

**ICANN**

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White**  
**October 31, 2014**  
**8:00 am CT**

Coordinator: The recordings have started.

Grace Abuhamad: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening, everyone. This is the CWG call today, October 22 at 1300 UTC. I'd like proceed with the roll call.

All right on the line we have Alan Greenberg, (Pitlan Shawna Jaji), Wanawit Ahkuputra, (unintelligible), (Mark Buttermann), Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Stephen Johnson, Desiree Miloshevic, (Eric Iyati), Fouad Bajwa, Elise Lindberg, Derby Chipandwe, Chuck Gomes, Donna Austin, Graeme Bunton, Stephanie Duchesneau, Lise Fuhr, James Gannon, Jaap Akkerhuis, Mary Uduma, Eduardo Diaz, Suzanne Woolf, Tomohiro Fujisaki, Matthew Shears.

And for staff we have myself, Grace Abuhamad, Marika Konings, Bart Boswinkel, Bernard Turcotte and Berry Cobb. If I've missed anyone please let me know in the chat and I will also upload the attendance list to the meeting notes and we can correct things from there. Thank you. Off to you, Lise.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Grace. Well, welcome everyone to the third meeting of the Cross Community Working Group. I'm the new co chair together with Jonathan and I guess you all got his email regarding the situation in the next couple of weeks.

Well, I'm elected by the ccTLD community and I'm the COO of DK Hostmaster. I hope we'll have a good discussion today. And as we have many things to do and many tasks to look at I think we should get started. And I hope many of you will do some volunteering to a lot of the work that we have in front of us.

And well, the first agenda item, or number two, is the notes from the last meeting and the review of the action items. And as you have the notes in front of you but I'd really like to repeat the agreed principles of the operation. One is - one of them is that we are to rotate the meetings.

And another very important one is that no firm decisions are taken during any single meeting without the substance of those decisions having been articulated and open for review consideration by those that may not have been present during the meeting. And that means that we're going to have like a subject discussed on two meetings.

Well, we're also expecting our members to communicate the views to their community and communicate back from the community to us. And, well, you're all expected to be familiar with the - and consistent with the documents - the current IANA contract, the IANA Coordination Group request for proposals and the charter of the CWG.

And furthermore since we have a limited amount of time I really request that you all keep your comments to the point. And if necessary speaking time

might be limited in order to have as many opinions as possible to any subject that we discuss. I hope you'll be understandable of that.

We have some action items that I'd like to review too. And one of them is the revised timeline. And I know Berry has made a - some slides about the timeline that I'd like - I don't know, Grace, could you put those up for...

Grace Abuhamad: Sure, uploading them now.

Lise Fuhr: Yes. Well but I'll start - I've seen the slides so I know what's in them. But we have, as all of you know, a very time - a very, very tight time schedule. And we have several key milestones that need to be completed. And we have a draft that needs to be out for public comment in early December in order to give a 21-day period for comments to the proposal.

And there is also a webinar outreach planned on the 8th of December. And we have to finalize the transition proposal and submit by January 19 before the adoption on the 13th. And we have to send the proposed ICG on January 31.

So as shown in the drawing it's really a lot of work. We...

((Crosstalk))

Lise Fuhr: ...we need to get done in a short period. And we have later on the agenda a proposal on how we can try and reach this. But in order to be able to meet these milestones I think it's very very important that member and participant keep their community involved and informed at any developments any time within the CWG.

So then we had an (unintelligible) review the ICG request for proposal together with volunteering to assist Alan who offered to do a draft for Item 1 and 2 in the request. And that will be dealt with later on the agenda. And we also have CWG members and participants to review the IANA function contract and that will also be dealt with on the agenda. Any questions or remarks to the notes or action items? I don't see any hands for the moment. Okay.

So we go on to the proposal on how to structure the work. We have - the co chairs have discussed a framework and we have delegated to Bernie to make a proposal. And first I'd like - we have a set of principles that we'd like to discuss with you. Grace, can you put that up on the Adobe room?

Grace Abuhamad: Yes, it's uploading now.

Lise Fuhr: Yes.

Grace Abuhamad: Going to take a few minutes, I'm sorry. Here it is.

Lise Fuhr: Yeah, no that's fine. Oh that's the slides? You should have...

((Crosstalk))

Grace Abuhamad: Okay yeah. Hold on one minute.

Lise Fuhr: Well while we're uploading the principles I'll just - yeah, here they are. We find it important to have a set of principles that will form the basis for the solution that's going to be presented to the ICG. And therefore those proposed principles are also built on some of the requirements from the NTIA and also from the NETmundial.

And I think we should have a short discussion of them now and then we'll set them out for comments in the coming week. And we'll discuss them at the next meeting.

But the first principle is that we want the solution that's chosen to have stability and security of the Internet. All proposals made by us should ensure the continued stability and security of the Internet.

We want the policy to be based on a bottom-up system so all proposals must have their core in the bottom-up policy. It needs to have transparency. We should operate in a transparent manner and there should also be transparency as a part of the recommendations of the CWG.

We - could - yeah, go a little up. The accountability is that all proposals should include appropriate accountability mechanisms which include regular proactive and independent assessments of the decision. And this is also to be accountable now and in the future so it's accountable for the solution with in-built accountability mechanism that can be flexible for future situations.

And also there is the evolution - the solution proposed by the CWG should contain clear evolution mechanisms so the solution can evolve. And I think that's very important taking how fast things go in this world in account.

So I see Elise Lindberg is first to...

Elisa Lindberg: Yeah, hello.

Lise Fuhr: Hello.

Elise Lindberg: It's Elise from the GAC. Just to scroll up, just a minor...

((Crosstalk))

Elise Lindberg: ...on the first principle if you scroll up - I don't see - just also posed by the CWG must ensure the continuance and the stability and security, I guess it's just typing mistake or...

Lise Fuhr: Yeah, it's not "or" it's "and..."

Elise Lindberg: Just - it is going to be high principles just to get it right. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Yes, yes. Noted. Any other comments for this? Yeah, Amr Elsadr.

Amr Elsadr: Hi. Thanks. This is Amr. Looking at these principles I think they're fine principles. But I was hoping when we do discuss principles and especially principles on which we will base the proposal for the transition that these principles really delve more into the details and the nitty-gritty of what we want this proposal to actually achieve.

And I don't mean in terms of the actual proposal but I'm thinking about principles like the ones outlined in the Internet governance project paper. Some of those principles are pretty good and I think they would give a decent set of principles to discuss on this group and see how those would fit.

And I'm not suggesting we necessarily adopt them but at least discuss them. And perhaps those will help also guide some of our work. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Amr, before you - can I have a quick question? You said the Internet governance paper, which one is this?

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, hold on I'll put the link for that in the AC chat room.

Lise Fuhr: Yeah.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah.

Lise Fuhr: That's fine, thank you. Alan Greenberg.

Amr Elsadr: If you like I could - I could read those out, there are four principles. They're not very long.

Lise Fuhr: No, yeah. Go ahead.

Amr Elsadr: Okay. Okay well the four principles in short are, one, keep the IANA functions separate from policy and standards development; two, don't internationalize political oversight, end it; three, align incentives to ensure accurate and secure performance of the IANA functions. And I think that's pretty much the same as the first principle you described.

And, four, dealing with the IANA transition from broader ICANN reforms that ensure accountability for performance of IANA functions which is to say just address the accountability issues that are specific to the IANA functions, not the broader accountability issues involved with ICANN. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Thank you. Alan Greenberg is next.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Under accountability can you - or can someone go explain what is meant by regular independent assessment of the conformity of decisions with

respect to policies? Does regular mean once every three years or is this in fact an ongoing process of hiring external consultants to review things?

Lise Fuhr: I would like to answer that because I don't think you want to have it that specific in this one because it's principles. For me how often is more a procedural thing you want to put in the actual proposal.

Alan Greenberg: I'm not saying we need the exact frequency, I'm just trying to understand what's being asked for.

Lise Fuhr: Okay well in - for personal thing I would think we should do it like every third year and not like flowing - like the (HRT) did. But, Bernie, did that - did this paper and he might have an idea behind it so...

Alan Greenberg: I would suggest if we're talking about every few years that it's periodic, not regular.

Lise Fuhr: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Just to convey the right message.

Lise Fuhr: Yes. Okay but, Elise, next.

