ICANN

Moderator: Brenda Brewer
December 3, 2015
8:00 am CT

Grace Abuhamad: Hi, everyone. Welcome to the CWG IANA meeting. It's our 72nd meeting, the 3rd of December. It's 1403 UTC. And I just wanted to check before we start if there's anyone on the audio line who's not in the Adobe room. Okay, it sounds like everyone's in the Adobe room. We'll do attendance based on that. And I will turn it over to the chairs. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Grace. It's Jonathan Robinson speaking. Welcome everyone. I think I will run most of the meeting if not all of it today. Lise has been pretty tied up with a combination of work and personal matters over the past week or so. So hopefully she will run the next meeting which we're due to have in two weeks' time.

We will make every effort to make this a short meeting. And - but we do need to make it an effective meeting so we'll take the time that's required to do the business necessary.

There's really a couple of things we wanted to cover in the opening remarks. There was an overarching program facilitation meeting recently. These are meetings that have been run once per month quite some time now - I forget

when they were first initiated but probably around at least six months ago. And I'll just highlight a couple of points from that.

We're expecting the presentation materials and transcript to be made public shortly. This took place last - in fact earlier this week. But the key points really I think from my point of view that were highlighted that obviously the CCWG work is out for public comment, the accountability work. And the key question for the co-chairs of that group is whether or not the chartering organizations can support that document in its current format or whether it will need further revision.

Indeed it does need further revision then a supplementary report will be required and that will impact on the timetable. This program facilitation meeting is really all about making sure that all of the relevant key groups, CCWG, ourselves, ICG, ICANN staff are properly coordinated and all know what each other are doing in order to - and have a common view of the overarching timetable.

There was a question posed by Byron Holland from the ccNSO on the confidence level in our SLE work and whether we had sufficient clear and effective documentation and clarity on the escalation path so that may be something we just sort of touch on again here and make sure we are comfortable and confident with that were going on. We can do that under the fourth bullet under the main section 2 in this agenda.

It was answered with some confidence in the meeting I should say but - by the staff responsible for that area of implementation but we might want to touch on it again.

I think probably be other only third - there was some talk of whether there was any need for a face-to-face meeting. For the most part that didn't have significant support. This is an urgent face-to-face meeting really prior to the termination of the CCWG's consultation work or consultation period. For the most part that doesn't seem to be required although it's possible the GAC may still ask for something, but that's outside of the scope of this group.

And then finally there was a point made about the work going on in the background and the US political scene. And the key point there that I took away from it was whether or not a certain rider would be included in the dot(Comac) that required NTIA yet again not to spend any money on the transition which of course does impact us because if there was a 12 month hold on spending money on the transition may well be sufficient to impact the ability of the transition to go ahead.

So it sounds like there's lots of work going on in the background at various levels but I thought it would be useful just to give you a brief update from that call. Happy to take any points of discussion or comments on that if people need to. But that's the high-level. And as I say, the details on that call will come out shortly I assume varied

Lise and I also met with the other operational communities, representatives of the other operational communities particularly to make sure there was both coordination and a common understanding of the work going on to deal with the IANA IPR because as you know a couple of ICANN meetings back this was a hot topic and an area of concern.

We had our own DT-IPR working on this, which we will come to in bullet 2 of the implementation section. And in fact I did circulate a communication to the group on the sort of areas that were discussed. I think at the moment there

is any deference - there's a sort of I guess probably accurate to describe is a slight tension between recognizing that we in the names community and the CWG DT-IPR need to do our work, and yet a desire to get on and start to work towards what might be a common solution. But there is a recognition that we do need to do this work. And there was an acceptance that that needs to go on. There was some pressure on us to produce outcomes or output as soon as possible.

We've also sent a letter to the chartering organizations regarding the role of the CWG, that's our group, in oversight of implementation. And as yet we haven't received any responses. You'll recall that we didn't seek responses in the affirmative. In other words we presumed that this group would continue to exist and in so doing be in a position to provide oversight of and guidance for the implementation work and absent any objections from the chartering organization that is our intention.

So it's not necessarily bad that we haven't heard anything. I understand that this is on the agenda of perhaps ccNSO soon and if anyone would like to comment on how this is being dealt with feel free to do so. But that's the state of play there.

And then finally as part of the opening remarks just to highlight that our next call is scheduled to take place in approximately 2 weeks' time. For various logistical reasons we require it to take place at a slightly different time and date then we have previous although we have in the past run both Tuesday and Thursday meetings. We plan to hold a meeting on a Tuesday, 15 December at 1600 UTC.

Now I apologize if that doesn't suit everyone, it never does. But would like to record that and we will send out an invitation shortly if we haven't already and communicate that.

Let me take input from Alan Greenberg. Alan, I see your hand is up, go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, thank you. I just wanted to report that the ALAC has agreed that the charter could effectively be extended for implementation. There was one comment saying that perhaps we should actually formally change the charter but in the end everyone agreed that doing it in formally in the way we're doing it we're talking about is fine.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Alan. That's helpful to know, that's useful. So we will record that and appreciate you communicating that. Lise, go ahead.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you. Lise Fuhr for the record. I just wanted to say that the ccNSO Council is having a call and have some questions to the letter but it's -- I don't think it's any major issue that they just wanted to talk about it before giving any response to the letter or nonresponse. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Lise. Any other comments or questions on those matters from the opening remarks? I understand that the GNSO Council has informally settled on this at this stage so it's still in a sense an open item, although I don't feel that it's a particularly controversial item so let's see where we get to with that. And it's useful to know the confirmation from the ALAC at least so that's helpful.

All right I think without further ado then we can move on to the next section which is Item 2 and where we start to talk about the implementation. And the order we have this in, you will see on the screen in front of you on the agenda

is to first take an update from ICANN staff and then look at the pieces of individual work related to current or past work of the different design teams. So I guess this is over to Trang most likely so I will pause and facilitate the staff input.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you Jonathan. And you hear me okay?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, Trang, we can hear you. Thank you.

Trang Nguyen: Terrific, thank you. Hello everyone. Thank you for the opportunity to provide you with an update today on the implementation. I want to start by reminding you that on the last CWG call we did receive very helpful feedback from you to include some additional information relating to the timelines and dependencies in our project update to you so thank you for that feedback.

We have incorporated your feedback into the slides that we are presenting to you today. The slides are really in there providing you visibility into the work that will need to be done, the timelines and dependencies. So if you have any additional feedback on these new slides that we have prepared please let us know. We want to ensure that you are getting the information that you need to do your oversight so if there is any information that you need that we are not providing please let us know.

Before we go through the slides I'd like to point out also that these are very high level project plans that we are presenting to you today. And the intent is to capture the main tasks for each of the projects, the dependencies of the tasks and the estimated timeframes for the tasks. The timeframes are estimates at this time and they reflect our goal to do as much as early as possible but we are still working with the NTIA on how much work we can do prior to the approval of the proposal.

