumably to the Public Comment Forum as an interim response. What do - how unorthodox would this be? How helpful would it be?

I mean so there's two options that I hear. I hear first of all that we ship it across to the ccWG and say, "Look, this is our work in progress, it's very much work in progress but please be aware this is the status quo."

Second, what about posting a work-in-progress, a draft -- an initial draft -- whatever we want to call it, to the Public Comment Forum? Are there any reactions and thoughts?

And James, that's a good point. I'm not sure what is normal procedure in all of this. But I don't believe it's conventional to put some kind of draft response.

So I'm going to get a comment from Grace and then I'll go to Alan. Grace.

Grace Abuhamad: Yes, so we have - there's no secret. This document is posted on our Wiki. So in terms of its being public in some ways, all the drafts of this document are public and we could circulate drafts like that.

In terms of posting it to the Public Comment page, it becomes a little bit more official. The procedure generally is that Staff provides a summary of the public comments as a Public Comment Report. And for the first Public Comment, we did that summary and posted it.

For the second - for this public comment, what we were thinking is that we could provide sort of the summary or small summary at the beginning but then provide a real detailed response using this document to show that each comment was addressed because sometimes there's concern that comments are

not individually addressed. So this document shows that every single comment was considered.

And so it isn't conventional in the sense, you know, to answer James's question, it's not conventional. And we weren't planning on responding to their individual emails; we were just planning on posting the document for any commenter to consult if they wanted to see how the CWG handled their comment.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, thanks Grace. So Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. Jonathan, in response to your comment, pretty much nothing we're doing is traditional and standard in how we normally handle things.

I personally favor being more open and understanding that there are going to be some people who will misconstrue what is there. But to try to alleviate that, I would put the disclaimer - if we decide to post the document as it is now, I would put the disclaimer that this is a first cut by Staff; it is not sanctioned at all by the CWG in any way. And put that not in the cover letter but actually on the first page in really large font.

But with that consideration, I would not object to seeing it posted. I'm not saying it must be posted either, but I certainly have no problem. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: I think I'll just note that there is certainly concern from Staff about posting more than one summary. So I think there's probably just a sense of a little bit of a resistance to put it to the Public Comment Forum, but that doesn't mean we can't share it by other means.

Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan. I think I agree with Alan, but there's one basic fact.

If we don't post some version of it with a little bit of lead time before June 4, then we need to eliminate all the suggestions that were made, and there were quite a few of them that people participate in the ccWG Comment Forum. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck. So the question is how do we communicate with our commenters who we really think should be contributing to ccWG and the time windows very tight for that.

Alan?

Alan Greenberg: Sorry, that was an old hand.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Alan. James. James?

James Gannon: I have no like procedural or conceptual issue with putting out a response push, I would have a large issue with putting out a draft response as our official response.

If we want to put out something saying that there is a draft response on the CWG list and they can find it there. (Unintelligible) in order to meet that kind of tight timeline, that's fine, but if I wouldn't support putting it out in the Public formal response if it is just at a draft at the moment. I think it needs to be something a lot more finalized (unintelligible) for putting it out a formal statement of the CWG to, you know, quite important commenters.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, that's a variation. Marika, I think your hand was up next.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. So I think - no, I don't have any - whatever way I think that the CWG wants to deal with it whether it's posting a draft or the version as it, but I think it would be good then at least to decide what would be the deadline for CWG members to provide comments and input to make this a final version.

As said, we have perceived Chuck's comment and we're happy to start, you know, addressing those or integrating those in the document if there are no objections to the suggestions he has made. But the question is indeed what is the timeframe for, you know, calling off those comments so we can actually say, "Well CWG has reviewed this and this is now the official response to public comments as they have been received."

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Marika. I mean isn't that a different point though? Isn't the point of the deadline for the CWG to comment on the document different to the objective here. And the objective here as I understand it is simply to flag with those people -- those commenters -- who we think should have commented or should comment into the ccWG comment. That's really our objective of any interim posting or communication.

Marika Konings: And this is Marika just to respond. It's more if CWG believes for example you can review this by Sunday, well then on Monday we can post a final version. But if people tell us now, well we need a week at least then the decision is do we indeed go ahead and post it as a draft clearly indicating that, but at the same time also have that deadline so we can then communicate at the end of the (unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, so I think my understanding is, and anyone is welcome to correct me if they have a different view, but my understanding is we have effectively said we cannot do it by the end of the high-intensity meetings because some Design Teams are still going to look at their parts of it next week. So it remains open into next week.

Therefore, it becomes very close to the June 4 deadline of the ccWG comment period to produce a final one. So we will not produce a final one sufficiently in advance of June 4 even if we do produce it in advance of June 4.

So in a sense we should put some kind of draft of communication out as soon as possible -- that's really to say today -- to take maximum advantage of the window. That seems to be where this is heading.

Greg, do you have an addition of point to make?

Greg Shatan: Yes, thanks Jonathan; Greg Shatan.