Elise Lindberg: Yes thank you again. Elise - Elisa from the GAC. I think these principles are very high level principles so I don't think it's going to cause any large discussion. Just to flag out that we will have to, you know, when we go further down the line with more detail in our proposals these guidelines are the ones that are going to stand out, you know, we have to measure the details to what's these guidelines. So we will have to post it of course to get comments on the GAC list.



GAC has also worked with some principles around this. So just to flag that I don't see anything to comment on now but I will probably come back and ask for something more on the principles. But thank you for you now. Okay, thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Fine. Just to make sure this is only a - this is a first discussion and we're going to have a second one so it's not that these are going to be concluded today.  
Mark Carvel.

Mark Carvel: Yes, hello everybody. And thanks very much for introducing this topic of principles. As I think Elise just mentioned, the GAC has already started a lot of work on principles to guide the transition with the modalities of the process and for the guidance of the development of the model.

So we started work. I'm the UK rep on the GAC. We started work in Los Angeles. We've got a lot of text already. We've got a leader in the GAC who is pulling all this together. It's Peter Nettlefold, the Australian GAC representative.

And we will be finalizing a set of principles pretty quickly to help inform the CWG and its work and also to convey to all stakeholders interested in and engaged in the development of the transition model where the governments stand in terms of principles.

And so I just wanted to underling that and the governments are well engaged now on this and will be working with the CWG accordingly. And so interesting you've got some high principles here. You've got - it's a very good start. We have a lot more to add to that. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Mark. Sounds good. I think it's very good to have as many views on this as possible. Byron is next.

Byron Holland: Hi. Thanks, Lise. I just wanted to make two comments, one on the principles and I guess it's already been said but just to reinforce, these are high level principles so I don't think we should be trying to get too granular on them right now. And the other is the comment already made about the Internet projects principles and whether we should include them or not.

I think they're certainly interesting principles but at this point I would say they're already, you know, listening to them they're already very solution-oriented and/or perspective-oriented and are probably - they're most definitely worth deeper discussion but I wouldn't consider them appropriate for the high level principles that guide the discussion as opposed to our solutions at the end of the discussion. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Byron. We have Chuck Gomes.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Just a couple comments on principles. First of all the evolution principle, I'd like to think that that is more than just a review every two or three years but rather a principle that our proposed solutions will have some flexibility in them or provisions for revision even sooner than that as needed.

Because if you wait two years or three years to review so I think things change awfully fast so I think the evolution principle should - we should interpret that to mean more than just a review every few years.

Secondly, with regard to the Internet governance project, Principle 4 on the separation of IANA accountability and the other, I think that's an issue that

will be dealt with by the charter drafting team and ultimately by the accountability cross community working group with regard to the two tracks.

And I think we have to be very careful in that area because an awful lot of comments from various sectors of the community have indicated the interdependency of accountability - with general ICANN accountability with the IANA transition so I - that principle I think I agree with Byron in terms of the applicability of those principles for actually the high level principles we're talking about now.

But if we were to consider something like we'd have to be in sync with what the other cross community working group is doing and make sure it's worded in such a way that it's very clear of the interconnection of the two efforts in terms of accountability and transition. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Chuck. And, yeah, and we have Stephen Johnson next.

Stephen Johnson: Hello, this is Stephen Johnson. Yes, I'm reiterating what has been said before especially by Byron here. But adding extra principles like the one mentioned today needs the next round of consideration for sure because adding principles at this early stage might increase workload in an exponential way almost.

So my suggestion is keeping it easy now and adding later on in the process if necessary. But so let's not add too much to this.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Stephen. (Martin Butterman). (Martin)? Oh, (Martin Butterman), are you there?

(Martin Butterman): Okay, we'll go on to Milton.

Milton Mueller: Hello. Yeah, this is Milton Mueller, Syracuse University. I'm a little bit puzzled as to the nature of the discussion of principles that we're having particularly since some of the principles such as stability and security are already requirements of the NTIA. And I don't understand why we would be wasting time discussing something that's a requirement that's going to be reviewed both by the ICG and by the NTIA.

Some of the other principles seem confused to me in the sense that they are principles about how the CWG should operate. And, again, that is a requirement of the ICG RFP so that's already something we have to abide by.

And it's also about how the CWG should operate rather than about how we should reform or transition the IANA which is what I think we should be talking about.

Policy-based bottom-up, again, the IANA doesn't do policy at least some of us believe it shouldn't. And indeed the whole point of not having IANA do policy is so that the policy will be located in the bottom-up policy making process. And so I think I agree with Chuck that the - some of these issues are actually more appropriate for the accountability group to be discussing.

Whether or not the policy process is bottom-up or not is really a topic for the other - the enhanced accountability group. And this group is concerned with filling the vacuum, so to speak, created by the absence of the NTIA. So I would think that a lot of these principles discussions would be a lot more fruitful if we had actually were discussing proposals.

For example, you know, if you're making a proposal you can discuss whether it contributes to or detracts from the stability and security of the IANA operations. But as a general principle, I mean, who's going to disagree with

that? Who's going to advocate that we should not have a stable and secure Internet? The proof is in the pudding in what you actually have in front of you. So those would be my comments.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Thank you, Milton Mueller. Any more remarks regarding this? I see Stephen and (Martin) still having your hand up and (Shawn), you're putting up again? You want to talk? Yes.

Man: Can you hear me now?

(Shawn): Yeah, yeah hello. Yeah, this is - oh okay.

((Crosstalk))

(Shawn): Am I on? Should I go ahead?

Lise Fuhr: Yeah, (Shawn), go ahead. I don't know if (Martin) is (unintelligible) but let's have (Shawn) and then we'll take (Martin). Yes.

(Shawn): Okay good. So this is (Shawn) for the transcript. So just to repeat what I just typed in the chat that's actually I also support what Milton just said. There's no need to (unintelligible) actually all this is already clarified in the NTIA requirements.

So if we must write some principles down they will just have (unintelligible) in that NTIA requirement and then we move on. So unless you want to just clarify some - indicate some working (ethics) of this group. Otherwise I think the principle is (unintelligible) and there's no need to over-stretch that one right now. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Thank you, (Shawn). Now (Martin Buttermann), but before you start, (Martin), I would like to remind you all of stating your name and affiliation before you speak because it's good for the group to know who you are and where you come from. So please go ahead. And please keep it to a two minute talk. Okay? (Martin).

((Crosstalk))

(Martin Buttermann): The beautiful thing is she already introduced us so but I'm (Martin Buttermann). I think this is a very good starting point. Most importantly, one principle is missing that should guide us all; let's keep this as simple as possible. So let's make sure that the matters we - the proposals we do don't lead to more unnecessary work (unintelligible) things like that or unnecessary complications. So basically a call for keeping always in our mind that we keep it as simple as possible.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Well I'll have Martin Boyle next.

Martin Boyle: Martin Boyle. I'm with Nominet dotUK and the ccNSO and I'm the member of the ICG. I'm sorry because I've been having very bad connectivity problems so I might have managed to miss the comment I'm about to make.

But I did hear Milton's intervention. And by and large I agree with him. However, I think one of the points that I would see is that before we start to talk about proposals I think - do think we need to get established in our own mind exactly what are the principles or the criteria against which we would judge the proposals as and when they come in.

As I read the principles that are on the Adobe room at the moment, I see these as being essentially the principles by which the CWG is going to work and,

you know, as such I wouldn't disagree with them. However, it does seem to me that that two sets of principles, the way that the CWG works and the way we are going to judge principles are actually two separate documents and both need to be addressed. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Yeah. Okay, thank you, Martin. I have Greg Shatan.

Greg Shatan: Hi, it's Greg Shatan from Intellectual Property Constituency, Commercial Stakeholder Group and Abelman, Frayne & Schwab. I guess just looking at the guiding principles I would say that other than the first bullet under Transparency, all of the rest of the bullets and sub bullets refer to the proposals and recommendations.

But I think if we just took that first sub bullet out of Transparency out and perhaps started a second principles for operation of the group of the problem of kind of - of dual duty here for this document would be resolved. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Greg. Any more comments to this? Well, Alan Greenberg. Oh you're not - okay well I think what we should do is we had this set that we still, I think, we still should send out for comments. And I would really like to have your input in writing.

And then we'll present a document next time that will hopefully fit into the comments you've presented. So and I will look into this together with Bernie I hope. Are there any who wants to volunteer being on this with me?

