

ICANN

**Moderator: Brenda Brewer
July 14, 2016
10:00 am CT**

Coordinator: The recordings are started.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you. Everyone, this is the 82nd meeting of the CWG IANA. It is 1504 UTC on July 14, 2016. And I will turn it over to the chairs now for the call to begin.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Grace. It's Jonathan Robinson speaking. Lise conveys her apologies, she's tied up in a series of meetings this week and so was unable to attend regardless of the time today.

Not totally sure I appreciate being reminded that it's the 82 meeting, that seems like a great deal of time to have been spent in all of this. And I guess I might have some of the highest number of minutes on these calls in terms of you hearing my voice so I apologize that you've had to hear a lot from me. I will try and keep things brief and succinct and functional and we'll work through what we have for today.

Just a couple of opening remarks really under the status update. We obviously haven't met for a while, although there has been a relatively high frequency

sometimes twice a week, normally once a week, of our Implementation Oversight Task Force group. And staff have been extremely busy working on the implementation aspects of this together with others such as the ICANN Legal team and of course Sidley working together with us and them.

We'll get a proper implementation update in a moment from staff. But what's become apparent really over the last week or two is that we – the intensity of the work that's being done to conclude the implementation is going to ramp up or at least it will need a ramp up of our input.

What that translates to in practice is that Lise and I feel at the group should meet more often, more frequently in order to be able to communicate this – communicate effectively with staff as they complete their work.

And therefore that we don't need the IOTF, the Oversight Task Force, because the purpose of that was to meet frequently and give feedback to staff and assist staff in their implementation work in the absence of CWG meetings. So the concern is if we – but the CWG meeting regularly and the IOTF meeting regularly that doesn't make sense.

So our plan, subject to no objections or concerns from you, is that we essentially reconverge the IOTF and the CWG and make sure that we have a single meeting, which will be CWG meetings on a relatively frequent basis going forward until we can more or less conclude the key oversight or interaction work with staff on the implementation.

I guess what the other point that I need to be remind – us including myself of our remit and purpose, as you know we of course designed the proposal, and now we – that proposal having been handed over to the ICG dealt with by the NTIA is ultimately being implemented by staff, which is their job.

And our role is to ensure that their implementation is consistent with our proposal and to utilize Sidley's help as and where necessary to provide us with any input on that consistency should there be any issues there, and/or in terms of general legal advice as the implementation goes on.

We agreed at our previous meeting that we were happy with Sidley working directly with ICANN on this and reporting back to us as necessary. It appears that many of the smaller issues can be readily resolved through direct interaction with the implementation staff and/or ICANN's legal staff and there's no point in inserting the CWG in between.

Where it is important is if there's some form of discrepancy between the view of Sidley and ICANN legal and/or implementation staff and in some way the CWG's view is required.

So that in a nutshell is where we are right now. And so that's the status update as to where we stand. I think it's simplest if I simply hand over for a brief update on the implementation to Trang and her team working on this. And then we'll ask Sidley to help us highlight some of the key issues that are currently being dealt with and really for the purposes of this call I think those are likely to be in and around the PTI bylaws. So to set your expectations I think that's where we will focus the bulk of our energies in this case. But let me pass over to Trang to deal with Item 2 under the agenda. Go ahead, Trang.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you, Jonathan. All right it looks like there's a full agenda today so in the interest of time I will go through the update fairly quickly and then please stop me if you have any questions or would like to make any comments. Next slide, please.

So we've made a lot of progress actually in the last few weeks particularly in Track 1 of activities which contains the root zone management project, primarily the parallel testing and the root zone maintainer agreement.

We had completed the successfully the 90-day parallel testing period last week. So that is now completed. We are working on – with VeriSign on a final parallel testing report that we'll be submitting to NTIA. And the announcement for the completion of that 90-day testing period will go up today. So that's an important and successful milestone in our transition implementation planning work.

The other item that we've also finalized in Track 1 is the root zone maintainer agreement with VeriSign. That has been finalized and has been posted on I believe it was June 30, the last day of the Helsinki meeting. It is currently published for 30-day public review period as per the ICG proposal. It is not a public comment period as it is a bilateral vendor agreement with Verisign, but it has been posted for public review.

So that essentially concludes the majority of the work that we have for Track 1, the root zone management track. There is some, as I mentioned, final wrap up things that we need to do, for example, the final report on the parallel testing for NTIA and then also ICANN Board approvals and execution of the RZM but the bulk of the work is completed.

With regards to the names SLEs, we are working on scheduling a meeting with the DTA for next week to go over with them our proposed performance targets for the new measurements that they have defined. This is as per the agreement that we had with the DTA in Marrakech.

We will be circulating to the DTA as well as to the CWG the report that has our proposed performance targets prior to the call. So we're hoping to get that out either tomorrow or early next week.

So that is on track. And as a reminder, the results of that work, which will be the performance targets for PTI for the naming function, will be included in the ICANN PTI contract.

Next slide please. On PTI, I know that there's a significant portion of the agenda today that's dedicated to talk about PTI so I'll just give a really quick update on the various materials that have been posted. The PTI articles of incorporation was posted for public comment – was the first document to be posted for public comment. And that is the one item that is required for us to incorporate PTI.

Which we would like to have completed prior to our submission of the implementation report to NTIA on August 12. And that's the reason we needed to get that out for public comment early so that we can have that process be completed, you know, in time for us to initiate the incorporation process. As of today we have not received any public comments on the PTI articles of incorporation.

The next set of materials that were posted for public comments were the PTI governance documents, which included the conflict of interest policy, the Board code of conduct and the PTI expected standards of behavior. All of those are drafted based on ICANN's documents and they were posted with the intent of finalizing the public comment process in time for us to have those documents be considered final by the time we submit our implementation report to NTIA on August 12 as well.

The one item that will not be completed by the time we have to submit our implementation report to NTIA would be the PTI bylaws. That was posted for public comment I believe either on the 11 or on the 12, I don't have the date right now. But around one of those two days.

And so they – that document will not be finalized by the time we submit the report to NTIA but it should be finalized shortly thereafter. As of this morning we have not received any public comments on the bylaw or any of the PTI governance documents.

Next slide please. On this the IANA IPR I think Greg is going to give us an update on the work around that so I'll skip over that item for now. On the RZERC, the public comment for the RZERC charter has closed. We – there were seven entities and individuals that submitted comments on the charter along several different areas.

