

ICANN

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
October 31, 2014
5:00 am CT**

Grace Abuhamad: All right so in the room we have Wanawit Akhuputra, Fouad Bajwa, Olga Cavalli, Paradorn Athichitsakul, Guru Acharya, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, Don Hollander, Graeme Bunton, Kris Seeburn, Avri Doria, Yasuichi Kitamura, Seun Ojedeji, Mathew Sheers, Donna Austin, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Elise Lindeberg, Lise Fuhr, Stephanie Duchesneau, Eduardo Diaz, Pitinan Kooarmornpatana, Phil Corwin, Chuck Gomes, Peter Van Roste, (Plemena Plapova), (Yav Akahoos), Mark Carvell, Amr Elsadr, Alan Greenberg, Allan MacGillivray, Stacey King and that's it.

For staff we have Marika Konings, Bernard Turcotte, Berry Cobb and Bart Boswinkel. We're all set, Lise. Off to you.

Lise Fuhr: Oh thank you, Grace. This is Lise Fuhr. I'm the chair of this call. And welcome, everyone, to the fourth meeting in our working group. I've seen a lot of activity on the email list and I think that's good. Well, I'd like to start with - please remember when you talk you state your name and your affiliation.

And as a small practical thing we could also do it when you check into the room. I see a lot of people are doing it but on the Adobe room. It would be

nice to have your affiliation too. I didn't do it myself but if we can remember that for next time.

I have to tell you that our next meeting has to be moved due to availability to the chairs. So it's going to be moved to Tuesday, October 4, we will repeat this, this will be at 1400 UTC instead of Thursday. We will repeat this later and write it to you. So I'm sorry for this but there's no other way we can have the call.

So I'll go on to the next item, note from last meeting and the review of the action items. And we had an action item on principles. That was to send out a draft to the list for comments. And Martin Boyle, myself and Bernie were to do an updated document with suggestions. We have a point on that later.

The working group members and participants were to identify which subgroups they wanted to participate in and all groups have been - there has been people volunteering for those. And we had to do with work on the Alan on the triage to - and that's also been done. And we had staff to do a special specific item for the triage and update the slides. This has also been done.

And we had the staff to send out further details about face to face meeting. And I'm very pleased to inform you that almost everyone can make it and it looks like all the visas are done. Oh, yeah, I get - sorry, I see on the line the meeting is moved to November 4, not October, sorry. Yes, I'm slow. I have to do a lot of looking at the screen and my notes so sorry for confusing about the dates.

Well but the face to face meeting in Germany is going to have all the members and there's going to be a lot of participants too so I think that's very

good. Everyone were able to make it in the end. We have one that's going to have an alternate but it looks like that has been worked out fine too.

So we - for the next item that's the second reading for the proposal on how to structure the work. And well we've sent out a proposal for the work structure and there's been some comments on the email list. And we have answered some of the questions and we can answer more here and we'll have a discussion. Well, the dates - that's only initial suggestions to make that clear.

And we will have it as a document that will be alive. And it's more to get a structure and get us going. So - and we will try on each meeting to review the schedule after we've done this. We can't do this this meeting but the other meetings we'll try to have a review with the staff and how far we've been on the work.

And then there is a proposal on a refinement of the structure for the RFP 3. And we have to - we have a proposal that we split it into contract management for the IANA functions contractor and the root zone management.

And I think we should discuss this split after Bernie has gone through the slides, that's been alternated. Bernie, can you put up the slides? And, Bernie, are you ready?

Grace Abuhamad: Yes, I'm uploading the slides. Here you go.

Bernard Turcotte: Yes (unintelligible). So for those that saw these last week there are very few changes so I'll just run through this quickly. Grace, can you make the slides sharable or - I can't seem to move them.

Grace Abuhamad: Better?

Bernard Turcotte: Ah, thank you.

Grace Abuhamad: There you go.

Bernard Turcotte: I'm hoping it will be. Okay, we'll go through the goal here. Relationship doc, ICANN availability, these are the existing blocks in the RFP. That hasn't been changed. We're still working to the structure of the RFP. Minor adjustment here in Section 3, back, in that we're proposing the breakup. There's been some discussion of that on the list.

Marika Konings: Bernie, this is Marika.

((Crosstalk))

Marika Konings: The slides are not moving along as we unsync them. We'll sync them again and if you look at the arrows at the bottom of your screen you should be able to move them back and forth so everyone will see what you see.

Bernard Turcotte: Okay.

Marika Konings: You see the arrows at the bottom?