Okay but - oh Martin Boyle. Was that a - mean to participate in writing the principles? Or you can...

Martin Boyle: Yes it was, Lise.

Lise Fuhr: Okay thank you, Martin. Amr Elsadr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, Lise. This is Amr. I'm just clarification on what these principles are for. Are for they - to guide the work of the CWG or are they principles on which to base the proposal? And I do have a comment on that question just...

Lise Fuhr: Okay, yes.

Amr Elsadr: ...just to follow up on that. Because I feel that - I'm just a bit wary about the time we have to develop a first draft of this proposal and submit that for public comment. And I would recommend that we don't waste too much time doing work that is perhaps in some ways repetitive.

And I would like to hear thoughts from others on why we actually need to set up a set of principles that will guide the work of the CWG considering we already have a charter that has been adopted by the different groups represented here. And this charter is quite clear on how we need to do our work including some of the principles on the screen in front of us right now.

So I would favor sort of skipping the principles on which the CWG needs to work and just start working on the proposal directly. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Okay thank you. I'll make a quick answer to that. I agree that the principles put forward for you is more about the group's work than the proposal. But as I heard a lot of you I think there is maybe we could make a set of principles for the actual solution so we have, like I said, a set of safeguards that the solution that we end up with is going to comply with these principles. Milton.

Milton Mueller: Yes, I think...



Lise Fuhr: Please state your name.

Milton Mueller: I'm sorry, this is Milton Mueller again, Syracuse University and Internet Governance Project and ICG. Martin Boyle, I think, was right that we need to have a common sense of what criteria we're going to be using to apply to proposals.

But I agree with Amr completely that we really don't have the time to be duplicating work that has already been done in the preparation of the charter, that's already been done by the ICG and it's already been done by the NTIA.

We're simply not doing anything constructive by having a statement that all proposals should ensure the continued stability and security of the Internet. The issue is, you know, what proposals are we talking about and how would they contribute or not contribute to the stability and security of the Internet.

I think we need to attack the problem at a much more specific level at this stage. We need to be talking about organizational structures and what, you know, get into the problem of responding to the RFP at the ICG.

Lise Fuhr: Yeah, well thank you, Milton. I can see on the chat there's a lot of commenting going on. I'm having a hard time getting it all. But I'm - I'll have Elise and (Shawn) and Chuck and then I think we - I'd like us to get on to the other because what we'd like - this is not going to be a showstopper for anything; this will be in parallel with all the other processes. This is not going to be - we have to agree on this before. So let's try and have this on email.

And we'll make an assessment next time on if we should skip it or we reach an agreement. But, Elise, go on.

Elise Lindberg: Thank you, Lise. It's Elise from the GAC again. I just wanted to mostly echo what you said that the solution we come up with must be tested towards some high level principles. I think it is important. I think it will - the importance of the job or the work we're doing in the CWG I think the community at least in the GAC they will ask if we had some bottom guidelines for what we wanted to achieve and some principles on that.

I'm not saying that we have to agree on a very long list, a very detailed list. But I think it should have principles in this. So we have to, I think, use some time of it - time on this. I don't know if we don't use it in a separate group or what we're going to do but we need some guidelines or some principles in the bottom. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Yes, we have (Shawn) and Chuck. And I see people asking me to stop the comments and I've done that after Chuck so we have two more and then we end the discussion. (Shawn).

(Shawn): Yeah, okay. So this is (Shawn) (unintelligible) ALAC. I just want to clarify something because I'm hearing, okay, principles, proposals, proposals and it seems like the CWG is looking like we actually going to be serving - serve up different proposals. (Unintelligible) proposed to develop one proposal which is just the proposal for names.

So I think it's - we don't - we are setting the principles for some people; we actually would (unintelligible) the proposed - the single proposal that we are drafting. So I think it's going to be very easy to check that single proposal against the NTIA requirements. Not the end point, the end point is the NTIA requirements. And if it's meets that - that single proposal meets that I think we

will be done. So there is really no need to keep repeating this - keep getting stuff on this principle aspect. It's just one proposal...

((Crosstalk))

Lise Fuhr: Okay, (Shawn), you made your point. Sorry, we have to get going on this so I'm going to turn over to Chuck. Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Lise Fuhr: Chuck Gomes.

Chuck Gomes: Sorry about that, I was on mute. Want to make a specific suggestion with regard to the principles. First of all I do agree with those that have said that the principles can be a measure we use to evaluate solutions so they're important in that regard.

But has been pointed out in the chat and in the discussions here, some of the principles are already in - given to us by NTIA, some of them are in the charter and so I suggest we make a list of all the principles from NTIA, from the charter and then if there's any others that we need to consider we can talk about those if people think they're essential for measuring our work going forward.

But I think seeing all those in one place instead of having the list we have on the screen and then behind that we have NTIAs and we also have the charter, it would be very helpful if they were all in one place and differentiated and then we can decide whether we need any more.

Lise Fuhr: Good idea. We'll do that and send it out to the group. Thank you. I will end this item now and then we'll go on to how we think the work should be structured. There's the proposal. I think we need that on the Adobe room please, Grace. And then I'll have Bernie do the presentation of the slides.

Grace Abuhamad: I'm uploading it now.

Lise Fuhr: Okay, that's fine. And, Bernie, are you there for doing the presentation?

Bernard Turcotte: Yes, ma'am. Can you hear me?

Lise Fuhr: Yeah. I can.

Bernard Turcotte: Okay. Good day, everyone. Since I don't know exactly what you're doing. I think this will go quite to the heart of several of the discussions we've had on the previous point. It's really about coming up with a structure so that we can separate out the work, get people working on distinct blocks and try to meet our required deliverables.

So just recapping the goals of CWG and I'm not going to go through it; everyone's familiar with a lot of this stuff. But you never know where these presentations will get used so it's always good to have them. Again talking about the relationship with the accountability review process.

All right, so we've heard a lot of talk about - responding to the RFP. The RFP lists the following requirements and what is - I think most people should be familiar with. The proposal is to structure the work so that breakdown the required sections of the RFP into reasonable chunks for all the deliverables and establish specific sub groups to undertake these in parallel where possible.

And basically I'll run through this quickly and we'll take questions after. So basically parallel stuff that can be done is description of the community's use of IANA functions. That's just facts as they are currently. Existing pre-transition arrangements, also can be done in parallel with the first part.

The third part really, to do it properly, needs to consider to be but then this should be able to come up with this fairly quickly. Transition implications, the initial version of this work should be combined with three - because if you're presenting stuff as post-transition oversight and accountability really you should be thinking about the transition implications.

NTIA requirements in Section 5 should be a final checklist when other sections are completed. And community process should be a summary of process tracking throughout our activities which should be ongoing from this - from the beginning of the working group.

So basically in each case we're talking about having a specific sub group and you'll see I've put in some rather aggressive dates here just to get us going because we really need to do that. A description of the community's use of IANA's function, the first draft, should be at the next meeting.

Existing pre-transition agreement policy sources, the same thing. Existing pre-transition arrangements, oversight and accountability, again we should really need to get at least a first draft out for next week so people from 3 - who are interested in working on 3 - can actually get going.

The third, which is actually working group RFP 3, are the proposed post-transition oversight and accountability arrangements. Just to be clear, members of this sub group should be familiar - and I do mean familiar - with

the NTIA IANA services contract, IANA's DNS activities and the procedures of the GNSO or the ccNSO.

This sub group may wish to further split the workload depending on the number of options or scenarios it is to work on. We understand that that's the big chunk.

Transition implications, as I said, could be considered as part of 3 or ongoing while 3 is being carried on. But it seems logical to try and match up these things. NTIA requirements, as I said, RFP (unintelligible) 5 is really if people have done their work within the boundaries that are required this should be fairly simple task once we've completed the proposal. And the community process, again, should pretty much be a mechanical thing which gets produced and validated by the sub group.

From a process point of view each sub group should appoint a sub group chair for purposes of being the person to provide the work output to the CWG. Each sub group chair should present the status of the sub group at each meeting if it's active. Sub groups working drafts should resign on a common repository. We've set one up if that is acceptable to everyone. Sub group chairs will provide the final report of the sub group to the chairs of the CWG.

So in a nutshell, without taking a lot of time, basically it's about creating sub groups to work on the separate parts of the RFP requirements so we can get to actually deliver the products that we need.

