ICANN

Moderator: Brenda Brewer
January 21, 2016
10:00 am CT

Marika Konings: Hello everyone and welcome to the 75th meeting of the CWG stewardship. And as per usual we'll take the attendance from the Adobe Connect room. If anyone is on audio only at this time could you please make that known?

No one's audio only. I'll just hand it over to Jonathan Robinson who will be chairing today's meeting.

Jonathan Robinson: Hi Marika. Thank you very much. Hello everyone. Welcome to 75. I can't believe we've been at this for 75 meetings. Let's hope we can make this a productive call then.

Thanks very much. It does seem like there's a core of committed people who are continue to work with us on this work. So that's great.

Lise and I were attempting to switch chairs each call but she's been very involved in a new job. And we've been working together behind the scenes. So I agreed I would lead this call so that Lise will field item 4.

So really the primary objective I think of this call is probably threefold.

We'll obviously received an update on implementation from the staff as we have been in the past. And then really we want to focus on three things, confirming our plan with respect to the IPR work which we discussed last - at the last call, the IANA IPR work, review and move ahead with any key items and keep up to date with the work on the coordination with the Cross Community Working group on accountability through themselves.

And I know that involves some of you are working very hard at burning the midnight oil to try and get through essentially a revision to the proposal, the draft that was produced last year and then finally to look at some of the work on the bylaws.

It's not clear to us, Lise and myself, how long this call will take. We've set aside two hours. We may be able to do it quite a bit faster than that. But we'll obviously use what time we need to get done with what we need.

So you have the agenda in front of you. If there any comments or questions feel free to raise your hand. And thereafter I will hand it straight over to staff for implementation, update on implementation and really highlighting any changes or differences or progress since we last met I think it was two weeks ago.

One thing I wouldn't mind is if at some point we need to think about staff's role in anything to do with the IPR work.

But I think that may be premature to raise at this part of the call. It's something which we might touch on briefly in Section 3, Agenda Item 3. And we'll need to be aware of that in future.

So it's sort of an open question if you like. And maybe we could even record that as an action item consider the roll of ICANN staff in the implementation of IANA IPR issues. Thanks Marika.

All right let me hand straight over to Trang, give us some an update from the Implementation Group and then we'll take it from there. Over to you Trang.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you Jonathan and hello everyone. The update that we're going to present to you today shouldn't take too long. There's been a lot of activities in the updates that we provided to you last Tuesday. So if we can go to the next slide please, next slide.

So we will go ahead and jump right into it.

On the RZMS side we are continuing to work on completing the required co-changes to accommodate the new SLEs and to support parallel testing.

We are still on track to complete both of those work, pieces of work by the end of February for the SLEs related stuff and by the end of March for the co-changes related to supporting parallel testing.

So all of that work is still on track and the team has made the expected progress that we wanted to see this past week. So everything is still on track there.

On the date of parsing work on the names SLEs we reported last week that the contractor that we had hired to do this work has made a lot of progress. We're glad to report this week that we have received a preliminary draft of the report from them.

And the draft we sent with the disclaimers that they are still reviewing the report and that some things may change as they go through the verification process. And they have also asked that ICANN validate their understanding of the process in the assumptions that they had made in the report.

So we are working on that. But a lot of progress has been made on that side over the last week, week and a half.

On the RZMA we have been and are continuing to actively engage with VeriSign to complete the draft of the RZMA.

We are continuing to make progress on closing the gap on the outstanding items. And we are still currently working towards meeting demand completion date that you see there on the slide which is January 31 of this year which essentially is the end of next week.

But as you can see we turned the best status of this particular project to yellow just to indicate that there is a chance that we may not be able to meet that date and the positions they may need to be pushed out.

However at this time we are still working towards the demand completion date that we've established.

So no date changes yet but we wanted to just make you aware that they may need to be pushed a bit. So that's why the flag has been turned to yellow.

On the other implementation areas which we have provided the dashboard for you in the next few slides you know the status is still that we are continuing to

work on the implementation plans for PTI to CFC in AzArg. And there's no other major update other than that on those three projects.

And then the other projects have not been started yet or there are no major updates. So those slides and those dashboards are provided for your review here as well as the detailed project plan.