We are also working on identifying what if any elements would require ICANN Board approval. So these things could impact the timeframes and we want to make sure that you are aware so that there are no surprises later on if any of the timeframes that we are presenting to you today shift.

So without further ado let's go ahead and look at the slides. If I could ask whoever is controlling the slides in the Adobe connect room to go to the next slide please. Thank you.

So the first set of updates that we are providing today are projects directly related to the CWG and names community. Next slide please. So the slide that we are looking at now is the slide on the ICANN bylaws project. Let me just take a minute and explain the slide so that we can all follow along.

Underlies side of the slide are the main tasks for the project. The color coding is just basically a grouping of related activities and a legend is provided in the further up the slide. So for this particular slide, the dark blue denotes that community activities; the purple colors that you see the note sort of the bylaws related activities and then the light blue colors that you see are USG or the US government activities.

The color blocks that you see on the right-hand side of the slide are estimated time frames for each of the tasks. This star or dots that you see are basically milestones. And then the black arrows denote dependencies.

So the timeline and tasks for the bylaws project mapped to the overall transition timeline that many of you have seen. As a summary we anticipate that the drafting of the bylaws would be completed in approximately 4 weeks

after the proposals are finalized which is reflected on the slide as the end of February.

The ICANN Board would then need to take an action to a post the bylaws for comment, as you see there in that milestone note in purple. And then the bylaws would be posted for -- we're estimating at least a minimum of 30 days to the full 42 day -- or 40 day public comment period. And then allowing for some time to incorporate any comments and to finalize the bylaws this takes us to mid-April and then the board would approve and then adopt the bylaws and then transmit the bylaws to NTIA.

Once NTIA receives the adopted bylaws it would complete this review process and then send its report to the US Congress and then the credential review process takes place. So this is consistent with the timeline that we have been sharing so none of this should be news I hope.

Next slide please. So this next slide shows the names SLE project. The work for this project is essentially around making the required code changes to the RZMS so that we can collect the required SLE metrics for a period of six months so that the CWG can then use that data to set performance targets for PTI.

Because the RZMS code changes will not be completed until the end of March, which will not leave enough time for the definition of the performance targets ICANN has engaged a resource to write codes to parse the data that we currently collect in the RZMS and RT ticketing system to see what usable data can be provided and in what format.

We are still anticipating that by mid-December we will have an idea of what data can be provided and in what format. If the data is usable it is estimated that we can start providing the data in mid-January.

So if all goes according to plan the six month metric collection period should be completed in mid-July. The performance targets can then be set and then incorporated into the ICANN PTI contract which would need to be executed before the IANA contract lapses. So as you can see it's a very tight timeline that we are working with here for this particular project.

I also want to highlight that we're also showing the work relating to the - making the RZMS code changes to remove RZA rule and the parallel testing work on this slide because there is -- there could be an impact to the names SLE project depending on how the parallel testing goes. So what I mean by that is so for example if we start parallel testing in February and then find that at the end of February care is an issue we would have to pause parallel testing, investigate back issue and then fix that issue.

So the resources that would be working on making the RZMS code changes, you know, for the SLE metrics would have to be diverted to fixing that issue for the parallel testing process and so therefore what I would do is extend the timeline for us to complete making the RZMS code changes for that SLEs. And that could push everything to the right and then not provide enough time for the six-month metrics collection. So, you know, we want to just be transparent and make sure that you understand all of the interdependencies and risks on this project.

Next slide please. Moving on to IANA IPR. As you can see the project plan is blank because we don't yet have any implementation requirements. We are tracking the work of the IPR design team and look forward to getting into

requirements so that we can start our work. At the request of the IPR design team we are researching the cost and timing considerations for setting up a trust as well as a few other items that they've asked about. And we are hoping to be able to get that information back to the design team soon. But essentially we are at this point just waiting for implementation requirements in order to build out a project plan for this project.

Next slide please. RZMS standing committee, this is the committee that will be giving the ICANN board advice on operational and architectural changes to the root zone. The CWG proposal didn't have a specific name for this standing committee so we've used RZMS standing committee here but if you have a preference for it to be called something else please let us know.

For this particular project we are going to be drafting and implementation plan. And we anticipate that we would have a to share with you by the end of January. The main tasks for this project will be around drafting the charter for the standing committee and constituting the committee so those are the two main tasks for this project.

Next slide please. Customer standing committee, this is another project where we are going to be drafting and implementation plan for. Currently we plan to have the implementation plan ready for your review in March for this project. The main tasks for this project is a little bit simpler than for the RZMS standing committee because the charter for the CSC is already included in the CWG proposal. So we believe that the work of this particular project is primarily around constituting the CSC.

Next slide please. IANA operational escalation mechanism, so this project refers to the IANA customer service complaint resolution process, the IANA problem resolution process and the root zone emergency process. We are also

planning on creating an implementation plan for this project and that will be ready for your review also in March.

The workaround this project we believe will center around revising the process documentations and updating and the tools and process procedures necessary to implement those processes. And we anticipate that that work will occur after the US government approves the proposals.

The IANA customer service complaint resolution process is an existing IANA process that the CWG proposal recommended an additional step to be added to that process which is a mediation step. So you also see us capturing there a task to define that mediation process for the IANA customer service complaint resolution process as it relates to the names community in particular.

Next slide please. So we are now getting to the post-transition IANA, or PTI. For this particular project we are working on drafting and implementation plan that we hope will be ready to share with you this month. At a high level the main tasks for this project will be to incorporate a (unintelligible) to file for 501(c)(3) status for that subsidiary, draft and execute a contract between ICANN and the subsidiary, the legal transfer of assets and resources to the subsidiary and then constituting, you know, that PTI board, and creating a PTI budget.

We're hoping that we can get as much of that work done as early as possible so we are working with NTIA on that but the (unintelligible) could shift because we are still in discussions with NTIA on how much we can do prior to their approval of the proposals.

Next slide please. So this slide reflects essentially the ICANN FY 17 operating plans and budgeting process and timeline of which that PTI budget is a part of. So this is an area that we have been working in close coordination with the Design Team O on and this basically reflects that overall FY 17 planning process and timeline.

Next slide please. So I believe that is an overview of all of the projects that are directly related to the CWG and names community. I also have prepared one slide to provide you with updates on the other projects that although are directly related to the CWG work we thought you me want to be aware of.

Next slide please. With regards to the RZMS changes to remove RZA role and RZMA, the RZMS code changes work is still currently undergoing and we are still expecting to complete that work at the end of January and start parallel testing in February.

On the RZMA we are actively engaged with VeriSign on RZMA discussions. And we anticipate that - or we hope that the RZMA will be ready to be posted at the end of January for public review.