There is an agenda item later on on this call for the RZERC charter so I will go over a couple of areas where there were comments that we wanted to highlight for this group. The next step for the RZERC would be to initiate the process for appointing organizations to appoint representatives to the committee. And we're hopeful to be able to have that committee formed by the time we submit our implementation report to NTIA on August 12 as well.

On the CSC, the status of that is that we're in a period where the appointing organizations are following their own internal processes to appoint members and liaisons to the CSC. The deadline for submissions of candidates is next Friday. We have received some submissions and we understand that many of the SOs and ACs are currently in the midst of their process – appointment processes so we look forward to receiving those appointments by next Friday.

The escalation processes essentially includes updating a lot of our process documentation, that work has started and is almost final. And we don't expect any issues with completing that work by the time we submit our implementation report to NTIA. Next slide please.

This slide is the projects relating to the CCWG track of work. So in the interest of time I won't spend too much time going over these items unless there is any specific questions or requests for update. So that is it for me, Jonathan, and I will turn it back to you for any questions.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Trang, that was very efficient, much appreciated. Any questions or comments for Trang? Or in fact I didn't invite comments on the sort of status update in the beginning so on either Items 1 or 2 any questions, comments or issues?

Okay well seeing none then I'll nudge us on. And thanks, Trang. If anyone does have particular points, feel free to raise them either during the call or on list. Really I think the substance of where we wanted to direct today's call was to look at the issues in and around the formation and implementation of the PTI.

My opinion is that the articles of incorporation are relatively straightforward. It's a two-page document and there's not a lot of potential controversy there although it'd be good to hear from Sidley if they do satisfactorily incorporate whatever input Sidley has put in.

There's also the key governance documents. In the first instance the conflict of interest policy, the Board code of conduct and the expected standards of behavior. My understanding is these three documents all essentially derive

from and have significant commonality with those of the ICANN Board and therefore should be both familiar to us and relatively uncontroversial.

So my suggestion to you is that we concentrate our efforts now on the PTI bylaws and any issues that Sharon and Sidley are able to flag for us that need discussion or input. We haven't yet got I think those are the points or concerns in a tabulated easy to manage format but I think that that shouldn't be problematic to be able to go through those and have a look at those.

So I think I'm going to hand over to you, Sharon, to deal with this next section. And really it's – I think from my perspective at least it's primarily around the articles, which as I said, I don't expect a lot of discussion on, but there may be points that people want to raise or questions or issues. And then to focus our attention in on the bylaws and any concerns or issues that arise with those.

And I think it's worth flagging that those bylaws as posted for public comment, do not necessarily reflect all of Sidley's views and advice and that the CWG may want to take account of and therefore we may need Sidley's help and input in providing public comment in on the bylaws. So I'd really encourage all of you to pay as much attention to this as possible both on list and in the meeting and we'll deal with it as we can.

So with that if you are so willing, Sharon, I'll hand over to you to make comments on any points that you may have on the articles and then in and onto the bylaws. And of course like I said, if anyone wants to raise other questions issues around some of the other formation documents by all means do, but it feels to me like articles and bylaws are where we want to focus our principle attention.

Sharon Flanagan: Thanks, Jonathan. In terms of the PTI articles, we did provide comments to ICANN legal on those. Those are not reflected in the version that was put out for public comment but I don't think they're terribly controversial. And one is just a point that relates to an overall governance point which I'll cover which is the threshold for amendments so the articles and also the bylaws.

So that's the status of the PTI articles. I understand that CWG is also looking at the purpose that is articulated in the PTI articles and may have a comment there.

In terms of the – and is there anyone want to make any comments about the articles before I move to the bylaws?

Jonathan Robinson: So I think the – I'll just make one comment there, Sharon. And I think I'd like to capture and action for this group then is to decide on whether or not to submit public comment on the articles and to prepare – and if so to prepare that submission. I mean, it sounds to me like for the record, we should do that because the danger is if we don't then notwithstanding the fact that these points may well be acceptable, we need to record them somehow and so it feels to me like unless I'm missing something we should submit those as part of the public comment.

Trang or anyone else, by all means, come in if you think there's a more effective and if it's a way to get those points recognized and sorted out, but if not then I suggest we go via the public comment route.

Trang Nguyen: Hi, Jonathan, this is Trang. No, I agree with you. I think the public comment is the proper way to express any concerns or issues that the CWG has with the drafted materials. With – specifically with regards to the PTI articles of incorporation, that topic was – and the purpose of PTI within those articles of

incorporation – that topic was raised within the IOTF and what we could do in terms of maybe getting the conversation stated within the CWG is pull the specific transcript for that portion, you know, where it was discussed and circulate to this group so that everyone is aware of what the issue is and also what the – some of the thoughts that were shared by members of the IOTF.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, thanks Trang. I think that's a helpful practical suggestion and also consistent with sort of converging the work of the group. So let's please do that and then I think it would be useful to capture the other points that Sharon's made as well so we know that the scope of what we potentially putting the input on and then we'll have to prepare that public comment.

Trang Nguyen: Sure.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks, Trang. Back to you, Sharon.

Sharon Flanagan: Thanks. So moving on to the bylaws, so we've had – Sidley and ICANN legal we've had a number of productive calls about the bylaws. We've exchanged multiple drafts. We've circulated those versions to you as they've been turned.

And I thought it would be helpful just to highlight, you know, where we stand on the various points. As I think I circulated as well to you, there is a chart that ICANN legal prepared for internal purposes, for its board, I believe, of the parts of the PTI bylaws, the aspects of the PTI bylaws that are not – cannot directly be tied to the CWG proposal. And so I think those are just things they wanted to highlight.

But in some cases what is in the PTI bylaws that were posted for comment reflect precisely what CWG requested and it's more than just I think ICANN legal wanted to flag that there isn't a direct corollary in the proposal, which

we think is, you know, completely appropriate, the proposal is not as detailed as the bylaws of course, can't be otherwise we would have attached the bylaws to the proposal so by definition the process of drafting means you're putting in more detail than is in the high level proposal.

So in certain cases, the – as I said, in certain cases the CWG approach is the approach that is reflected in the bylaws that are – that were put up for comment. And I don't think in some those cases I won't even flag – I won't even flag that that is part of the governance chart that ICANN prepared because what's in the bylaws is what CWG requested.

But there are certain places where there's a divergence and I will point out those places and see if there are – maybe there's a different view that CWG would have and then that can be reflected in the public comment.

So starting at the top, the – and if you want to put the bylaws up you could but it don't think you need them up there because these are all topics we've talked about before and I think can be talked about at a level of generality that we don't actually need to see the language.