And that's the proposal and I'll turn it back to Lise for discussion. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Okay thank you, Bernie. Any question, comments to this? Yeah, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lise. And thanks, Bernie. This is Chuck Gomes from the Registry Stakeholder Group. A question for you, Bernie. Did you - did I see you that suggested a sub group for RFP Item 3? And if so, it - I can see the value of a sub group being, you know, managing the writing of that but to me that's the bulk of where our work needs to focus with proposals and so forth.

And I'm not convinced that a sub group should be doing that. I think that's a group as a whole in terms of soliciting ideas. Now if the sub group is soliciting those ideas that covers my concern there. My point is - my main point is that I think that particular item is so crucial to the whole thing that we need to keep the whole CWG involved in that process in some way. And if a sub group coordinates that I'm good with that. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Bernie, do you want to answer that straight away?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Bernie just noted that he fell off the call. I don't know if he's already back.

Bernard Turcotte: Yeah, I just came back but I missed the question, sorry.

Lise Fuhr: The question was if Item 3 were going to be done a sub group or because Chuck thinks this is the most important work so it should be done by the whole group.

Bernard Turcotte: Well I think it should be reviewed by the whole group and the whole group, I mean, basically this group can decide to do that. However, usually in these things there are people who want to actually do the work and get it - and getting it reviewed are two different things.

So really the concept here that I'm presenting is getting some work done; it also is to present where we're at including drafts at every meeting in the CWG, and we're talking about having a meeting every week. So, I mean, I'm perfectly comfortable if we want to have everyone on that sub group. I don't think it's a question of the groups being closed, we'll have the various draft documents always available to the CWG community. And if there are teleconferences anyone can join.

But the idea was to have a set of - a set number of people who are committed to actually doing the work so we can actually deliver something that can be considered by the whole CWG. It doesn't mean that because this group is doing the work that this is the final result of it. I don't know if that helps.

Chuck Gomes: Lise, this is Chuck. Could I clarify since...

Lise Fuhr: Yes, yes if you do it fast you're welcome. Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Bernie, sorry you missed some of what I said. I don't have any problem with the sub group having the primary writing responsibility and the coordination role. But I think it's more than just having the rest of the people in the CWG review it; we also want to allow them to provide input into that.

So I'm not totally opposed to the concept of a sub group but I think it's such an important area that we need to allow input from the whole committee on a regular basis - and you've kind of suggested that. So I don't think we're far apart there so I'll leave it at that.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. James Gannon...

Bernard Turcotte: Madam chair, if I may just add on to that?



Lise Fuhr: Yeah. Okay.

((Crosstalk))

James Gannon: ...process here that are basically - we have a very short timeline to work in here. We're talking about sub groups and chairs, we're a relatively small group here, we're under 50 people. Are we adding something here that's not required? (Unintelligible) carried out by the group as a whole as opposed to complicating things unnecessarily.

Lise Fuhr: I'll do a short answer to that, James. It's not in building hierarchies, if that's what you're thinking of, it's more getting jobs done in parallel so you have a specific subject that everyone can do. And you have a group that's responsible for that and feeding into the process. But I don't know if that's helped. (Shawn).

(Shawn): Yes. This is (Shawn) (unintelligible) for the transcript record. So I think - I'd like to respond to Berry - I think the idea - the idea of having some people draft something and we then all contribute on it or other inputs I think is fine, it's a good way to start things off especially now that we have no time - not much time around. So I think it's good suggest.

Perhaps it's not - it may not be necessary to formalize it, calling a sub group or something just to ask for volunteers for - a few volunteers to start up a draft and then we could now all - of course we will all have access to the Google docs. We'll see it's the draft is coming up, we can have our comments. But there should be some people who (unintelligible) update the draft. And, you know, we all do the changing things at the same time.

But I like to also make comment on the items. I think Item 1 and 2 already exist in some documents, right? I think like has been pointed out the SSC reports have those things already existing so maybe we could just share the URLs of those things and then we don't need to actually create a sub group for those things like have been said. Item 3 is our major area of work and we should just get to that as soon as possible. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, (Shawn). I'd like to just say that these are asks following the RFP. I know there's been done a lot of work and I think we can use that in our proposal or in our feedback to the ICG. But we're asked to do this.

Okay but, Amr Elsadr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, this is Amr. I have a question - and I'm sorry if I missed this. Is this sub group - or Sub Group 3 specifically as - is there a plan to have other calls during the week specifically for this sub group or is it just about collaboration over email? I'm looking at the chat in the AC room and I see that Marika has suggested that this sub group - specifically Sub Group 3 use the main mailing list. And I'm just wondering if there is no plan to have calls then what's the point of making a sub group?

Having said that in principle I'm not opposed to sub groups at all. I've seen them work well in the past and having worked on several parallel tracks is a good thing especially considering the short timeframe we have to deliver.

Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Okay I - well I don't think there was any specific process for the sub groups. They were to decide themselves if they needed to have conference calls or to do it by email. But that was my understanding of it. Bernie, you might have another - do you want to add in? Bernie?

Bernard Turcotte: Oh trying not to - I'll try not to fall of the call while I'm removing mute this time. No, that's exactly right. I think that the idea of the sub group is less (unintelligible) as I explained earlier, it's about just finding people who are actually going to commit to doing the work. A lot of people have day jobs, have limited bandwidth available and so the expectation is not just to put your name on this.

And it's not about - it will be posted anywhere it's really about getting the work done and everyone being able to follow if they're interested, if they're interested on a daily basis they can follow it; if they're interested just on the calls there'll be an update and understanding it.

But various sub groups may have different requirements for how they need to work. Obviously we understand that Sub Group 3 is going to be the one requiring the bulk of the work and the discussion. And I don't think it's about creating separate mailing lists or anything else or keeping anything confidential, it's about just chunking out the work so we can deliver.

Lise Fuhr: (Shawn), is that a hand or you forgot to lower? Oh, seems you forgot to lower. Okay, well Elise.

Elise Lindberg: Thank you. Elise from the GAC again. Just a short comment, I don't see anything wrong in having sub groups, as I said, to organize the work and get it done. But as long as we have sufficient time to look into it and to pass it around to the communities, have discussions on it, then we don't all have to be in all of these groups. Okay, thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Any more comments on this one? Eduardo Diaz?

Eduardo Diaz: Yes, it's Eduardo from ALAC. I am just - I think I need something here, just one clarification. Are we going to have a mailing lists for each one of these groups so we can collaborate at that level? Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: No, it was proposed to do it on the normal mailing list for the CWG.

Eduardo Diaz: Okay, thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Any more? Elise, you haven't lowered your hand.

Elise Lindberg: Oh, sorry.

Lise Fuhr: Anyone else? Because I would like to - we have Item 1 and 2 that Alan is going to make a short presentation of where the work is regarding that. But I know there's still a need of volunteers for that group. And we have the other groups that even though we - we'll have those done after next week I would like you to think about which ones that you would like to volunteer for the next week and we would need people to be able to start after the next meeting right away in order to get things done.

So please think about which groups you would like - sub groups you would like to join. Group 1 and 2 is already going and we need more people on those. Three, four and five are going to wait for the others but need to start soon after.

Yes. There is a - there's a question if participants are (electable) to join subgroups on the chat. And for me, yes. I think everyone can join the group. Mark Carvell please.

Mark Carvell: Yes. Thank you. Mark Carvell, U.K. Government. I - did I understand you correctly Lise would you said three would not start now? I think it should start now. I mean it's - time is precious. But correct me if I misunderstood. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Well, actually you didn't misunderstand. But what we were trying to say is that three had a dependency on the work from the two first items. And when that was done, we could start this. But I don't know, Bernard, have you any additions?

Bernard Turcotte: (Man), just a note to the group. I think it'll take us a little while to get things - and by little while I mean until the next call next week. The notion is to get one and two at least in draft form to the group before the next call.

So if people are interested in actually contributing to this, reviewing it and making sure it meets the sanity test before the group, we would need to know that now. I think (Alan) is leading those two groups but we really need to activate.

So I think the only thing we're talking about relative to three being started is A, identifying the members and getting that settled in and by that time I figure we should have the first drafts of one and two, which will allow Group 3 to proceed.

Woman: Yes.

Lise Fuhr: Yes. We have Greg Shatan.

Greg Shatan: Hi. Greg Shatan, GNSO, Commercial Stakeholder Group, IPC. The - I agree with Mark and - Carvell and other's who've said that I think Group 3 does not need to wait to get started.