On the SLA documents for the RIRs, we have been working very closely with RIRs on finalizing that document. Most of the operational terms have been agreed to and the legal terms are being reviewed and discussed between the RIRs and ICANN Legal. And we are in discussion with the RIRs on the legal terms of the document and we're hoping that that document would be finalized by the end of January.

Obviously the execution of that document will not occur until after NTIA or the US government approves the proposals in mid-June but we are hoping that the document will be finalized well in advance of that.

The same with the MOU supplemental agreement with the IETF and IAB, that document has been drafted and ICANN is just currently doing a final review of that document. The document was drafted very early on, I believe it was either May or March of this year and a lot has happened since so we're basically just doing one final review in light of the final ICG proposal. And version 3 of the CCWG proposal just to make sure that everything is aligned.

We're also anticipating that that document will be finalized by the end of January at the latest and then the execution of that would occur after the US government approved the proposal.

The last three projects that you see listed here falls under the umbrella of the CCWG proposal. We've identified that these are the three projects that will come out of that proposal, IRP enhancements, reconsideration requests enhancements and community powers. We are currently reviewing the CCWG proposal Number 3 to identify the implementation requirements and we are hoping to get the high-level project plan built out for these three projects by mid this month.

So that wraps up our presentation and are updates to you. Jonathan, I will be happy to take any questions.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Trang. That seems clear and thorough. I see there's a question or a couple immediately coming up so let's go straight to those. Greg Shatan.

Greg Shatan: Hi, Greg Shatan for the record. My questions are on Page 9, post transition IANA, PTI, one of two. On the second line it says, "ICANN incorporates subsidiary." I assume that's just loose talk because the PTI is not legally a subsidiary - or will not legally be a subsidiary of ICANN unless there's been

some determination otherwise. And more importantly, I don't see any place on this timeline where the articles and - of incorporation and bylaws of PTI will be prepared and perhaps that's our - that's, you know, at least in part work that should be done inside the CWG. But it's not here.

And as we know from both our work and the CCWG's work, bylaws at least are not something to be taken for granted. Articles may be a little bit more generic but I think we have a particular situation here that's going to need to be reflected particularly in bylaws. So I'm wondering where that is in this process.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay that's a good point, Greg, very good point. Trang, do you have any initial response or I'll just give you the opportunity in case there's anything you'd like to say at this stage.

Trang Nguyen: Hi, Greg. I think I understand your question about the incorporation piece but I hesitate to provide an answer. I would prefer that perhaps we can take that back and have our legal - and consult with our legal team and then provide a fulsome response to that particular question to you.

With regards to your question about the PTI governance document and where, you know, why it's not directly reflected on this slide, what we were thinking about doing actually is providing sort of a draft of that, the articles of incorporation, the mission and the bylaws in the implementation plan that we will be providing to you for review and input.

And then once that is agreed upon that's the information that we would use to then support the underlying items on here in terms of the incorporation of the subsidiary and the filing of the 501(c)(3) paperwork.

Greg Shatan: I don't think the 501(c)(3) paperwork is going to be an issue, it's really the issue is that the bylaws are substantive governance documents and I think they're going to take several weeks at least for consideration review by this group because they feed back to a number of important concerns that were raised in our work about how PTI is going to be, you know, governed essentially. So if the - if the actual incorporation phase is supposed to start in mid-February it would seem to me that we should be reviewing articles right about now or really the bylaws in particular.

Trang Nguyen: Sure, sure. And certainly we're happy to take feedback from you as to whether or not additional time should be allotted for the review of the implementation plan for PTI. We can certainly move that line item to the end of February or into March if you feel that that additional time would be helpful.

Jonathan Robinson: So thanks, Trang. Just to help out here - and I think the project plan will be what the project plan will be and it will have to be modified to that extent. Greg, first point is about - is being captured well by Grace in the action items. I mean, essentially it isn't a subsidiary that ICANN will need to incorporate its formation of an affiliate. But we have at times loosely referred to those as a subsidiary because in common speak it is - could be seen as that. So that's probably worth tidying up. It's really forms affiliate - it should say ICANN formation of affiliate.

The second point is that this one that actually is both - got some substance to it and some process. I mean, the question is when do we get on with the articles and the bylaws. And it seems to me that we probably need a line item to acknowledge that there needs to be some work done on it. And the substantive point on that is who produces the first draft.

Now you suggested reasonably that it might be the first draft is produced by ICANN Legal and/or your advisors. As it happens with the CWG related the bylaws relating to - the bylaws relating to our work for ICANN Sidley is doing that on our behalf.

I'd quite like to hear if anyone else has any other comments or reservations directly in response to this. I know we've got Chuck, Lise. So Alan your hand has gone in response to that, so I'll come to you first just to see if there's any other input. And, Greg, by all means come in after Alan if no one else has come along, if you have any firm views on this.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I guess I don't see this as an impediment. I think we do need acknowledgement that the bylaws should be passed by the CWG and give us some reasonable time to review them. The actual operation of the company is not particularly onerous and we have not really put a lot of detail into our specification of that.

There's a little bit in terms of what the board has to be able to do and things like that. But I don't see it as a major item but it does need to be acknowledged and the CWG does need to be in the loop on that one. That is one of the implementation things that I think we were talking about earlier in this meeting. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So that certainly seems to recognize that the work needs to be done, and Greg highlights that we need a line item for this and we agree upon process to draft and revise them.

So I suggest we get the line item into the project land. The proposal in essence from Trang is that -- and I suggest we take this as an action item unless there is any objection to it -- that we seek an answer from ICANN Legal and/or

their third party advisors to their willingness to take this on and in the time allotted -- or implied to be allotted, which is really to get a draft pretty early in the new year to us so that we've got time to look at it prior to its incorporation in February.

So that seems to be what's being proposed here. I'll move on to the next people in the queue, and then if others want to come back and specifically mulling over this if there's any other detail or point that needs to be discussed here on the pre-prep work for articles and bylaws, we'll come back to that. Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jonathan. And special thanks to Trang and all of the ICANN staff that have put all this effort into the timeline. I think that is really critical and very well done.

I may have missed it but I don't think I saw a timeline for the IANA functions review. Is that built into some of these and I just missed it as we went over them? Should that be a separate timeline or included in one of the existing timelines like PTI? I'll let Trang respond to that, if that's possible.

Trang Nguyen: Yes thank you, Chuck. So the way that we had been thinking about the IFR is that is will be reflected in the bylaws, so that one piece of it. And then the operationalization of the IFR because the first IFR isn't expected to take place until two years after the transition, that - we were thinking that the - that operationalization aspect of the IFR would be work that would be slated for after the transition. So that's where our thinking is on the IFR.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Trang. Does that answer your question, Chuck, satisfactorily?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, I think so. This is Chuck speaking. It probably would be good to communicate in this overall presentation that that's the case. But yes, I'm - that makes sense to me.