So the first point though is the purpose. And this is similar to the point that we were raising on the articles that we understand that CWG may have some suggested changes to the purpose that is articulated in the PTI bylaws and the purpose in the articles and the bylaws will largely look the same so that's just the same open point.

The second topic is the provisions of Annex C of the CWG proposal. As you may recall there were some provisions in Annex C, it had been requested that those provisions be carried over into the bylaws and also into the contract between ICANN and PTI.

ICANN had some concerns about that language in some cases they didn't view it as appropriate for bylaws or they thought it was more appropriate for the contract or they thought it didn't actually reflect the current way that decisions are made. And so what was included in the PTI bylaws that was posted for comment are two general provisions that don't directly tie to Annex C but have some of the principles from Annex C.

And but we don't have all of the, you know, the bullets that was in that chart that we had been circulating on Annex C. So I think on that one it's really, you know, a question for CWG as to how you wish to advance it. It's not a legal point, it's really more some of the more kind of operational and the question is whether what's there in the PTI bylaws, the two provisions that were included by ICANN is sufficient or whether there's still a feeling that more needs to be done in the bylaws themselves.

Okay. So moving – I guess I'll just keep moving on through the list here. The next item does require CWG input on and that is for director qualifications. You may recall that we had asked a question about with director qualifications for the PTI Board we had noted that in the ICANN bylaws there is a requirement for diversity and should a similar provision be included in the PTI bylaws.

And the response back from CWG was, yes, that should be there. We should have some notion of geographic and other diversity. And then there was a further thought from CWG that the diversity should be evaluated among the Nominating Committee directors as a group and then among the ICANN directors as a group. Just reminder for everyone, we'll have five directors; one director is the president of PTI; two directors appointed by ICANN; and two directors nominated by the Nominating Committee.

The comment that was raised by ICANN legal was that having this diversity apply to the two PTI – the Nominating Committee directors and then separately to the two ICANN directors might be quite difficult. It's hard to get diversity among two people. And that instead what should be looked at is the Nominating Committee should look at the overall, the group of five, and say are we satisfied that the two people we're putting forward will help achieve diversity. And I understand that that is more consistent with the way it works at the ICANN level.

We thought that made sense. And so the current draft of the bylaws that's up for comment has the concept of diversity but it's looking at the overall group. So that – we thought that was okay. And if anyone has any concerns can raise them but we thought that seemed like a good solution.

Jonathan Robinson: So Sharon, it's Jonathan speaking. I think just in terms of a matter of process I think it's very useful you walking us through at a high level these issues. I imagine it's hard for people to track all these issues and think about the substance and detail in them. It feels to me like what we're going to need here is, you know, we can get some initial feedback and to the extent that people are on top of it and are able to provide initial feedback on any of these issues that would be useful.

But it feels to me like we are going to have to tabulate these, you know, subject issue, CWG response, and do some work along those lines, which I think was something you had potentially volunteered to do. And I think for us practically the decision is do we get ICANN staff help to do this or does Sidley help us to do it. But one way or another it still feels useful for me that you walk us through exactly as you're doing but I just wanted to flag to you and others how I think we might deal with this going forward.

It's, you know, some of these things might be relatively easy to resolve like the one you've just mentioned may be a relative no-brainer to just look at the current wording and CWG simply accepts that. Others like the one prior, may require more discussion and working out. Thanks, Sharon. And thanks for your checkmark in the chat, Cheryl.

Sharon Flanagan: Yes, we – Jonathan, that is absolutely fine. We have our own just chart we're working off of and we can just share that with you with just a little cleanup so that's fine, we can give you something to be looking at.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, if that's not a significant additional piece of work for you then I think that would be very helpful and I think we should just probably capture that as an action and ask for you to do that and share that with us please.

Sharon Flanagan: Yes, we can do that. Okay. Then I will keep moving through the topics. The next topic is who is the chairperson of the PTI board. And the CWG – we had raised we wanted to make sure that it was, you know, the president shouldn't be the chair just because it's, you know, good governance for the president and the chair to be separate.

And then CWG came back and said that they thought also that the chair should be someone from among the Nominating Committee members, the Nominating Committee directors. That is what the PTI draft bylaws say right now but that was flagged as a question and it was included in the cover memo that was put forward with the posting of the bylaws.

And it's just a question of whether that is – that requirement would be too limiting and you might not get the best person to chair if you put that requirement on. So that's something to consider.

Another topic to consider was the terms for each – for each director. So the proposal from CWG was that it would be a two-year term. We had noted that the maximum under California law is four years so you have flexibility. The default is one year, the maximum is four years so flexibility between, you know, those two ranges. And you all had come back with requesting two years.

ICANN had said, you know, that's going to be requiring a constant on-boarding process because these are staggered terms so every year there's somebody coming in that's new or a couple people coming in that's new. And is two years really the right length and would you want to consider something slightly longer, maybe three years. So that's a thought – something for you to think about.

Similar related concept is the term limits, the CWG had proposed that you can't serve more than two consecutive terms. And if those terms are two years obviously that's four years. And the question is whether that's going to – causing people to cycle off too quickly and create a lot of processes having to reorient new directors and whether the term limits is something that you want to have.

The next item is an issue that flows through...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Sharon, can I just come in on that previous point because I think that is an interesting one and it maybe – please, others, if you do have a comment you'd like to raise now while Sharon runs through just raise your hand and Sharon and myself will both look out for that.

Actually on this topic, the CWG – well first of all I should record that I have a perspective or perceived conflict of interest being one of the two initial directors on that. But notwithstanding that, as chair of this group we did discuss this in some detail and came to the outcome we did.

But my personal feeling is that that's new input. We hadn't had ICANN's perspective on this so at the very least we should consider ICANN's perspective and see if that causes us to rethink our previous position. So that's a nice example of something where we had given it due thought, we had come up with a position but nevertheless it may be useful to reconsider based on that input. So, yes, thanks for flagging that. Back to you, Sharon.

Sharon Flanagan: Sure. Okay the next topic is an approval threshold that flows through a number of places. I will talk about it here and then I'll reference it when it comes up in a couple other places.

So, you know, the normal standard for what board approval is required to take action is just the majority of the board. We have flagged whether you might want to have a super majority in certain circumstances because we have this situation where we have two ICANN, two Nominating Committee and a president, if you just had three the president and either of those two groups, the president and the two ICANN or the president and the two NomComm, could become the three and then that doesn't really seem to be in the spirit of what the governance should be.

So we had asked the question of whether it should be a higher threshold, four of five, and that would ensure that you couldn't have just three going off sort of one constituency kind of running off and taking action.