While clearly in the final report one and two are critical table setting items for the ICG and the larger community and the world to understand how our proposal, you know, came to be and how it differs from the current state of affairs, I think we need to assume for the purposes of this group that we all have a decent working knowledge of one and two.

Maybe we couldn't all sit down and write one and two by ourselves in an empty room. Some of us probably could. But that we need to assume that we don't need to wait to see a written report of how the current work takes place before starting our proposal for the future. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Greg. Chuck Gomes.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Chuck Gomes from the Registry Stakeholder Group. And I'm one that's working with (Alan) on one and two. I think you'll find that when one and two are done at least the first draft that it provides very good context and clarity for Item 3.

Now that said, I think that there's no reason why Group 3 couldn't be formed and become functional right away. So I fully support that because that's where a lot of time is going to be needed. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Eduardo Diaz.

Eduardo Diaz: Yes. This is Eduardo Diaz from ALAC. I agree with Greg that, you know, this Group Number 3 should start working on it. In fact I've seen various mails

around before we put this group together about different arrangements or different proposals for, you know, this transition.

So, you know, I don't see why that group cannot start working with those and then one section to be - Section 2 is done, then they can be refined based on what Chucks's group is going to put out. And that way we can, you know, we can start the discussion ahead of time. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Yes. Well, I don't - well, if Group 3 wants to get started, I think we should have the volunteers and the - for that group too. But first I'd like - do we have - do we have an agreement on the basic structure of this work because it seems like everyone is satisfied with how the structure is? It's just the timeframe and how we do the structure or - and the - and how we arrange the groups if it's got to be first going on or going later.

So everyone, I don't see anyone opposed to the structure, right, about having worked on in subgroups and doing it according to the RFP items, so. And then regarding Item 1 and 2, I see a lot saying it's not open and why hasn't it been posted.

I think it's because there hasn't been done much work yet and no one really had volunteered for that group yet except I know (Alan) and Chuck are looking into it. But I don't think there's a whole of work done. So I don't think there's anything to be worried about about transparency.

I have Eduardo Diaz.

Eduardo Diaz: No. I'm sorry.

Lise Fuhr: Or you forgot to lower.

Eduardo Diaz: I'm trying to lower my hand. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. And then we have Group 3. If you - if we're agreed on the structure and I hear a lot of people wanted to get started on Group 3, I would like the volunteers to come forward and you can do that by putting it in the chat. I think that's the easiest way to do it.

Elisa Lindberg: Lise. Lise.

Lise Fuhr: Yes.

Elisa Lindberg: Can I just (drive) in there. It's Elisa from the GAC again.

Lise Fuhr: Yes.

Elisa Lindberg: I'd just like to say about the connection. It's going back and forth here. I'm getting thrown out of the site and I have to connect again. So I think maybe the chat thing is not where you should post any interest right now. I don't know if any others have that problem.

Lise Fuhr: No but if you can't reach the chat, well you can send an email to...

Elisa Lindberg: Yes. Yes.

Lise Fuhr: ...you can send an email to Bart.

Elisa Lindberg: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Very good. Maybe - Lise, may I make a procedure proposal that after...



Lise Fuhr: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: ...this call we send out the slides to the full working group and that we announce that people can volunteer for the group. So others who are not on the call yet and who have - who are participant and new member can subscribe to each of the groups.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. That's fine. So you want people to subscribe after the meeting. And...

Elisa Lindberg: Yes.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes.

Lise Fuhr: ...after they (receive the)...

Bart Boswinkel: That's just as easy so we can share this - say the slides again with the full group so those people say there are some members who are not in the Adobe so they could have a look at it as well.

Lise Fuhr: (Of course).

Bart Boswinkel: And then say - and they include in that email a - say that people can subscribe on the email list so everybody is aware who has subscribed to which group and then start. We'll combine a list based on that - on these emails and say that we closed initial subscription to this working group by Friday.

Lise Fuhr: That's fine. And I see someone wanted to volunteer for Group 1 and 2. But I'm sorry, I wasn't clear on that one. But we were going to make the call for these when (Alan) is going to have this - that item on the agenda.

But okay. We have - Eduardo, you're trying to lower your hand or you want to talk?

Eduardo Diaz: I wanted to talk. This is Eduardo.

Lise Fuhr: Oh, okay. That's good. Feel free.

Eduardo Diaz: This is Eduardo, yes, from ALAC. I just want to add to Bart's comment that, you know, it's good that we going to subscribe to the groups and also if we can have some kind of Wiki page for each one of the groups so we can, you know, do our work somewhere and follow through and see who is in the group. That's just a suggestion. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: That's a very good idea. What do you think Bart? Is that possible?

Bart Boswinkel: In my view it is. And going back to Milton's comment, say officially this is not officially as we discussed initially. It is open. But at least you want to compile groups so everybody's aware who is doing what to make progress.

Lise Fuhr: Yes. Okay. Thank you.

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Lise, if I can get in the queue.

Lise Fuhr: Yes. Yes. You can. You're next.

Marika Konings: Thanks. So this is Marika. So as you may have seen, I'm trying to keep up with notes as well as action items of this call. So the idea as Bart has already noted as well that we'll send those out after this call so it's really clear as well

for, you know, what the action items are and what our people are expected to do. So hopefully that will help as well in getting clarity around this.

I've tried keeping track on some of the names that have come forward. But we'll start, you know, collecting those names that we get stated on the list following the notes and action items that will come out from this meeting.

Lise Fuhr: That's fine. Thank you. And Bernard, you have your hand up too?

Bernard Turcotte: Yes. That's correct. For the work space there is a Wiki there. (It's been) mentioned that some people don't like working on that. Just from a straight repository point of view, at the end of the presentation there's Google Docs section that has been set up for each subgroup and where we will keep the membership list and all - copies of all documents.

So that's already in there - subgroups working drafts to reside on the common repository. That's before last slide.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Thank you Bernard. Any other comments to this before we move on the next. Bernard you're not lowering your hand or do you still have something to say? Disappeared.

Okay. Well, we'll go on to the next item then. And in the end of this meeting we'll do a short summarize of the action items. And if you feel something is missing there, please just tell us.

So the next is status on the work on Items 1 and 2 and volunteers. But (Alan Sencera) has volunteered last meeting on preparing this. And don't know - (Alan), do you want to present or talk about.

(Alan Sencera): Sure. Can you hear me?

Bernard Turcotte: Yes. But there's a lot of echo in there.

(Alan Sencera): Okay. Let me - all right. I'll try my headset then. Just give me a second.

Lise Fuhr: Hello.

(Alan Sencera): All right. So how's this? Is this better?

Man: No.

Woman: (Alan), you probably need to mute your speakers from your computer. That sounds bad.

(Alan Sencera): All right. There we go. Okay. But it means I can't hear what others say. All right. So let me just talk briefly and then I'll put this on mute. So yes, I put up my hand to volunteer to lead for one and two. And I think as others have said on the call, this is about getting down to the nitty-gritty and getting some of the work actually done.

So I'm from the ccNSO community from .ca. So what - and most of this background has to come from the - from someone from the cc and some from the gTLD community.

So all that we've really done so far is Chuck Gomes I think he's mentioned already from VeriSign and I had a call yesterday. And the way that we proposed to proceed is to develop an outline based on headings because putting the material into the exact format that the ICG has requested is, you know, it'll take a bit of a narrative to do that.

So Chuck sent me a proposal last night, which I have not looked at. But what I propose to do is to take that to put in some headings that would reflect things from our point of view because essentially there will be some aspects which are common.

For example, the root zone is something, you know, the functionality is the same between the Gs and the CCs whereas obviously policy processes would have to be described - will have to be described separately.

So that's really where we are now is after I get my headings put in on that, then I will circulate back to the list and then we can start the job of actually putting a bit of narrative under some of that.

All that being said, having talked to Chuck, we don't want this to be a huge long tone because I think as some people have said, it can detract from the real work we have to do but rather it hopefully will be a summary with references to existing documents and footnotes, which will just help to flesh out the whole proposal. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you (Alan). Any comments, questions for this? And as said before, we're going to have you volunteer after this on email, so. If no one on this issue, then I think we should move on to the next. That's (Alan) has also done an example of a triage of the IANA function contract. And Marika, could you please put that on the screen? And (Alan), do you want to walk through the triage?