Jonathan Robinson: Very good. Thank you. Next in the queue is Lise.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Jonathan. I have a question for Slide 7 and that's the CSC, where the implementation plan is actually to be defined after ICANN 55. And my question is, is there a reason why it's so late, it's after 55? Because for me, this could be an issue where I could imagine that some of the groups would like to discuss the actual implementation plan because this is going to be a group where some of them are going to be very active within.

And sorry, I would like to echo this - Chuck. I really think this is a very good and thorough plan, and I'd really like to thank you, Trang, and the rest of the team for making this. Thank you.

Trang Nguyen: This is Trang. Thank you, Lise. To respond to your question about the timeframe for the implementation plan for the CSC, we tried to stagger out the - we tried to stagger them out for a couple purposes. To make sure that, you know, the CWG has adequate time to focus on each implementation plan before moving on to the next. That's why we try to stagger them out.

And then also from our perspective, you know, to make sure that we internally also have the time to truly focus on just one item at the time - at a time. But certainly, you know, if you feel that, you know, there is adequate bandwidth and that, you know, you'd like to see the implementation plan for the CSC to be done sooner than March, we can certainly move that timeframe up.

I just worry about bandwidth if we have, you know, the PTI implementation plan, the CSC implementation plan, and the RZMS standing committee implementation plan all floating around for review and discussion all at the same time. So that was primarily the reason why we tried to stagger them, but happy to take feedback on that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Trang. This is clearly a logical structure, it's just a question of whether or not we can get some key elements done in advance and whether we miss critical opportunities to cover items at the ICANN meeting, for example.

Let's go to Paul Kane next.

Paul Kane: Thank you very much. May I ask that we return to the slide that discussed the SLE, please? I think it's - oh here we are. Thank you. Slide 4. So first of all may I echo those of Chuck and Lisa and thank ICANN for preparing this particular piece of work. It is very clear.

One thing I would like, Trang, just to clarify is that she very kindly indicated that data would be made available to us. But if problems are detected in the RZMS, it could cause actual delay in data capture and, more accurately, delay in our ability to build the service level expectation thresholds.

Are you saying that by ICANN delaying or IANA delaying giving us the SLE data and also the thresholds it will delay the transition as well? Because we are very keen that their transition only occurs when a proven service level expectation document is in place?

And also just for your information, Trang, we are on the working group did offer to review the data, the historical data, in the summer and we were told in

the summer that permission was needed from NTIA and no attempt was made to actually facilitate that.

So I really want to get a cast iron guarantee from you that transition will not occur until the service level agreement, a proven service level agreement, is in place.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you, Paul. Yes that is the understanding, and we understand that service level targets or performance targets will be set and they will be incorporated into the ICANN PTI contract for execution prior to the expiration of the IANA contract. That's a given.

What we're just trying to highlight is that to get to that point and to meet all of those requirements that are currently on the table with regards to six months of SLE metrics collection and then the setting of those SLEs, you know, that doesn't leave a lot of room for error in the timeline that we have to work with here.

So if the timeline as we defined here and as we have - and is currently on the table works out according to plan, we think that that can happen by next September. What I was trying to highlight is that if unanticipated issues come up, so such as, for example, if something goes wrong with parallel testing and we have to make additional changes to the RZMS, which then will require as us additional time to make the code changes to accommodate the named SLEs after we fix the issue in the parallel system and testing process, that may not leave us with the - enough time, with the six-month window that you require to collect SLE metrics before the performance target could be set.

That simply is what we're trying to highlight here. Now it is possible that that window could be made up by using the existing data, which is the secondary

stream of work that needs to be captured in the dark blue color here. But that also assumes that we are able to pull usable data out of the current system. And so we'll have a better idea of that by the middle of this month. You know, but that's what we're trying to highlight here for you.

Paul Kane: Thank you for the clarification, Trang. Much appreciated. And again, one of the reasons why we wanted to have the parallel testing incorporate the SLE requested changes to the RZMS was actually to address that very point. So our proposal originally, which ICANN I think took on board at the end of the summer, was when the parallel testing was implemented. The metrics for collecting the SLEs were also incorporated. It just seems the two have split.

But I do appreciate what you're saying and I look forward to having a conversation with you in the middle of December when you know precisely what the historical data can provide. So thanks again, Trang.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Paul. And you and Trang will see I put in the chat -- it's Jonathan speaking -- a note that, you know, do we have any wiggle room with, not that it's desirable but could it be possible to work with less than six months' worth of newly collected data? So that's something to also think about. As I say, not that it's desirable but do we have any wiggle room there. It's something to also think about when you're evaluating it too.

Okay let me go to Greg next, and I suspect he'll want to come back on this pre-preparation for incorporation of the affiliate. Come in, Greg.

Greg Shatan: Greg again. Jonathan, you are correct. Back on Page 9 there's two things. I notice in addition that there's a line that says, "ICANN constitutes PTI board." And that's not coming until July. This seems peculiar because the board members need to be listed on the 501c3 paperwork and are, you know, are

needed for the governance of the organization from the time of its incorporation typically are included initially in the - initial board members are included in the articles of incorporation.

So I'm not sure what's going on here. So I don't want to bore the group with these things. They're all things that probably could worked out, but I'm not sure how one can form a corporation in February and not appoint its board until August unless what you're using are basically incorporators or just kind of, you know, straw man, if you will, as board members for the first few months, which frankly could also happen with the articles and bylaws. Generic articles and bylaws could be filed and then they could be amended afterwards.

I don't know how the affects the 501c3 application if you're significantly changing what you're corporation is set up to do and it's set up to run, but I'll leave that to others. But I think the bigger point really is that we do need to get Sidley involved in this. They do need to be reviewing, if not drafting, the bylaws and the articles. The governance of PTI is an integral part of our overall plan, and it needs to be done in a way that is - that meets our requirements and is fit for purpose.

So that's not saying it can't be done by ICANN but it can't be done by ICANN without our review and support, and given that this is a strong legal dimension, our counselors -- or counsel rather -- to review all of this. And I think we need to get some more meat on the bones about the plans for doing this for drafting the articles and bylaws for picking the board, the possible disjunction between the timing of the board pick and the actual time when the corporation is supposed to come into existence some months earlier.

So I think we really need to see. I know it says that the implementation plan for this hasn't yet been defined, but clearly it's been though out enough to set up a timeline. So I think early communication and communication in both directions on this is really necessary. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Greg. So I think one point that's become clear and that needs to be captured as an action from this is that there really need to be a review of the timeline associated with the formation and incorporation and pre-transition organization of the legal structure of PTI that needs some more work from a project planning point of view. So that's an action on Trang.

In addition, this group we have a client committee call pending. We haven't set it up yet but it's clear from the agenda from this meeting that a client committee call needs to take place. I think we need to go into that meeting with an additional item on our agenda, and that is this particular point: the formation and organization of PTI.

