

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
November 5, 2015
5:00 am CT**

Grace Abuhamad: Thanks Jonathan. So everyone, welcome to the 70th meeting. It's 5 November at 1105 UTC. We started the recording. Is there anyone who's on the audio line who's not in Adobe Connect at this point? Okay. Jonathan, I'll turn it over to you.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. Welcome everyone. I will Chair today's call and we have apologies from Lise. She may be able to join us later in the call but is not available right now.

We obviously last met at ICANN 54 in Dublin those of you who were present and those of you who were able to join us over the Adobe Connect or telephone.

It's our intention to schedule meetings every two weeks from now on but not necessarily to run them. It's not in our interest to run the meetings if there isn't business to conduct and we won't do so. But we will - in order to secure the space in all of our respective diaries, we will book those in and do so.

What strikes me right this minute is that this call has a relatively low attendance, which is a concern. We need to think about the time and I'll talk to Lise and staff about that. We don't seem to have benefited from the very early time I guess from a West of where I am from a sort of UTC perspective. And we don't seem to have called in significant participants East. So we need to think about this and see whether there's a better time slot.

Our intention currently is to continue with the 11 and 17 UTC. But like I say, we're looking at this as participation involvement here at 11. It's bad to terrible from a sort of North and South American type perspective. It should be better from an Asian, Eastern Europe to it's Asia perspective but it doesn't seem to have brought significant participation from there.

So we need to think about that. Look at our participant list and see what we - how we do that. And it's - yes, that's a good point (Sabine). Thank you. There is a class going on as well. And so just bear that in mind. But we'll schedule the meetings and then keep an eye on that. The point being this is for the (task of ITS) idea and yes. And so yes, Olivier, got that as well from other (unintelligible) (Sabine).

All right. So Item 2 and we'll work through this as efficiently as we can. Again, we'll (only) take more of your time than necessary is to pick up on the implementation issues here.

We talked about this as a group in Dublin. And we met with and heard from the ICANN staff who will be essentially executing on the preparation for implementation and ultimately the implementation. As you perhaps recall or know, that team is headed by Akram Atallah who is supported by Trang and members of her Project Management Team.

So one of the questions that existed in either implicitly or explicitly for some time is the role of the CWG in implementation. And I think that's interestingly have not addressed it absolutely explicitly although we have talked to it and through it on a couple of occasions.

It's become clear that at least to the Chairs and I guess that's what we wanted to make sure we rearticulate to this group and make sure the group was comfortable with that is that our belief and understanding is that we have a role in implementation and that role is to ensure that the implementation works, is consistent with our proposal and to provide input on the staff's work on implementation as and when it's required or when it's necessary to bring it back in line with our intent in the proposal.

So having said that, it feels like we - the most logical option is rather than attempting to sort of disband the CWG and reconvene an implementation team of some sort, it feels logical to us to continue with the work or with the CWG in its current form and to use the CWG to essentially monitor the implementation and provide input where necessary and ensure it's consistent with the proposal.

Our charter doesn't say anything on this. It's essentially silent. So in order to do that, we really need - we believe as Chairs that we need two things. First we need to make sure that no one from the CWG has concerns about that or objections.

And second we need to communicate that to the chartering organizations and let them know that this is our interpretation and intent and make sure that that doesn't cause any concerns.

So our intention is to check this with you the group and I'll think given the attendance and so I will recheck this with the group at the next meeting or Lise will depending on who's choosing to Chair at the time.

And second we will immediately go ahead to draft a letter that's in preparation to send to the chartering organization indicating our intention. And I expect we'll copy that to the ICG as well because at some point there was a - there was also a question over quite how hands on the ICG will be in implementation.

I think with conversations historically and in mostly simply in Dublin and some of the public comment that the ICG had made, it's all becoming clearer and that's our plan.

And so thirdly the third action that needs to take place is we need to get the sign off from this group or at least the lack of objection to that role. We need to communicate this to chartering organizations. And we need to make sure that the Akram, Trang and team are aware that this is our intention.

I think they are but I think we should formally notify them and make sure that they think they are in a position to update us regularly on their work on implementation so we can play that role effectively. We can undertake that role effectively.

So those are the key sort of overarching points on implementation. Yes, and so (Yoav) to your point, I think I have a written proposal as such. It's really more of a formal and clear communication of our intent. And providing there are no objections, we will simply continue with that.