So Jonathan that is the major updates that we wanted to provide to the group this week. And I'll be happy to take any questions. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Trang. Typically as we're getting used to efficient and clearly presented so thank you for that. I see Paul Kane has a question please so let's go straight to Paul.

Paul Kane: Thank you very much Trang. My question is very brief. Before the Christmas recess we were talking about providing us with some statistics so we could start doing vent of the SLE.

When do you think you'll be in a position to provide those statistics so the work can start because I need to inform the rest of the group please?

Trang Nguyen: Thank you Paul for your question. As you can see on this project slide we had reported, we looked at the, let me see the first dark blue line there.

We - you are correct, we had intended on providing something to the CWG sort of middle of December. As you can see is reflected as red there because we did not meet that date.

The dark blue line reflects what the new date would be which is the end of January for us to provide that data. And as you can see there we are still on track there.

The report that I have just mentioned is actually the work that the contractor that we have hired has been doing. And we do have a preliminary report of that and are working with them to finalize. There's some assumptions that they want us to validate. So we're working on that.

But we're still on track to deliver against the new data that we communicated.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Trang. Paul did you want to follow-up on that or - I think Paul is typing. We'll take a response then if it comes.

Any other questions or issues for the ICANN Implementation Team?

Okay so Trang if you could just know it that point as we go on...

Paul Kane: Just...

Jonathan Robinson: ...to discuss.

Go ahead Paul.

Paul Kane: Just a quick follow-up and I apologize. Could you remind me of the date that we will be in receipt of the statistics so at least I can tell the rest of the group because they're asking because they have to pencil and time to review the statistics you give us. I apologize if I've missed it. So what date will we get the 80% of the data?

Trang Nguyen: Sure Paul. It is at the end of January. So essentially that will be the end of next week?

Paul Kane: So thanks very much Trang, apologies. Thanks.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. And Tren you will have picked up already to keep an eye out for the discussions on the IANA IPR I think from your side and see where we go to as in terms of your potential role in assisting us with any implementation work there.

Trang Nguyen: Yes Jonathan, thank you. We've been keeping sort of an eye and that so looking forward to continued discussions there.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So with that let's switch to that topic then. Let's go on to Item 2 which is the IANA IPR.

Now as you know we discussed this very briefly two meetings back in December and then more substantially at the last meeting of the group in January this year, previous meeting.

And essentially we went through the background, looked at the legal input and took the input from the IPR Design Team that we had run.

We talked it through and came to view that we could at least be satisfied with what the DCIPR group called functional neutrality. In other words providing that the operator, the holder of the IPR had sufficient neutrality as defined by this group and it wasn't necessarily to create a whole new entity.

And almost what almost follows from that is that effectively the IETF trust becomes the logical option as a potential holder of the IANA IPR providing no substantial issues emerge with that in the future.

But from where we sit today that appears to be the logical or at least a satisfactory outcome.

So therefore we took that as a provisional conclusion for in effect a second reading or at least a second airing at this meeting to make sure that the group was satisfied with that.

And thereafter we'll move on to look at the critical terms that the principles with which the operating communities will then have to be engaged with the IETF trust in respect - with respect to the IANA IPR.

So let me pause there and just make sure that no one's got any objections, concerns or objections or indeed if anyone wants to supplement what I've said there my very brief summary of where we are to date.

Greg go ahead.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. Not much to add to what was a very good and succinct summary but wanted to add one thing which is just the definition of neutrality or functional neutrality that the BPIPR is working with is that the owner must operate that - such that effective control over its actions with respect to the IANA IPR is not dominated or steered by any of the operational communities to the exclusion of any other though kind of a equal control sort of test.

Obviously that's a - something that has to be dealt with in different ways, you know, with the IEPF trust, you know, clearly having as its trustees IEPF members of their administrative oversight committee who double as the trustees.

But I think that we're reasonably confident that we can work with the example terms that the IEPF kindly circulated to kick start this and satisfy that even though there's, you know, some asymmetry inherent in that set up. But being pragmatic I'm sure that we will be able to overcome that.

But I just wanted to be clear what the - what we were talking about when we were talking about neutrality because even that simple word has been subject to varying interpretation over time. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes thanks Greg and thanks for - thank you very much for sort of formalizing my shorthand description.

So given that really the question is - and I take at seeing no objections to be clear that we and are not - we're not objecting and we will proceed on that basis.