So I guess I'm asking the group to empower the client committee to discuss with Sidley. From what I've heard today, our assumption will be that we will be expecting ICANN's legal to prepare and set up PTI consistent with the CWG's expectations. Because that is consistent with ICANN doing the implementation and us doing the oversight.

If we receive a strong and well-articulated objection from Sidley to that as advice to the group, we can come back and review that decision. But subject to that, I suggest we go with that approach. So the proposal is twofold. One, Trang updates the project plan to reflect the input from the group today. And two, the client committee discusses this with Sidley as part of our agenda of our forthcoming client committee meeting.

Grace, I hope you've captured those and I'll ask the group if there are any objections to that to let me know. Otherwise, we'll press on with that path of activity.

Trang Nguyen: Jonathan, this is Trang. May I make one comment to that and to address what Greg just shared?

Jonathan Robinson: Please do, and I'll note Greg's support for that by a checkmark in the chat for the proposals I just outline. Go ahead, Trang.

Trang Nguyen: Okay. Thank you, Jonathan. So what I wanted to share is that this timeline does reflect some of the things that Greg brought up with regards to potentially having sort of a, I don't recall the exact word that you used Greg but I'll use my own word, and it may not be the legally correct word to use, but sort of a very rough draft of the articles of incorporation or bylaws. And that was, you know, filed or done early and then we find that over time it's necessary, because there's a few different things that we need to take into consideration here.

The PTI board cannot be constituted until after the U.S. government approves the proposals. It's unlikely that they're going to let us do that beforehand. So we've got to work with the NTIA requirements as well, but at the same time, our desire is to try to do as much as possible. And so there's a few things that we're trying to balance and figure out how to get things done, you know, to try to get the work done as early possible but at the same time not step over the line with the NTIA.

So the timeline and what you see here doesn't necessarily communicate that nuance, but that is something that we're intending to have laid out in the implementation plan. But obviously, you know, will be presented to you and

if you like to Sidley for review and feedback as well, you know. So that's one point I want to clarify.

And then the other point that I want to make to Jonathan is that I think ICANN feels very strongly that we should be drafting the PTI governance document, and certainly that would be available in the implementation plan for Sidley and for your review and comments and feedback. But I think that is one point that we feel very strongly about.

So I will stop at that and, you know, hopefully we will - we'll make the changes that you requested on the project plan, you know, basis but I think a lot of the details that we're talking about here will come out in the implementation plan when we share it.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Trang. And if they do, that will be helpful but as long as the overall high level (unintelligible) can also reflect that, I think it's clear that you have to walk that walk between not implementing things you are not permitted to, yet getting on with things as much as possible.

Greg gave one example where that may be possible. It's perfectly possible to - well I'm not a lawyer but I understand it would be possible to, you know, typically incorporate without the actual board members in place.

There may be things you can do and it's worth talking to the lawyers about this and making sure that we get done whatever we can in advance, which is really the essence of this. It's making sure we have sufficient time to review the bylaws, go through the process to identify the relevant directors and so on.

Yes, understood on ICANN drafting the PTI docs. I think that we don't want them to be too rough. Lawyers don't like things being too rough. They need to

be responsibly comprehensive pass at that so that they can then be reviewed in that way. And there seems to be support for Sidley reviewing it. And as I say, that's consistent with what - with how we envision this implementation to take place.

So unless there's a strong and well-articulated objection to it being done another way, point noted on ICANN's strong feelings about preparing the first draft of the PTI documents.

Paul, your hand is still up but I think that's an old hand. Paul Kane. And so that probably creates the opportunity then to move on from this project planning and update part, Trang, unless you had anything else you wanted to add.

Trang Nguyen: No, nothing else from me. Thank you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great. Well thanks again for high quality materials and for dealing with the input on this. Let's move then on to an update from the design team working on the IANA IPR. And so that's I expect we'll be hearing from Greg for an update there. Thanks.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Jonathan. It's Greg Shatan again. We've had I think two meetings of DT IPR since our last meeting of the CWG. We've made what I think is considerable progress, although I think we've hit a couple of gating items where we have - where we need to get over the hump in that regard.

Conversations have been spirited, although the group is on the small side, maybe eight people, of whom about four or five tend to do most of the discussing. We continue to work forward on our principles and requirements document.

On our last call we began to review the - Sidley's document with regard to IPR and structure. That was not completed but we need to make sure that we capture, you know, their concerns and weigh any principles and requirements that they proposed.

An additional section of our principles and requirements document is being prepared by - or a draft is being prepared by Andrew Sullivan, which will deal with kind of operational requirements relating to the iana.org domain. Much of the work we've done up until this last meeting really related to what I'll call kind of the trademark issues and not so much the domain management issues.

And from an operational standpoint, those are at least as important, if not more important or even far more important, in terms of going forward. So expecting that from Andrew toward the end of this week as well. I expect that we will have probably, you know, at least two more meetings of DT IPR before our next CWG meeting on the 15th, I believe it is.

And I think that at the meeting of the 15th we would hope to bring back to this group a substantially stable draft of the principles and requirements, which I would hope to be able to post to the CWG several days in advance of the meeting on the 15th to allow for some discussion on the list of the draft so that we can pretty much use the call to perhaps if not finalize the principles and requirements, at least get some very strong direction from the group on any open items, which would then allow us to finalize it and bring it back to the group and essentially, you know, put that portion of DT IPR's work behind it.

I see a hand from Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Yes thank you, Greg. Just a comment. At the last meeting, you said you had hoped that we'd be able to have the discussion at this one. I, you know, without putting unreasonable pressure on, we really can't delay it past the next meeting, because that effectively pushes it into the next year.

So I think we need to have something at the next meeting, even if it's not complete so that we can start understanding the general direction and make sure that we know how we're going forward. Because by the time this whole report goes to the NTIA, which is essentially not long after the first meeting that we're likely to have in January, this has to be put to bed. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Alan. I recognize that, and that's consistent with the - with Jonathan's report on the implementation coordination discussions as well and the output from those. So I'm - but - and more importantly, that's consist with our timeline. I think there was some important factors that needed to be dealt with by the group that - before we brought it back to this team, which I think until those are worked out or at least stabilized, it would have been premature to bring the entire document back to this group.

That said, I think there's really one question which to some extent is a dispositive question or one that, you know, depending upon how one views it could send our work very much in one direction or another, which is to define - when we talk about a key principle or requirement being that the new owner of the IPR be neutral, and this is also a word that's specifically mentioned in the board's August 15 communication.

It refers to a neutral third party mutually chosen by the three operating communities. And there's been spirited discussion and really kind of two alternatives have emerged as to what is - what should be meant by neutral. And the first is what we've called the narrow definition, which is just that the

new owner should not be captured by or under the sole control of the IANA functions operator, essentially ICANN or ICANN/PTI.