(Alan Sencera): Hello.

Lise Fuhr: (Alan).

(Alan Sencera): Yes. So again, I'm flying a bit blind here. I think a couple people have said on the list that there is going to be a lot of nitty-gritty in this at the end of the day. The existing contract I think is in effect - a checklist of issues that we all have to consider before this deal will get done as it were.

So what I'm proposing that we do and I'm happy to lead on this or someone else can volunteer obviously is just to go through the 46 page contract with a view to isolating those issues that we're going to have to consider in substance as part of this process.

So what you see on the screen is I've just taken three or four examples from the contract and there's an example of the way I would propose to triage them. And obviously I'm looking for comments on this.

So I take the first one is performance standards, which is Section C.2.8 in the contract. Obviously this is something we would want to retain in substance going forward. It's something that we may wish to consider improving.

And I just put a little checkmark in that it's linked to oversight and accountability because there is this whole issue of how that links with the other process.

So that's an example of the triage. Obviously I have a (unintelligible) to scope because the contract also includes numbering as well as protocol parameters which are not within the scope of this group.

I think - and there are a couple of other examples there that in the current contract there are requirements in conflict of interest. I think that these are a good idea and we should consider retaining these in substance.

But these are not something that I think we as a group need to dwell on in substance because this is not - if we start debating the specificity of conflict of interest requirements, we're never going to get this deal done. But nevertheless, it's something that I think we should seriously consider retaining.

That being said, there are a large number of provisions in the contract work, which are specific to the fact that this is a government contract and I think have no place in an arrangement to which a government or the U.S. Government is not party. The example I used there is the provision in H.16, which is requirement for certification regarding links to terrorist (findings).

So overall, as I said, this can be a useful filter of issues. And for example, and this is what I mentioned when we were in Los Angeles, there are provisions in the contract regarding intellectual property and patent rights.

And the current contract requires that these belong to the U.S. Government. So that's an issue that we're going to have to consider in substance and resolve before we're finished because obviously we don't want the U.S. Government to retain any rights to data as well as intellectual property going forward.

So with that, I'll pause. And really - so my questions to the group are two fold. Are you comfortable with the initial categories of triage? And secondly, is anyone - is anybody prepared to volunteer with me just go through this process?

And lastly I would say this is something we can do in parallel to the other work. It's just at the end, you know, we don't have to get this done right away. But it's something that should be done before the overall process is over.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. I have Milton Mueller in the queue. Yes. Milton, are you there? Hello. Then I'll go to Elisa. I can't hear any Milton. Elisa, can you hear me.

Elisa Lindberg: Okay. Thank you. Elisa from the GAC. And thank you for this. This is very, very useful. And I think just to say that this is essential for the work we're doing. To look into what has to be secured and to (unintelligible) like it's done now.

I don't have a comment right now. Rather not - I haven't looked enough into the details of how (these all fit). But I still think this very, very useful for our work. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Thank you Elisa. Milton Mueller, are you there? You raised your hand. Okay. (Bill)'s getting on the phone he says. Anyone else has - Milton, are you there now? Anyone else has any comments or remarks for this? Mark Carvell please.

Mark Carvell: Yes. Thank you. Mark Carvell, U.K. Government. Well I think this is an excellent approach. The A to E category of - categories for the terms I think is very good. I think that's an excellent basis for determining the key essentials for the success regime. So this looks very good to me. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. I don't know - Mueller, are you on the phone now? No. Doesn't seem like it. Anyone else that's on the phone or anyone else want to ask questions or comment on this one? Yes. I have Greg.

Greg Shatan: Greg Shatan, GNSO, CSG, IPC. The - I guess my one comment here is I'm glad to see him A, that the word arrangement is used because I don't think we



should presuppose that there will be a contract between IANA and the oversight or stewardship body.

And I think that in addition we also need to think along the same lines as I see the numbers and protocol parameters groups thinking about which is who are the customers of the names function and whether they should be the same as the accountability mechanism or a subset of that or separate from that.

Now that's I guess getting down the road a bit. But I think the point here is to understand what's in the contract and what concepts need to be retained but not yet to decide what type of document those should be retained in and who should be the parties to that document if indeed it's a document that has parties. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Before I get on to Milton, (Alan), do you want to reply to that one? (Alan)? Doesn't seem - okay. Milton, you're next.

Milton Mueller: Yes. Yes. Sorry I was - I tried to use the computer rather than the phone. I was actually going to make a point similar to the point that Greg just made, which is that I really think it's very productive and helpful for (Alan) and others to go through the IANA contract and particularly separate out the names part of it and figure out how it relates to what we're doing.

However, when you say retain or do not retain it needs improving and so on, you are assuming that there would be a new contracting authority similar to the NTIA. And I think that's an assumption that I actually favor. I think that that is the (state) that a proposal wants to take. But it doesn't make - I know that other people maybe don't agree with that.

And so we can't have a very meaningful discussion of these particular elements of the contract unless we have come to a meta agreement on the fact that there would be a contracting authority. And, you know, who would be this - who would the contracting authority be is the - probably the first items of discussion.

So I think that it's something that goes into what you've been calling Group 3 is it not? But I think this kind of level of detail really advances our discussion at this stage. And I just want to make it clear that we do need to understand whether we're talking about a new contract authority or not.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Milton. I don't know if - (Alan), are you there? (Alan Sencera).

(Alan Sencera): Yes I am. I think as someone else pointed out, Milton, I agree with you that there may not be a contract, which is - so I tried to use the more neutral term arrangement. I see the current contract is a form of operational understanding or I'm saying these are the things we as a community want to ensure continue to happen in the future.

So the contract is a good twist. Yes, we want conflict of interest requirements. Yes, we want (audit) requirements. It's - there's a whole long list of things. So I think it's very useful for us.

How we actually operationalize these things is something I think that's going to have to be considered in Group 3. So this - what I've - what I'm suggesting we do is just we go through this as a filter to identify issues that we have to consider.

I think someone has mentioned - or I will. There's also the issue of the 5 or 600-page ICANN proposal, which is itself incorporated by reference within the contract. And that will have to be looked at as well.

But I think we're going to be looking at a - in whatever arrangement we end up with a more general clause that would say however we bring - give it (a fact) that ICANN is going to continue to do what they promised to do in that 2011 proposal.

And - but we'll have to go through that as well but I don't propose doing it to the same level of rigor as here. But I haven't - I've only glanced at it thus far.

Lise Fuhr: Just before we go to James Galvin, there is a question if this belongs to Group 2. (Alan), do you have a comment for that one?

(Alan Sencera): I see - well, I guess this would be a separate group in this instance. This is in my mind parallel work. I think this is something we can finish relatively quickly. I know I'm volunteering for a lot of things. But I think we can get through it quickly more to say here are things in categories.

Dump it out to the list and then it's done in the sense that it sits there and then I think as Milton tried to suggest, once we have a better sense of the structure that, you know, or and some of the organizational aspects around this, then we can go back to it and say okay. Can we deal with intellectual property? You know, how do we deal with some of these issues that have cropped up? So the answer to that is I guess it would be a separate group.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you. James Galvin.

James Galvin: I suppose it's just following on and Milton comments first.

I think it is valuable work to do now because not - although it is specific to a contract, it can be used in future as a guideline but also for whether the proposals will actually meet what was the previous standard.

So it may be specific to the contract now. It can be used in the future to guide principles and proposals as well.

Lise Fuhr: Okay thank you. Milton you're arm is still raised. Is that because you haven't lowered it or do you want...?

Milton Mueller: Yes. Sorry.

Lise Fuhr: That's okay. Anyone else have any remarks or questions for the triage? Seems (Mike Allen) is ready to do a lot of work on this group so I - and I agree that it could be done in a separate group.

So if anyone wants to volunteer for that I think we should also do that on the email. Okay (Shawn)?

(Shawn): Yes this is (Shawn) for the transcript record. I just want to declare about the triage. Is it part of - what part of the Item 1 do you think is this one? So that is the first question.

If we are charitable and chairing for this - because I think it's been - as indicated we are the - volunteering and it's going to be done on the list. So it would be good to have a summary of this then on the list and no content and, I mean, which is volunteer and how to volunteer.

My other comment is in relation to this contract. Yes it's okay to review the contracts. However I think looking at the contracts with the hope of actually saying how I think too.

