

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer  
June 11, 2015  
6:00 am CT**

Coordinator: The recordings are started. Speakers, you may begin.

Marika Konings: Thank you very much. Hello everyone and welcome to the 59th meeting of the CWG Stewardship Group on the 11th of June at 11:00 UTC. And I'm handing it over to our chairs for today, Lise and Jonathan. Please go ahead.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Marika. And thank you all for joining this 59th call. It's been a long journey and I don't know if it's over yet, but I think we reached a very important milestone today.

This call will - sorry. My name is Lise Fuhr. I'm one of the two co-chairs, and I will chair this meeting together with my other fellow co-chair, Jonathan Robinson. We have divided this meeting into two halves, where I will do item one, two, three and Jonathan will do the last part of the call.

Well our proposal is now finalized and it will be distributed to the chartering organizations today and that is a great milestone. As I said before the CWG has read the proposal three times during the last three meetings. We've had 24

hours of statements. Now the proposal is ready to be submitted to the chartering organizations, the SOs and ACs. We haven't received any minority statement, so we have a proposal that's ready to send off.

This means that we as a group need to start looking ahead and looking ahead to BA to the Buenos Aires meeting and concentrating on security the chartering organization's support. So Jonathan and I have discussed that we really need support, the CWG as a whole needs support assistance and hard work from you, all the members and participants.

We find that you're all ambassadors for our group, and it's - this proposal is our work. We all own it, and it's important that we promote it and we work really hard to ensure the support for this proposal. So this is our - we would urge you to be ambassadors and use the Buenos Aires in ensuring support for this proposal.

That was the opening remarks. Does anyone have any questions or remarks to this? If not, I will move onto the transfer of the final proposal. As I said in the beginning, we the chairs will transfer the proposal to the chartering organizations today. We are in the middle of preparing a covering letter that will be sent with the final proposal. And that covering letter will describe the proposal and part of the process but also there are some additional work that needs to be done.

So what is it that we need to - that needs to be done after the final proposal has sent? Well part of it is what I said and that's not as much in relation to the proposal itself. It's that we all have a lot of presentations, meetings and communications in Buenos Aires that needs to be done. And this includes us all. We need to be really good at communicating and promoting this proposal.

Another part is that we need a conclusion of the SLE work. And here we will rely on staff to project manage this. We talked about this - we've talked about not having the DTA continuing after the proposal has been sent to the group. So we actually suggest that staff will project manage with - together with the DTA members.

We need to define the boundaries between the proposal, the implementation and of course the post-transition work from this group. But we think that staff that has been helping us with this CWG proposal and IANA staff and DTA members could work together to finalize this SLE work.

Of course we also need to be mindful of NTIA approval to be sought for any changes as necessary. And there is also the issue regarding budget, where we, the chairs, will ask for an estimated statement of work and budget that's needed and then request approval of the budget needed. So that part will go to the co-chairs of the CWG.

The ICG leadership also needs to be of course kept in the loop about what's going on so we need to ensure that they - we have checkpoints that are taken care of, so we don't leave this out in the open after submission to the ICG. This is the plan of going forward with the SLE work, and we would like to ask the DTA members that has been working together on this to continue as a group with this staff and IANA staff, and I know that (Bernie) will be in charge of helping us out with this.

I can see Paul Kane has his hand up as the lead of DTA. Go ahead, Paul.

Paul Kane: So thank you very much, Lise. Yes I think that proposal is very sensible and a prudent way forward. I've just sent to the list - (Bernie) and I have been trying to recover over the last couple of day and unfortunately haven't been able to

make it yet. I did speak with Kim Davies from IANA and (Bernie) to a smaller degree some time ago, well a couple of days ago, in connection. We're trying to come up with a plan, and you've touched on it.

I think the idea may be to rename the members or the design team to maybe the SLE working group or ad hoc working group, I think as Alan mentioned it during the last call, which seems a very sensible way forward in that if we have the endorsement of the CWG for our work, then we can lay out a roadmap relatively efficiently, working with ICANN and IANA to have a service level document ready in relatively short order, and then we can populate the thresholds once the implementation of the capturing the time stamps has been done.