The second and broader definition of neutrality is that the new owner should be neutral with regard to all three operational communities, perhaps even to the point where it is not captured by or under the sole control of any one operational community. In the abstract, those, you know, seem like, you know, good alternatives to discuss.

In particular where we have the suggestion of the IETF trust as an option and one that is acceptable to the other two communities, the broader definition of neutrality could be seen to create difficulties at the least for the IETF trust to be considered as an owner -- not impossible but might require some modifications to the trust itself or some other methodology by which it is essentially made independent of the protocol perimeters community as well as the numbers and names community.

Or alternatively if we're really only talking about capture or sole control, the issue is how - goes back to what I sometimes think of as the Avri Doria proposal of a jointly managed trust, and then the question is, you know, how can that joint management be accomplished with a minimum of changes to the IETF trust.

As Avri noted in the chat, she says, "I thought the IETF trust decided there were to be modifications to the trust." Andrew kind of walked that back a little bit in the call. He said that it was his understanding or his belief that the trust would not be changed.

But, you know, that's - without a proposal to do so, I'm not entirely sure that that's a line in the sand for the IETF trust or not. Plus there are ways of

managing - there could be ways of implementing a joint management strategy for the IANA IPR only, leaving the IETF trust essentially unchanged with regard to all of its other trust assets and duties.

But given that the beneficiary of the IETF trust is the IETF, there's always going to be some, you know, special relationship between the IETF trust and the IETF. Maybe people don't mind that the way some people minded ICANN having a special relationship to the IPR, but that's a question that we're wrestling with, whether the broad definition or the narrow definition should be the one chosen.

I think most likely - it's likely that that discussion will come back to this group rather than being resolved in the DT IPR, in part because we have so few people participating in DT IPR. I think it would be in essence unfair to the CWG to make a decision there, you know, based on, really, just input of a handful of people who have varying opinions.

\

So would prefer to have, as somebody was saying, where there are options, bring those options back. But by and large, do not intend to bring back multiple choice options to the group, but rather bring back stable principles and requirements for review by this group. So that would be an exception.

Alan, is that a new hand?

Alan Greenberg: That is a new hand but I'll let you finish speaking first.

Greg Shatan: No, this is a good point for you to speak.

Alan Greenberg: All right. This was not a major issue -- certainly from the Names Community. If the IP -- Intellectual Property -- and the IANA name went away, we could

still survive. The ITF would be the only group that really has a significant problem, and even that one could be managed.

I think we're making too much of this. There's an adage I live part of my life by that is worded - and it's not worded well but the wording is, not everything worth doing is worth doing well.

The source of it comes about, you know, from a computer-based computer design part where the question was do we need to design the perfect connector or will one we can buy off the shelf work. And if the one we can buy off the shelf will work, just do it and let's not spend six months designing a new connector.

I think we're in that mode here. We need to do something. And I really don't think it's worth looking at the level that we're working at right now and trying to get the level of perfection that we're going into it; just my opinion. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Alan. Paul?

Paul Kane: Thank you Greg. I would sort of semi like to echo what Alan has said. I think we're making things really complicated; this should be a very simple task. And it's the good-old kiss little saying which I think comes into play.

Has to regard been had for (Internet Dot Net)? That is the one, actually, on which the root servers and the real community functions; (Internet Dot Net) as well as IANA Dot - I think it's Org. Yes, IANA.org. I'm not sure where people are on the (Internet Dot Net), but that is equally important.

Greg Shatan: I'll not have to say that in the course of our discussions of DT-IPR that we have not even touched on (Internet Dot Net) nor has that been mentioned as a domain to be transferred from ICANN to the new owner. So I think up until this moment, I would say the presumption was that there would be no change to (Internet Dot Net). So if that is...

Paul Kane: So can I just say...

Greg Shatan: ...Paul is that...

Paul Kane: ...David Conrad has just put in the chat the root servers do not use (Internet Dot Net). I'd make sure the hints file of the name servers also are using IANA, not (Internet Dot Net). I thought the hints files were (Internet Dot Net).

              But I - David Conrad knows much more than I on this topic, so I'm guided by his wisdom. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Greg, it's Jonathan. I've got a couple of points and questions for you. I mean I think - I suppose what I understood sort of domain name side of things, I understood that previously it had been understood that ICANN would retain technical control of the relevant domain names, and this is for these purposes. But - so this is about of an issue for management of the IPR as such.

              But a couple of other points that struck me was one, Alan earlier in his prior point talked about the timeline and the proposal going to NTIA. Just to be crystal clear, the resolution of the IPR -- while we would all like to get it dealt with and it's understood that there is some time pressure to do this both for various reasons -- it is not on a critical path of the proposal going to the NTIA. So it is not an impediment to the ICG transmitting the proposal by the Board to the NTIA.

I don't know if you mentioned that you had a couple of additional members join the group who may have been rather less contributory in the first meeting, but both with their (sic) expertise may be able to help.

And one other sort of point or question to be thinking about is clearly, the IETF trust is what it is and whether or not it can be modified might be the subject of some discussion. If you do end up, I understand you're pretty much at a point where you're considering a binary option; it's either the IETF trust in current or modified form or new trust.

And if you go down the route of new trust, it's possible that this new trust could do - and I've heard some cordial conversations about endowing such a trust with money to be able to backup IANA in the event of any financial problems at ICANN. So it's possible that a new trust could do more than simply look after the IPR.

And I guess the scope - my understanding is that the scope of this group is to deal with the principles and requirements in relation to the IANA IPR whether or not that's new trust or the IETF trust does more than look after the IANA, which self-evidently, the IETF trust does and the new trust could potentially.

So really, it' about (sic) confining yourself to that scope. So that's - I guess that's a kind of comment on both the additional members, scope of the work and timeline. Thanks.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Jonathan. Just comment briefly on those.

I think - yes, first, we do have two new members; David Maher and Scott Austin and both whom have considerable experience. And David is well known to many of you probably in the PIR.org space as well.

As far as the IANA.org - the primary thing that Andrew was addressing -- and we'll of course, you know, see the document -- is not at odds with what you just said. The understanding is clearly that as long as ICANN is the IFO that IANA.org will pretty much be what it is or will evolve as needed by ICANN as the IANA Functions operator.

It really goes more to the issue of what would happen upon separation which was not really otherwise considered. And where there might need to be essentially separately managed sub-domains of IANA.org for different IFOs.

And as far as, you know, the kiss rule or whether we're overdoing this, I think this is - I don't think we're aiming for perfection; we're aiming for something that will run. I think, you know, things - another aphorism is that things are unimportant until they go wrong. And what we want to do here is make sure that this won't go wrong within, you know, a reasonable - and within what we can reasonably anticipate. And so there are issues here where things could quickly go wrong and we want to avoid those. Other than that, I think that we are actually keeping things fairly simple.