And therefore the basis on which we proposed last week to - or two weeks ago when we last met and on which we propose to work is that we will utilize that group that has been operating that is sort of made up of the representatives from the different operational communities including Greg as DTIPR head as myself and Lise as co-chairs this group to continue the coordination and move this work forward with continue reference back to the operating communities.

And really the key task there is to make sure that we start to flush out at least at the high level the principle and example terms under which the different

operating communities are going to have the relationships - relationship with the IETF trust in respect of the IANA IPR.

That group has agreed as was requested from this group's past most recent meeting, past meeting that group has agreed to make all of its future email conversations public and have an open email archive.

The only reason for not doing a historic is that they've just been through kind of group of individual emails rather than there has been none to date. But notes from the meetings have been circulated. And those from yesterday's meeting of that same group will follow shortly.

And in fact that the initial timescale is quite an aggressive target which speaks to essentially reach agreement on the high level principles in advance of submission of the ICG proposal to the NTIA which is really means in practice an attempt to reach high level agreement on all of the principles relating to the IPR by early February, early next month.

So that's a summary of what's being discussed there. And I don't think there any actions for this group at this stage say for to accept that position or register an objection if you have any concerns.

I'll say from my point of view it seems like a functional group. I'm a little worried about too much work going on in that coordination group. And I think that's the one thing to watch out for and make sure that the work is done referred back to the operating communities and as soon as possible referred to experts for the implementation which is why flag to the point earlier about staff fought for implementation.

I mean much as Greg has specific and very useful expertise in this area but the rest of us do not. And it's more important I think that we get the principles right and then use that as a basis on which to instruct experts to execute on the base of those principles.

Thanks. (Cheryl) I note your check mark in respect to those comments.

All right any other comments or questions on Item 3 or we will move on to Item 4?

Okay seeing none I'll take the opportunity to hand over to Lise to introduce and work through Item 4 with you. Over to you Lise.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Jonathan. And I will start with a little repetition of how we have been dealing with CCWG accountability by saying that you might recall that in December we sent the CWG response to the accountability proposal.

And this was a draft where we actually pointed out there were some issues that needed to be worked further on.

Some of the issues were the budgets where we needed some more text and some more clarifications. And furthermore we didn't see that the appeal mechanism was mentioned to cover CWG or the sorry, any decisions from the PTI.

And at the moment the accountability group are working really hard as Jonathan also mentioned is implementing this in their response. And of course other input. And we have staff tracking this implementation.

And as we also talked about at our last call the Accountability Group is actually working with the first and the second reading. And they have meetings twice a week. So things are moving really fast at the moment.

And because it's a very intensive work plan from the accountability workgroup we the CWG was asked by the accountability chairs to review the issues that we have raised in our response in December on the flags so speak.

So we at the last call CWG discussed another way of working with the review of their work. And we agreed on reviewing the documents by sending them to the list and deal with them on the list.

So that's why Jonathan and I sent out the documents Saturday for this the CWG to review and comment on. We send out two documents (sic). One was regarding our budget requirement and another document was in relation to the separation power.

So the budget had had a second reading so that was final one whereas the separation of powers was only the first reading.

And regarding the budgets we have received three responses from the group.

We have sent all three of them to the Accountability Group. We have also in the same email implied that we would suggest to this group and actually we were so - well we didn't ask Chuck beforehand but we actually - we actually suggest and that Chuck as the leader - as the lead of the DT, the Design Team on the budget should take contact to Jordan Carter and Jonathan Zook who are writing the text on this issue in the Accountability Group.

So that's an issue we need to discuss and we'd like to hear if there's any objections both from Chuck of course but also from the group.

I'll make a quick pause here and I can see that Paul Kane has his hand up. It's - and Chuck has his hand up. Paul go ahead.

Paul Kane: Thank you Lise. And I'll be very brief.

As you can tell on the mailing list I'm getting a little confused as to where these documents are available.

I'm just looking out the stewardship mailing list and I do not see the documents you refer to.

But I think it's very important that we at the CW review the document prepared by the CCWG to make sure that it does meet our requirements specifically on the budget if you're wanting to make sure that the IANA staff in the IANA operation, PTI operation had a ring fence budget.

I just don't see the documents that you're asking us to comment on. There's nothing. I just checked now in the stewardship list.