If there are concerns, questions or indeed objections, we'll have to deal with those as they come. But in the first instance, I think our intention is to simply communicate clearly to the chartering organizations our intent and probably a little on the rationale for that and then leave it at that. Olivier, you have a question. Go ahead.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking. On the topic of asking the SOs and ACs of the chartering organizations, do you expect this correspondence to be a case of while do you - this is what we're doing; do you object to that or would you actually require affirmation action from those chartering organizations and then re-chartering the group or extending the group or having to commit to some formal process to get the group to go towards implementation?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Olivier. It's a good question and it goes to its effective point. What Lise and I have discussed and our intention at present, which is what I'm effectively seeking support of the group to do, is to undertake the oversight role on implementation and indeed to simply communicate that intention to the chartering organizations.

I think it's probably unnecessary to (speak) a mission in the sense of making it an open-ended question. I think it's more efficient to say this is our intention. Please let us know if you have any questions, concerns or issues arising. And if not, we will take silence as a non-objection.

I think that's probably the most efficient given this will stretch community resources given the apparent logic of doing this work and so on. But that's where we stand as co-Chairs at this stage.

Okay. So thanks for that support. I think if there are - would anyone else like to ask any questions or comments on that? If not, I think we'll go straight on to the work of the DTO, which is picking up on the budget related work.

All right. Thanks for you support those of you that indicated for that work on implementation (getting called) in the chat. Let's pass over then to Chuck who is the sort of Team Lead on DTO. I think DTO had the opportunity to have a first meeting. But Chuck, if you could give us a sort of update and the direction of travel, I think that would be useful even if there isn't a lot to report at this stage.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan. Chuck speaking. First of all, let me very quickly remind people what the ICANN operating plan and budget process is. It's the same as - pretty much as what happened last year.

And so what's happening, the budget process - the operating plan and budget process has already been ticked off. A meeting was held - just a planning meeting was held in Dublin.

And a key date - the first key date in that process is January 15. That is when ICANN management will finalize the assumptions it will use on the transition of the IANA functions of PTI.

So the better assumptions they have on January 15 the more effective or the more accurate the draft budget will be. So on January 15 that's when they will finalize the assumptions at least at that point in time for the fiscal year '17 budget, which starts on June - or expect me, July 1.

So Design Team O has been reactivated. And we had our first new meeting yesterday. Met for about an hour and a half yesterday. I think it was a very productive meeting.

And the purpose of Design Team O is to serve as a facilitator between the full CWG and the ICANN Finance and Implementation Teams to try and facilitate a common understanding of what the assumptions are for the implementation of PTI in particular so that in the development of the draft budget that will be posted for public comment on March 5, that will be as close to what will happen as is reasonably possible understanding that we know that changes may still occur.

So it's not as if things have to be locked in by January 15. But the better we understand the assumptions upon which the budget will be built, the more accurate and usable will be the draft budget that goes out for public comment.

So our role then to bring it down to where we're at right now is to work with the ICANN Finance Team and Trang and the Implement Team to work on those assumptions and then to test those assumptions with the full CWG. So the Design Team O is not intending to make any decisions of its own but we will try and facilitate an understanding of the assumptions with the full CWG.

Now in that regard what we have targeted is to try two weeks from now, which would fit into the next possible CWG meeting, is to have a base set of assumptions that staff proposes for the implementation of PTI and to communicate those to the full CWG to see if there are any concerns, if there is consensus in terms of the assumptions being used with regard to the fact that they do represent and fulfill the intent of the CWG recommendations for the transition.

And then we will - between now and the end of the year or very early in January then try and reach consensus in the CWG as to the assumptions so that come January 15 then staff has an assurance that the assumptions they are using to build the PTI budget that'll be a part of the overall ICANN budget are as close to what will eventually happen as reasonably as possible at that point in time.

So let me stop there and see if there are any questions. We have at least two people from Design Team O on the call, (Cheryl) and Olivier. So if they want to add anything, I certainly encourage them to do so as they were a part of our meeting yesterday as well.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck. (Unintelligible) I'd encourage any other input and I see Olivier is ready to do so and (Cheryl) notes that you covered things well. And just for the record, I noticed that - I hadn't noticed earlier that Trang had joined us. So thank you Trang from ICANN staff who is key to project managing on overseeing the implementation work. Go ahead Olivier.