I would actually be interested -- that either on this call or on the list -- in people's thoughts about the question of neutrality or whether - you know, what neutral means. And, you know, that could be addressed as a generic answer or it could be addressed as a question of whether you think the IETF trust is neutral, which I guess will betray your definition of neutral.

So, you know, feedback would be appreciated on that point from outside the group. And, you know, I guess I don't care is also an answer, but as with my previous aphorism, of course nobody cares as long as it all works.

Jonathan Robinson: So Greg, maybe that's something you can think about. If you can't get sort of a document to the group -- which ideally you should do in advance of the next meeting -- you might want to frame the key questions that the group is grappling with and seek to get some input on those. And obviously get those questions to the group in advance of the next meeting.

Greg Shatan: I'm actually confident Jonathan that we will get a full document. I think we will have framed certain questions in there. The document is actually I think quite far along at this point. I think we'll need another ten days or so to get it there from this point.

But I'm confident that we'll be able to get a full document to this group far enough in advance; hopefully at least, you know, say 48 hours in advance or so -- 36 hours in advance of our next call -- so that there's a chance for people to be, you know, reasonably well acquainted with the document and perhaps have started some discussions about it. So - but we will definitely frame, you know, any significant questions and call them out.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Greg. Can I give you a target of Friday the 11th please because the meeting is scheduled for relatively earlier on Tuesday. And so Friday would be great if you could (unintelligible).

Greg Shatan: That's right. I see, yes, where it switched from a Thursday to a Tuesday. So yes, so I think - yes, we can, you know, aim for basically a week from tomorrow.

Jonathan Robinson: Wonderful. Okay, Lise's got her hand up and I think we need to move on after that Greg.

Greg Shatan: Okay, I'm happy to do that.

Lise Fuhr: I just wanted to echo what Chuck is saying in that Chat, so I was just fine with keep this discussion on the list and produce a document as soon as possible. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Good. Okay, well we have - well, it may not be consensus. We've got some good recommendations to let the DT-IPR do its work and feel free to help out and then this can come back to the group. So thanks both.

The next active group is the work being done with DTO on the finance budget side of things. And so I know Chuck has been leading that group and may well want to give us an update and/or seek some input. So go ahead Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan. I sent a message to the full CWG list late on Monday, so hopefully a few of you had a chance to look at that.

But in our last call -- meeting number 72 -- (Zaviay) gave a presentation with five slides or four content slides on the approach being proposed by his team and the GDD Implementation Team that Trang leads on developing a budget for IANA/PTI.

Unfortunately in our last meeting, there was not time to have any discussion on that. So I hope we can have a little bit of a discussion on that today.

I'm not going to go - my message was fairly long on Monday, so I'm not going to go through it in detail, but a key target date that (Zaviay) pointed out was

January 15 which is a target date at which Staff would like to have all of the assumptions with regard to the IANA Functions implementation -- with regard to the transition -- known as much as possible so that that gives them time between then and March 5 to finalize the draft ICANN Budget which will include the budget for PTI and the other CWG recommendations.

So those are important dates to keep in mind. March 5 will be the start of the Public Comment Period, and of course all of us will have opportunity at that time -- including the CWG as a whole if we want -- to comment on the IANA PTI Budget.

Now I said in my message on Monday that any guidance that CWG can provide regarding budget assumptions will facilitate the process. And what I'd like to focus on today -- and any feedback that any of you have -- is whether there's anyone that does not support the approach being proposed by (Zaviay) and his team and the GDD Team that Trang leads.

I can tell you that since our last meeting, all of the active members in the DTO do support the approach that (Zaviay) proposed in our last call. And that approach -- just to summarize very briefly -- is that Staff will, in preparing the budget for IANA DTI, will first create a draft budget based on a base case scenario that will involve minimal operational changes from the current IANA services the way they exist. And (Zaviay) showed the slides on that.

Now in addition to that, Staff will also estimate possible budget impacts to that base case scenario with various alternatives that might be cases where more than just minimal operational changes are needed.

In the draft budget then that is produced on March 5, we would all be able to -- including the entire community -- will be able to look at those, not only the

base case cost, but possible alternatives to the base case and what the cost impacts would be and will be able to comment on that.

And basically, the questions that we'll need to be looking at is does the base case budget suffice in meeting the CWG recommendations? Are some alternative operational changes needed beyond the minimum? Have any costs been omitted or insufficiently estimated?

And so we'll all have a chance to look at that in detail starting March 5. And then of course, Staff will analyze the comments that they receive and produce a budget -- a final budget in June -- for Board action.

Now, it's really important and I said this in my message Monday, to realize that everybody is aware -- including ICANN Staff -- that there are lots of moving parts, some of which may still be moving come June; we don't know, okay. So everybody is aware of that.

But what I would like to do is throw out three questions for any feedback that people could provide today with regard to the approach that (Zaviay) outlined.

First of all, do you see any problems with this approach to developing the budget for public comment? Second question; are there any operational areas for which you think more than just minimal changes may be needed in the implementation of the IANA Functions with the transition? And third, do you have any suggestions for improving the budget development process that (Zaviay) outlined?

So I throw those two questions out and will ask - and thanks for putting the slides up (Chris); I appreciate that.

Does anybody have any feedback on these -- especially if there is anyone that has any reservations about this minimalist approach in terms of operational changes at the beginning of the transition? If so, where are your concerns and where do you think may be more than minimal changes in terms of current structure and operations? Where might those be?

And I'll stop talking there, be glad to answer questions, and would appreciate it especially if anybody has any concerns about this approach. If nobody speaks up, I'll assume that, like Design Team O active members, everyone supports this approach.

Lise?

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Chuck and thank you for actually showing the slides to us again and doing the very good email you sent to the group.

I think the approach seems very appropriate. I just think we need to ensure that we -- at any later stage -- can come back (Zaviay) and ICANN as such if we have found an issue that needed to have a different approach than this one. If we need a further separation of a support function or something else when we're deeper into the actual implementation phase because it's - and you have touched upon this in your email very well.

I just want to stress that I think this could be the only issue that I see because, at the moment, this seems like a very beautiful approach, but we just need to ensure that we can come back and say, "Oops, we found out that this separation need to be or this function needs to be separated." Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Lise; well said. And thanks for reinforcing the issue. And if anybody thinks that any of the assumptions on the budget do need more attention and

maybe -- as Lise said -- more separation from a physical or organizational point of view in order to fulfill the CWG recommendations, then if we can identify those areas before January 15, that could save us some time later on.

Now, we will have opportunity during the Public Comment Period when we see the budget detail -- including with alterative operational approaches -- to comment then, and I'm sure we will. But if we can provide any input earlier, I think that might save time later.

