

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer  
February 5, 2016  
10:00 am CT**

Coordinator: The recordings are started.

Grace Abuhamad: Great. Welcome everyone to the 76th CWG Stewardship meeting on 4 February. It's now 1603 UTC. And I have Nathalie on audio only. Do I have anyone else on audio only at this time? Okay seeing as there is no one else on audio only we will take roll call from the Adobe room as usual. And I will turn it over to the chairs. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Grace. This is Lise Fuhr. I will chair the first part of the meeting and Jonathan Robinson, my co-chair, will chair the other part and I'll chair item 1, 2 and 3 and he'll do the rest. And welcome everyone to the 76th meeting. We still have a lot of issues to discuss but we find the key issue or the key objective of this meeting is actually to deal with the ICANN bylaws that relate to the CWG stewardship. We have the response table where Jonathan sent an email to you reminding you to have a look at it. And we would like to go into more depth with this table on this call.

Furthermore, some of you might have heard about the transition cost that relates to both the CWG and the CCWG work. We will also be discussing this but we will discuss it under Item 4. And since I know that Greg Shatan cannot stay for the whole call, he can only stay the first half-hour, we will have Item 3, IANA IPR, as the second item and move implementation update as Item Number 3 instead. Sorry for the reshuffling of the subjects but it seems necessary in order to have Greg give an update on the IPR.

And with that I'll ask if there's any -- anything to the agenda or any questions. Doesn't seem like it. And we will go ahead and start with the IANA IPR. And I'll hand over to you, Greg, to give an update on the IPR issues. Thank you.

Greg Shatan: Thank you, Lise. And good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. The IANA IPR at this point stand as follows, we've had meetings with the collaborative group with the CRISP and IANA plan teams, protocol and numbers teams having adopted as a starting point of our work the example principle term that IETF kindly provided and working forward on those with the goal as decided to have the new owner of the IPR, the IETF trust.

We have marked up the example principle terms. And it's due to be commented on over the next few days by the members of the collaborative team. And then I think at that point we'll need to probably circulate a draft publicly. We've moved to a publicly archived mail list for the -- that work as well since it's now more directed for a particular IPR subject.

At this point really still waiting for -- we've had comments from Andrew Sullivan that there are a number of other folks involved in looking at the document. Still waiting to kind of see which, if any, points kind of remain open, what issues need to be discussed and brought back to the CWG for determination of the CWG's position on these open issues.

So I'm looking forward to having a call. I think we have a call on Monday at 0700 UTC to go over the documents. And then we will be able to, as I say, you know, follow the path that I've just outlined. That's pretty much it for the moment but I'll be on the call, happy to take any questions in the chat or online.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Greg. And I also noticed that Grace has linked to the icon in the chat. Any questions for Greg? No, doesn't seem like it. Thank you, Greg, for that update.

Greg Shatan: My pleasure.

Lise Fuhr: And we will move on then to the implementation update where we have ICANN staff where Trang will be presenting the update. We also have a special guest star that would give us some of the SLE data parsing. This would also be a part of this update. But Trang will tell you a lot more about this so I'll handed over to Trang to give first a general presentation and then we will hear about the SLE data parsing. Thank you. Trang.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you, Lise. Hello everyone. As Lise mentioned we do have a guest on the call today with us, (Mark Blanchard) from (unintelligible) who has been working on the data parsing for the SLEs, will be presenting his work and some of his findings so I will keep my update portion short to allow Mark some time to present his work and then answer any questions that you may have.

Next slide please. So for the status update this week, on the RZMS project and to work to support parallel testing, we are still on track to complete that work

by the end of March and in fact we think that we may be able to complete that work even sooner than that.

On the names SLE project we are still on track, again, to complete the RZMS code changes to accommodate the SLEs by the end of this month. So that work is still on track and in fact we are looking to see if we can pull back in a bit more but we are certainly on track to get that were completed by the end of the month.

On the data parsing side, as I mentioned, (Mark Blanchard) is on the phone with us today and he's going to be presenting on the work that he's done and some of his findings.

On the RZMA, we reported last -- on the last call that we may have to push the band completion date out to allow sufficient time for discussion and final revision of the draft RZMA. And in fact we do have to do that and have reflected here for you the new planned completion date of February 29. We are still very actively engaging with VeriSign to - and are working hard on finalizing the agreement. We just need the additional time to do so that's reflected here.

As you can see the red boxes indicating that we did not meet the previously communicated planned completion date at the end of January but we are -- we believe we are on track to be able to meet the new planned completion date of February 29 or working very hard to meet that date.

Thank you. On the PTI, we are continuing to work on drafting the implementation plan. In addition, there is a few other things that we've been working on. We are working on selecting a name for that PTI entity which we will of course share with the CWG. We have also started to work on drafting

an annex to the ICANN PTI contract to incorporate the names SLE. The annex then of course along with the draft ICANN PTI contract will of course also be shared with the CWG when they are ready.

Another thing that we'd like to flag before you regarding that PTI project is that we moved the date of the incorporation of the PTI to the end of March. When we created the project plan for PTI we anticipated that the proposals would be delivered to the ICANN Board by the end of January and then based on that date we set the incorporation timeframe as middle of February. But since the CWG shares issued a blog this week anticipating that they will obtain chartering organization sign off on the CWG proposal in Marrakesh we pushed the date of incorporation to the end of March.