Though what came back was from CWG was, yes, four of five, that makes sense. And it must include both of the Nominating Committee directors in every approval. The point that was raised by ICANN that we think it's a legitimate and fair point, is that by requiring both of the Nominating Committee directors you've given one person, one director, the power to block every vote of substance, you know, these are for the significant items.

And so wouldn't it be better to just simply require a 4/5, not say that you need both of the Nominating Committee directors, and by saying 4/5 just the logic of it is you need to have at least one Nominating Committee director approving and at least one ICANN director approving.

So we thought that made good sense and still achieved the spirit of what we were trying to accomplish and the intent but it's just something since you had given direct feedback on requiring both Nominating Committee directors we wanted to flag – we wanted to flag that for you.

This is a situation where what is posted for comment just has the 4/5. So if you're good with that that's fine. If you think you need both Nominating Committee directors, that would have to be made in a comment. Okay.

The next point is on expense reimbursement and compensation of directors. We talked about whether the PTI directors should get paid for their services and the answer was a clear no. but there was a thought that reimbursement of expenses would be appropriate, travel expenses to meetings and the like.

The comment that came from CWG was expense reimbursement was appropriate for the Nominating Committee directors but not for the ICANN appointed directors. And ICANN legal came back and said we don't really think it's appropriate to have, you know, treat the directors differently. We

think all the directors should be reimbursed for their reasonable travel expenses and that, you know, we should just treat everyone the same way.

In some ways it's all, you know, the money that would go to the reimbursement either ICANN is paying the appointed directors to travel to the meetings or indirectly ICANN is paying through funding of PTI. But the point was just should they all be treated equally and we thought that seemed appropriate to just – we're just talking reimbursement of expenses it seemed to me that that was appropriate.

I am just going to pause and go back because I see a comment from Alan on the chat about 4/5 implies 80% which is unanimity. If there's a vacancy. Or it could be interpreted as all seated minus one. And that's right. I think – and we sort of acknowledge that too, if you require 4/5 and there is a vacancy then you'd need all four, you'd need unanimity to do any of these major actions.

These are significant actions though so we thought, you know, if you need all four that's appropriate for these types of actions. And if it's significant enough you can, you know, obviously fill the vacancy more quickly. But we, you know, we thought that given the nature of these special approvals, these are not for ordinary course Board matters, these are for special items, that, you know, the 4 of 5 would be acceptable.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Sharon. It's Jonathan. I mean, I think that's an important argument to capture because it's clear that for these – your point is that for these special circumstances the vacancy should be filled before, you know, so such – it's not – it wouldn't necessarily be appropriate to set those as a percentage point. So that's interesting and we should bear that in mind when we – when and if we come to discuss this further.

On the previous one, on expenses, I must say that sounds like something got slightly lost in translation. I'm not quite sure how that happened. Because clearly one would expect, as you pointed out, reasonable expenses to be reimbursed one way or another. And I'm just not quite sure how – I don't recall how that happened. I don't think there was an intention to exclude the ICANN directors. I think it was really, from my recollection of the discussion, it was really the focal points were around the Nominating Committee directors and whether or not they were paid and whether or not they were reimbursed for expenses.

And as you said, we came down on a pretty clear position of no payment but reimburse for reasonable expenses. And it felt like we perhaps didn't consider the other directors explicitly in that way but I don't think there was ever an intention to exclude them from reasonable expense reimbursement. That's my recollection in any event. Back to you.

Sharon Flanagan: Thanks Jonathan. And that may be, you know, this did not come out of a discussion we had with you all, this just came out of the chart you gave us back so it may just have been something that was lost in translation. So and this is one of those situations where the draft bylaws contemplate equal treatment across all directors for reimbursement of expenses, no compensation. So if that's okay then there's nothing for CWG to comment on, that's just something...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Sharon. So that may well be a non-issue but we can work it through on the table and just say no comment or something like that with – at the time. Thank you.

Sharon Flanagan: Yes, okay. Okay this 4/5 topic, and Alan had a comment, “should we just say 80%?” and I think that’s fine too. Alan, I think that gets to the same place and is maybe clearer so if we want to do that we can do that.

This comes up – this 4/5 item comes up in another place, which is if you're forming committees of the Board that would require a 4/5 vote as well on the thought that committees can have a great deal of power and you wouldn't want a committee that could be created with a less, you know, less than true consensus and then that committee is running off and doing things that are not really approved by the full Board.

Okay so the next item worth noting – I think we go all the way to the budget and strategic plan. And that one I would ask if Chuck or anyone else has anything to weigh in on. The draft, as put forward, we didn't have any comments on it.

The only thing we had flagged is the topic I had flagged on an earlier call which is we just have a little timing issue which is that the way it's set up is 270 days prior to the fiscal year beginning the budget has to go to the PTI Board and then get approved, but then on that exact same timeline it has to go to the ICANN Board for approval. So I think we just need a little bit of a buffer between when the PTI Board approves it and then when it turns it over to ICANN.

And I see Sam noting in the chat that ICANN agrees that we need a small modification on timing. This is really a purely mechanical issue and we don't think it's anything significant but it does – it's otherwise internally inconsistent the way it's set up currently.

Chuck Gomes: So this is Chuck. And Xavier and I talked about this in Helsinki. And he and his team are working on a process to address this. Unfortunately, it wasn't possible to get it done before the document was posted for public comment. But the intent is to get it in there as soon as possible. I haven't seen it yet unless I've missed it, I've been offline quite a bit in the last week or so. And so my understanding is that some adjustments will be made. I don't think they're major. I think the assessment by staff and Sharon are correct, that this is all workable.

The way it is right now probably doesn't literally meet the CWG requirements but I don't think it's going to take – and neither did Xavier – think that it was going to take any major changes. So we'll see – oh and I'm glad to see Xavier's hands up and I'll turn it over to him.

Jonathan Robinson: Xavier, come in if you would like to. We don't hear you right now.

Sharon Flanagan: It sounds like some of us are having trouble with the audio and some of us aren't. I can't hear Xavier but it sounds like others can.

Chuck Gomes: I can't hear either. This is Chuck.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, I'm on a telephone and it maybe that those who are dialed in do not hear him and those on Adobe do.

Chuck Gomes: Same here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And here.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, majority do not seem to be able to hear Xavier so – and Olivier confirms he appears in Adobe Connect only in audio so if we have to allow him...

Sharon Flanagan: Okay, well I can continue. Hopefully we're not both talking at the same time.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes.