Okay Jonathan, I'm not seeing any other comments. And Greg - or Grace, you're right; I didn't have the latest version of the slides, but they're just minor changes, I think, in the slides on that. And so Grace, if you want to send around the version that was actually shown last week, that's fine; I didn't have - I wanted to get it out as early as possible this week and I just grabbed the first one had. Thanks.

Thanks Jonathan and thanks everyone for listening. Please continue to provide feedback on this between now and January 15 if you have anything.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck.

And I think that's - I mean my sense is that this has had a decent pass over with the work and that essentially we are not making change for changes sake -- which is consistent with what we wanted to achieve. We wanted to make sure we had some key concepts in there which seem to be covered; CSC Board separate-ability and those are all covered by the current structure. So there is no point in doing things for the sake of presentation or other reasons.

So it seems like you covered it well and thank you very much. And so you also made it clear when our deadlines are for bringing up further input, so that's useful.

Good. I don't think there's anything more to say on DTA. And in fact, I don't think we'll keep this as a standing agenda, right, because it's effectively covered within the (unintelligible) from the ICANN Staff. Please contradict that or come in with a raised hand if you do feel differently.

So it seems to me we're in position to move on to Item 3 here which is to further discuss the bylaws.

Now you may remember -- hopefully you do -- that Sidley presented - well, first of all, supplied us with a written set of the proposed new bylaws for ICANN as they pertain to the work of this group.

Having gone through those with Sidley, it was clear that there were numerous requests for input during that document and item. There were two outcomes really; one, there were numerous requests for input.

And two, having looked at the complexity and scope of the document, it became clear to this group that we should at least give consideration -- and in fact, we agreed -- to -- in discussion with Sidley -- that it was probably better that they work on a simplified version of the bylaws and put some of the weightier content -- at least in terms of volume -- into some form of supplementary document. That didn't reduce its impact, but it seemed to be a very substantial set of - a substantial document to be incorporated into the bylaws.

Therefore, what we agreed to do was two-fold; one, review the existing document and look for where all the questions and inputs were; and two, instruct Sidley to go ahead and produce rather a simpler version of the bylaws, and that all of what they included in that previous document didn't need to be included in the way it was -- which they were amenable to do and said was an alternative way of working.

So what we are looking for here is, one, the possibility of reviewing those points of input, but I'll come back to that in a moment; and two, the opportunity to get the client committee to formally instruct Sidley to do the alternative approach to these bylaws which is to produce a simpler and shorter primary document with reference to other materials in annexes or supplements.

In terms of reviewing the initial table, what we've proposed to do with Staff have prepared that table but not produced the content for it at this point. It runs to something like ten pages.

And the problem with it is, if the document is to be altered substantially and we do a whole lot of work on those inputs, it may be that some of those will no longer be required in the new draft.

So really - I think, Grace, if you could put up that document just to give an indication of what's there, and if it's available we could share this with you on the list, but it seems that we first need to have a further conversation with Sidley. If you look, there's -- like I said -- it runs to nine or ten pages of potential inputs. And if Sidley has (sic) to reduce the document down to a different form and format, it seems that we may be putting the cart before the horse in terms of trying to fill in all of these responses to the questions.

So what we need to know is which of those questions in the left hand column you see in front of you will survive will survive a redrafting of Sidley's initial draft.

So what that seems to say to me is that right now, the only action that needs to come out of this particular point is that we empower the client committee to discuss this with Sidley and to go ahead and instruct them to work on the simplified version of the bylaws.

So I don't know if that creates any questions or issues for anyone. And I will pause to make sure that if anyone does have concerns that you feel free to raise them or comment, but that seems to be a practical way forward.

So right now, we've created -- if we go ahead with this -- two sets of issues for the client committee to talk to Sidley about. One is the work that is supposed to go on on the PTI bylaws, and two is the revision of their own work on this ICANN bylaws pertaining to the work of the CWG.

Grace, can you confirm whether or not? I think you may have shared this review framework with just the Chairs at this point. I'm not sure it's gone to the whole group but I stand to be corrected. I don't think it would do any harm as a record just for people to see what this looks like in any event. So if it hasn't been shared, it's worth doing it, but with the cover letter saying that this is on hold pending a further discussion with Sidley on the revised bylaws.

Okay, so yes. Thank you Grace. So that can be shared then with the group afterwards as a matter of record and for anyone to get further opportunity to better understand what we propose to do and to comment on that.

All right, that probably deals satisfactorily for now with Item 3, and therefore, frees us up to go onto Item 4. So when you get a moment Grace, bring up the agenda back into the main screen.

And so here we had in mind to give you an update from the latest coordination call with the Chairs of the CCWG which actually has been postponed until tomorrow, and so we'll update you in due course on that.

And really, just wanted to make sure we ratified and confirmed what we intended to do on the dependencies between the work of the CCWG and the CWG. We discussed this at our last meeting.

And the intention here is that we will -- with the help of Sidley -- that we need confirmation or at least no-objection to instructing Sidley to assist us with the dependencies, which we discussed on the last call. And I'm - I guess I'm effectively giving it a second reading just to make sure no one has concerns about that.

So our intention is to instruct Sidley -- so this will be the third piece of work that the client committee will talk to Sidley about -- to prepare for us a document -- which is a follow-on from what they did on the previous draft -- that we propose that this group will submit as soon as possible, but in event no later than the end of the Public Comment Period, to the CCWG indicating our state of satisfaction or not with whether or not the CCWG's current draft -- Version 3 -- meets our dependency requirement.

And thereafter, having done that, we will update that based on what changes, if any, takes place on the back of the public comment, and resubmit that to the CCWG after they revise or republish their draft.

And I think for the sake of good order, we should communicate both of those directly to the chartering organizations as well. So in both cases, they are aware of the status with respect to our dependencies and can proceed with their work unencumbered by uncertainty about where we might stand on the dependencies.

So that's really, I think, the primary update that comes from there from this area. And I don't expect significant substance other than those items to be covered in our conversation with the Chair tomorrow that we have talked to them regularly and will do so again tomorrow.

Yes, so to summarize then, the client committee has three areas they need to deal with. It's making sure that we're all clear on the work that is to be done on PTI and Sidley's role in this group to review that work, to make sure that Sidley revises the bylaws -- ICANN bylaws pertaining to the work of the CWG -- and finally, assist us with our work on the dependencies for the CCWG. So those are the three instructions this will be conveyed to Sidley by our meeting of the client committee.

The most urgent of that is probably to get on with the work on the dependencies as soon as possible, but the bylaws though is far behind that. And then being aware of the review of the bylaws pertaining to PTI is a little bit further behind that.

Okay, any other business, questions, or issues to be dealt with today? Have we missed anything? It doesn't feel like we've rushed through things; we've given good time. But any other points or comments that anyone would like to make, or questions?

Okay, seeing none, thank you very much for that. It was a productive meeting, and we'll be seeing you on Tuesday in just under two weeks from now. Thanks everyone.

END