Oliver Crepin-LeBlond: Thank you very much Jonathan. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking. And I just wanted to thank Chuck for the update. He covered I think nearly everything.

I just wanted to emphasize one thing though. We did spend a significant amount of time yesterday discussing the level of granularity that would be needed for these accounts and for these - this budget.

And I think it was well understood that with the number of unknown unknowns some of the - some of the detail if you want will not be possible because it's just taking figures out of a - out of a hat effectively.

So what one would be looking at in some cases to really have a belief about a ballpark figure for some of the - some of the items and not be able to itemize any further if one was to be able to have something that holds well together (fancy). Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Olivier. Go ahead Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan and thanks Olivier for pointing that out. Let me be clear that the intent between now and January 15 isn't actually provide financial details, cost estimates and so forth. What it is is to make sure that there is consensus from the CWG in terms of the assumptions that will be used to develop the estimate of cost for the fiscal year '17 budget.

So and Olivier is very right. We're not going to be able to get down into a fine detail in terms of the assumptions that - but we will try in working with staff to have as high a level of - or as reasonable set of assumptions so that the CWG can confirm that in fact those are consistent with our recommendations. And if not, come up with alternative assumptions that would better fit the recommendations we made if that is needed. So thanks for pointing that out Olivier.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. Any other comments or questions? I suppose there's one other point that I would think of it and it's just, you know, this is a - there's a line to be walked here between doing all of the best possible preparations given especially the time scales involved and not actually getting on with the implementation prior to the approval of the transition itself.

So that's another line that's got to be worked but it - or worked. It seems we're in good shape to do that. They've got the links with the Finance Team. The keys from our point of view will be to make sure that the overall project

management is in a single place, which I think it is with Trang; and making sure that we are plugged into the implementation work as it goes and as (unintelligible) to cover all the items; provide input where required or necessary and course correct where appropriate. Good.

So let's move on then to the next item, which is to get a very early update on the work on the DT-IPR, which is barely just kicked off. I think we hoped we might be able to get it going a little sooner but inevitably there's a period after and the intent (to an) ICANN meeting where there's been a regrouping or time up for whatever.

So that's - we've got a group of volunteers for that group. And I think we have a volunteer in Greg to take a lead role on the coordination of that group. I don't think the group has had the opportunity to meet yet. Maybe a meeting is planned. Is there any - and of course we have a draft remit for that group talking about the principles and requirements for the home of the IANA IRP.

So it is in a sense a charter for that group to the extent that we would call it a charter. It's a group of volunteers and there's a team lead. Have I missed anything? Would anyone from staff or that DT-IPR fledgling, as it is like to make any comment or input? Greg, go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Jonathan. Greg Shatan for the record. You see that nobody else is on to be team lead so I'm it. I'm happy to do so. I think our first order of business will be kicking off our email list, as you say, with our remit as well as a document that has been re-circulated that is sort of a checklist or scorecard of the outcome of the various meetings and questions relating to the remit before DT-IPR.

I think our next order of business will be - (we'll poll) to have - find time for a meeting amongst our group. I would say that it is not too late to join the group if you are interested and haven't done so yet because you can tell you would still be getting in on the ground floor.

Other than that, quickly nothing to report. But I do expect to a doodle poll out today and to schedule a call either - probably not for late this week since it's already late this week but very early next week and to rapidly make up ground. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Greg. We obviously look forward to that group making some progress. And I guess I should reiterate from the Chair's point of view our commitment to coordinating this with the operational communities and making sure that our work is known and understood and that the coordination goes in both directions. And in fact as a starting point we'll take any prior material as input into this DT-IPR.

Let's move on then. And on the SLEs there is work going on in the background and I think our intention is for Lise and myself to ensure that we start working on that either through the Implementation Team or directly able to update us on a regular basis; in other words, as and when we have these meetings so we can be sure that the work is being - is on track and in progress. So that's our intention.

Paul did give an update of a meeting that he had and in fact he is team lead together with co-Chairs and key staff working on that including the implementation project management people. And Paul, feel free to add to that or comment on that as you like. And Olivier, I see your hand is up. So go ahead with any comment or question you would like to make.

Oliver Crepin-LeBlond: Jonathan, it's Olivier. Did you call upon me or Paul?