Sharon Flanagan: I only have one more item at this point and that is the threshold for amendments. This is also the 4/5 item so it's the question of is 4/5 acceptable or 80% acceptable without requiring the – both of the Nominating Committee directors, which could give undue power to any one individual. So we were okay with the 4/5 subject to CWG's review.

So those are the major items or actually those are I think really all the items in the bylaws at this point so you can see there's not a lot that's left open but there are a few things for your consideration, and then we can help draft a comment letter.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Sharon. That was, from my point of view at least, extremely helpful. And I think it'd be very useful to get that into a table. The CWG should then review that at the next meeting and try and really conclude our views on that at the next meeting in order to keep with the timeframe as I understand it and, Trang, correct me if you see it differently. But it feels like – I guess well we've got – I guess we've got to work within the public comment deadline and I need to check that.

But maybe someone could help me there how many CWG meetings we've got between now and close of public comment. But...

Trang Nguyen: Jonathan, this is Trang. The first item that will close public comment is the PTI articles of incorporation, that closes public comment at the end of the month. So between now and then I believe you will have at least three more CWG meetings and Grace or Brenda can correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe there are two next week and at least one the following week. Thank you Brenda. Brenda has projected in Adobe Connect room the calendar and scheduled CWG meeting.

So that is right. We will have three more CWG calls prior to the close of the public comment period for the PTI Articles of Incorporation. The PTI governance document I believe the public comment window for that closes in - on August 7. So if you can go to the month of August Brenda. I don't know if you have that.

Grace Abuhamad: The document is un-synched.

Trang Nguyen: Sorry about that. To the month of August then it looks like you will have four CWG calls between now and the closure of the public comment period for the conflict of interest policy board code of conduct and PTI expected standard of behavior.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: ...and Brenda for that. So I think what we can do is we will get the table in relatively short order from Sidley. We will - we can start to look at populating that via discussion on the list. And we can deal with it further after next

meeting and then ultimately integrate that into a public comment either by instructing Sidley to draft that for us or doing it ourselves. We can work that out at the next stage of the process.

And then as far as the articles, which are the more urgent one, I just need to understand where we will get that, where we will capture that input. (John), do you have a - I mean I'm just wondering whether we just add that as part of the same table. That may be the simplest way of doing it.

So we keep our attractive things in one place and then we just (carve) off the top two or three items, which pertain to the articles into a single public comment. That may be the neatest way of doing it. How does that sound?

Sharon Flanagan: Yes. That sounds fine. There's only two items in the articles. It's the purpose and it's the threshold for amendments. So we'll just put those at the top of the chart and then you can respond to those at the same time.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. That seems to me to make sense. That should be a relatively efficient way of doing it then. Thank you. And then we'll deal with those first and most urgently so as to meet the deadline for the public comment on the articles and then we can systematically work through these half a dozen or so, six or seven points that you've raised and give us two or three now.

Okay. So any further questions then on the articles, the key points we've heard around the bylaws, the other governance documents? Any other points or questions? Matthew Shears, come in Matthew.

Matthew Shears: Yes. Thank you Jonathan. Can you hear me all right?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes. Fine. Thank you Matthew.

Matthew Shears: Okay. This actually has to do with just a - just seeking a clarification. I'm sorry to take you back to maybe Sidley could provide it back to (unintelligible) of the PTI bylaws where it talks about the principle office for transaction of business of a corporation.

And it says in that article that the principle office may be established at any place or places within or without the State of California by resolution of the Board.

And I was just wondering if in this particular case we could have a situation where the Board of PTI decided to move the principle office of PTI to some other location outside the State of California or indeed outside the United States possibly.

And if that were the case, would there be any mechanism by which the ICANN Board or indeed the empowered community would have a say over that decision? And if somebody could clarify that, that would be greatly appreciated. Thanks.

Sharon Flanagan: Matthew, I need to check on whether that office could be outside of California. It wouldn't change - it wouldn't change the fact that the PTI is a California non-profit corporation. It would just be the physical location. But let me get back. I'll send an email around to you all on that.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Thanks Matthew. Thanks Sharon. Matthew, did you re-raise your hand or you're done? Okay. Thanks. Greg Shatan. Go ahead Greg.

Greg Shatan: Thanks. Greg Shatan for the record. There's one concern I see and maybe this has been touched on already to an extent but (unintelligible). We iterated that

both the article and the bylaws - the purposes that are stated for PTI are extremely broad.

I mean just to operate (unintelligible) for the benefit of, to perform the functions of and to (drag out) the purposes of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers, that means that PTI, you know, is capable institutionally of doing everything that ICANN does.

That's certainly not the intent of PTI. And so that seems a little odd that the purposes would be so broadly stated especially after we at least in the Accountability Group spent, you know, oodles of time trying to be much more specific about the purposes and mission of ICANN.

So that just struck me as peculiar to say the least especially given that the mandate of PTI is really quite restricted.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Greg. And I'm sorry Matthew that I missed your earlier comment (and I can) see that you had raised this much earlier. Sharon, do you have any comments on that? Are you able to provide any insights as to why that is or isn't a concern or an issue?

Sharon Flanagan: I think it's a valid concern. And I think maybe tailoring this purpose more - but there was some concern it wasn't broad enough and then here the concern it's too broad. And I think really what the issue is is it's not tailored. It's just - needs to be more precisely drafted to reflect what the IANA functions are and what PTI is actually doing.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Well that's helpful. And then just to remind me and others on the call, that is that will be one point in the table, isn't it? I mean that's clearly going to come up as one of the points on the table is the refinement or

otherwise of that purpose. Sharon, that's a question for you to confirm; it's the dealing with the...

Sharon Flanagan: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: ...purpose is an item on the table.

Sharon Flanagan: Yes. The purpose is an item on - in both the articles and the bylaws.

Jonathan Robinson: Right. So we can then potentially pick that up and work on it. Greg, your hand is re-raised.

Greg Shatan: No. Two points. One to follow up on that point. There's some very nice language that I think was actually cut out of the ICANN Articles of Incorporation that describes, you know, more or less well what PTI is doing. That can serve as a starting point.

On a different point and more just kind of a point of process, I don't think that we've sent the conflict of interest policy Board code of conduct and expected standards of behavior for PTI to Sidley for review since those are, you know, government's documents and grounded in legal concerns and be mandated by law it seems to be appropriate to get Sidley in the loop on those documents.

And figure I would raise that here rather than, you know, trying to do it through some, you know, form of email channeling. So I would like to see that done.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Greg. So just going back to the previous point. Can we put an action on you to share that draft language that only opt on the purpose that

you're aware of? If you could take that as an action to share that language, that would be great.