That is the existing policy can be proved to integrate some type of - some items or major items in the contracts to strengthen this policy processes. Existing policy processes should be one of the major goal of having to review the contract in the first place, not with the goal of actually having to put - to have another contract in proxy.

So if the volunteer or the team that will be volunteering to review the contract should actually be looking I think with ahead more. And now it can be together - our financial policy improvement in ICANN too. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you (Shawn). I have Bart raising his arm too. Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes just again a procedure. Would it be helpful if we include this - say if you would go back to the - say the structure of the work, include this as a separate work item and we create a separate repository, and so people can volunteer for this specific group as well?

So we extend whether it's two or three or four it doesn't really matter but people can work on it rather quickly.

Lise Fuhr: Yes. I agree.

Bart Boswinkel: But we include it in the slides before we send it out.

Lise Fuhr: Yes. Very good idea. (Shawn) you forgot to lower your hand or you have an additional remark? No? Okay. Well any more remarks for this item? Doesn't seem like it.

Okay. I think we should move on to any other business then. So anyone have any other business that they'd like?

Eduardo Diaz: This is Eduardo here so I'm going to...

Lise Fuhr: Yes Eduardo.

Eduardo Diaz: ...off my hand but I forgot about it.

Lise Fuhr: That's fine. I could see now.

Eduardo Diaz: Yes I want to add two things. One, I want to comment on this wiki thing, back to the Google Drive when we're going to do this work. I wanted to say that Google Drive is great for a document repository.

But when people wants to put comments on it and collaborate in conjunction it's not the best tool. So I suggest - strongly suggest that we use something that's a wiki so we can comment and collaborate there, and then use Google Drive just for the central document repository. That's one comment.

And as another business I would like to - for you to remind us. I know we received an email about this face-to-face meeting that now we're going to have in Frankfurt. If you can explain some of what is going to happen there. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Eduardo I need - what is going to happen or regarding the dates of the meeting or at the meeting? Sorry.

Eduardo Diaz: I'm sorry. Logistics. Logistics. So logistics to get there and...

Lise Fuhr: How to get there?

Eduardo Diaz: No, no, no, no.

Lise Fuhr: Oh.

Eduardo Diaz: Just to make sure that Frankfurt is the place and November 10 - or how you see the date.

Lise Fuhr: Yes. I would like to turn - I see (Grace Arunda) calling in. So (Grace) could you please tell us if something has been concluded regarding the place?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think (Grace) is still in Adobe Connect but she's...

Lise Fuhr: Oh.

Marika Konings: ...actually on another call.

((Crosstalk))

Lise Fuhr: Oh she's on another call. Then Marika please. Okay thank you.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. So we are in the process of finalizing the arrangements with the venue, so we hope to be able to confirm that as soon as possible as

we know it's of, you know, utmost urgency (sic) to give you a specific destination.

But the location is indeed Frankfurt and the dates are confirmed so we hope, you know, following the meeting that we'll be able to send you further details shortly as well, and for members of the Working Group how to work with our travel - community travel team to get your travel arrangements arranged.

And I think (Grace) also indicated and I think - and Monday that we would need an indication from those of you that may be coming and at your own expense participants so we are sure that we have sufficient place in the venue to accommodate everyone.

But we will send out an email after this meeting to reconfirm all that information so everyone has that, and hopefully we'll get feedback shortly.

Lise Fuhr: Okay.

Eduardo Diaz: Thank you. I'm going to lower my hand. Okay I don't have any more comments. Thank you. This is Eduardo.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Okay Alan Greenberg.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Alan speaking. The concept of alternates is being discussed for the accountability group but I don't believe we have any provision for them. And given the number of comments about people who might not be able to get to the face-to-face meeting either due to other, you know, competing commitments they already have or visas, it might be very useful if we could quickly decide that alternates are allowed.



ICANN has said they will only fund the members and we may well be rather short of members at this point.

Lise Fuhr: So you mean that alternate is - you need to explain a little more about alternates. Everyone can come to the meeting.

Alan Greenberg: Everyone can come to the meeting but only the 19 members will be funded. But there may well be a significant - or at least some members who cannot come either because of other commitments, prior commitments or visa issues.

And if the appointing organizations can name an alternate in place of someone who can't come and ICANN would fund them that would be very useful.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. (Shawn) is this on the same issue?

(Shawn Farley): Yes. Yes. So this is (Shawn) again for the transcript record. So on this issue of - is it concluded now that it's going to be in Amsterdam or in - because we need to know the venue?

Also I think it's - I mean, is that - you or whoever just said that this is not going to be convenient. And I think it just be fair to put up a Doodle or something to agree on the dates and see which one is the best.

And we can't just pick a date and if they are - because all these 19 member, I mean, all the members ought to be there. So if all the members are not there - if some certain percentage of the members don't make it it doesn't - it won't - if it is not necessary then ours is just - we'll just keep on having the remote discussion.

So I would suggest that we put up a Doodle. For me for instance I won't be able to make it at that date, so it would be good if you put up a Doodle to sort out the dates and analyze.

And if we have all the members here present right now you could even just give a plus 1, plus 1, plus 1 right now and then agree on the dates, agree on the venue.

And there was a suggestion on using a less visa challenging venues like - which one? So they said those with commercial sponsor that that's - especially if you want people from developing regions to participate in this process.  
Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you (Shawn). And I do understand your trouble but I was promised that the ICANN Staff would do all what they could in helping you achieve visas and those things.

But we are really having difficulties by getting any other dates so it's - the Doodle is not going to work for this one. But - well (James Galen) you're next.

(James Galen): I suppose it follows on from (Shawn)'s comments about participation.

Lise Fuhr: Yes.

(James Galen): I don't know if it was the face-to-face meeting in the last week and I pushed - there was a request for a translation interpretation of documents. I noticed that Olivier from ALAC officially requested it from ICANN, and he wants to comment from either ICANN Staff or from Chairs on what the situation was - interpretation on the calls and translation of document is.

Lise Fuhr: Okay I see Marika has her hand up. Marika?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. Maybe in relation to - yes several of the comments made and then I think Lise has already said as well, you know, we are under a lot of time pressure and as a result have very little flexibility on meeting venues available as well as locations as we, you know, also need of course support from our meetings team to arrange the settings and also looking at of course the membership base of the group which, you know, has led us to the dates that are on the table as well as Frankfurt.

And we've taken note of the suggestion of alternates and I think it's definitely something that could be considered if indeed, you know, the Supporting Organization and Advisory Committees, you know, formally confirm and answer and people have been chosen as alternates.

I think maybe - and the next step would be for us to, you know, confirm with the members whether they can be present or not. That would give us an indication as well to which groups you would need to reach out to see if there are alternates available to attend.

In relation to the request for interpretation and translation - and I believe this was something that was discussed with (Jonathan) as well as Byron. So I don't know if Byron prefers to comment on this or maybe I can take a stab of what I think was discussed between Staff and the Co-Chairs of this effort, you know, looking at, you know, resources available/timeframes and I think the compromise that was made is that documents and transcripts of the meetings will be translated.

Unfortunately we will not be able to provide interpretation during the calls, you know, for various reasons. But we hope that at least it's a way to, you know, accommodate some of the requests, noting that of course it doesn't meet the complete request but we're trying to do our best to get those turnaround as soon as possible so people can benefit from that work.

Lise Fuhr: Okay thank you Marika. Mark Carvell?

Mark Carvell: Yes thank you. I just wanted to sort of set out my idea for the work planning for the physical meeting, the face-to-face meeting in Frankfurt. I think as I understand it this will be the only face-to-face meeting that we will have before finalizing the proposal if I understand correctly so it's a critical meeting.

I would suggest that between now and the face-to-face meeting the teleconferences gear up for finalizing contributions to the outcome of the face-to-face meeting, which I would argue should be the principles and the first draft of a proposal.

Maybe not fully fleshed out. There may be gaps but we should as a group - it should aim to produce a draft that will be a credible, concrete output from the physical meeting.

So the subgroups via the teleconferencing and online working can now start to finalize their inputs into the meeting in Frankfurt. And the teleconferences provide the means for ironing out differences of opinion and so on so you get some kind of gravitation towards consensus.

So I would just underline the importance of a work plan along those lines if the meeting is to succeed as the only opportunity for all the group to come together and converge on a proposal. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Mark. I'd like to do a short comment on that because we're planning on the structure slides. It was planned to have some proposals on the 10th of November.