My view is that we should post this document to the Public Comment Page. I think that it should be explained in some, you know, abbreviated fashion that, you know, it is a draft. But I think there's no point in hiding an awful lot of good work and information that is helpful that will be helpful to many people. And I really it's posted on our Wiki but I think it takes it to another level of transparency to put it on the Public Comment Page. It should be clear exactly what it is and not taken as anything more than that.

But, you know, I don't think - I think we just need to keep the information flowing out and, you know, contextualizing it where necessary. But I don't think we do ourselves or the commenters any favors by keeping this document kind of more quiet.

And I think in any case, most of the commenters who should be commenting on the ccWG's work are probably well underway in doing so considering that the comment period for that closes a week from yesterday. So I don't think it's going to be news.

But nonetheless, you know, if we believe that specific comments, you know, should be addressed to the ccWG, you know, we may as well say it now; it's not going to help to say it later. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So I think the objective is clear. The idea is to communicate this in an effective way as possible with some kind of heading. And whether that heading is on the document or ahead of a link is okay.

So a couple of things; I'm going to come to Holly in just one moment. But it feels like we've got the objective.

Is anyone willing to provide a draft of that header text even if it's immediately after this call? It would be helpful. So if anyone can just provide a quick - if anyone is willing to volunteer to provide that draft, that would be great.

Let's hear from you Holly and then we'll see where we go to wrap this up.

Holly Gregory: Hi everyone. Very good discussion today; very helpful in having the whole picture.

I just had a very minor suggestion to make on how you might post this which is to, because it's a very helpful document, just post it now without the comment section filled in until CWG has had a chance to, you know, really

think through it and agreed on all the comments that are right now in draft form.

Grace Abuhamad: Hi Holly, this is Grace just to respond. I think if we did that we would have to reformat the whole document and it's kind of formatted currently. We can't - it would be hard to just delete that column the way that the document it currently formatted.

But it's a good idea. It would just take a lot of additional time.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, it's Jonathan speaking. I think we've got guidance anyway as to what the intent is and what the objective is. I think we can fix this pretty quickly and perhaps you should just leave it in the discretion of the chairs to sort of this out and get something done.

Greg?

Greg Shatan: This is Greg Shatan again. I just want to follow-up.

I don't - to my mind, I haven't looked at every page, to be honest, of the tool. But I don't think the response column contains anything particularly controversial; it's mostly just a series of assignments to the sub-teams. And then the CWG appreciates your feedback, and sometimes - and most of the time - and will consider your feedback in its deliberations.

You know, I see a few places where there is something more than that. But again, you know, this reflects the working method of the group and I don't see anything, you know, there that is going to boil anybody's blood. And if it does, they should understand that this is a draft and drafts change. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, thanks Greg. Alan, I think I'm going to try and wrap this up now. Like I say, I've got a practical suggestion.

Alan Greenberg: Yes, just a very short comment. Staff quite wisely took any really controversial suggestions and said the CWG is going to have to decide. I don't think there's a lot of controversy in what is there and I really don't see the harm in posting it. But we'll turn it back to the chairs.

Jonathan Robinson: Avri, go ahead.

Avri Doria: Thank you, this is Avri speaking.

And perhaps because I have a very grumpy perspective (unintelligible), but I think that if I wouldn't see a set of answers posted with all of those generic thank yous for comment, without the comment having yet been discussed, I -- and I wasn't part of this group -- I would start to wonder. And I understand that those thank yous make sense once we've gone through everything.

But before we've gone through everything, they really seem like a brush off. Or as I say, maybe it's just my grumpy self sees them as a brush off. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, I can see how this is a little challenging. I can see how they might seem like a bit of a brush off. But again, they are - it's - they are not complete at this point.

And I think as long as we make it clear that this is a draft, I think that the middle road might be to make a posting to the Public Comment Period saying that active work is going on to review the public comments. Many of them have flagged that - a number of them have flagged that there is relevant

material for the ccWG here and the group seeks to make this as widely known as possible prior to the closing of the ccWG Public Comment Period.

And I think if we capture that, we capture the essence of it without waving the generic thank yous in front of their noses. It's clear that this is a draft at that point. And so that feels to me like perhaps the middle road.

Avri, is that a new hand?

Yes, along the lines of what James says. So I think we have an objective in mind as I said. The objective is to flag with those that we think could usefully comment to the ccWG that they should, and we can achieve that without hopefully causing little or no offense to the commenters -- and hopefully Avri.

All right, well that leaves those of you who have got up early or have other things to get on with to go and have a cup of coffee or make next steps with your day. And we'll be all meeting you within a couple of hours of course at the next meeting.

Thanks for showing up for this one. I think it was a good meeting. I think we've started off on a very good footing so thank you very much. Let's keep it going and see if we can't push on through to making as much possible progress as we can.

Thank you all participants including Sidley, and thanks for your comments. Talk to you in a few hours.

Donna Austin: Bye.

END