And then second I'll call for any - I mean any comments or responses to Greg's suggestion that the COI policy, the Board conduct and expected standard behavior could or should be reviewed by Sidley.

And maybe Trang or someone from ICANN you'd like to comment on how closely or not these match the existing documents in place for the ICANN Board because that may influence our thinking as to whether or not these need more substantive review or comment from Sidley. So any responses to that? Sam Eisner, go ahead Sam.

Sam Eisner: Thanks Jonathan. This is Sam Eisner from ICANN legal. And I'll respond to the item on the conflict of interest policy, Board code of conduct and expected standards of behavior.

Those documents are actually very directly based off of the ICANN documents that are in existence. We went through and took the base ICANN documents each that have been reviewed and posted for public comments and developed, you know, historically most recently for the conflict of interest policy and the code of conduct in 2012.

And for the expected standards of behavior that actually just closed. A comment period was recently updated earlier this month. And so we took those and revised them to reflect - in the conflict of interest one for example we reflected the more limited scope of officers and the different relationships there to make it a PTI specific document but based on the text from the ICANN document. We did the same thing for the Board code of conduct.

For the expected standards of behavior there - we (identified) those. They track the existing ICANN expected standards of behavior. However, given the non-policy role of PTI, we removed reference to policy development work and participation and policy activities that had a very prominent role in the expected standards of behavior. So they are very closely aligned to each of the correlating documents within ICANN.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Sam. So given that explanation from Sam, how do any others feel about Greg's suggestion that these documents or proposal that these documents need review from Sidley? Are there strong feelings in either direction? Any comments for feedback on that? Or Greg, does that perhaps satisfy you as well? Perhaps that having heard that explanation, you might feel differently. Go ahead Greg.

Greg Shatan: I don't think that really changes my opinion. It's helpful to know their genesis. I don't recall that we had Sidley review those documents. And, you know, the fact that they have precedent is useful to know clearly but that doesn't necessarily mean that there's nothing in those that might raise issues from the point of view of the CWG.

So I'd rather know that there are no issues to raise rather than just rely on the fact that they were duped and revised from existing documents that somehow, you know, make them sanitary. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Greg. Any other comments for or against what Greg is suggesting here? It's difficult to - I mean it's - I'm a little on the fence on this as you can possibly sense. I mean I've got both a personal view but also a suggestion from one person.

I think what I - all I can suggest for now Greg is that you post that suggestion to the list and ask for agreement or disagreement because it's difficult to initiate a piece of work on a suggestion of one. Yet there's no one arguing against it either. So it'll be good to get some feedback on this and perhaps I could ask you to do that and we'll - we can take it from there.

So Brenda, if you could capture that as well so it doesn't get lost - this suggestion and it doesn't necessarily mean that this - so that would be good to share that on the list - the suggestion; both the documents could be re-circulated and the comment that Greg is suggesting that it would be good practice for these to be reviewed by Sidley and we want feedback from the group as to whether or not this is supported.

And I guess it - to be fair given the context that these are substantially based on existing ICANN documents.

Greg Shatan: Jonathan, I would - Greg again. I would just only note that Matthew Shears, Cheryl Langdon-Orr and (Martin Simon) have supported my position. So my strength is the strength of four as I am pure at heart.

Jonathan Robinson: Oh, I'm sorry. My chat's not scrolling. Apologies Greg. My chat is up - further up. So I haven't been seeing it. I thought my chat was a little dead. I apologize. I hadn't even seen that.

Okay. Well given that there's a reasonable level of support for it, which I hadn't seen when I made that comment, I think let's ask Sidley to make a review of those documents. Let's - we will ask or we should really - to formally do this we should put it through the Client Committee.

And Greg, maybe you could help us find the form of working that would be satisfactory to you, which makes it as efficient as possible a review that doesn't make it overly onerous but satisfies the requirement that you want. So if you could help us through the Client Committee formulate that request, I think that's the way to do it.

Greg Shatan: Happy to do so Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Thank you very much. All right. And Sharon flags that in order to do that it would be helpful to have red lines against ICANN standards documents, which seems like a reasonable point - I don't - in order to understand that.

Okay. With that then, I think that concludes our work for this meeting on the bylaws, Articles of Incorporation and governance documents. And that leaves us with - I'm going to skip over for obvious reasons the naming functions contracted inter-company agreement because we simply don't have those at this stage.

Although I'm going to ask Sharon for one comment on this and to hear your latest thinking on this Sharon and that is there's been some discussion around whether or not it is appropriate to separate out the relationship between ICANN and PTI into two contracts in the form of the naming functions contact and the inter-company agreement.

Where has the dust settled on this or is it still an open item Sharon? Are you able to give us any comment or input because sooner or later this will need to be agreed and understood? Has Sidley got a more current view or can you give me any update on that or us any update on that?

Sharon Flanagan: We don't have a further update on that. I don't know if Sam Eisner can weigh in on the status of that.

Jonathan Robinson: In other words Sharon, before we go to Sam, it's Sidley's view remains that ideally this should be all in a single contract or is it - what's your sort of current position on this or is it yet to be determined?

Sharon Flanagan: In part it's hard to know without seeing what's in that contract. But the concern I have in separating the two - the contracts from one into two is that this inter-company agreement would be completely outside of any governance oversight that's available through the ICANN bylaws.

The ICANN bylaws only cover the PTI ICANN contract. So if there's anything in this inter-company agreement that's really critical, there is just no - there is no accountability. That's the concern I have but maybe there's nothing in there that matters that much. But I just don't know because I haven't seen a term sheet for it.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Well that's very helpful already because that indicates that there is - it flagged the issue but indicates that really it's not possible to deal with it substantially until such time as we see the scope and content of those two proposed agreements. So that's fine. That's helpful to me.

But let me defer and see if Sam if you - if there's anything you'd like to say on this at this stage or if you would like to also wait until the drafts have been or the scope and/or drafts have been shared with Sidley and the positions are further clarified. Sam, is there anything you'd like to add at this stage?

Sam Eisner: Thanks Jonathan. I just want to confirm that I think that we're actually very aligned with Sidley in the way that Sharon just presented the issue. We need

to make sure the things that are really material have a place for that governance control and that things that are operational that might not need that same governance control might not need to be in there.

And so I think that the way that she expressed it is really very consistent with how we are working on the document. And I lost a little bit of connectivity when Trang was doing the update. I don't know when she - if she presented any update on when the - when we'll be releasing the IANA naming functions contract.