Bernard Turcotte: Well I'll go back then.

((Crosstalk))

Bernard Turcotte: We should be at the beginning slide?

Marika Konings: We are.

Bernard Turcotte: Okay. Second slide, are we all good? So the objectives have been changed, the relationship to ICANN accountability review process, no changes. Structuring the work according to the RFP, no changes. Proposal to structure the work accordingly, RFP, no changes. Parallel optimization, the only change is in Section 3. And also instead of chunks, some people didn't understand the concept of chunks so the idea behind chunks was just - does not require any further breakdown.

No changes to Group 1. And the work has begun, we can talk about that later. Two, goes into 2a and 2b. Oops, mix up in the slides there. And we added 2c after the call last week for the triage of the NTIA IANA functions contract.

Section 3 is where we're proposing to split it up into 3a based on SSAC 68 description of NTIA oversight and accountability responsibilities and to the contract administrator for the IANA contract. And 3b, NTIA as root zone management process administrator.

Four, transition implications, there have been no changes here. Delivery to be determined. And really we're looking at this being done in parallel while we're developing options in Section 3.

Section 5, NTIA requirements, this work should only be the final sanity check to produce the text confirming this requirement (unintelligible) updated so no changes here. Unity process, again, 6, no changes.

We've changed the name from chair to - of the subgroups to rapporteur given that it could have confused people relative to the responsibilities so really we're talking about someone who simply brings back the work output of the various subgroups and the references.

So that - those are the changes and the presentation. Back to you, ma'am.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Yes, any questions, remarks for this? I saw some of you on the list have - you didn't really like the idea of splitting the Item 3 into two but any comments on that? Yeah, Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, this is Amr. I was just wondering if rapporteurs were also meant to sort of play the role of coordinators or chairs for the subgroups and whether there will be a decision now or when the subgroups start to do their work on whether there will be additional calls for these subgroups. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Actually I find it's up to each subgroup to decide on how they would like to work, if they want to do it by calls or by the email list or whatever. I've seen suggestions for each subgroup having their own email list. And I don't know if that's a way to do it.

But I know that - the role of the rapporteur is - people didn't want it to be called the subgroup chair so this is a rapporteur role. And it's also up to the group, do you want the rapporteur to be the one driving the work or, you know, pushing the work forward in the group. And I think it's very much - of course some of the groups are quite large and - it would be good to have someone being in charge of getting the work done so it could be rapporteur. Any comments on the rapporteur issue?

Very quiet today out there. Okay, Eduardo.

Eduardo Diaz: Thank you. This is Eduardo from ALAC. I think, you know, I understand the role of the rapporteur of being somebody that would report but somehow this group needs some kind of - if you don't want to call it a chair some other like

driving this, you know, so there's some kind of an agenda and order that, you know, and try to be like maybe a coordinator or something like that rather than a chair. Thank you - if you don't want to call it a chair. Because, you know, somehow somebody has to coordinate this group. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Any other comments on having a coordinator? Well, yeah, Greg Shatan.

Greg Shatan: Hi, this is Greg Shatan for the transcript. I also think it's important that there be someone who's doing more than just the rapporteur job of taking back the work product. And sorry, I didn't catch the discussion of the rapporteur, chair issue on the email list but I think that if chair somehow to some people meant too much rapporteur I think means too little in terms of responsibility.

It'd be nice to think that each group is kind of like a string quartet where there's no leader, in reality the first violin is the leader and here there really needs to be someone.

And I think that in - especially in the larger groups the role of the chair in trying to recognize consensus as it's forming and trying to - and to provide, you know, structure to the calls and to the discussion without being overbearing or trying to lead to a particular result, that's the chair's idea of good time, that's a role of a chair in a consensus-oriented process is an important one. If we don't want to call it chair we need to call it something but I think rapporteur is kind of under-selling the job. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Okay, yeah. Marika, you have your hand up.

Marika Konings: Yes this is Marika. I think it's actually building on what Greg said and I think as some people have commented in the chat as well that maybe each subgroup can indeed, you know, determine for itself whether beyond a rapporteur an

additional role is needed and, you know, whether that role should be that same person that serves as the rapporteur or whether that should be a separate function.

And I think looking at the subgroups for some of the larger groups, especially group 3, there may indeed be a need to have a separate, you know, chair role or coordinator role for someone just, you know, managing meetings or discussion while, you know, for some of the other smaller groups maybe just having a rapporteur is sufficient as I think a lot of the work is just happening on the mailing list and is being done in the form of different drafts.