And you need to remember that the proposal that's going to be set for the 1st of December is a proposal for public comment, not a final proposal. So there's going to be some time working with the proposal so that's not going to be the end or the final one.

That's going to be delivered in end of January to the ICG. And I have (Shawn) on the list.

(Shawn): Yes this is (Shawn) for the transcript record. So I want to just make a few points. I'm not sure I understand why you said the dates is difficult to change at the moment.

Has that been agreed by the members of the group or was it - was this part that said it's difficult to change the date because if major number of the group members are saying that the dates is not convenient, it's just fair to put up some consensus on the dates?

Secondly, I think we need to understand that it's - yes alternates may not really contribute much in this, although we just - we said we should always update the - there's going to be a lot of work and as I will - have been told it will be already mentioned.

So there's an importance in making sure that the people who are participating actually also be at the face-to-face to allow a proper synchronization and proper follow up of what is - that I've already discussed.

Nevertheless if alternates are going to be the last resort then it should be that we've tried all the other options and they did not work. So my first position would be that we should actually discuss as much as we can on - and agree on the dates - on the venue and on the dates before we then look at the option of the alternates. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you (Shawn). I need to remind you that we - as we solved the timeline it - this will - the meeting dates will give us some time to work and it will give us some time after the face-to-face meeting to do some alterations and work again after having discussed this very thoroughly.

So this is a matter of several circumstances that got us to choose those dates, so it's not as easy as just doing a Doodle because the time is precious here so this is - seems to be the best timing. And I have Byron on next.

Byron Henderson: Hi.

Lise Fuhr: Hi.

Byron Henderson: Thanks Lise. Could I ask the presenters to go back to the timeline slide - the one with the bar chart? And, you know, none of the comments about timeline are unreasonable in that yes it would be ideal if we had more time and could find a way to work through the timing better.

The reason, and I'll take certainly much of the responsibility for this, is in trying to work through the timeline we find ourselves extremely limited in the opportunities to have a face-to-face meeting.

So the first assumption is we need enough time between now and the next face-to-face to actually do some work, but we want to have the face-to-face prior to the first submission.

So those are fundamental assumptions in that we wanted to have the face-to-face before the first submission so we could do the - do any final work or final modifications as Mark Carvell was indicating.

So that certainly puts us into a limited number of available weeks where we could actually have a face-to-face. There was also a relative assumption that we didn't want to force people to do this on the weekends so it was during the week and allowed for travel time to and from.

And as you start to narrow those options you are left with very, very few weeks and/or days to do the - to actually propose. And the other fact is no matter what date we choose there's going to be people who can't make it.

So we also have to just accept that, that given 19, 20 people plus Staff and others there will be people who cannot make it and that is an unfortunate reality of the timeline that we're working in.

And then there are simply the pure operational logistics of and relatively short notice getting that many people to one facility with the minimum miles traveled by the collective group and the operational realities of that.

So, I mean, when you really start to boil down the practical, you are left with very, very few available dates and that's the why we got to the proposed date that we have.

So I recognize there are concerns about it and, you know, right out of the gate I'll apologize for that. This is not Lise's doing per se but I think I also have to ask everybody to recognize the operational and the timeline realities that we're facing in proposing those dates.

So that's the how we got there. I know it won't satisfy everybody but that's kind of the rational logic behind how we got to the dates that we do. And I am not convinced at all that a Doodle poll is going to change that in any way, shape or form. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Byron. We have Chuck next. Chuck Gomes.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Chuck Gomes from the Registry Stakeholder Group. Recognizing that the dates are fixed a decision that I think needs to be made and communicated as soon as possible this week is whether an alternate can be funded if a member cannot attend.

I absolutely think that should be the case but that needs to be known right away because people are going to have to make their travel arrangements shortly.

So I am suggesting that we need a decision -- I assume it's from Staff -- whether an alternate can be funded instead of a member if the member cannot attend in person.



Lise Fuhr: Okay. Marika or Bart, do you want to reply to this? I can see you writing, "We'll confirm this as soon as we can," but do you want to elaborate on that further or...?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I - we'll check internally because we just need to have signoff from, you know, the budget owner for this effort. My personal assumption is that it shouldn't be an issue as of course the overall numbers would stay the same.

But we do need a formal okay before I can tell you but we'll do that as soon as we have an answer.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Given the time we have eight minutes left of this meeting and I'd like to do a - summarize of the action items. I have Eduardo on the list and make it short please.

Eduardo Diaz: This is Eduardo from ALAC - very short. I have seen in the - how do you call it - in the chat, you know, if an alternate goes will - that person will have the power or it's another word to vote or which, you know, participate in the actual consensus calls if there are any of those things happening? Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. I guess we'll have to look into that too and Marika you have your arms up.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I just want to clarify as well that, you know, I think as per the charter the idea is not to have any voting. The Working Group is supposed to operate on the basis of consensus.

And I think - so for these meanwhile, I mean, should there be a need to have a formal consensus call that that is indeed limited to the members. But I think if

you look at the timeline and where the face-to-face meeting is placed, I think the idea is that indeed a lot of work gets done during the face-to-face meeting which will hopefully result in this draft proposal, which then gives, you know, those that were present in the face-to-face as well as those that couldn't either participate remotely or not be present there an opportunity to, you know, express views or, you know, points that were maybe missed in that week that we have after that before publication.

And I think only at that stage if needed a formal consensus call would need to be conducted. So I think at that stage, you know, all members are, you know, present or available again so hopefully that shouldn't be an issue from the perspective of the face-to-face meeting.

And I think, you know, as - yes and there's some comment in the chat and I think already remarks as well. The assumption is that any alternates would be, you know, confirmed or appointed by the SO and AC that is affected.

And, you know, the assumption is indeed that those alternates are members of or participants of the Working Group to make sure that they're up to speed and familiar with the conversations.

Lise Fuhr: Okay thank you. Well in order to be in time for ending this meeting I'll move on to the next item and that's a summary of the action items. Marika or Bart, will you do the - do - recall the action items?

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I'm happy to cover the action items. I said, you know, I've been trying to keep track of notes and action items on the right hand side of the screen and those will go out on the mailing list, you know, shortly after this call.

And obviously if I've missed anything or misstated anything, you know, please feel free to, you know, send your suggestions to the list. So with regards to the specific action items in relation to the guiding principles for the CWG, the action item is there that we share again the draft document to the list to solicit written comments, but also taking into account of course the comments that were already made today.

Lise and Mark then will work with (Bernie) to update the document based on the input received and suggestions made, and then determine whether an updated version is needed at this stage to be further discussed at the next meeting.

In relation to the proposal and how to structure the work, the action item is there for Working Group members and participants to identify for which subgroups they would like to volunteer.

And I've added a note there that, you know, for those volunteering for subgroups please make sure that you are able to actively contribute. All members will be able to provide input and feedback throughout the process, but subgroup members are expected to hold the pen and the discussions forward.

In relation to the triage of IANA functions contracts, the action item there is for volunteers to work with Alan - to come forward to work with Alan on this effort and express their interest on the mailing list.

And it was also agreed to include a separate work item for this particular effort and the slides will be updated accordingly. And then the last action item under Any Other Business is to send further details about the face-to-face meeting as soon as possible, and I will add to that a confirmation on whether

alternates can be appointed by SOs and ACs should members not be available to attend the face-to-face meetings.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Thank you Marika. Anyone then for a short comment about any items that's missing? If you don't have anything I have Amr Elsadr, but before that I will say we'll send it out and you can also of course reply on the email list.  
Amr?

Amr Elsadr: Thanks. This is Amr. I just wanted to ask in case it was missed in the chat that all slides - you said they'd be uploaded to the CWG wiki. I'd appreciate that.  
Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Well all slides will be uploaded. Yes of course. Any other questions or remarks? You have a minute. If not I'll thank you all for participating very actively in this meeting.

And we will have the next meeting on the first day and we will shortly send out the time. And of course we will try to get you updated on the face-to-face meeting as soon as possible. So have a nice evening, morning, night wherever you are in the world. Bye.

Woman: Bye-bye.

Marika Konings: Thanks.

Eduardo Diaz: Bye-bye.

(Shawn): Thank you.

Man: Bye-bye.

Chuck Gomes: Bye all.

Lise Fuhr: Bye.

Woman: Thank you.

Coordinator: Thank you for your participation. You may disconnect at this time.

END