But we're also intending to release ahead of terms on the inter-company agreement as well at the same time so that you can assess how they work together. And we've been very sensitive to that exact type of concern that Sharon just mentioned. So I think that we're actually very aligned in how these things could move forward together.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Well from my point of view subject to any further comments from Trang, then that deals with the issue for now. But aware that there is a perspective issue but it's not clear that there is an issue.

And if we are to see the draft namings function contract - names function contract simultaneous with the heads of - head of terms for - and just terms for the inter-company agreement, that may well make it into a non-issue or a readily resolvable issue.

So Trang, is there anything you wanted to add there or do you think we've covered it well enough?

Trang Nguyen: We've covered it well enough Jonathan. And we are very hopeful that we'll be able to get not just the naming functions contract and inter-company services

agreement sort of term sheet out today but also the two subcontracting agreements for the numbers and protocol parameters as well.

I think we're at a place where we are very close to getting those documents finalized internally. So I'm hopeful that we can release them either today or tomorrow.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Great. And I'll note that Sam Eisner confirms in the chat that they will be able to provide their red lines to Sidley on the previous documents, which are conflict of interest, Board code of conduct and expected standard behavior. So that's good.

Let's move on then to the RZERC charter. And this is an area where I'm a little weak as to where we are. So I could do with some help from Trang or someone else as to what the issues are or what's outstanding with respect to RZERC charter.

I think we've closed the public comment. We've had some public comment. And Trang, maybe you could remind me where we stand on this and what if anything we expect from the group at this stage.

Trang Nguyen: Thank you Jonathan. Yes. So on the RZERC the status of that is we have closed public comment period for the RZERC charter. Brenda I don't know if you can go ahead and load the couple of slides that I have sent under other charter into the Adobe Connect room.

We, as I mentioned, we received comments from seven entities. And we are currently in the process of doing the staff summary and analysis of those comments as well as updating the charter based on the comments received.

There is one area - a comment that we received that we wanted to flag for the CWG -- and that's on the next slide; so you can go to the next slide Brenda -- for consideration. And that is around the quorum and voting threshold section of the RZERC charter.

And the couple comments that we received was that perhaps there could be more details added around the quorum and voting threshold because that seems a bit light for the typical charter for working groups. And that comment was submitted by (unintelligible).

And then the RYSG also commented that the composition of the RZERC includes representation from both the ICANN Board and a PTI representative. And so that may cause a disproportionate share of influence on any type of decisions or actions that the RZERC takes.

And so the RYSG recommended that a clause be added to the charter to prevent that disproportionate - that potential disproportionate share of influence. And so that's sort of along the lines of voting threshold.

So that's one area that we wanted to flag for this group, you know, to consider the - within the IOT if we had had significant conversations around voting threshold and quorum and decided to keep it very light essentially requiring that consensus be - that we would have consensus for all decisions and actions by the RZERC.

And the reason behind that is that the issues that this committee would consider of very or of great importance. So it is essential to have consensus among all parties in order to be able to ensure that the recommendation that's being made by the RZERC is a sound recommendation that's supported.

You know, the - so that's the reason for why we kept it light in the charter. But given that, you know, we've received these couple of comments, you know, we wanted to check back with this group and see if additional discussions - if this group wants to have additional discussions and - around these topics, the quorum and voting threshold.

And if not, then ICANN's position would be to default back to the discussions that's already been had within the IOTF when the RZERC charter was drafted and keep the language as is.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. Jonathan here. (I have) a suggestion on process. I think it would be helpful perhaps if you shared notwithstanding any comments others might want to make but maybe the best way to deal with this is a table along the lines of the public comment tool, which you may be using and just indicate the comment, the proposed response and perhaps the rationale.

And, you know, essentially (speak) because that is what your role is. To me it's you put the document out. You've had the public comment. You're going to respond to it. And really you want to know if there's any objections to your responses is what it feels like to me you need.

Trang Nguyen: Well...

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead.

Trang Nguyen: (Surely) Jonathan we can definitely do that. I think a lot of how we plan on addressing a lot of - so I guess there's few categories of comments. Some of the comments raised concerns that actually already address by the charter so there's no edits or any additional work needed.

There's another category of comments, which are not consistent with the proposal language at all. And so therefore we would not be implementing those comments.

And then there are sort of comments that are in the gray area, which is, you know, what I've shown here is, you know, the voting - the quorum voting threshold is not something that's specified in the CWG proposal; however, we include it in the charter because that is - it's something that's good to direct sort of the work of the RZERC and so that is reflected in the charter and it's also a common thing for committee charters to contain.

And so, you know, in terms of how do we deal with these type of issues, that's the sort of gray area. So we wouldn't necessary need to speak for the CWG's input and feedback on all comments because for a lot of them it's pretty clear in terms of how we would address them.

But I could certainly highlight those that are in the gray area where, you know, we would want to see what the CWG would like to do in terms of whether or not we stick with the language that's in the carter or if there should be further discussion.

Jonathan Robinson: That sounds sensible enough. It's really a matter of trying to get through this and make sure that you get the confidence that you need to the action taken if not controversial or going to cause...

Trang Nguyen: Right.

Jonathan Robinson: ...(unintelligible). So that sounds sensible.

Trang Nguyen: So certainly Jonathan, by next week we should be able to share with the group a table of some sort along the lines of what you had requested.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Given that, is there anything else you - would you like to cover the other points now or do you think it's better to just pick up on that table next time?

Trang Nguyen: I think we can pick it up next week when we have the table ready. I think really this is the only area where - that's a bit gray. The only other thing is the comments that the RSAC had submitted relating to the scope of the RZERC and potentially it being a little bit broad.

So we're working through on how to address that comment and should have more information next week. So I think in terms of timing next week might work best.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Thanks Trang. Well that deals with that then. Thank you for that and for your response. The next item then is the work on the IANA IPR. And as you may recall, this is being handled by a group of representatives of the three different communities that depend on IANA for its functions and therefore have a shared interest in the IANA IPR.

And the representatives of that group were from the Naming Committee point of view were myself and Greg and (Lisa). And we've worked over some time and produced some work and we've got to a certain point now.

And I think it's probably appropriate that I'll just hand this over to Greg to - Greg, if you could give just very briefly remind people how we got to where we are and what the issues are and where we're working. And I think we're

still in a space of midway through getting the legal advice from Sidley but perhaps you can detail that.

I think we would then hope to bring to the group for decisions all future input at the next meeting. So perhaps you could provide an update and see if there are any questions or issues arising at this point.