So maybe that is a path forward where either sub groups start out with a rapporteur but then also discusses whether additional roles need to be created and if so if those additional roles need to be filled by separate people, you know, without of creating a huge administrative or bureaucracy to go in the meetings.

Lise Fuhr: Okay well there's been suggestions of having each group deciding for itself. And I agree that we need a rapporteur but if you find that the coordinator group should be separated from the rapporteur group it's fine. I think each group should decide and to find out if you want the rapporteur to be a coordinator to or have both.

So for me it's not as much what we call it it's just that we get the work done and we have someone who's responsible of reporting back to the group and to have the subgroup work so we have an outcome for each meeting. So, yes? Any more comments on this? Doesn't seem like it.

So I think we decide that every subgroup has to find a rapporteur and a coordinator. This can be the same person but if you want two it's fine. We just

need to know that the rapporteur has to report to the group - the whole group and the coordinator has to ensure that the work is moving forward within the subgroup.

Okay I don't - we were - I don't know if you think we have discussed the split of Item 3 thoroughly enough or you're fine with it and let's go and see how it works. We'll have - we'll have this for comment and final decision on the next call but I think we should work after this structure until the next meeting a list. Anyone else comes with another suggestion at the moment. Okay, well any more last calls for anything on the proposal on the structure of the work?

Okay. I think we move on then to the principles of the new draft. And we've sent out an email with two documents attached because there was a request for a document containing a list of the principles from the NTIA and from the ICG. And that has been made and sent out.

But in the same email Martin Boyle and I have been drafting a set of principles and/or criteria to kind of have a review of the proposal this group ends up with. So this is meant to be a help to ensure that whatever we end up with is taking all the aspects that we need to - it's covering all the aspects we want to have covered and to have the principles laid out.

I don't know maybe, Grace, I went through this very fast, can you bring up the principles for...

Grace Abuhamad: Sure, I'll do that right now.

Lise Fuhr: I think we should bring up the ones that Martin and I did. It's not that I want a big discussion on this, I just want to have a short presentation of them. And then I think we should do a lot of the comments - we should do the comments

online, on the email, because we need to move forward and have a look at the material that we want to bring forward and not too much on the principles.

We can do that also on the face to face meeting. We don't want to get too deep into procedures, we want to have things done and then review it and see how it's going to work. So I don't know...

Grace Abuhamad: Yeah, give me one minute I'll upload it.

Lise Fuhr: Yeah. Yeah. But the - well I can do a further presentation because what we mean is to have the outcome - principles for the outcome and I think the principles that we had laid down from NTIA and the ICG were more the process - the principles for the process that this group should work within.

So it's - this is more like a sanity check, did we have all the - did we take care of all the issues we thought were important for the work or for how we want IANA to be in the future. And we also put in there is a difference between how the ccTLD works and the gTLD works.

And I think this is going to be also an important part of the solution. So well this is very very small. But I hope you all have had a chance to look at them. If anyone has initial comments you're free to present them now or you can do it by email. But I would only have a discussion for like 5 minutes on this because I think we should go to the other that's the status on the work. Anyone has a short comment? No? Okay.

We'll move on to the status on the work. So as far as I am informed there hasn't been any rapporteurs appointed yet to any of the groups. But I don't know if any - any of the participants in the Group 1 has a status on the work?

Alan, I can see you're in the call. You were in that group, do you have a status on the work? I can see Chuck raising his hand. Chuck, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Alan's in - this is Chuck Gomes from the Registry Stakeholder Group. Alan is in Bussan and only has - does not have voice access.

Lise Fuhr: Oh okay.

Chuck Gomes: He's just in Adobe and Adobe only.

Lise Fuhr: Yeah. I see that now. Yes.

Chuck Gomes: So he asked me if I would give an update. So - and you did - let me make sure because I didn't hear your comment fully, Lise...

Lise Fuhr: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: You're looking for an update for 1 - 2a and 2b?

Lise Fuhr: Well if the - it's the same group, we'll have 1 and 2 and 2b but if it's not we can - if you can do all it's fine.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Wanted to make sure I was talking about the right thing. Okay so I will - first of all I think it does make sense, although we haven't heard back from all of the volunteers yet on this because I just sent them a message yesterday on this that it will make sense to combine 1, 2a and 2b because there are an awful lot of connections between the three sections.

I sent late yesterday a draft of Section 1 that is still being, as at that time was still being edited by one of our members, and a very comprehensive edit. That

editing has now been done. But the subgroup itself hasn't had time to comment and discuss on our email list that was created yesterday.