Jonathan Robinson: I called upon you since your hand is up and we'll come to Paul next since his hand is up or you may defer to him if you prefer.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Okay. Thanks very much Jonathan. Only because I was not speaking. Just a question. I have seen there is some movement at the moment in other operational communities to define their SLEs or SAs - I'm not - I can't remember by - offhand.

But is there any cross pollination between their work and the work that Paul is doing? Thank you. And I realize of course they are pertaining to different things. I mean the protocol parameter has been and IP address but I didn't know whether there were common SLEs between them. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: So quick response and then I'll hand over to Paul. To the best of my knowledge there's no sort of formal coordination. And then just to be clear, I think Paul is not actively doing any work at this stage. The work is in the hands of the ICANN staff and they're working on preparation for the new SLEs.

And so we'll be seeking updates from staff rather than Paul or the former DT SLE. And Paul, come in if you would like to have a (turn) and I see Trang, your hand is up as well. So we'll come to you next. Paul, go ahead if you still want to make a point.

Paul Kane: I will be very brief if I may. So yes, just for those that weren't in Dublin, we had a very useful meeting with Trang, Akram, David Conrad and the Chairs, the co-Chairs of the CWG.

In summary the intent to NTIA approval was to use historical log data to ascertain the performance of the IANA. And from that log data be able to fulfill about 80% - possibly 80% of the SLE thresholds. And so we can start populating that once the data is available. It was a very constructive meeting.

With respect to how the naming communities, SLE, SLA relates to the numbers and the protocols, there is - because the functions that IANA deliver is different, each group has actually asked for their own SLE, SLA from ICANN.

Some groups are still finalizing it. But there is little overlap between the naming numbers and protocols at service level expectation requirements. But I would welcome Trang's1 update with respect to how things are progressing.

And just build on what Jonathan said. I think it would be useful to hear from staff on a regular basis as to how matters are progressing with the implementation of the SLE requirements mainly because the working group members are willing to take the data and to do the heavy lifting between now and whenever the thresholds can be determined based on past performance.

So thank you Jonathan for the opportunity and I'm happy to take questions from any CWG member or any member of the community. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Paul, and we will do that if anyone wants to say anything. And I'll hand it over to Trang now. Trang, go ahead.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you Jonathan. Can you hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: It's a little soft Trang, so if you can modify (unintelligible), it would to mic it would be great that we could hear you.

Trang Nguyen: Okay, let me change the volume and hopefully that will help. So thank you Paul. Yes, we'll be happy to provide an update on the CWG calls moving forward with regards to progress on the SLE front.

Since Dublin, we had started to take a look at the data and figuring out how we would go about parsing that data out and providing you with the data that we had talked about in Dublin.

Separately, we have also had some informal conversations with NTIA to gauge whether or not they would be willing to allow field OCD's data. And they have not objected to it. They did request that we file with them a formal request so that they can go through their process of review and then providing a formal approval.

So we're in that process of drafting that formal request to NTIA. And once we have NTIA's approval, we will communicate that. So that's the status of our work in Dublin on the SLE front.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Trang; that's helpful. And we obviously look forward to updates from you on the SLE work and on any other implementation related matters that we could continue to work with you in that sense.

Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan and thanks Trang. So what's the status of the other 20% of the data that may be needed for finalizing the SLEs? What is the plan with regard to that?

Trang Nguyen: Jonathan...

Paul Kane: If I may.

Trang Nguyen: Okay.

Paul Kane: Sorry, either of us Trang. If you want to take it first, yes sure.

Trang Nguyen: Sure, yes thanks Paul.

So my understanding is that what we had talked about in Dublin was the first part of the work is to identify what data we're currently collecting, and what percentage of that data addresses what percentage of the SLEs that have been declined.

The remaining (unintelligible) -- that leaves 20% of SLE -- will require co-changes to the RDMS. So once we define what the 20 or whatever percentage that ends up being, then we can have a further discussion with the CWG and others as to the signing of that pertaining to (unintelligible) that would be required.

Paul, is that your understanding (unintelligible)?

Paul Kane: So yes indeed; that is my understanding. And just, Chuck, to build on your point, the SLE document was quite comprehensive. What we've tried to do is break it down into two segments; that element that are easy to obtain based on historical information and what is needed going forward to fulfill the CWG's requirements.