I do understand my colleagues from the Accountability Group have been very busy. And for that I'm very grateful. But it would be great to have those documents that you're asking us to comment on in the stewardship mailing list please.

Lise Fuhr: Okay Paul. I'm sorry it didn't reach you well. But all ask staff to actually put the links in the chat to the documents.

I'm also - that's another point under this issue that I haven't started. But as staff has been asked to do a document that tracks our requirements and the ones that had some issues. And I'll ask Grace Abuhamad: to do a quick walk-through of that document after we have finished this brief discussion on the budget issues.

So you will see this document actually tracking the implementation from the Accountability Group. But we will give you the links in a second. I hope that you will have them so you can see the document. Chuck go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Lise, just a question first of all. Have Jordan and Jonathan Zook been provided the comments that I submitted or should I provide them those?

Lise Fuhr: I - the - well I - we sent it to the accountability chairs to actually distribute to the group. We sent them yesterday all the comments. But as I don't think there'll be any harm done by re-sending it to Jonathan Zook and Jordan Carter.

Chuck Gomes: Okay I'll do that later today.

Lise Fuhr: And is that a yes that you'll be fine with actually being in contact with Jordan and Jonathan?

Chuck Gomes: That is a yes.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you.

Chuck Gomes: No problem.

Lise Fuhr: I think - okay that sounds good. Thank you. Chuck? Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes thanks Lise. Yes I think that's - I agree with your suggestion to Chuck. It makes no harm to double up their communication to the CCWG people.

To Paul's point I mean I'm sympathetic to some extent. There's a lot going on. The CCWG is churning out work and documents.

And it is - Paul and others just what I found useful in doing this because I went back to our December communication to the CCWG which is the root of our issues if you like, our points for them to consider and that's a good reference point to start with.

And then I think the work that Grace Abuhamad: is doing, you know, tabulating the evolution and responses of that will be a very helpful document in addition then finally to the links to the substantive documents.

But really the sort of summary is provided in our December communication to the CCWG followed up by the summary that Grace Abuhamad: will provide in table format and then those links.

So some sympathy with the issue of, you know, where to find this information, I'll be sure were tracking it.

And I think we as a group could do with others being diligent in making sure that we are satisfied that our requirements are being met.

I know that the CCWG chairs and participants are working in good faith and with actually commitment to try and meet what we need. So it is incumbent on us to be diligent and in essence hopefully sign off on their work. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Jonathan. And just to double check is there any objection towards the working method that we're - give Chuck the lead on actually being the liaison between our group and the accountability group in trying to ensure that our budget requirements are implemented as we ask for in our response?

None. I will hand over to Grace Abuhamad: to make a quick walk-through of the table on the tracking of the accountability work.

I'll just add to this table that I - we tried to add more specification on precisely where in the actual proposal the implementation of our requirements are. But as things moved very fast at the moment it's really difficult and they - the actual reference will change all the time.

So we found that it would be useless to be more specific than this. But I'll leave it to Grace to explain more about the table. Grace, go ahead.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you Lise. So everyone on screen what you have is an attempt at tracking the main areas that the CWG had requested the CCWG to work on.

There are four areas that are outlined there on the first - in the first column. And what I did is I excerpted text from our comment to the CCWG so that we remember to, you know, sort of what we were asking the CCWG to do.

The - on the community mechanism the first row I indicated where the first reading and second reading had, you know, what days those had occurred on and then gave - provided links to the documents that came out with those readings in the CCWG.

And then on the very last column provided a sort of a summary of the outcome.

So as you can see in the first row on escalation and border removal board removal the CWG requirements have been fulfilled.

On the budget item they have closed the conversation. They had their second reading on 14th of January. But once the documents were circulated over the weekend for review by the CWG Chuck had pointed out some inconsistencies that then Martin had followed up on, et cetera.

So I put the link to Chuck's comments in the table and then now we have a plan for addressing those. But at the time that I drafted this I had put a little red notation to indicate that it was still something outstanding.

In the third row I've looked at the separation process. This seems that the separation process has been addressed at least to the CWG requirements.

But there'll be some work involved in the bylaw drafting phase that will require some attention and coordination between the CWG and the CCWG.

The same applies for the IRP review or the IRP edits that the CCWG is working on. And specifically in their call on the 19th of January they had outlined two options or they had asked the - for the CWG to look at preferences.