Since the incorporation process is not on the critical path we do not anticipate that this change in the planned completion date will have any material impact to the transition.

Next slide please. Thank you. On the (RZRG), we have begun working on defining the scope of the committee and on drafting the implementation plan so that work has just started. And similarly, for the CSC we've also started to work on drafting the implementation plan. We are also reviewing the CSC charter in close detail to see if there are any areas that may require further clarification. And then that's the update for the CSC and (RZRG).

Next slide please. On the bylaws, as I mentioned before, as per the CCWG has a new timeline and per that timeline we've adjusted the date for the bylaws accordingly.

So essentially what we have anticipated before was that the bylaws drafting would need to be completed within a 4 to 6 week time frame after the

proposals are delivered to the ICANN Board to allow sufficient time for a 42 day comment period and then incorporation of any public comments into the bylaws and then get that finalized within roughly the anticipated 90 day period that NTIA requires further review of the proposal. So we've made adjustments to the bylaws drafting date based on the new CCWG date.

And back includes my updates for this week. Lise, I will turn it back to you and take any questions.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Trang. Is there any questions for Trang? I don't see any. Thank you, Trang, for a very informative as usual update. Oh, I see Jonathan has his hand up. Jonathan, go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Lise. I'm not sure how well formulated my question is. I'm seeing the work on the review of the CSC charter also the thoughts on the bylaws timing. I think we're going to have to -- I wonder if, Trang, if you or anyone in your group has had a look through the document that we are working on with a series of questions in and around the bylaws? And I'm just thinking - we'll have to figure out how we work together with you on that so that the whole thing stays coordinated. And that may need a call off-line in addition to these updates just to make sure we stayed joined up with you. But have you had a chance to look over those at all?

Trang Nguyen: Hi, Jonathan. So I am aware of that document. Grace obviously has shared it with us. I have to admit that I have not reviewed it in close detail. We are tracking the conversation in the CWG email list relating to the CSC. There's been a lot of exchanges recently around that. So we are tracking those conversations and making sure that we take that into consideration as we are drafting the implementation plan. But certainly welcome, you know, an off-

line conversation to further discuss how we may, you know, better or more closely coordinate around the CSC.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks, Trang. I think it's just making sure that the work is neither duplicated nor that anything falls between the cracks. But we will come to some of this when we talk about the bylaws work later in this call so I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you, Jonathan.

Lise Fuhr: Well thank you, Trang. I actually have a question regarding use at the RZMA and the PTI has been - missed the targets. And some is of course because of the CCWG not having a proposal yet. That are there in the locations of those delays?

Trang Nguyen: So on the RZMA our goal is to try to get that finalized before we start parallel testing. And both VeriSign and ICANN are very aware of that and are working hard towards getting that finalized as soon as possible. For that PTI we didn't necessarily miss the date to incorporate PTI. I believe we could still do that by the mid-February time frame.

However, we pushed it out -- the reason we pushed it out is because we don't - we have been viewing the board's approval or the board's transmission of their - of the proposals to NTIA as sort of a trigger point for us to move ahead with incorporating an affiliate for ICANN. And so that's why we moved that because of the CCWG's new timeline, move that back to the end of March. As I mentioned, that is not on the critical path so we do not anticipate that that would have a material impact on the transition.

Lise Fuhr: Okay, thank you. That's very helpful. Okay, any other questions to Trang? If not I'll handed over to (Mark Blanchard) to go through the data parsing in relation to SLE. And I'll just note that I have a question from Paul Kane regarding the data parsing because he - the group that's working on the SLE is asking also to have the raw data so with that in mind we can have a look at this report. Thank you. Marc.

Marc Blanchet: Hello. Everybody hear me? Can you confirm, someone?

Lise Fuhr: Yes. We can hear you.

Marc Blanchet: Okay cool. So next slide. So the scope -- the scope of this work is to see if the 11 SLE metrics that were identified by the working group in the document cited below can be applied or (unintelligible) to the current IANA combined RZMS and RT system. And it's actually especially appropriate for this study that we are saying RZMS and RT because they work together and sometimes data is available in one or the other in terms of that. So we have to think about the whole system as a combined one.

The 11 metrics are (unintelligible) in appendix of this presentation if you have any question. Next slide. So the way we did the study is ICANN has provided secured access to a clone of the IANA RT4 and RZMS database on a virtual machine. And they also provided some documentation, you know, doesn't run and stuff, technical documentation of those.

However, as any documentation and obviously since this - on the surface a simple system but in fact a complex system on, you know, under the hood then we have some, you know, communications back and forth with ICANN staff about clarifications of (unintelligible) or stuff like that.



Also (unintelligible) presented in the study were done by programming scripts querying the RZMS and RT database. Obviously it is a larger amount of data there so we were not, you know, we didn't verify every possible ticket and every possible statistic because it would take, you know, years to do.

So we did some random sampling of the tickets and spot-checks especially for the weird or exceptional cases that were found. And we manually verified the output. So obviously that is an iterative process that we did that, you know, make the heuristics and approximations better and better as we went.

Next slide. A few considerations and limitations of the study, so RZMS, the web interface was put in production around April 2011 before it was RT, the new, so and our study was started on December 18 where we get access to the VM, as I described before. So to avoid unstable tickets, meaning tickets that were spending, you know, between, you know, before those dates or after, limit the study to tickets from January 1, 2012 to November 30, 2015 and so which is almost four years of tickets.