So in the inbox I've just outlined a very quick proposal that has been discussed with IANA, and I'm very happy to work with (Bernie) going forward to make sure that the proposal is complete and the SLE is in place with acceptable thresholds from the data transition. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Paul. That sounds like a really good suggestion. I haven't had the time to see what you sent to us. I don't know if the group has any questions or comments regarding this. And I see Donna Austin asking, "Who will compromise (sic) the working group? Would it be the DTA members?"

I think from the outset it was that it should be DTA members, but if anyone wants to join in, I find it's important that those members consist of people who are knowledgeable about the service level and the IANA work. So it's - it should be the issue.

Paul Kane: I think what -- just if I may -- what we are doing with ICANN's support is appreciating that the design team as such is coming to end, our proposal is that

there will be a URL link so members of the community can see our work in progress. Kim and (Adam), one of my guys, are proposing to have a weekly call, just once a week, it has been more frequent in the run up to this, to try and bring the document to conclusion.

With Buenos Aires on the way, Kim's availability is somewhat constrained, but we're looking really at sort of four or five weeks out from today to have the thresholds in place. So at the moment the proposal is just to keep the design team members, basically DTA members, so we have the three gTLD registries, we have the three ccTLD registries, but then we will make the document public via the ICANN site, the wiki links, the wiki site, so that the community can see what we're doing. So there will be a fair opportunity for members of the community to watch our progress.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Paul. And I think that transparency is a key issue here because that will give the community the possibility to interact, not interact but to follow the process over time.

~~(Keith)~~Keith, your hand is up. Go ahead.

~~(Keith)~~Keith Davidson: Hi there. I just wonder about the formal recognition of that, of what's essentially an informal group. And perhaps it's something that - well firstly I think it's a great idea that the subgroup continues to develop the SLEs and gets a finality on that, but I wonder if something that both the GNSO and the ccNSO need to do some formal recognition to so it can continue to operate as a proper cross-community working for the future. And I'm happy to take the issue up within the ccNSO to that end. But I wonder if someone might take that up with GNSO.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, ~~(Keith)~~Keith. I think that sounds like a very good idea, and I see Jonathan has his hand up. Jonathan, go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: Lise, I was going to say it's a very bad idea, but now I can't.

Lise Fuhr: It's all right. Go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: I'm kidding. I think it's a great idea.

Lise Fuhr: Okay.

Jonathan Robinson: It sounds like a good idea. And actually just to help ~~(Keith)~~Keith, Paul and others with this, we as a - the chairs covering note for this already highlights this issue as an outstanding point, so it strikes me that in transmitting or transferring this out of our hands in the CWG, as part of that handover of the baton, when we hand it to the SOs and ACs for approval, we will make sure we include in that handover the highlighting of this point and in so doing, I think that can be then linked into their approval. So they can then ideally approve the final report and acknowledge that this work is being continued in the way envisaged by the CWG.

So I think that's a good tie up and it should hopefully work. And it actually deals with the concern we had, which was running the DTA as such when the design teams were intended always to report their work back into the CWG and conclude their work. And to that extent, we have concluded the work of the DTA, save for this outstanding item. And so I think we've found a solution that works, and together with the covering note from the chairs, that should make it back into the chartering organizations and help in that way. So that sounds sensible. Thanks.

Okay, I see Lise says in the chat that her call has dropped, so I'll pick up from here until she managed to rejoin. Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: I hate to harp on this issue, but I just heard two different things. I heard a suggestion that the ccNSO and the GNSO do it, and I heard from Jonathan that it go to the chartering organizations. Those aren't the same thing.

Jonathan Robinson: Fair enough, Alan. That's a good point, as usual. It's a key detail. I - it strikes me that - well what I said was it certainly covered in the letter to the chartering organizations. Whether we then need - I mean it does no harm for all of the chartering organizations to recognize in their reply that this work is continuing. I think ~~(Keith)~~Keith was particularly concerned because this is a group comprised of ccNSO and GNSO participants, but I think it does no harm for the chartering organizations to recognize that. So I suspect it can be handled both ways.