As Trang indicates, there may be some code changes necessary and that may happen later. It is intended to come April 2016; all of the SLE data capture mechanisms will be there.

But what we're trying to do is simplify the process and actually enable much of the work -- 80% of the work -- to take place between now and April with the data-capture of the 20% -- or whatever percent it is -- taking place post-April mainly because they are not a significance in terms of actually determining the user experience. They're important, but not as significant.

So the idea was to use the historical data to cover the main body of work and then mop up the more outliers -- as it were -- post this April. But thank you for the question Chuck.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, good. Thanks Paul and Trang. Trang, your hand is still up. Do you want to come back again on that? Okay, good. So that seems like we've got a good position there and understand where we are with the SLE related work, so that's helpful.

I think that brings us to the end of item two and we can move then on to item three which really talks about - which touches on the opportunity to discuss what may happen with the secular work of the CCWG and the ICG.

I think it's clear that ultimately the ICG will await our satisfaction that's - or certification that our dependencies have been met by the work of the CCWG. And the issue there for us is how will we do that.

Lise and I have discussed this and our view is that there's really a two-fold process that needs to take place. And so I'd like to record that with the group

and see if you have any concerns or issues with that and make sure that everyone is comfortable with that.

It's now become clear that the CCWG on Accountability will run another Public Comment Period with the latest variation of their proposal including the various elements of that and the ultimate accountability and associated model.

So what we believe is necessary to do -- or will be necessary to do -- will be to communicate into the Public Comment Period and indicate that the proposal has dropped for public comment either meets or doesn't meet our requirements. And if -- especially if not -- why not?

I think they anticipate -- and it's reasonable given the correspondence we've had to date -- that it should meet our requirements. And so it's my anticipation that we will be writing to say it does meet our requirements. So of course, I don't want to preempt what does come out in the final proposal, but that's the current expectation.

And then assuming that proposal isn't materially modified by the public comment input, we would then be in a position to certify to the CCWG that it meets our proposal - or meets our requirements.

I expect then that we can communicate that same or copy the ICG on that so the ICG will know that that's the case, which will then -- as we understand -- free up the ICG to be able to submit their composite proposal knowing that they've done their work and the dependency issues are met.

And that will also then empower the chartering organization to deal with work of the CCWG unimpeded by concerns over whether or not our requirements

have met. Clearly, the chartering organizations will assess the Accountability work in the round -- you know, in the whole -- and will not only concern themselves with whether or not our dependencies have been met, but we will need to be clear on that point.

And so that's our proposed route. In summary, we communicate in the Public Comment Period, we communicate on the final proposal, and we copy the ICG and probably the chartering organizations as well, so everyone's clear as of when our dependencies are met.

And that feels like the process. And so I just want to update you on the Chair's thinking on that and see if there are any comments or issues relating to that. And I'll pause to see if there are.

Excellent. A few hands up here, so let's go to first to Martin Boyle. Go ahead Martin.

Martin Boyle: Thanks Jonathan; Martin Boyle here. That certainly seems like a cunning plan.

I suppose my only question is whether -- bearing in mind the CCWG proposal becomes then an integral part of the CWG's transition plan -- whether you actually do need to wait until you get chartering organizations approval to you that they accept the CWG's recommendation if it does - sorry, that ended up being more compile issues than I meant. But it's whether the CWG can make the decision by itself or whether we have to at least consult the chartering organizations and wait for the chartering organizations to respond.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Martin. I think I see the logical part there. I suppose -- technically -- really that feels to me like, in the logical process, we would communicate to

the CCWG on Accountability and indeed the chartering organizations that it is our belief an understanding that our conditions have been met.

I think the opportunity for the chartering organizations to object to or question that would be when they approve or not the Accountability proposal. So I wouldn't we would go independently to them, but I think there is a logical conclusion to the whole point, to the circle of activity. I think that's to your point on, and that's something to bear in mind.

They even benefit from an update to a sort of flowchart of the process. That's something we can look at. Let's take that as an action to look at a piece of communication on this as to how -- in terms of timelines and activity -- how this all works.

Paul again; go ahead.

Paul Kane: So thank you Jonathan. I have a confession. I have not read the latest CCWG proposal. But I attend the Dublin briefing which was very useful from the co-chairs. And I did raise this point at that meeting.