Category 5 requests which were, as you may remember, the ones that are, you know, special, were not analyzed because they would require each of them a manual analysis and I don't think that's the, you know, the reason of this study.

Root server requests also were not analyzed because they were, you know, really too special and, you know, not fit with our understanding of the - what you guys want to analyze. So and obviously only the 11 metrics were analyzed, no dashboard requirements were looked at. Next slide.

Okay the trend system does not distinguish between ccTLDs and gTLDs. And obviously Category 3 and 4 were identified as foreign gTLD and ccTLD.

Obviously (unintelligible) such as, you know, two-character, you know, TLD, one can understand (unintelligible) ccTLD and gTLD but IDN ccTLD and IDN gTLD are more completed (unintelligible) because there is no, you know, way so you have to look at the - another, you know, registry or something that tells you which one is which.

So - and roughly speaking, the current system doesn't distinguish between these two - between ccTLD and gTLDs because that seems to be not designed for that.

Many instances, we found many instances where multiple tickets were merged together for various, you know, reasons. And that creates a pretty complex system to analyze and parse automatically. So for those cases, you know, (unintelligible) that we may have less reliable statistics because we have - when they were independent they had their own tread and states and, you know, and emails and, you know, being populated in tickets.

And then when you merge them to one ticket all make it completely puzzled so it's kind of more difficult therefore we found some instances where we were able to make the appropriate heuristic work but we are pretty sure that some didn't work because of the complexity of this.

Next slide. The metrics identified obviously for PTI (unintelligible) may be integrated in different ways especially regarding the current process, how we map it to the current process. So for example, we found that (unintelligible) ICANN staff had a different interpretation than we had of the precise meaning of the metrics so, you know, they detail actually what does that mean in the actual system.

And maybe the interpretation, the understanding of the actual metric itself. So the detailed -- the study itself, the report will contain at least a detailed interpretation of our interpretation and will be documented so at least people, you know, see what we have understanding how we found that statistics of those metrics based on our interpretation. If obviously the interpretation is someone else and the interpretation is different than obviously the statistics would be different.

RZMS and RT seems simple and (unintelligible) but in fact it is pretty complicated and has a lot of states and, you know, stuff in it. Obviously one of the issues we had was that anything that is related to a change of state where there were email (unintelligible) were obviously more difficult to process by script.

So for example we the contacts are requested to confirm the request they have a template and they said, you know, follow the template which is I accept or something like that. But obviously sometimes people replied by I agree, I agree, please proceed, okay, you know, all kind of stuff. So you need kind of an AI, you know, system to parse those.

So, you know, it would have been better or easier for us to parse and get that (unintelligible), you know, were done through the Web interface and the - of the email just for, you know, logging and reporting what's going on. But, you know, that's where we are.

Next slide. We have (unintelligible) categories. So the working group defined five categories. They are currently not tagged in the current system. So (unintelligible) mostly with, you know, pretty good reliability but many complicated cases being, you know, potential unreliable statistics.

For example, sometimes tickets start with, you know, that looks like one category but then evolved to another one and then, you know, and then it makes the, you know, structured parsing more difficult to achieve.

So to remove that potential unreliability of steps we actually decided not to use the categories for the study. And instead we grouped the metrics were divided into two or three groups that sometimes resembled categories to provide better metrics. For example, things such as the fact that it's on ccTLD or gTLD were not used again, for those reasons.

The fact that a ticket for zone changing ticket versus only contact tickets, often zone changing tickets also include contact tickets - contact info change so, you know, so if you're looking for, you know, statistics related to the contact change in those tickets it's kind of convoluted with the rest of the process within the zone changing process itself. So next slide.

Delegation and redelegation requests, Category 3 and 4, are a pretty complex process with multiple internal (unintelligible), some of them are even not, you know, fully documented or described in the current system. So obviously for those the statistics are much less meaningful or have a large variation of duration that seemed kind of weird but, you know, when we look at the tickets it's (unintelligible) difficult to parse within the complexity of the actual (unintelligible) processes themselves.

Next slide. So what we did is for each metrics, so the 11 metrics, we provide in the report our detailed interpretation of the metrics. All we did the (unintelligible) of the tickets based on that explanation so minimum, maximum, average, medium and standard deviation. And for a few tickets other statistics for giving, you know, another perspective on it.

And the discussion on the findings, so for example (unintelligible) inspection of random tickets, next moderation ticket or special tickets so we were trying to find why the approximation worked or didn't work or for example worked but the duration was kind of very large so then manual inspection gives us the (unintelligible) of why it works and actually give us comfort of that the heuristic works (unintelligible) cases.

Next slide. So a summary, we were unable to meaningfully fully, you know, approximate the metric number 8 and again the numbering is also in the appendix of this presentation if you want to refer. There is a large variation of durations of three tickets, 2, 6 and 7. There is a large variation but very few exceptional cases, 3, 9, 10 and 11. So if we remove the exceptional cases then it's a small variation. So - and, you know, not too much variation on the duration for three tickets.

So obviously the variation (unintelligible). In some cases just the (unintelligible) property of the test. For example, manual reviews variation are obviously, you know, kind of vary depending on the different interaction of external interactions with people. So it's, you know, by default it is obvious that it could be very variable in terms of duration at best.