So it's not ready for discussion yet but I at least wanted to send a document that if people want they can get an idea of what - a good idea of what Section 1 looks like.

Most of the rough work has been done for Section 2a and some of the editing has been done as well. There are a couple of pieces still to do with regard to the ccNSO input on that in that section.

And then the work on 2b, quite a bit of work has been done on that but a full rough draft has not been finished quite yet. Once it is it'll be edited and the subgroup will be asked to discuss it on the list.

With regard to targets obviously we've already missed most of the targets in the work plan. The - should be no problem having a subgroup reviewed document for 1 for our next meeting, although now that it's Tuesday that make it a little tighter so we'll see on that. But I think that's doable if the people in the subgroup will be responsive over the next few days.

With regard to 2a, again, the change to Tuesday will make it more challenging. But 2a I hope by the end of the week or early next week will be in pretty good shape for subgroup review. I'm not sure it'll be ready for - to distribute to the full CWG list.

And I hope I - our Tuesday meeting of next week that the 2b will at least be in review by the full subgroup but I'm sure it won't be ready for the full CWG group to take a look at. If you have any questions I'd be glad to answer those.

Lise Fuhr: No, I think - well I only one, you haven't chosen a rapporteur or a coordinator but you seem to be moving good so it's fine. But it would be nice if you choose one within the next couple of days so...

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Lise. This is Chuck again. We understand that. With Alan busy in the (plenipod) in Bussan he was - he kind of started of as what we might call coordinator and rapporteur, at least the way I understand the terms, but it's been much more difficult for him to do that while in Korea.

So we have not formally done that but I think he has asked me to kind of pick up where he's been unable to do it. And I think we're functioning right now fairly well, we'll see, because just four, five, six people were added to the subgroup just yesterday. And so - and the email list was just created late yesterday for the combined three areas.

So we will do that but in the meantime I think we're - it appears at least from my perspective that we're moving ahead.

Lise Fuhr: Oh thank you, Chuck. I think you - it looks like you've done a very good job. Any questions or remarks for Chuck from the group? No, doesn't seem like it. Yeah, well the next group is Number 3, proposed post-transition oversight and accountability arrangement. Who will talk about this group and the status of the work? Awfully quite. I don't know who are in that group.

No volunteers? Yeah, Eduardo.

Eduardo Diaz: This is Eduardo from ALAC. Just to mentioning that group the - basically the conversation that has happening, you know, through the email list is that - it's about splitting the group in two - the work of the group in two. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Well, a status that we haven't started is also a status so for me it's just that the whole group - the big groups knows what the subgroups are doing so I think we're formed and people were eager to have this work in parallel with Group 1 and 2 so that's why I'm asking if we have anything from that group. But it doesn't seem like it.

And I think for all the groups and for the sake of informing back to this group I really urge you to find a rapporteur and a coordinator as soon as possible.
Greg, you have a comment?

Greg Shatan: Greg Shatan with regard to Subgroup 3 I would say that, you know, there's a lot of spirited discussion on the mailing list of the shape of the proposal for the future. Not entirely clear to me whether every participant in those discussions is a member of the subgroup or not and it's proceeding rather organically. But there are, you know, definitely discussions of the substance of the proposals that Number 3 would take on.

You know, most lately a lot of discussion on whether there would be an oversight council or other sort of accountability oversight body and what the composition and the roles of that body would be.

We probably do need, as you say, to have a rapporteur or coordinator and someone to, you know, start driving the discussion toward, you know, in some form of structured manner and kind of take apart what's being said and look at the variables and trying to winnow down the variables to conclusions. But there is certainly a spirited discussion at the moment. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Any other comments to what Greg just said? Yes, I have Chuck on the list.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck from the Registry Stakeholder Group again. I'm going to back up a step. I want to make sure that we are all on the same page with regard to the contract triaged subgroup which is called 2c.

Lise Fuhr: Oh sorry.

Chuck Gomes: I definitely recommend that that be a separate subgroup from the combined one, 2a, 2b. But I want to make sure we're all on the same page on that.

Lise Fuhr: Oh yes I forgot that. Thank you for reminding. We'll take that after - I think we need to finish this subgroup 3 and then will go back a step after that. Greg, your hand is still up. Did you forget to take it down or you want to say something?

Greg Shatan: Old hand.