And it's really pertaining to what enforcement mechanisms the community -- the naming community -- has to the separation of the PTI or the IANA Functions Operator from ICANN. Bearing in mind the escalation mechanisms within the CWG proposal already make provisions for ICANN to have numerous opportunities for their Staff -- the PTI Staff -- to correct anything that is deemed to be catastrophic.

My fear in the presentation that was given was that it could become an attracted affair at a time of crisis. At a time of crisis, one doesn't want to be going through effectively trying to determine how a separation occurs,

otherwise that delays things. And if there is a catastrophic failure, then it would be just exacerbating the problem.

Further, if ICANN themselves decide they don't wish to be running the IANA Functions Operator anymore -- the PTI anymore -- there needs to be a well-defined path specialize (sic). And I think that is actually missing in the CCWG proposal - and thank you Grace for the correction. I did mean (sic) the CCWG.

And so I would invite Greg's clarification on making sure that if it is deemed separation should occur, either triggered by ICANN or indeed triggered by the community, that it is actually undertaken very efficiently so there is no disruption to the Registry Community as they seek to have entries in the Root Zone. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: That's a really good point Paul. I mean I think that, in a sense, there's two different points there. And there will inevitably be a tension between the efficiency with which a process like that takes place and the view care.

But in any event, what probably is required is another piece of communication or articulation which wasn't fully possible, and isn't, until the CCWG's proposal settles.

But it feels to me like we should certainly be looking into something which summarizes and encapsulates how that takes place.

Where I saw a separate point in your statement was the point around - or your point of operational continuity. And that, while it is connected, it's almost - what one really needs to be guaranteed in all circumstances is that service is

resumed regardless of what's going on in the background. So that's a good point.

Eduardo?

Eduardo Diaz: Thank you, (unintelligible).

I think the process that (Unintelligible) mentioned, I think, that, you know, it's a logical process and I think it's very good. My concern is about timing.

And what I wanted to say is that, you know, some of us are very involved in the CCWG's work. And I would suggest instead of waiting for, you know, the comment (unintelligible) to start, you know, as soon as we have something that we think that is going to come out in the comment period, that we should get that and discuss within here because I don't think we should wait until the comment period to say we don't agree with that. We should discuss it and even if we can do it before, we should have a chance here to look at what's going to be put out before it starts. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Eduardo. And I'll just note Matthew Shears comment in the Chat indicating that there is some discussion in the CCWG about the interaction between the work of the CCWG and (unintelligible) DTL in our group and how those correspond.

Greg, go ahead Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks Jonathan. I was actually going to mention the same that as Matthew which is Jordan Carter -- one of the (unintelligible) in the CCWG -- did indeed kick off a conversation regarding essentially the end phases of our own DTL process and the (unintelligible) which details that.

So I would suggest that, you know, those who are on both lists keep a very active eye on that and participate in that conversation. If there are concerns, it would be better to raise them now while the draft is still kind of open for business than to wait a number of weeks into the comment period to bring these things up.

So as it stands now, I think the goal of the CCWG is to try to carryout faithfully what we've outlined in our report in (NWL) to that. But it is a multi-stage process, and when we designed it, it was intentionally a multi-stage process. And, you know, involving Board, you know, SOAC approval and Board approval and community mechanism approval to different stages -- both at the beginning and at the end of a squib process -- and then it that only comes after the IFR process, which (Wallick) does not require Board approval; those are for GNSO and ccNSO approval to kick off an IFR. Well, it's a special IFR; it's not a periodic one that, you know, kicks off of the calendar.

So if - and given the single-designator approach that needs to be settled on, you know -- the solution to the Board not doing what we think it should do and voting differently than the community -- are outlined in our report which is basically to treat it like a piece of policy development recommendation that's been brought to the Board by a simple majority. And only after that would there be, you know, reports to other methodologies such as request for reconsideration or arbitration under the plan for, you know, selling all or part of (unintelligible).

So, you know, that's where things are in a nutshell. If we think that there needs to be some sort of (unintelligible) or panic button, you know, built in, then I think we need to do, you know, to talk about that.

And just to point out, if the IFR process that doesn't require Board approval, the beginning of a squid process -- which is the declaration of work in cross-community working groups does require Board approval, and then the end result is this squid process should there be a separation -- again requires Board approval.