Next slide. So finding and summary, the IANA current system are not currently designed to report (unintelligible) metrics as requested by the community for most of the cases. (Unintelligible) were implemented to provide, you know, pretty good approximations for most metrics of - the summary. But some metrics actually the approximation is less (unintelligible) than - obviously this kind of work that, you know, we could do further more complex heuristics and it would improve the approximations of the metric but, you know, then the question is how much time, you know, anyone wants to put on this. And so it's a question mark.

The system itself has a pretty good level of complexity to support our cases and we were actually surprised even if we know what RZMS does, it's actually a complex piece of software and space. And last is, you know, interactions using email creates much more (unintelligible) for the parsing and heuristics. Good examples are when contacts confirms a request (unintelligible) of text but only humans can really interpret. So that's it for me. Any questions or back to you to the chair.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Marc. I actually have a question because you're talking a lot on the slide about we chose to go with some categories and not with other categories. The "we" is that together with the working group or is that you as a consultant? Was this work done in close cooperation or how was it done? I'm asking a question because Paul Kane is not here so.

Marc Blanchet: Sure. We mean the team that worked on the study. So (unintelligible) team.

Lise Fuhr: The team that worked on the study, that's including the people from the CWG?

Marc Blanchet: No...

Lise Fuhr: No.

Marc Blanchet: ...actually just the contractors.

Lise Fuhr: Just the contractors, okay. Okay thank you. I don't know if there is any other questions for this because unfortunately the lead on our design team, Paul Kane, is not here so we will have him go through it and contact you. But I see

Jonathan has his hand up and Chuck also. Go with you, Jonathan, first. Go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, thanks. I was just chatting a little bit with Paul. He's traveling. And he was saying he was - I think what would be most useful to shortcut any indirect routes is that he should probably have a direct call with either the - with the relevant staff and - under whoever is working on this.

He did say to me he thought they were looking for the data - the raw data but I think it's better than the - the contact. So I think what we need to do is ensure that there's some sort of follow up and discussion and that that clarifies whether or not this meets the expectation or can be in some way meeting the expectation of what the DT SLE group was looking for. Thanks, Lise.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Jonathan. I see in the notes that Paul Kane should have but I would like it to actually be the design team on the SLE as such as they're a team including Paul of course. Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lise. And thanks for the presentation. I fully endorse Lise's and Jonathan's suggestions for the call with the SLE team and Paul - including Paul. But based on this, it looks like the data that's obtainable for a large number of the 11 metrics is not very reliable.

Does that mean that a lot of coding will have to be done to be able to provide good measurements of the metrics? Or does it - should I assume that some of the metrics may not even be achievable in the near term? I don't know if anybody can even answer those questions. But they're the ones that are running through my head right now.

Trang Nguyen: Lise, this is Trang. May I respond to both Jonathan and...

Lise Fuhr: Yes of course. Go ahead, Trang.

((Crosstalk))

Trang Nguyen: Thank you. So with regards to Paul's request for a call, we can certainly arrange that and will be - and I can certainly take the action item to reach out to Paul to get that scheduled. Paul's request about - or Paul's request for the raw data is something that he has raised to us in the past and we have communicated to him why, you know, our concerns around that. And why that may not be possible.

And instead of providing the raw data has suggested that we engaged a contractor, which is (unintelligible), to actually go into our system and databases and perform the work, you know, that Paul is looking to have done. So essentially what Marc just presented to you is the work that we had informed Paul that we would do because we could not provide what's (unintelligible) confidential data to an external party who's not - who could be conflicted. So that's in response to sort of Paul's questions about the raw data.

And then, Chuck, in response to your question around whether or not the - we are going to be able to collect data as part of the 11 metrics that has been defined, that's actually the reason why we are - we have been working on making code changes to the RZMS in order to be able to collect the data as per defined by the working group. So that's the work that we've been doing.

And that's the work that we anticipate will be completed by the end of this month. So by the end of this month our RZMS system will be able to collect the data per the 11 metrics that have been defined.



Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Trang. I have a question regarding the confidential data because for me I'm a little puzzled by data that goes in the IANA databases needs to be confidential regarding how long the response time is. Of course you can have personal data that you don't want to reveal but isn't it possible to anonymize it? Trang?

Trang Nguyen: Hi, Lise. Yes, so in response to your question I think we have internally looked at that. And had considered whether or not that was possible at all. And, you know, I don't know if David Conrad can speak to this but we - it was something that was difficult for us to be able to accommodate such a request and that's the reason why, you know, we've had a few conversations with Paul Kane about this and ended up making the suggestion that we've been on the contractor to do the work instead.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. But...

David Conrad: This is David Conrad. If the data is anonymized then it is not raw.

Lise Fuhr: I can see Andrew is actually mentioning the same. But for me it's more what do you want to use the data for more than if you want to see it for response time and SLE who's asking might not be such a important question. So I know you will not deliver raw data but it might be data that's useful for the purpose. But I don't think we should discuss any more about raw data here. I would leave that to the design team to have this conversation with you and get back to the group.

Are there any other questions or comments for this? And if not I will - I'll hand it over to Jonathan to discuss CCWG update and we have quite a lot of issues to discuss with you not only regarding that but also of course our bylaws. Jonathan, go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Lise. Happy to do so. So I think there's a couple of points to make here. We had a useful update and coordination call with the co-chairs of the CCWG yesterday. It's clear that the group has still got - still trying to work with some significant challenges and to get through some important points not specifically to do with the work of this group in fact.