Greg Shatan: Oh thanks Jonathan. It's Greg Shatan again. We - the group - the collaborative group that Jonathan mentioned did come up with what we call the, you know, principle terms for the IPR documents, which were done - hello.

Woman: You're still on Greg.

Greg Shatan: Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: Okay. Somebody else's problem, not mine. Okay. Well, in any case, I will speak over the beeping. We came up with these principle terms but these were done, you know, really kind of on what you might call a business level and were subject to legal comment by Sidley.

We initially had a - Sidley look at the document and provided a - they provided a number of comments. Then we had a follow up meeting phone call with Josh Hofheimer from Sidley to discuss his comments, see if we had resolved them or if they were, you know, it was an understanding that they were the type that could be resolved when we turn to drafting the definitive agreements.

Through that discussion we were able to eliminate quite a number of open items from the Sidley comments and Sidley has just served up last couple of days a revised set of comments, which is down to basically six open items that needs to be reviewed and then we'll have a further discussion with Josh to, you know, see how, you know, we might need to resolve these issues as well.

And may be that these are issues that will then need to be discussed with representatives of the other two communities. One of the things that we flagged that there probably is a need for discussion with representatives of the IETF Trust with regard to some of the things with regard to their management and funding of the actions and activities in holding the IPR and the domain names. So that's something that is an action item to be scheduled.

At the same time we have been moving forward on the definitive documentation. IETF Trust Council took it upon themselves to prepare a first draft of the community agreement and the license agreement and those have now been circulated to Sidley for review. And I have not had a chance to look at them myself but I'm sure they'll, you know, at least serve as a starting point for drafting of those documents.

The plan is actually to have the license agreement be three license agreements but we might as well start from a single draft and work on it as one document as long as possible before it's cloned and adapted ever so slightly to the three different communities particular effects and needs and parties to those documents.

So I think that pretty much summarizes where we stand. One footnote to what Jonathan said earlier, there's been somewhat of a changing of the guard on the number side as the team that was initially representing numbers came kind of from the ASO level of things and it's now shifting to an RIR level team. So

that's just kind of a footnote to the whole process. Anybody has any questions, happy to answer them.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Greg. So I guess the message is that we are getting on with this because there had been some concerns in the broader communities that this hasn't been progressing as well as it could or should. I think it's going tolerably well in terms of the pace and the spirit to which things are being done is good. So we just need to keep it kicking over.

There was one other point that (Elisa) raised actually on the IOTF call on our Implementation Oversight Group that she's been tracking is that we need to make it - make as many of the groups aware that the substance of the names community work and Implementation Oversight and so on is now going to take place back in this group.

So if any of you are connected to anyone who has been following this group not from the names community or anyone else if we could encourage as much participation and activity in this group over the next few weeks, that would be very helpful so we keep everyone on board and get the work done as we need to.

Thanks Greg. Thank you for that update. And we'll go ahead and meet with Josh for - and Sidley for a second meeting and hopefully have participation and involvement from one or more members of the IETF Trust trustees.

Greg Shatan: Thank you Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: All right. Good. So that really allows us to then move on to Item 4, which is the work of the Client Committee. We've been very diligent historically in making sort of the Client Committee an (instructor requesting) anything from

Sidley that the group hadn't asked for. And I think we've tried to continue doing so.

There was a lot of sensitivity at the very outset with the Client Committee was set up to ensure that it wasn't an executive group outside of this and it was better channel and manage our relationship with Sidley.

So we will continue to make every effort to do so. And you can see the work that's got to go on next. It's the work of making sure that the - these key PTI documents are handled properly and that we deal with the IANA IPR. So we haven't - I'm not detailing absolutely specific instructions to go across the essence of the work that's being done in that.

We had a request from the implementation staff to permit them to post to that list. When we set up the Client Committee list, we originally set it up with no posting rights from ICANN staff. There's a sensitivity around potential conflict of interest and so on.

I've talked about this with (Lisa) and I think our view is that we're not in such a sensitive state of the work at this stage and that to the extent that's tactical from a project management and operational perspective, we don't have a concern and certainly could open that up to Trang and colleagues from ICANN being able to post to that list if it's efficient.

And so I just wonder if there are any objections to that or if Grace if she's - she's already able to post. I think it was particularly (have) ICANN legal. So given that that's the case, I think - and the motivation here is not to subvert the work of the group but just to make sure that any proper coordination is taking place.

I think that's what we're proposing to the group. The proposal is that we have the ICANN Project Team be able to post to the Client Committee list for the purposes of smooth running as a project. Any concerns or issues or objections to that? Okay. Seeing none, we'll set that in place. And if there is concerns that arise for whatever reason, we can revisit that. But for the moment we'll go ahead with that.

And I think that's it. Let me just check my own notes and see if there's anything else left here we should cover. From my perspective, that's it. Let me see - is there anyone else that would like to add anything?

One thing I would say is please can I encourage you all to - if you have interaction with other members or participants in the CWG is just to encourage - let them know that the - of the work - this work is going ahead in (this high intensity) phase and we'd like as much active participation as possible as we try and bring this to a conclusion.

And we have currently set the next few meetings - we got a request for time rotation. And the minute you go to time rotation or if you don't, you're sort of damned if you do, damned if you don't. Inevitably you're going to inconvenience someone by sticking to the time or rotating it.

So today's meeting was at 1500 UTC. Our next meeting you can double check on the calendar but I believe it's 1400 UTC. And then the next one will be 0600 UTC, which is going to be just about tolerable from the West Coast and very nasty on the East Coast of the United States. But of course we're much more sympathetic to Asia - Austria and Asia.

Any feedback you can give us -- we recognize we won't please all the people all the time -- would be helpful. And of course we will monitor who's on those

calls for the number of attendees and location and try and manage this accordingly.

So the next - the calls are provisionally all scheduled at 1400 UTC but for the next two, which are 1400 and 0600 and we'll modify those times as we move through the sequence. So for the moment you've got - well, in fact we haven't even provisioned the schedule under 1400. We just put a placeholder on the day. And we will come back to you on timing as thinking develops on this.

And in particular if you're in a sort of, if you like, if you're in a less populous time zone or you feel that you've been prejudiced by the call times, please let us know and we'll do our best to accommodate you.

Okay. With that, I think I'll bring the meeting to a close. Thank you for helping make it an efficient meeting. And thanks Sidley for your input. And we'll pick this up shortly. So we've managed to succeed in finishing in 90 minutes, which is good news.

Thanks everyone and we'll talk with you on list and in the forthcoming meetings.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Jonathan. Thanks everyone. Bye.

Man: Thanks everyone. Bye.

END