And Sidley in the past had outlined two options for the CWG. And so I put those options as phrased by Sidley back into this document. And I think it would be wise for the CWG to indicate a preference so that in the

implementation or bylaw drafting phase these could be, you know, there's some direction on how to move forward.

So that's a brief summary of what the table consist of. As Lise mentioned before she turned over to me we - I still would like to go back and per Chuck's request and put in more direct references to the page and the paragraph where these changes have been implemented.

But at this stage not all the documents have new text in the documents. So it was a little bit hard to do that for this call. But hopefully in the revised version maybe next week I'll be able to provide more detailed references to the changes that were put in place.

And I can circulate this document after the call with links to the latest versions of the documents including the one, the IRP document that was discussed this morning in the CCWG where I didn't have a link when I produced the document yesterday.

So I'm open for questions are we can just turn it over to the chairs for discussion.

Lise Fuhr: Grace, actually I have a question because you say that it would be wise for the CWG to decide or identify a preferred solution for the IRP.

What is the timeframe for taking that position?

Grace Abuhamad: Thanks Lise.

Lise Fuhr: Do you know?

Grace Abuhamad: So my - that was a comment. That was a personal comment on whether the, you know, the CWG should indicate a preference.

I think it really comes down to the work that's going to be taking place on the bylaws drafting and as well on the IRP implementation work that Becky Burr is running in the CCWG.

And I don't think right now there's a specific timeline or a specific deadline. But my view would be that the earlier the better just so that work can be directed in those, you know, that in that direction.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Grace. I see Chuck has a question. Chuck go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Yes a question, maybe more of a comment. But Becky Burr via some registry personnel in the CCWG reached out and I was involved on the IRP issue. And I just would kind of like to test my thinking on that, make sure that I'm on target with the whole CWG.

But it's my understanding -- and this is what I communicated -- that the CWG needs to have the ability for the community to use the IRP if PTI does not fulfill its performance obligations under the IANA functions contract.

I guess my first question then to the group is am I accurate on that?

And then a second question is this -- and I'll give it and then we can talk about both together if that's okay -- is the proposed bylaws that Sidley has drafted refer to the IANA functions contract.

But there's nothing in the proposed bylaw changes that actually or specifically says that, you know, that ICANN is required to enforce that contract.

Now I think that's kind of implied and there's language that the CCWG has proposed that talks about the needs of the stakeholders being met.

Now to me that's kind of broad. I think it would be a little bit better if it was more specific in that regard. But I'm curious as to what everyone thinks on that. But it's all related to, this is all related to the IRP.

So first of all did I get it right that what we're looking for as a CWG is to make sure that the community has accountability mechanisms to use in this case the IRP if PTI doesn't fulfill its obligations, in other words if ICANN does not enforced PTI to fulfill its obligations under the IANA contract. Did I get that right?

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Chuck. You're actually took the next item and started the discussion. And I think that's actually perfect.

So that's really good because Jonathan and I had discussed that. We have noticed that there's been some concerns online regarding how the IRP is being implemented.

And you're opening on what it is we actually want from the IRP I think is its important and spot on.

So let's see I can see Martin Boyle has his hand up. Martin go ahead.

Martin Boyle: Thanks Lise. Can you hear me?

Lise Fuhr: Yes we can.

Martin Boyle: Good, thank you. Yes Chuck's raising this issue is quite timely because on the CCWG call this afternoon this was an issue that the CCWG flagged as needing to be referred back to the CWG. So we will I assume see a full communication from the CCWG fairly shortly.

I think the issue really is that we need to think very carefully about what it is that we want from the IRP to support our requirements.

And I think Chuck has just outlined quite clearly these areas where we need to as a group come to a conclusion.

Now one of the issues I think I would have concern is essentially enlarging the IRP to cover things in the PTI that have already been addressed through the IRP directly with ICANN. So in other words is it will be used as a second bite of the cherry as it were.

And that I think is an area predominantly to do with the gTLDs and the contractual relations within there. So I leave that to people who know something about those subjects.

However the idea that CWG needs to have the ability to use the IRP if PTI does not fulfill its performance requirements I think that is the backstop as it were that I would expect the performance requirements would be dealt with through the CSC and then would be escalated by the ccNSO or the GNSO for further action.