But I think we that's well of it is that they are working to particularly tight deadlines and their work is, as you well know, most of you if not all of you, that their work has spilled over into this new year, new calendar year and has therefore -- they're working up against tight deadlines.

We covered with them and touched on the two key areas of dependency that they've been working on in relation to our work and it's really summarized on the document you see in front of you, the area's points that have been dealt with. But I guess most recently they were focused on ensuring that we -- that the work on the IANA budget was sorted out and there was a joint group of people that I mentioned in the email, working on that.

And then there was the combined solution that needs to be drafted to deal with the IRP process. So that's all essentially covered in the tracking sheet that's in front of you and has been circulated to the group.

What we haven't got is of course the final wording. And I think Grace's email that was sent out yesterday, did cover that process as to how that would work. Just check that, that was covered in the email that Grace sent out to this group.

So I guess really the main point for me is we've done -- we've worked pretty closely. We're waiting to hear the final outcomes. There will be limited scope for further rework. So the essence is really I guess from the chair's point of

view and managing this, our desired outcome would be that there were no further iterations to this.

Of course, if there is a substantial or material concern then we will need to deal with that. But for the most part the documents you see in front of you that summarizes that and the final details should be something you're able to follow and check with and make sure that we are satisfied with the dependencies on that.

And Grace Riley points out in the chat that there are revisions going on -- there is work -- sort of work in progress to get the final text so we will need to see these in front of the group. And I guess that ties into our logistics, depending on where those stand that may impact our need or not for a further meeting. But I won't, I mean, Grace summarizes the process that the CCWG is working to end the chat on the left-hand side of your screen.

So that summarizes where we are in terms of our work on the tendencies with the CCWG. Are there any questions or comments in relation to that? Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jonathan. It's unfortunate that Paul Kane is not able to join us but I understand why he cannot. I have -- regarding the budget I get the impression that he is concerned about something that is maybe a difference approach than what's in our proposal in terms of the PTI budget. I don't know if it would be helpful if we can arrange a call with him and you and Lise, myself, anybody else that wants to be involved to make sure that were on the same page.

I tried to ask some questions via email to make sure I'm understanding correctly how to address his concern. But that doesn't seem to be working real well at least it hasn't so far. So I guess my suggestion is if maybe it would be

helpful if we can arrange a call between the co-chairs and Paul and myself and anybody else who's interested in to see where he's at.

Because I think we proposed a little different approach for ensuring continuous funding of the PTI then what Paul wanted to see. And we talked about the kind of thing he was talking about in the design team a long time ago but it still seems to be an issue. So to be able to put this to bed more quickly my suggestion would be some sort of a call unless, in the next day or so we're able to get clarity from Paul in terms of what his concern is. I hope that make sense.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes it does. Lise, I know you've had some contact with Paul recently. Are you clear on this or do you think, I mean, I'm very happy to do what Chuck suggests if necessary. It's unfortunate that Paul couldn't be on the call because it would save some moving around. But nevertheless if that's what's necessary I'm happy to work with you and Chuck on this.

Lise Fuhr: Yes, I think it would be good -- sorry to interrupt. But I think it would be good to have a call with Paul because he -- I have the impression that he is a little concerned about the (unintelligible) of the IANA budget and how to ensure that. And it might be a matter of how to percept the process and how to put into the CCWG proposal. So I think we might have this call and then try to discuss it.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, let's do that then. Grace, I suggest that we take an action exactly as you've got there. That's right. Perfect. So we will set up a call as soon as possible really, tomorrow, Monday, Tuesday using a Doodle or whatever relevant tools are necessary and trained it together quickly and deal with this.

Okay thanks. Any other comments or questions in and around the work of the CCWG as it relates to the dependencies that we have on that work?

There is one other point in relation to the CCWG that's worth raising. It's very much a work in progress at this stage, and early. But there has been a concern raised really through the Board Finance Committee who has become concerned that the extent to which the costs of the transition are departing from those -- from the budgeted costs.

There are a number of contributions to that overrun. But a significant factor in all of that is the legal fees incurred through the work of the CCWG most recently entered the work of the external lawyers that ICANN has instructed, and to some extent the work that we have instructed, although that's much less material in recent times.

So there's a concern been raised. There is a plan to get together with the -- some or all of the ICANN board members, certainly the Board Finance Committee and the Board Chair, together with the chairs of both the CCWG and the CWG, that's Lise and myself. And also in fact, the chairs of the chartering organizations, the SOs and ACs that have been responsible for chartering these groups, to talk about really two things at a high level.

One, how to better manage costs and ensure that at minimum we are better able to predict the costs and ideally better able to control the costs collectively. And secondly, probably to think about -- start the conversation at least about how those costs might be met. So that conversation is that a meeting scheduled for Tuesday next week, 2200 UTC. So I think the group needs to be aware of this in case you hear rumor or other information about it. Lise and I have been asked to join that meeting. We will.

It throws up a number of issues including - I guess the reason I end up we wanted to raise that now is because the next item on our agenda is talking about the bylaws, which we will be commissioning potentially or almost certainly external legal work. And so that dynamic of cost and budget needs to be -- we need at least to be mindful of that as we think about any work we do.

So I thought I'd mention it back in the context of the joint work with the CCWG. And I guess at that stage we can probably, if there are any other questions or comments there?

Alissa Cooper: Hey, Jonathan, this is Alissa Cooper. I'm sorry I'm not in Adobe Connect. I had a different point to raise just before you wrap on this item.