Lise Fuhr: Old hand, okay. Yes any other on this subgroup 3? I see on the list but it's very important that we discuss the coordinator but I would like to do that on the list. And I think the group 3 should have this done. And it would be very nice if this could be done by tomorrow at the latest that you've chosen your rapporteur and coordinator because we need to have this going so by the end of tomorrow would be nice. Any comments to that?

Grace Abuhamad: Lise, this is Grace.

Lise Fuhr: Yeah.

Grace Abuhamad: Hi, I just wanted to remind the group that I've created - so there's one mailing list for subgroups - RFP 1, 2a and 2b combined, it's a joint mailing list. And then there's another mailing list for RFP 2c. And then as noted in the chat the

decision last week was to have the RFP 3 group stay on the main CWG mailing list. So that's the status. We have two small mailing lists that are publicly archived and the RFP 3 group will stay on the main list.

Lise Fuhr: So it would be nice to have mailing lists for every group instead of having the whole group getting it and then you can look at the list in the archive if you want to see the discussion, is that what you proposed Grace or?

Grace Abuhamad: No, I was just giving an update to what the status is currently of the mailing lists. So there are two mailing lists and Group 3 is currently on the main list. If anyone wants to change that I can do that but that's the update of the current status.

Lise Fuhr: Yeah. Okay - I like to read the discussions on the chat while chairing this. But, yeah, I see comments, Greg.

Greg Shatan: I just suggest that perhaps as a process point that for those discussions that are part of the subgroup 3 maybe we can - when we title the thread for it maybe we can just put the number 3 in brackets or something so that we can distinguish those that are part of that process from all of the other discussions that are taking place on the main list.

I agree that we don't want to take it off to a sub list since in essence it is the work of the group but at the same time if we can't tell the forest from the trees we'll have a little bit of difficulty deciding if what we are discussing is part of the work of subgroup 3 or not. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Sounds like a good idea. Amr.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks. This is Amr. I was actually going to suggest something different than what Greg just said. It's not so much a suggestion just as a thought, I think it's a good - for some reasons I do think that our decision to keep subgroup 3 on the main mailing list is a good decision. There is obviously a great deal of interest on the work of this subgroup.

And I do believe it's the largest in terms of membership, those who volunteered to be on it. However just a thought that it might be confusing on when the work of this subgroup is being discussed and updates of other subgroups are being provided. I'm just worried that some of that might get lost in the middle and I'm not sure if titling the threads is the best approach.

And I was just wondering if folks have some thoughts on revisiting the decision to keep that discussion on the main mailing list or perhaps creating a dedicated list for that. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Elise from the GAC.

Elise Lindeberg: Hello, can you hear me?

Lise Fuhr: Yes.

Man: Yes.

Elise Lindeberg: Yes, okay, the mic is up and on but okay no thank you. It's Elise from the GAC. I think also it's important to have it on the main mailing list, that is - it's a great interest for many people and who can follow it. And I also think it is very important to identify that this is part of the work of the subgroup 3.

So, yeah, that's probably my comments for now. Just so it's not the list that's as different topics under the subgroup 3 or legal matters or whatever we discuss so now it's all over, I agree on that one. We need just to identify the discussion as the subgroup 3 discussion. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: I have Bart before Greg so, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: Just say maybe you've seen it on the - in the chat say there was a suggestion from Donna and an answer from Marika that staff may capture and summarize the threads on the list. And I think that's no problem at all and we will start mapping these into the different kind of threads.

The only thing is we have to keep a certain, a bit of a standstill in order to capture the previous discussion and then move forward so maybe we can do it as of say 10:00 am or right after this call so we've captured this and then we share it with the group as soon as possible.

Lise Fuhr: Yeah. Thank you Bart. I see Greg again, Greg Shatan.

Greg Shatan: It's Greg Shatan again for the record. Maybe as a combination of the various proposals so far a subgroup mailing list could be created for subgroup number 3 and then everyone on the main mailing list should also automatically be made a member of that mailing list so it's a committee of the whole but it's work for archival purposes will be captured in a separate list that's nobody would be excluded from the process but at the same time when somebody wants to look back to see what's going on the mailing list would be in a separate place for posterity. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: I'll put myself in as speaker. I think that's an excellent idea so you have both, you will have the whole working group as a member of the mailing list but

you can separate them mails, yeah. Good idea. Anyone have comments for that one? It looks like people like the idea.

Okay then we will have to move back to 2c which I forgot. And 2c, that's a triage. Were you a part of that too, Chuck? You were going to do that for Alan too or? Yes, Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck from the Registries again. No, I am not a part of that one so I...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...what's discussed on the list as everybody else probably has but no I'm not.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. Anyone else in that - Marika, you have your - yeah.