Alan Greenberg: Just to be clear, it does do harm because we are doing this under the guide of a CCWG with participation and chartering from other organizations. And to say a key part, which is going to be decided by a subgroup which is composed only of registries will be decided by the registries, this changes the optics of it. I think we just have to recognize that and remember that. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Alan. I meant it does no harm for it to be acknowledged and approved by all chartering organizations. Alan, to your point it possibly does good.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Sorry, I dropped off. My line just went dead. So I didn't really hear the discussion and who's next in line. There was discussion between - Alan Greenberg, have you had your question or your remark and Jonathan? So then the line is down to Greg. And I'm sorry I can't pick up on the last discussion.

Jonathan Robinson: Lise, let me help you so I hand over to you properly before we go to Greg.

Lise Fuhr: Okay.

Jonathan Robinson: The point is that there was a question as to whether the ongoing existence of the work of the SLE group would be in some way approved or ratified by the ccNSO and GNSO, and I picked up to say that actually this will be covered in our note that covers this document, saying this is a key part, as we transfer this to the SOs and ACs, this will be covered in our covering note indicating that this is an outstanding piece of work and we have a mechanism for closing it.

So as part of closing that loop, it probably makes sense that the chartering organizations come back and with their approval are effectively acknowledging that this piece of work needs to conclude to tie up all of the loose ends. So we will cover it off in our covering letter. That's what that was about, and Greg may want to pick it up further.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Jonathan. Okay. Greg, go ahead. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Hi this is Greg Shatan. I think hopefully we've managed to come back from that little swerve. You know, clearly the existence of this ad hoc working group doesn't meet the approval, then the organization would need the approval with the idea that if it comes down - as it comes out with further work that the approval of the chartering organizations then, all of them, recognizes that this work is still being done is catching up to the main work, to the main proposal and that'll be - that there'll be a method by which that gets married up later.



So I think the idea that the group itself needs to be approved is a little bit off the mark, because we're not disbanding yet. We can have whatever groups we want. The issue is that it gets into approval - proposal and approval of whatever work comes out of the working group. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr:

Thank you, Greg. And actually it's touching on kind of the same point that ~~(Keith)~~Keith saying. (Unintelligible) only recognizing the group that already exists. So. And I agree. It is a group that already exists, but we would like to actually rename it after the finalization of this proposal because - and recognize that the group needs to finalize or to conclude their work after submission of the actual proposal. But having a plan makes it easier and better to actually agree.

Okay so let's move onto the next issue we have, which is also covered in the covering letter. And that is the IP issue that's been raised by Bill Manning on the list. Jonathan and I will have this mentioned in the covering letter. We will also discuss it with Sidley on the client committee call on Friday.

This is an issue that also needs coordination with the ICG and the CRISP team, the IANA plan. So we will deal with it as Jonathan proposed on list, which I second, in the covering letter and with the groups afterwards.

Greg, your hand is still up. Is that an old hand or a new hand? I can also see that Jonathan Robinson to the last conversation is saying that I understand at least one other RFP respondent has not yet concluded the SLE discussion. So we're not on our own here. And other groups, I don't know if that's the numbering or the protocol.

Okay any questions or remarks to this part regarding the implementation? We will deal with that during the discussion under after - under - beyond ICANN

53. So if there is no further questions or remarks regarding the transfer of the final proposal, I'll move onto the communication points.

And here as you know - you might know, we have had a webinar today this morning. Another one will take place almost right after this call. Jonathan will do the one after this call. I did the one this morning. We have high international attendance with quite a few participants. I think it was around 60.

And there were plenty of good questions. A lot of them were concerned about the process after the acceptance by the chartering organizations. And it was very good to see a lot of new names, new people that haven't been part of this process joining the call. I think it's great that we can reach out for - to a wider audience and it's been in this group.

Well we had a slide deck prepared for this. This slide deck is going to be available for all, and the slide deck has two formats. It's PPT and PDF. The PPT allows for easy editing so you can edit it if you need to do specific presentations. And we would encourage you to use this slide deck to do the communications that we have been talking about earlier. It's really good to use it and have it as a help to explain the actual proposal.

So we hope that you will use this when you're being ambassadors for this proposal and by this - helping us spreading the word. It's also important that we during the next couple of hours - weeks are ensuring and helping people understand the relationship and linkage with the CCWG. It's important that this is fully understood, both that we give the sense that we have made the conditionality regarding our requirements.