And if I remember correctly that further action was to call for an IANA functions review out of sequence. So I think I might struggle a little bit to know exactly what. But I would actually then link that to Chuck's second point which is the proposal bylaws referring - the proposed bylaws referring to

the IANA functions contract and the bylaws therefore giving an obligation on ICANN to enforce its contract with PTI or any subsequent operator of the IANA functions.

And that would seem to me to be probably the most useful point of ensuring that there was an IRP that if ICANN started using its contract or trying to impose something through its contract that it shouldn't be or alternatively not bothering to enforce its contract then the IRP would be perhaps the best mechanism to ensure that it corrected that.

Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Martin.

Jonathan go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. I think it feels like we're going in the right direction here. I'm - I think I'm supportive of what's being said.

But assuming I understand correctly it feels to me like what's critical here is to be as we said in the chat a little we've got to be very clear on what our requirements are.

But we've also got to be careful not to open all of this up to redesign. We've got to be consistent with what we've said in the past.

And, you know, we've been - we said in the past that PTI as an affiliate of ICANN is in effect analogous to a wholly-owned subsidiary. So it's very tightly bound into ICANN. So we need to recognize that, recognized that we built in a whole other supervisory and escalation mechanisms.

And we've just got a make sure that that tie-in works in the way that we intended it to and that we can make use of those escalation mechanisms.

And when and if they break down and don't work that we've got access to some form of independent review and that all sort of works.

So it feels like it's very useful to - it's terrible cliché in our world at the moment but sort of stress test this and make sure it all works properly without reinventing the wheel.

So that's to me is the tension here. We've just got a make sure we don't make that CCWG jump through hoops. They've got a job to do. We've set them a task. We set it out pretty clearly in our December communication.

And we've got to remain consistent with that December communication and the other work that we've done but indeed make sure it is fit for purpose. We can't just roll over and say yes it looks all fine. We need to be sure it is fit for purpose.

So quite how we do that in so short time that's available I think that's the challenge its how do we work now. I mean so that feels to me like a challenge.

Lise Fuhr: That certainly is. And well we have actually with the budget we suggested that the Design Team read on this issue was kind of covered. But I don't recall we had a special Design Team on the appeal mechanism.

But I know that Avri has been very much involved in this. So unfortunately she's not on the call so we can't ask her. But to have someone who is actually

following this pretty closely and reporting back to the group could be a solution.

Chuck hands is up (sic). Chuck go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Lise again and thanks Jonathan and Martin. And I think I'm in full agreement with what Martin said on this.

But I wanted to call attention to something that I'm - not on the GNSO Council but I've been tracking what they are submitting again that they have a meeting today to decide what they're submitting to the CCWG.

But one of the things with regard to Recommendation 5 from the third draft proposal that the GNSO is stating that relates to what we're talking about right here is that there's conditional support for recommendation five provided that the bylaw clarifies that ICANN has a responsibility to enforce its agreements.

And of course that relates to what I think at least one point that Martin made and then also the IRP may be invoked for failure to act or for example failure to enforce its contracts and in this particular case to enforce this contract with PTI.

So I just throw that out because it's related to what we're talking about here. And so I think that message will come from the GNSO Council and what they decide to send in terms of that supporting organization's comments to the CCWG. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Chuck. That's really helpful. And well so what we could do is actually to we should review the current IRP wording to see how it correlates with our needs and actually as you also talked about Chuck be more specific

in what it was precisely we need, which ability do we want the IRP to take care of.

And then we need to communicate this to the Accountability Group as soon as possible.

So I guess Jonathan and I will review and send out to the group to review and have a discussion on the list as the others. And then we need to discuss and make sure that it's in line with our requirements and then pass it on to the Accountability Group.

Okay with that said I don't have any more issues in relation to the Accountability Group. And we will continue to work and discuss the items on the list.

I don't know Chuck, your hand is still up. Is that an old hand or is that a...

Chuck Gomes: That's an old hand.

Lise Fuhr: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: I will take care of it.

Lise Fuhr: Okay good. So we will get back to you on the list in relation to actually review and discuss this IRP issue. And we need to communicate our final discussion to the Accountability Group as soon as possible.

With that I'll hand it back to you Jonathan to - with the next item.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Lise. I'll so note that there's an action item which is good, the last action item captured that we will review the current wording in relation to the IRP. And that's going to communicate our feedback.