Marika Konings: Yeah this is Marika. Just a note that Alan actually writes in the chat that he can report in the chat so I think he's probably typing up what the status update on that one is.

Lise Fuhr: Oh okay. Yes. So Alan just put a long report in the chat. Marika, could you read it aloud for - I don't know if everyone is...

Marika Konings: Sure. This is Marika. So Alan reports that 2c has produced a draft which I think is available on the wiki. The triage document has as its objective is to identify issues which may need to be considered at some point in the development of the transition proposal so we can provide useful input into the elaboration of specific transition options and proposals.

Work is continuing and or comments are welcome. However, finalizing this work should not be a precondition to the development of the proposals by

RFP CWG 3. Given the limited amount of volunteer time available and the fact that most RFP 2c members have also volunteered for group 3 actual completion of this work will likely be differed to allow efforts to be - deferred to allow efforts to be concentrated in - as WG 3.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Marika. And thank you, Alan. I've seen the work on the triage on the wiki and it's very good and it's nice that we have a starting point. And I certainly agree that we shouldn't make this slow down the other work we're doing. So any questions or comments to the triage from the group? Not really.

We have then Group 4, transitions implication, but I think these Groups 4, 5 and 6 are to be - well they work on their issues later because - the transition implications are dependent on the proposal from Group 3.

That I think it would be nice if participants within these groups will, as the other groups choose their rapporteurs and coordinator. So everyone has this as an action item. Anyone has any questions for this or comments? No, it doesn't look like it.

Okay, well then we have the next item and it's any other business. Here I can repeat that our next meeting is moved and it is on Tuesday, November 4 and that's at 1400 UTC for two hours like this meeting. I'm sorry about this but there's no other way we can make it.

Is there any other - oh Amr, sorry. Yeah.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks, this is Amr.

Lise Fuhr: Yeah.

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, we're in the other business, this is an agenda item we have today?

Lise Fuhr: It is.

Amr Elsadr: This is still a two-hour call, right?

Lise Fuhr: Yes. But if you guys - we don't need to sit for two hours if we don't have anything to discuss at the moment.

Amr Elsadr: Okay, well I do have one point under any other business that I would like to bring up which is the agenda for the face-to-face meeting.

Lise Fuhr: Yes.

Amr Elsadr: So far on the mailing list, according to the last update we got from Grace that agenda has not been determined yet. But I think it would be a good idea for the group to start working on what we'd like that agenda to be especially if we would like members who will be present to have sort of coordinated approaches to what the discussions - what their input to discussions will be with their communities.

I think this does need to be coordinated and we do need time to do this. So I think it would be a good idea to work on the agendas as soon as we can. This hasn't been done yet.

A second point I wanted to raise is on an earlier agenda item which is the principles. And I know we said we should do this on the list but since we do have some time I would just like to point out I think that Matthew Shears said in the chat a little earlier regarding the oversight principle.

And let me see if I can find the text here.

Grace Abuhamad: I'll go ahead and upload that document if you'd like.

Lise Fuhr: Yeah, I think...

Amr Elsadr: Okay sure.

Lise Fuhr: ...it's a good idea. You want to upload that document that Martin Boyle and I have drafted?

Amr Elsadr: Yeah, that is correct. That is correct. Under principles...

((Crosstalk))

Lise Fuhr: I hope it's a little bit bigger than the...

Grace Abuhamad: Yes, I've got it in a PDF this time.

Lise Fuhr: Yeah, okay that's good.

Amr Elsadr: Let's see. Oh yeah, under B2, I'm sorry it's principle B2, independent oversight, it says oversight should be independent of the - I'm sorry, I'm looking at the Word document and not the screen, yeah, there we go. Okay independence of oversight, oversight should be independent of the IANA functions operator and should assure the accountability of the operator to global - to the global multistakeholder community.

Well I think that there's a slight problem with having that in the principles right now since this is in fact the issue that is being debated quite...

((Crosstalk))

Amr Elsadr: ...on the mailing list. Whether the accountability of the operator should be through the global multistakeholder community or perhaps through a (unintelligible). I'm not advocating one or the other right now, I'm just saying that this is something that shouldn't be a principle that we should be working - I mean, we shouldn't be under the assumption that this is a principle that we want to be working with moving forward just yet.