And this will actually empower all to be able to make a decision regarding the proposal, because if the requirements are not met, well the proposal will need

to go back to further revision. So giving people this insurance will be good to have, and actually the slide deck is great showing this. We, the chairs, Jonathan and I, will work together with the CCWG chairs.

We're working on a blog now that will try and actually highlight this cooperation between the two groups and the linkage and the conditionality in order to make it clear for all that we have taken this very seriously. And we find that the proposal as set forward by the accountability chairs and the accountability group is actually meeting these requirements that were set forward by the CWG.

So these are the key communication points at the point. Jonathan will touch on another one, and that's going to be the Buenos Aires meeting and how we will do those. Are there any questions to this communication points? Any views or comments? I don't see any. So I will hand over to Jonathan to do item four and five and the rest of the call. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Lise. It may be that we're heading for a record short call here, but let's make sure everyone has their opportunity to say whatever they need and cover these different points. Obviously we're all acutely aware we're now heading up towards the Buenos Aires meeting, and there are a series of meetings relating to this work that you have seen -- relating to our work -- that you should have seen a schedule of previously.

Can we have that schedule up in the room? Yes, so this gives you the areas highlighted with respect to the work of the CWG and related matters. To me, it seems that the critical thing we need to achieve as a group through these meetings is to build confidence in our proposal, and that's at all levels, the sort of substance of it, the process that went into it.

We had a bit of discussion with ~~(Olivier)~~Olivier on list about the emphasis in the webinar, this morning's webinar, on process, and he made a good point and it was supported by Paul that there was a concern over the folks on process. And perhaps we could do some work on this slide, as I said in my e-mail response to ~~(Olivier)~~Olivier.

I am conscious that we need to sort of bring people along on the journey as well as the outcome, because all of us have been through a pretty detailed journey in figuring all of this out and accepting various compromises and changes along the way. So there is a value in that journey without unduly laboring it.

So that seems to me the one thing that we've all got to try and work on is confidence in the substance and value of our proposal. And the second is confidence in the ties and dependencies with the CCWG that the organization's evaluating our proposal can trust in those links and understand them. So that's my feeling of two of the critical things we've got to achieve in the run up to and in BA.

Alan, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Jonathan. In reference to the e-mail things, which happened in the middle of my night, so I'm just catching up on them now, they're all in reference to a change which I requested to be made several times, which I understand was not made, and that is to be really explicit and clear in the most clear language that the special IFR can be triggered only by the coincidence of approval of the ccNSO and the GNSO. And I understand that's the one that was misrepresented or potentially misrepresented in the slide and will be corrected.

It would really be clear, especially since we're getting this document translated and will be handled by other people, that this is really clear. So I don't know if the final version that is going out, which I may not have seen, that word each was changed to both in the appropriate places. But it's really important. It's not a little detail that may have gotten misrepresented in the slides, it's a crucial part of the decision, so let's not be afraid of making a correction at this point in grammar if we have to make sure that we don't have people going off as we present this around the world with a misunderstanding. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: That's a good point, Alan. Let's have a quick word with ~~(Sharon)~~Sharon on this one since she kindly got up early again to be with us. ~~(Sharon)~~Sharon, this point relates to the approval of each of the GNSO and ccNSO, and Alan and perhaps others would like to see it say both the GNSO and ccNSO. Now this actually was a point made by one of the Sidley people on a previous call, saying each was more legally correct.

But I think the concern that Alan's got is that in sort of plain English, as it were, in plain speak, it doesn't convey it. It suggests that it could be either of them rather than both of them. So I don't know if we can - yes and Greg if - so this is really the point is if we can - if each has that - if we can somehow clarify it.

So the slide - I acknowledge that the slide is at fault and the slide might need correcting -- or potentially at fault. The question is, is it - what do we want in the proposal. Because the slide will follow the proposal. Let me turn to ~~(Sharon)~~Sharon, noting Greg's point in the chat that each means both, not either. But let's hear from ~~(Sharon)~~Sharon.