I think there's probably a small supplement to that is and we should take input on list as to - in fact maybe we can make it a separate item or maybe we take input on the list or receive input on list as to the requirements for the IRP consistent with our prior work and recommendations to the CCWG.

So we just ask people to articulate those requirements on the list so that we know what we're testing against.

Thank you Marika for capturing that. I think that will be useful.

So anyone who can assist us with articulating those requirements so that as we as a group work on testing it we know what we're testing against so we can - because otherwise the saying here is, you know, some of us feel it's okay but we're not testing it against something solid. That feels like a helpful way to do it.

But please do bear in mind that we must be careful, very careful in this respect not to make new requirements. They must be consistent with what our original response to the ICG and our subsequent communications with the CCWG.

Okay so next item is the work that's going on in the bylaws. And we had - we're going to be doing a couple of things here.

We - our process to be clear is we ask and got diligence and rapid response from Chuck, (Donna) and Avri. We asked the design team leads to contribute their best efforts to answering the questions that have been posed by Sidley.

There were areas where they felt they could not or did not have, you know, the scope or expertise to answer so those were left undone. And we are staffed to make a first crack at those.

So in a sense this is work in progress as we build this up.

And once we have built it up completely which I think we should target no later than the next meeting we should have it in place for review at the next meeting.

So in a sense we got of first reading of this set of responses at this meeting. And then we can take a second reading on the 4th of February in two weeks' time I suggest to you.

So really I guess the opportunity here is it would be probably clumsy to go through this all line by line or item by item in this call.

Those of you that have had a chance to review this document already it would be great to have any particular or specific input you might have. And if you haven't please do look at it on the list and come up with any comments or input.

Like I say it's technically not complete in that staff has undertaken to fill in some responses. But if you have suggestions or input to either the blank items or the draft infills please go ahead.

So I guess the question here for the group now is any comments or questions or input on that methodology and that timing and approach and/or on the substance within - contained within the document in its current draft?

Grace as the sort of holder of the pen on this I don't know if there's any additional comments you would like to make or anything that you want to draw anyone's attention to or if you feel there's a particular item that it would be really good to get some assistance with please feel free to flag that.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you Jonathan. I'll just come in briefly. There's some areas where staff support I didn't feel totally comfortable making a determination on a possible response for the CWG. So those areas are left blank.

There are some areas where I believe some of the questions have to do with some implementation items. And so I've indicated those maybe to be determined. But I welcome, you know, any feedback from the group on those issues.

There are a few areas where (Donna) and Chuck and Avri had provided some responses. And in some cases they weren't necessarily conflicting but they were asking questions of the CWG, you know, to indicate a preference for certain option or another things like that.

And in those cases - I'm going to look for an example. But I noted that put in a comment in the track changes version of, you know, for as an action for the CWG to possibly answer some of those questions.

So for example on Page 13 Avri had outlined two different options. And she had put at the end of her comments that the CWG would need to pick one. So that for example would be something that the group would need to provide feedback on.

There's also an area on Page 9 Chuck had provided - there's a question from Sidley and Chuck had actually in response provided three questions of possibly the CWG may want to post to the ccNSO and GNSO as part of their escalation.

So those - Chuck had put in three questions. It's up to the CWG to determine whether we want to pose those formally to the ccNSO or GNSO - I mean and GNSO or you, you know, bring that - those questions to those groups at a later date during the implementation phase so that there's sort of a fine line I think in some of these questions as to what can be determined now and what may need to wait a little bit.

And I think (Donna) did a good job of outlining some of those at least for the CSC that some things do not need to be written the bylaws today but would be elements for the CSC to define once it's beginning its work.

So I think that's just a brief overview of some of the issues that popped up and in my staff review of it. But it really needs a thorough review from the different members of the CWG.

So good - I'll circulate a Word version. I'm hoping that I can consolidate different responses. But I'm hoping that the group will pay some attention to it.

Jonathan Robinson: Excellent thanks Grace. And that's - thanks for your work and thanks for your encouragement to get the right response to it. Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan. A process question really.

So Grace - and by the way my compliments on the table. I put that in the chat but I'll say it verbally as well. I think it's very helpful. And if we have those other references that once you have time to add them in terms of page numbers and stuff like that that'll be great.

But Grace has identified some areas or to be determined or questions that have to be answered by the CWG.