This is something that we still need to discuss further. So I just wanted to raise that point. Matthew Shears brought it up earlier in the chat and I think he is correct. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Can I ask you a question regarding this? Because for me there is two things in this one saying that the IANA functions should be independent and there is the accountability towards the global multistakeholder community. So it's both that you think it's too early or just one of them?

Amr Elsadr: No, I think unless there is disagreement on that the oversight should be independent, which I have not seen much disagreement on, I'm not contesting that, I'm considering the second part of the sentence which is accountability of the operator to the global multistakeholder community.

And this I think is being discussed quite - I mean, it's dominated the discussion on the mailing list this past week since our last call. And I think maybe perhaps we should take that out of the principles and just wait until the group reaches some sort of consensus on how that should be.

Lise Fuhr: Yeah. Well thank you for that. And I think we can have a discussion of this now but I also think it's very important that you do comment on it online too. Chuck is next or whether Greg?

Chuck Gomes: I think Greg was first.

Lise Fuhr: He was first, sorry. Greg.

Greg Shatan: Hi, Greg Shatan again. I would have answered the question you put to Amr in the opposite and at the question of independence of oversight is not decided as opposed to whether the operator should be accountable for the global multistakeholder community. So maybe both parts are really still kind of in discussion rather than kind of fixed. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Greg. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Hi. Chuck from the Registries again. I guess I would pretty much agree with Greg there. But just to clarify what Amr said, I believe that NTIA has required any solution that comes forward to be accountable to the multistakeholder community. I think the question is, and correct me if I'm wrong on this, Amr, but the question is how we do that in terms of Pacific proposals. So I hope that's a fair clarification, Amr, correct me if I'm wrong on that.

Lise Fuhr: Okay. I have - Amr you can make a quick reply to that before Paul. So yeah.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks. And thanks, Chuck. This is Amr. Yeah, I don't have the text of the NTIA announcement up in front of me right now but I do recall that - but I do recall but they did say they wanted to transition their role to the global multistakeholder community.

I found it a bit vague, to be honest, because they did mention that at the beginning of the announcements at then when they had I think it was four - oh thanks, Grace, for the link - they did have four requirements in the announcement saying that would support - support and enhance the multistakeholder model so that's one of the four principles that the NTIA sort of stipulated.

So whether the actual proposal needs to include that the oversight is accountable to the multistakeholder community as a sort of a prerequisite or requirement, I'm not too sure about that and maybe we can discuss this further on the list. But I'm sure it should support and enhance the multistakeholder model which doesn't necessarily mean that the oversight needs to be accountable to it.

So I guess that's just the way you could read into it. But I'd be happy to take a step further on this. Thanks, Chuck.

Lise Fuhr: Yeah, Paul Kane. And before Paul is that I'd really like to say this is a document that has been shared very recently with you. And I think we should have the very a thorough discussion online and have it at the face-to-face meeting too. So it's still an open document, nothing is final. But we'll have a short discussion. Paul. Paul Kane, are you there? We will go for Elise until Paul gets online. Elise.

Elise Lindeberg: Thank you, it's Elise on the GAC. I just wanted to confirm what Mark already had been writing - typing on the chat. It's nice of the GAC that's developing their own principles in (unintelligible) I just got an update from Peter from Australia who's coordinating that work. So this is ongoing.

And so the question about is this - principles that you and Martin have put together and the GAC principles - this is the same, I already wrote an email saying that no it's not. But I don't think it will be a problem. We will see (unintelligible) so we will work (unintelligible) with that. Okay thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Elise. Any other comments for the moment?

Grace Abuhamad: Lise, Paul has put a note in the chat. Would you like me to read it out loud?

Lise Fuhr: Yes, yes please.

Grace Abuhamad: Okay. So Paul Kane says, "Any other business, for your information the ccTLD community is stating - starting consultation survey amongst the ccTLD managers. We hope to have indicative results by the face-to-face meeting."

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Paul. Yes. Oh, we have - Elise, is that a new hand or you forgot to lower your hand.

Elise Lindeberg: Yeah, it is. No just also to confirm that we also are going to have our (unintelligible) for the face to face meeting I think.

Lise Fuhr: Okay, thank you. Eduardo, yes.

Eduardo Diaz: This is Eduardo from ALAC. I just - I'm just want some - I'm curious what is the survey the ccTLD survey all about and what are they consulting about? I'm just curious. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Yeah. I can give you an update on that because also - also a part of it. And because survey where we ask all ccTLD operators to give their opinion on

their use of IANA and how they want IANA to be in the future. So it's about the IANA transition.