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead, Alissa.

Alissa Cooper: Just wanted to give you all a heads up that in light of the statement from the CCWG co-chairs that ICG has had some discussion about our own wrap up process and our intention, as you know, has been to seek confirmation from the CWG to confirm whether the CCWG meets your requirements once their proposal has been concluded. And so our expectation is that we will do that when the CCWG proposal goes out to the chartering organizations.

So just wanted to like that for you because, you know, I presume by that time the CWG will have, you know, concluded itself that its requirements have been met. But obviously an expedient reply from you back to the ICG when you receive that question from us would be in everyone's interest. So just wanted to give you a heads up that our plan is to get -- is to ask you for confirmation when the proposal goes back to the chartering organizations.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Alissa. That's very helpful to have that knowledge or reminder of that point. I wonder if -- it's probably useful to remind the group -- I know it was covered in the blog but of that timing because if the time -- the time that the CCWG report goes to the chartering organizations is -- I think it's anticipated to be a couple of weeks before the Marrakesh meeting from memory, somewhere like mid-February, around a couple weeks from now. Is that correct? Do we just confirmed that -- we got that expectation right for the timing?

Alissa Cooper: Yes, so that would be the idea is that, you know, basically we want to ask you that question once their proposal is, you know, finalized and isn't expected to change anymore. And so that's the same point when it goes off to the chartering organizations. So yes, it should be sometime this month.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, okay good.

Alissa Cooper: If all goes to plan obviously.

Jonathan Robinson: Understood. All right, that's helpful. And then there's a question in the chat from Donna as to what the process we undertake with Sidley in regard to managing costs and what the kind of conversations have taken place.

So this is interesting because really we've had two - the way in which this works within the CWG and the CCWG is slightly different, but as you know we in this group have run a client committee through which all instructions to the law firms have gone. And we've used that specifically in mind -- we started that out with cost control in mind as well as effective management of the legal resources.

We've talked with Sidley about costs in different times, in different ways in the past. And one of the things we have started to do, although there was some resistance from them for logical reasons, was to seek quotes on the work before commissioning it so we knew, we had an indication of the cost.

So it's my -- what we haven't always had is a good circle of the relationship between what you would normally have in a sort of more conventional setting I suppose where you seek a quote, you get some response on the work, in a timely fashion see the bill, you're able to correlate that bill with the work. That cycle - the bill - because the bill is going to ICANN, they're not necessarily detailed and we are not necessarily seeing them in a timely way, there has been that issue.

That said, over the last while, we have not had any significant work running with Sidley whereas there is significant work running with Jones Day and Sidley via the CCWG. Jones Day via the ICANN staff as external advisers to ICANN, and Jones Day as external advisers to the CCWG - sorry, Sidley and - getting the name of the other firm, there were two firms engaged with the CCWG. We don't have that second firm.

Now I must say I've rarely seen the lawyers - Don asks if we've been surprised by the bills. A likely say, I mean, there's two issues here. One, the reporting hasn't been that regular or that easy to track. But to the extent that we have seen them, whether and if we have seen the bills I'm never not surprised by the size of them I suppose. But realistically we haven't had a lot going on in that respect for the last couple of months.

Alan, go ahead.



Alan Greenberg: Yeah thank you. I just wanted to note that the concern of the board and the Board Finance Committee certainly is real. But of the very brief numbers that were given in the invitation less than half of the total costs are for external legal costs. So clearly they are concerned about the external legal costs but it's not limited to that. And it's interesting because as a volunteer leader in ICANN, I have on a fairly regular basis, tried to get a handle on what certain things cost. And we've never really had any answer back on that.

And now that appears to be part of the -- a major part of the focus. So I think it's going to be an interesting consultation. And, you know, it's not always clear that volunteer managers can manage the overall costs. But in the past we've had no indication whatsoever of what those costs were and that makes it clearly a lot more difficult. So it's going to be interesting. But, just to point out external legal costs are certainly a major component of it but at this point the estimates are under half so this is a wider discussion than just controlling external legal costs. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: That's right, Alan. Thank you for that, that's a good point. I mean, essentially there are - the fundamental concern of the Board Finance Committee is that the project - a project to undertake -- manage the work on the IANA transition is not going according to budget. The costs are in excess of budget. A major contributor to that is the -- are the external legal fees. But they are not, A, the only - as you rightly point out, they are a fraction of the total.

And there are other items that are also tracking well off budget. And so there's a bigger picture. But, you know, to the extent that we have commissioned external legal work this group is part of that conversation.

That's right, Donna, to your point in the chat, translation services are proportionally, perhaps even - whilst they are not as large in quantum as the legal fees they are quite significantly over run, maybe as much as 100% over budget. But those figures will become clear as we talk with the Board Finance Committee and see what notice can be put in place to better manage those.

The most important thing is to give this group, A, an insight into the fact that Lise and I have been drawn into that conversation in our capacity as co-chairs of this group; and, B, to be mindful of cost as one factor when thinking about commissioning any further work.

So let's use that as a segue into the next item which is the Item 5 of this call which deals with the bylaws relating to the CWG Stewardship. Now pertinent to what we were discussing previously, Sidley had previously spoken with the Client Committee and felt that given their background in working with us and in devising the whole proposal and where we come, their proposal was that they were best equipped to make the first draft of the bylaws pertaining to the work of this group, the ICANN bylaws pertaining to the work of this group.