~~(Sharon)~~Sharon Flanagan: Thanks, Jonathan. Can you hear me okay? Hello?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

~~(Sharon)~~Sharon Flanagan: Okay. The language that's there currently is accurate. It's each and then there's and. Each of the councils. You know, it doesn't say or. So for us it's very clear. It's very clear legally and kind of technically but I appreciate it might not be coming clear in a plain English manner. So there's no ambiguity in the language, but one way we could clarify it is we could say both of the ccNSO and the GNSO council, paren, each by a supermajority vote, close paren. And I'll type that up into the chat.

The issue is by saying both, the proposal from Alan, there is ambiguity. That actually creates ambiguity because it suggests that they may vote together as one group, and you only need a supermajority of the whole, not a supermajority of each. And so it's very important that it's the supermajority of each organization. So let me put some language in the chat.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, ~~(Sharon)~~Sharon. That would be helpful and hopefully that will satisfy us both sort of legally, if you like, and also in terms of the communication elements of it. Alan is your hand remaining up or does that clarifying language...?

Alan Greenberg: That was a new hand. Two things. First of all, it did say - it said each, and I understand legally that may be correct, but it said each according to their own rules. So I'm not sure how one could misunderstand that. But nevertheless I was willing to accept the fact that the change was not made several times without any rebuttal or answer that I saw.

But the fact that the slides, whoever composed the slides got it wrong and whoever answered the question from ~~(Olivier)~~Olivier, according to what

~~(Olivier)~~Olivier's saying, got it wrong, there's an opportunity for misunderstanding. I think we've demonstrated that, so let's make sure we don't follow it through. Thank you very much.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Alan. I think we've demonstrated it and now dealt with it with the help of ~~(Sharon)~~Sharon. So let's put the revised - advised revised text in and hopefully that really kills any ambiguity or concern in this respect.

~~(Olivier)~~Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Jonathan, it's ~~(Olivier)~~.

Jonathan Robinson: ~~(Sharon)~~Sharon is that - if you could drop the hand if you no longer want to speak or please feel free to go ahead. And then Chuck go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jonathan. I keep seeing in the chat and in slides and everything else the indication that the CSC can initiate a special IFR, which is not true. So let's make sure we correct that. The CSC escalates to the GNSO and ccNSO, who then can do that. So just a correction. I don't think we want to imply something the CSC isn't tasked with doing. Thanks. And by the way, as you may not have seen in the - on the e-mail list that (Donna) confirmed that's a correct understanding.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Chuck. I had seen that and in that sense initiate only means to escalate, not to commence, correct. Apparently ~~(Olivier)~~Olivier would like to speak. Okay ~~(Olivier)~~Olivier, do come in if you need to in due course. So just to remind you what I was saying...Go ahead, ~~(Olivier)~~Olivier.

~~(Olivier)~~Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay thanks. Thank you very much for touching on this. I want to mention I'm absolutely fine and satisfied -- sorry I'm in too sun much here -- satisfied with this. What I would say is perhaps we've also not looked at simple diagram that shows the escalation from the internal discussions

within the CSC and within IANA when there's a problem a specific request or task, all the way up to when it reaches the separation working group.

Because I think there's - it's not ambiguity at all, but certainly there's little understanding by people out there of how many safeguards we've put in that, and I think we should really show that this is something that is based - really essentially on just a technical function and the technical performance and that has several layers of safeguards so the process itself cannot be captured by any vested interest of some sort.

I think that's really important because it would show - it would go directly in line with the fact that we are looking at a system that will be as stable, as reliable and continue to ensure the operational stability of the IANA functions, and that's important. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, ~~(Olivier)~~Olivier. I will try and emphasize that in the second webinar. Lise and I will take that point with us into the Buenos Aires as again per our exchanges we should all take that with us and try and make sure we explain that.

I certainly did try at one point an intervention in the early webinar today to emphasize when someone said this looks like a very, you know, significant set of issues. I did highlight to the group, to the webinar group, that actually it's a relatively simple structure which in fact as we note, took into account the simplicity we were asked to provide in the early public comment. But it becomes in a sense complicated, but really that's through the safeguards during the escalation phases.

So that's going into Buenos Aires. Monday is clearly a very high profile meeting, and it comes straight after the opening ceremony. And so just



pointing that out, that's the so-called town hall meeting between 10:30 and 1. We had a discussion together with the CCWG chairs. I think they're going to take the lion's share of that meeting, but it's critical that we come in at the front of that meeting and explain why the transition creates the need for additional accountability and set the path and therefore why the CWG is working on this, and then end the meeting with clarifying exactly what has been done to close those and tighten up those bonds, if you like, through the five specific points.