Eduardo Diaz: Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Yeah. And any more to any other business? I know I'm closing down the discussion on the principles but that's because I really like you to have a thorough look at it and give comments online, and then I think we shall discuss it on the face to face meeting. And every remark about oversight and all the others will take a look at it.

Greg Shatan.

Greg Shatan: Hi, Greg Shatan for the record. While we might not quite be there yet on this call I think that either on subgroup 3 calls or on this call next week perhaps it's time to start discussing the substance of the business of the group rather than kind of what's, you know, more procedure, I mean, the discussion principles is a discussion of substance but I think we need to get to the point where were actually bringing the discussions online to the call of the topics that are being debated.

I'm sure that will be doing plenty of that in the face to face but it's clear that the reason that we have to our calls is to start to get down to brass tacks. Apologies for using the idiomatic phrase. But I note that the ICG call also ran out of steam after only a half an hour because they seemed to have nothing yet to discuss but that shouldn't be our problem.

And certainly once we have kind of captured the sense of the discussion to date we should have a starting point for substantive discussion on our next call

so that we can kind of, you know, drive dialog forward in real-time. Thank you.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you, Greg. And I must say I agree with you but I'd like to have a substance that's been, you know, sent out for the group to review and then discuss it thoroughly because we need to have - give people the time to have a look at it and, you know, give their thoughts in order and then to discuss it. And I agree no more procedure; let's get going with the substance. Thank you for your comment.

Any other - subjects on any other business? Avri.

Avri Doria: Yeah, I guess I really don't understand why we don't, especially the people that wrote this don't sort of talk us through it. I mean it's brief enough to have read, you know, either before this meeting or at this meeting was talking process for the first hour.

And perhaps talking through it and having the people who wrote it explain why they wrote. I mean I'm totally, you know, surprised at the assumption that there is oversight within a set of principles. So I'd very much like to understand that and I don't. And yeah, we can do it online on email but I'm not quite sure I understand why we don't talk about it. Thanks.

Lise Fuhr: Avri, well thank you for your comment but what I'd like - I'd really like you to have time to read it before. And this was sent out yesterday. And we can have a discussion on a meeting if you want it and I would love to go through it. And I'd also like Martin to be here. He was not able to be here today.

But we will gladly go through it and have a discussion on it. I just - I don't want to get into too many details on - principles are very important but I don't

- this can also be a showstopper and I didn't want it to be that. So for me I just wanted to present it at this meeting and then have a more thorough discussion on it later. But it's not that we don't want it presented but I would really have Martin to be here too and he wasn't able to be here. So I hope that's fine with you.

And regarding the oversight, as it's not carved in stone so if people are against oversight as a principal for me it was more like an oversight make sense regarding having - like we have the subgroups without a coordinator, you need someone to be in charge or to do the checks and balances. But we'll see if that's going to be needed.

Any other on any other business? No. And I know we have an hour but I would really like you to use that hour for finding your rapporteurs and coordinators. You can use that for setting up calls maybe. But, Marika, can you do a short review of our action items?

Marika Konings: Yes definitely. So this is Marika. So the first reminder again, the next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday 4 November from 1400 to 1600 UTC. We will be sending out the notes immediately after this call so everyone can review those and take note of the action items.

That just to recap the first action item is each subgroup should appoint a rapporteur or a coordinator for purposes of bringing back output to the full CWG as well as - oh I should update that - as well as a coordinator who will be responsible for moving the work of the subgroup forward.

Each subgroup should discuss whether the role of rapporteur and coordinators should be filled by one and the same person or whether these roles should be split between two people.

In the second action item is everyone is encouraged to review the revised principles that were circulated on the mailing list and provide input.

Production item is staff to capture the discussions to date in relation to subgroup 3 to serve as a starting point for the subgroup's work.

And item 4, staff to create a new mailing list for subgroup 3 which will have all working group members and participants subscribed to the list which will allow for capturing the conversations on a separate thread but with everyone involved.

And that's all I have.

Lise Fuhr: Yeah, anyone think we are missing in action item here or - no? Okay then I will end the meeting and say well thank you for your very helpful thoughts and discussions. And I think we have a lot to work with the next couple of days. And I know we're going to be meeting in a short while but please if you can move forward and have a rapporteur from each group for this meeting it will help us a lot.

And have a nice day, morning, evening wherever you are. And thank you again for joining the call.

Bart Boswinkel: Bye, bye.

Marika Konings: Thanks.

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: Bye all.

END