So whatever the CCWG does, it's hopefully what we ask them to do. And that if we want something different, well then that's an interesting question.

So that's where I see things standing right now. And if there are feelings that things need to be somehow different and can be accomplished through the CCWG process, now is really the time to do it because while this is a real third Public Comment Period, note that it is taking place simultaneously with the documents being sent to the chartering organization for their review and approval.

Not that I think that indicates there will be a high degree of resistance to change as a result of Public Comment Period, but anything that can be in the document that is going to the SOACs for approval will be much more likely to, you know, smoothly be adopted than something that comes up only in the Public Comment Period. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Greg. Yes, and I think that's the point that the co-chairs made of the CCWG on Accountability. That if there is any input given the timing of the essence in the preparation of this, then sooner the better, and ideally not during the public comment prior to the final drafting of the report for public comment.

That's certainly relevant and there's a link to this work that it's really the work of the CCWG and meets the channels through there.

All right, I think that's a clear update as where we are in that process and some of the issues that needs to be finally kept an eye out for.

Moving on to Item 4 which is the work we are undertaking on bylaws, Lise and I were somewhat optimistic that we might be able to give you an update. We have had an update that the work is ongoing on drafting the CWG specific bylaws, and to remind you that we agreed to instructively -- and have done so by the client committee -- to ensure that Sidley draft the bylaws that pertains specifically to the work of the CWG. And Sidley is undertaking that work.

They gave us a two to three week estimate. Probably a little - we might be just outside that three-week window now. I think we were expecting that the draft might come out this week possibly before this call. It hasn't to the best of my knowledge, and so that's really something that's a work in progress and we'll have to update you (unintelligible).

I just think what the point on CWG review was. I'm drawing a little bit of a blank on this one. Maybe someone can remind me from Staff if anyone is aware of this -- the intension behind this point.

Grace Abuhamad: So Jonathan, this is Grace. I think the idea here was just to go to discuss, as a process, for when those bylaws are drafted, how the CWG would review them and then submit them for implementation.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, thanks Grace. It's CWG review of bylaws. That's why I'm missing that it's not the review of CWG review of bylaws.

Yes, so at some point, we will have to look at those and systematically go through them and make sure that those bylaws are, again, consistent with what we intended prior to them going to ICANN. There's no point in going across to ICANN and they're not saying they were not what was intended.

So we will need to go through those systematically, but I expect what we'll want to see is see the draft, let Sidley present us with that, and then look systematically when and if there are concerns with them.

So I think that really covers the work that we intended to -- somewhat neatly -
- within an hour, unless there are other points.

I made the initial remarks about the upcoming meeting schedule, the fact that we plan to schedule meetings every two weeks. And we will do our best to populate those with either meaningful work or not run those meetings at all. We have no intention of running meetings that aren't required, and will keep them short if possible as well.

Are there any other points that anyone would like to make now, and (AOB), prior to us bringing the meeting to a close?

Okay, so I note in the Chat there's ongoing discussion around how to handle this ultimate separation process and make sure that the CCWG and CWG work is consistent. I'm sure that will track online and in email as well -- the CWG and CCWG (unintelligible).

I know Greg's point that makes an interesting suggestion about whether there's any kind of subsequent (unintelligible) or backup for IANA. That may be in the form of either - I don't know if that's financial or operational. But one way or another, their continuity is clearly vital and that's something that might be

worth picking up as a fairly effectively (unintelligible) (unintelligible) (unintelligible). So that's something to think about in the background.

All right, if there are no other hands, we'll be meeting in a couple of weeks. Time will be picking up the work of all-implementation of either, you know, the communications to be made, the work of the DTO, the (FDR) in particular.

And Matthew suggests that we consider in the (unintelligible) issue there being, Matthew, one of integration of the separation, the point in and around the (unintelligible).

Okay, yes. Why not? I mean it's effectively there anyway in one sense under the broad banner of CCWG. But yes, let's see whether it develops and we'll review what progress has been made in the meantime at the next meeting.

Good. Well, that's an efficient call. thank you all again, especially those for whom this is a very early call, and let's see where we go next time with attendance at the later time and outside of, hopefully, a clash with other meetings.

Thank you again, and we'll see you shortly at the next meeting and by the email list or lists as necessary.

With that Staff, we can stop the recording and bring (unintelligible).

Man: Thank you. Bye.

END