I see that the chat is ongoing on the point on initiate, so we can tidy that up to try and make sure that that language just before the final proposal goes it. But it is clear that the CSC may only refer to the ccNSO and GNSO for checking. And so that can get tidied up rather than actually commence the SFR without that check and balance in place, which we worked so carefully to craft.

Any other comments or concerns about the nature of the meeting in Buenos Aires? And clearly, you know, you heard Lise say and I guess I may have even already reiterated that the reliance on the group, the members and participants of this group, to explain and go out and explain the work of this group. And I know some of you have already been doing admirably.

All right. Keeping with moving things on track then, please pull me back if you do need to say something, but let's talk a little bit about where we go beyond that. And clearly anticipating that the proposal is approved by the chartering organizations or there are no objections to transmitting it to the ICG, we will then proceed to do so shortly after the Buenos Aires meetings.

And I guess one of things that we haven't done, and I don't expect us to resolve this now but it's a seed to think about, over and above the two issues that we have already highlighted is - which are the (unintelligible) SLEs and

the intellectual property, the question is what role, if any, this group has in overseeing or ensuring that implementation is done in the way it should be.

And there is a reference in our charter too that's - perhaps its worth even noting that we - we'll - I think our charter considers us consulting with the ICG representatives to determine when we can consider our work completed. And so there is a question of how we tie up the loose ends after all of this.

Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, Jonathan. As tempting as it is to dissolve and say we never have to continue doing this, I think we have an obligation to have a process in case a chartering organization comes back with any questions or something like that. And even if the charter didn't say with the ICG, evidence from the GNSO and PDP implementation is such that there was - there will always be the opportunity for misinterpretation or requiring clarification, and I think the group formally needs to stay in place until we're sure that our work is not only - the writing is not only done but the understanding of it is thoroughly done. So I, as I said, tempting but I don't think we really can dissolve. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes thanks, Alan. I see a checkmark from Chuck in that respect. And it's really - I guess what I'm saying is and we will want to come together to make sure that we're consistent with the charter, we understand what our role and remit is post BA. And I guess what I'm implicitly suggesting is we will get together after BA and make sure we capture this formally, notwithstanding anything else that we finally need to do as result of the BA meeting and the transfer to the chartering organizations and potential subsequent transmission to the ICG. ~~(James)~~James?

~~(James)~~James Gannon: On a point of practicality as well, so currently in the proposal we've envisioned that Sidley will assist with the formation of the PTI and various other aspects. So my understanding is that the CCWG is the client for Sidley, so if we expect them to that work for us, the CCWG will need to stay around in some form or another in order to continue that contractual relationship that we have with Sidley in order to go through the PTI formation and whatever else that we need them to do from that point of view.

Jonathan Robinson: ~~(James)~~James, just to be clear when you say CCWG, I think you mean this group, this - which we've generally referred to as the CWG. I understood you. And yes, well that's a point I've flagged a couple of times and does need resolution is that we need to revisit our initial mandate for Sidley we will need to then talk with - we'll need to talk amongst ourselves and potentially talk with ICANN of course, who have funded this work, and see what role Sidley or any of independent advisors might play and how that might be structured going forward.

And to my mind, that's again part of the landscape of implementation that it's useful to have a couple of ideas thrown out here so that people are thinking about it. I'm certainly not expecting to draw conclusions right now and resolve it, but it's something we might get - have some discussion on in -- where am I? -- in Buenos Aires and need to be aware of that and so have started the thought process.

Greg?

Greg Shatan: This is Greg. I would just assume that the - that Sidley would stay with us till the close of the transaction, so to speak. And I don't think that needs additional approval. Obviously we don't want to continue along with some sort of Flying Dutchman with additional crew on board as well, but I don't

think that - just like Alan said, as much as we might want to let ourselves out of this, I think that we're done when the work is done, which at least is up to the point of implementation and if not beyond.