Am I correct in understanding that we will deal with those at the second reading on February 4 or is the anticipation that we would do something on those either today or between now and February 4 or both?

Jonathan Robinson: Check I think it's probably both. If there's something to be said now let's have it, let's hear it and let's make the updates.

Let's work a little on the interim and try and complete it with it at the February 4 in order to then transmit it to Sidley. That's the thinking at this stage.

Martin go ahead.

Martin Boyle: Thanks Jonathan. Yes I think there's been lots of good work done here. And so certainly would like to thank staff and (Donna) and Chuck and Avri for their input into the document.

I guess I've got one sort of big comment. And then I've got a couple of minor points that are probably best dealt with on list as we move through developing this work. So I'll just stick with the big comments.

And that is that it seems to me that an awful lot of what is figuring in this document risks looking to embody stuff into bylaws that could or perhaps should be dealt with elsewhere for example in the statements of work or in the contract between ICANN and the IANA functions operator.

And that approach certainly seems to me leading us down a set of bylaws that could end up being quite complex and long and not open to stuff changing in the future.

The obvious point for me is on the work of the CSC where the CSC itself obviously needs something in the bylaws to ensure that A, it's there and Bit is listened to.

But when it actually comes to its way of operation, the way it escalates issues it seems to me that that is something probably best left to the CSC. And it's - the CSC's answer ability to the GNSO and the ccNSO on issues that haven't been properly covered or addressed.

That was my sort of big point of caution. I don't know whether we've sort of gone too far down this process or whether we can sensibly start flagging that, you know, this is something that should perhaps be being dealt with in either terms of reference for the CSC or for PGI or for the contract between on ICANN and PGI.

And I think we probably just do need to think about this quickly before we get too involved in essentially setting the framework for drafting bylaws. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Martin thank you. It's Jonathan. That's an excellent point and it's a timely point.

So let's just make sure we capture that. And I think we can just simply capture that item - well capture it in action actually.

CWG to ensure that bylaws derived from the work of the CWG are appropriately sized and fit for purpose. So at least we put an action on ourselves to do that.

But let me remind you where we are in this process because originally Sidley drafted a comprehensive document and provided a series of questions.

We went back to Sidley and said look, nice document but this seems too long and we would prefer a cutback version of the document. Would you like to work on a cutback version of the document?

They said yes, we're happy to work on a cutback version of the document but we think it will be helpful if you answer all our questions in any event.

So it's a really helpful that you remind us that that's where we are in the process.

I think we've got it and I think they've got it that we do not - and I saw that Chuck responded with a positive checkmark to your point in the chat.

So hopefully we are where you would like us to be. We are not going to have over lengthy over complex bylaws.

And to the extent that what is intended can be accomplished elsewhere it will be. And these answers to these questions simply provide a comprehensive background to the work on the bylaws and any other associated documentation.

So hopefully we've got it and you've reminded us to do that. That's a very good point. So thank you.

And let's capture that sort of minor point that you made on based - that you suggest that hopefully others will as well raise that.

So I think we have a plan for dealing with this. We have a timeframe and a plan. I think Lise and I and with your help we should think about the timing for this.

As I said currently the target will be to get it finalized for return to Sidley by the close of our next meeting. And so it will be very helpful to work on this online in the interim.

As far as other items are concerned moving then on to any other business I just check that there are no their hands. I see no other comments or questions at this point.

So call for the points under any other business. So our next meeting is planned for Thursday, 4th of February at this same time 1600 UTC.

It feels to me like we will - we will be likely to require additional meetings as we go. And we've committed to that we won't run meetings unless it feels necessary and there's substance to deal with.

I don't know if the appointment of a ccNSO member can be - they're replacing a staff and can be communicated. This - there was an ARB from the last meeting.

Okay so Paul if you have the name of the replacement let us know. If not you can let us know on list as soon as possible.

And I will just call are there any other points or questions that anyone would like to make before we bring things to a close?

Okay well thanks very much Paul, cooperative and efficient meeting.

There is some work to be done both in terms of dealing with our work with the CCWG and this work on the bylaws. But hopefully this meeting's made us aligned and in good shape to be able to undertake that work.

Thanks everyone and we'll be talking with you on email and on the 4th of February at the next teleconference.

So with that we can stop the recording and call the meeting closed.

                         END