We in this group agreed and instructed Sidley, through that Client Committee, to make a first draft of those bylaws which they duly did. In doing so, there were two things that came up, two key points really. One, that their draft contained a number of questions in it. And two, that this group felt that was unduly lengthy.

The bylaws needed to be brought down and weren't really -- consistent with what Sidley had asked us to give a feedback on would we feel that it was more appropriate that some portions of that work were outside of the bylaws and generally that was our feedback, we would like to see a shorter version.

And their response to that was fine, we can do that but that doesn't mean we still don't need you to help us with the questions and points we posed in our first draft.

So right now this group has got -- and then we've done some good work particularly led by the relevant design team leads in populating a table, which you see in front of you now, that deals with those questions in which we've had some discussion on the list of the last 24 hours. And so that's piece of work.

A question has been posed as to whether or not we considered using ICANN legal to draft the bylaws since they are fundamentally familiar with the operations and organization of ICANN. So there's really two key questions I think for this group to consider now is one, how do we finish this work that we've got in front of us now? And two, do we continue down the path of using Sidley to make the first draft of the bylaws or do we consider using ICANN legal to make a first draft to then be reviewed by Sidley?

Lise and I talked about this and I think on that second point our view is that we should probably have a further conversation between the Client Committee and Sidley and make sure we understand the rationale and the likely program of work but possibly even trying get some understanding of the costs.

I'm pretty sure, if my memory serves me correctly, and I'd love to get confirmation of this, that we sought a quote originally on the drafting of these bylaws in any event. So I am almost certain that that's the case. And if anyone can remind me that would be helpful.

In any event, Greg is confirmed that we did so we are working to a quote. And I think given the amount of time that's passed, I mean, essentially it seems to

me that it makes sense given the conversation that's going on on costs, I think it makes sense and I'd like the group's permission for the Client Committee to go back and have a half-hour update call or so with Sidley just to discuss where we are on these bylaws and, you know, the likely process going forward.

In the meantime -- so does anyone have any concerns or objections with that? If you do please let it be known, otherwise we will take it that we will get back Client Committee, which is Lise, myself, Greg Shatan, and Martin to go back and talk. Thanks for your check mark in the chat, Cheryl.

So any thoughts on how we go through this document? I know Martin has provided the most recent revision, Martin Boyle that is. And in fact in Martin Boyle's case we do have that most recent revision up here. I mean, there are 17 pages of this document, not all of which are either controversial or need further input. So it probably makes sense for people to raise specific points rather than for us to go through it in fine detail.

Martin, let me turn to you. Martin Boyle.

Martin Boyle: Thanks, Jonathan. This is Martin Boyle here. Going back to your earlier point about the bylaw drafting, I'm assuming that the CCWG, when it gets to the end of its process, will also have the same issue on bylaw or drafting. And so I just really want to get on the table the thought as to whether there is or not any advantage in there being a common pen being held for all the drafting points.

As for the reason you asked me to take the floor of give you a chance to respond to what I've just said and then if you want me to lead off on the comments I've made on the document in front of us then I'll be happy to do so. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Apologies, Martin. Common pen being - was that in reference to dealing with this document or drafting of the bylaws?

Martin Boyle: It's the drafting of the bylaws in totality. So if you're going back to talk to Sidley with the Client Committee, I wonder whether there would be value in having a discussion with the CCWG co-chairs to find out what they think might be the preferred method for the rather extensive bylaw drafting that's going to come from the CCWG recommendation? Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: That's a good question, Martin. And from memory, I think we discussed this - we certainly touched on it yesterday. And there are - in the discussion between the co-chairs of the two different groups there are slightly different processes going on here. And there is an agreement, as I recall, between the CCWG co-chairs, ICANN legal and the external legal advisors as to how the drafting of the ICANN bylaws might go.

In our case, we're specifically confined to bylaws pertaining to the creation and formation of the PTI and those key points that, you know, the specific points that emerged from the work of this group. And Sidley's argument being that they were very familiar with the genesis and development of the work of this group and therefore were best positioned to make a first draft with the detailed understanding of both the sort of letter and spirit of what was intended, if you like.

So I think they are slightly different. I think - I hope that gives you an answer. And I understand that there may seem to be a logic to dealing with the ICANN bylaws in total. And we should continue to discuss that with CCWG chairs. But I think the processes envisaged are slightly different.

Martin Boyle: Were you waiting for me to respond, Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes or to go ahead. I think you are going to then either be satisfied with that response or comment and plus go on to any other points you wanted to raise, Martin.

Martin Boyle: Okay, thanks very much. Yeah, all I wanted to do was flag that or ensure that some discussion was going on between the two groups on commonality where there was any commonality. Yes I agree with you that the draft bylaws that we've got in front of us or the potential draft the bylaws that we've got in front of us are ones that have come from our work and therefore are properly quite clearly distinct from the work that the CCWG is doing.

However, what I think worries me just a little bit is that there might be certain things in the design of in particular where things are going to be escalated or might need to be escalated that if they are covered in a slightly different way in different parts of the document we might lose a certain degree of coherence in the final bylaws. But I'm generally happy with the way you're proposing.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Martin. I'll just give a very brief response to that and then let you move on. That's a good point. And then another argument that Sidley have provided in general is that they are obviously as external advisers to both CCWG and CWG I therefore in a position to provide work that is coherent across the two groups. So hopefully with expertise and involvement they are able to do that. But it's a good point.