And I think it's the beyond that's the question, kind of the post-closing, if you will, at least the post, you know, the decision to go forward on the part of the at least the ICG, if not I believe the U.S. government allowing the actual implementation to begin. An exciting time I'm sure that we will look forward to. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Greg. And I'm just - what I'm trying to do is make sure the group is thinking about how we will dot the I's and cross the T's in that - in any work beyond Buenos Aires and all try and form a common understanding, especially to the extent that it's not clearly covered by the charter or any other existing documents such as the engagement letter with Sidley. So that's really where my thinking is on this.

Go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Just for clarification, I'm assuming there is no weekly retainer even if our legal advisors aren't doing any work in a given week. Is that - or is there a clock (unintelligible)

Jonathan Robinson: Correct, Alan. There's no - and ~~(Sharon)~~Sharon confirms that.

Alan Greenberg: Then I - then they have to stay around because we don't know what the questions are that might come up. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So just for the avoidance of doubt, we are transmitting our proposal. We are going together as a still formed group into Buenos Aires. We're going

to have significant interaction and ideally the SOs and ACs, the chartering organizations, will approve the proposal for then immediately post BA transmission to the ICG.

~~(Mary)~~Mary rightly points out in the chat well what if there are questions. And clearly we need to be in place to answer questions and make any resolution between the different proposals. So there will inevitably be some (unintelligible).

But I then look beyond all of that and say well, you know, what happens beyond that cycle of activity and that's really what we will need to be clear on. And I'm not sort of advocating dissolution of the group, and there's been some fairly strong points made as to why the group will need to continue in some form or another, and it's really we'll need to do some work on doing that.

Again, I don't think we can resolve that on this call but it's useful to have thought about it a little. Greg?

Okay, well that covers that point at least for the time being. It's - it is an open issue by definition since it's beyond ICANN 53. And, ~~(James)~~James, I don't think implementation and testing with the ICG has been covered in that sense apart from the obvious work that's gone on to discuss stress testing or implementation or impacts of the proposal in the various sections of the proposal.

So are there any other points under A or B before we bring this call to a close and prepare for the webinar not long from now? Is there anything else, any other points that are material that have been omitted?

All right. Thanks, Lise, and thank you all. I hope you'll agree that that was a useful sort of wrap up in a sense to just orient ourselves following all the work that's gone into the proposal. There's a couple of changes that have been set up here.

Let me respond to your hand, ~~(Mary)~~Mary. Go ahead.

~~(Mary)~~Mary Uduma: Can you hear me? Hello? Can you hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: Hi, ~~(Mary)~~Mary. We hear you.

~~(Mary)~~Mary Uduma: You can hear me, okay. (Unintelligible) question whenever we do our trips or who actually supervises the PTI? And I don't know whether we've made it very, very clear in our proposal that the - who takes the oversight.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. I accept, ~~(Mary)~~Mary, that this is going to be a question that we will be asked probably time and again. And I think, you know, we spent a lot of time talking about...

~~(Mary)~~Mary Uduma: (Unintelligible)

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry, ~~(Mary)~~Mary, is your mic on still? Did you have another point you would like to make?

~~(Mary)~~Mary Uduma: Sorry.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so just on that point of oversight, I mean we spent a lot of time on the binding of the PTI to ICANN via the fact that it's proposed to be a member - a public benefit corporation with ICANN as sole member and the nature and composition of the board, the fact that the board is what we called an insider

board and a board majority controlled by ICANN and the impact on what that means and therefore that that goes up to the accountability of the - of ICANN itself.

But this is complicated, technical and hard to articulate. So we have some work to do to explain this, which is why as I say it's so important. And if - I think the message I would take is if you are in Buenos Aires and a member of your group or you were aware that this is an issue that's being - that's somebody's struggling to grasp but then you feel unable to adequately explain it, I think that's the time to bring in others of the group, other members, participants and to assist with explaining these points.

Okay well thanks, ~~(Mary)~~Mary, for that and thanks everyone. I think it's a good point and hopefully it's - this is the sort of thing, together with the webinar, that help us sharpen our thinking and our explanations, because there's a lot to cover and it's been pretty comprehensively worked on.

So we'll see you some on the webinar, all of you next week or late next week or early the following week in Buenos Aires, and let's get on with transmitting and explaining our proposal. Thanks again everyone. We'll talk soon.

END