Martin Boyle: Okay then thank you very much. If I sort of lead off with my chin on the document that's in front and the comments I submitted yesterday. I think, as I raised the last time we had a quick glance at this document, I can't remember

when, was it last week, that my main concern is that we don't fall into a mode of working that if it's there as a recommendation it goes into bylaws.

And I think we should be quite strict about whether something does actually need to be enshrined in bylaws. And if it is enshrined in bylaws to recognize that what we are actually doing is probably very effectively locking it down and preventing it from change. So anything that where there is likely to be a degree of evolution coming from experience then locking it down in bylaws is not a particularly good way of approaching.

But I'd also say that we've got a similar problem and that seems to be coming up a little bit on trying to pass, and this came out quite clearly in my mind for the CSC, of trying to tie rules of procedure down in a contract between ICANN and PTI. Again, I think that an awful lot of the discussion that we had in the CSC design team was all about the role of the design -- the role of the CSC itself and a lot of that then came down to working effectively with PTI to ensure that any issues difficulty were addressed.

And so yesterday evening when I looked through this document and decided that I ought to at least get down that concerns I vaguely referred to last call, it seemed to me that what I wanted to do was come in with something that was very much at a principle level, in other words obliging PTI and ICANN to work to resolve issues with the CSC but not to tell them how and not to essentially constrain the way back the CSC can work most effectively with the community, with the PTI, with IANA, with ICANN or with the community itself.

So I think that's all I really want to say. Sorry that was a bit long but it seemed to me that we ought to be trying to get things as far down the chain as we

possibly can rather than constraining us and future generations to particular mode of working. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Martin. And in the broadest sense I think that's consistent with the sort of overarching instruction that we had given and will reiterate to Sidley that the next iteration of these bylaws needs to be to the extent that they can manage it, smaller in size and use references to external documents wherever possible for both the reasons of ease of use and sort of elegance of the bylaws but also that the functional reasons you described.

And I notice that Chuck put up a checkmark when you were talking about - talking in support of that kind of approach in general and, Cheryl I see records her support for that as well.

Would anyone else like to raise any detail points about this document? As you can probably detect I'm a little reluctant to go through it line by line. There are some open questions and discussions, although I think we're relatively well resolved in most cases. I'm very willing for anyone to flag a particular point that they feel needs discussion, comment or further work on it.

And personally I'm prepared to commit to go through it once myself and provide a final review. But has anyone else got any concerns that they've had on reading it or in response to Martin's further comments? It's a good question. Chuck asks what is happening with the to be determined items.

Go ahead, Grace.

Grace Abuhamad: So I had flagged certain items as to be determined where I thought that in some cases these were things that had to be worked out with ICANN as part of implementation because we didn't have the information necessarily as a



CWG at this stage. So I don't have any progress to point to that it's just that's why I flagged them as TBD.

Jonathan Robinson: That's a good point, I certainly gave some thought to the first one, the ordinary course - ordinary course asset dispositions. I mean, my initial feeling, for example, on that would be no, in the ordinary course of business that shouldn't be something that's going on and so that - but what one wouldn't want to do is so constrain PTI that there was some problem with it - with the way in which the post transition IANA could work. So it's really a matter of talking through that and understanding.

So to that extent on that example I agree, it's probably more of an implementation point as one discusses how things might operate on a day to day basis or year to year basis and how to cover that sort of detail.

Well my suggestion or proposal to you is that we take one final pass on it and see what we can bring out of this. And I'm prepared to do that as a co-chair, if you like. The DT leads have made their effort; others have come in and commented. Staff have assisted where they can. And it probably needs a final review. I'm prepared to do that.

And so it seems to me that the next steps are review and update the document, have a conversation with Sidley as to how this might proceed, mindful of both their original quote on costs and the overarching sensitivity that's come up on costs, and then finalize a way forward based on that and come back to the group reporting that.

Bearing in mind, our current plan is, as I said at the outset, to reduce, simplify - let me say it in these three ways. Our current plan is, one, to provide best possible answers to these questions to equip whoever is drafting the bylaws

with those answers. Two, to instruct Sidley to then take those answers and produce a slimmed down version of what they did previously. But, three, prior to doing that to have a conversation with Sidley and understand the likely scope, timing and cost of that work consistent with the cost sensitivity that's going on.

And then I guess, finally, to communicate that to the implementation team which must, by definition, include ICANN - communication with ICANN legal.

All right so unless there are objections or concerns that feels like a way forward and the way to take this through the next steps. Our current plan then - and I think I'll move us on then to the final item which is an AOB. And our current plan under AOB really is just to flag that the - the next planned meeting for this group is exactly two weeks from now, that's 1600 UTC on the 18th of February.

To the extent that there's a necessity to have a meeting sooner than that or to move it we'll be in touch very shortly. But that's the currently-planned next meeting of the group. Are there any other questions or comments or points for the group at this stage?

So thanks, Grace, for the very good notes. I think I'd like to capture an action that there is a - there needs to be a Client Committee meeting between the Client Committee and Sidley to discuss next steps and process and costs for the evolution of the bylaws. Yeah, perfect. Thank you very much.

Any other comments, questions, last call before we bring the meeting to a close. Thanks, everyone. That's useful. We'll try and keep things going and

not take any more of your time than for the moment. Thanks for a useful meeting and we'll be in touch on email.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Jonathan. Thanks, Lise. Bye.

END