

ICANN

**Moderator: Gisella Gruber-White
October 6, 2014
8:00 am CT**

Coordinator: Inform all participants today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. Also all lines are open and interactive for the duration of today's conference. To avoid background noise please utilize your mute function on your phone. Otherwise press star 6 to mute or unmute.

Thank you. You may begin.

(Grace): Thank you. Good morning everyone. Welcome to the (CWG) call. It's currently 13:05 UTC.

I will proceed with a roll call.

On the line we have (Chris Seaburn), Rafik Dammak, Matthew Shears, Chuck Gomes, Jonathan Robinson, Graeme Bunton, Robert Guerrero, (Yep Arguhus), James Gannon, Martin Boyle, (Jen) Wolfe, Phil Corwin, Donna Austin, Alan Montgomery, Mary Uduma, (Juanawit Huptra), (Shawn Genji), Fouad Bajwa, Olivia Crépin-LeBlond, Elisa Cooper, Byron Holland, and Susan Kawaguchi.

Have I missed anyone?

(Jane Labigga): (Jane Labigga).

(Grace): Okay, thank you. I have got (Omar) as well and (Pamina). Thank you.

I will go ahead and get a few more of you on the chat to confirm.

I think we can go ahead and begin Byron - Jonathan. I'm sorry.

Oh and just a note and for staff we have Nathalie, Marika, Bart and myself.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you (Grace). It's Jonathan Robinson, apologies for a brief moment of radio silence there.

So (unintelligible) welcome everyone to this first meeting of the Cross-Community Working Group.

We have significant participation which is in a sense not surprising and great to see. Obviously you were reminded of the housekeeping issues ensuring that phones are on mute. It sounds like we have a nice clean line which is great and that the call and future calls will be recorded.

You've got - and obviously as well as everyone who's participating, we've got myself and Byron from the ccNSO who jointly co-chaired the Drafting Team that did the preparatory work to get us to this point. Be very mindful of the deadlines, the magnitude of this work and the likelihood of a very tight timetable to get us to an endpoint over the next forthcoming period.

You'll see up in the top right there is an agenda of your screen. And we'll aim to work through that as efficiently as possible. I am conscious that a number of you have to leave at the top of the first hour. And we may well try and bring the call to - the meeting to land within that timeframe if at all possible.

What we intend to do is go through that agenda including make sure that we've had a little look at the charter and the various bits and pieces that the agenda covers. I'd like to make sure we also highlight in addition to the diversity and size of the Community Working Group there's a couple of points. One that have come up in the interim since the charter was published. One a little concern over the use of the term observers and the effectiveness of participation.

The intention of the Drafting Team was that anyone who participated should have an opportunity to participate on an equal basis and with a sound contribution. So I think we'll come to that a little bit more when we look over the charter.

I understand there's also some concern about the use of and/or requirement for statements of interest. I think this is something which, you know, it's very familiar and common place certainly in the GNSO although I appreciate that it's not necessarily in other groups. The spirit of this is to ensure that we are identifiable and in terms of our - to other members of the groups and that there's a sort of short summary and an indication of interest so there's some form of level playing field between participants.

I think if anyone has concerns about this it may be that - you may be less concerned if you're able to just provide some sort of short summary of your participation.

But I think that hopefully we can be a little bit flexible and tolerant on that if there are serious concerns. But the intention was simply to make sure that we were known to and identifiable to one another.

Byron I'm not sure. That probably covers the introductory remarks I wanted to make. I'm not sure if there's anything else that I've missed or that you would like to cover of.

Byron Holland: No. I think you've covered it well. Thanks Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. So let's keep things moving by going straight on then to have a review of the charter to make sure we are all similarly oriented and have got a clear feel for the objectives of the group.

Marika Konings from ICANN Staff has helped here by preparing a set of slides which cover some of the major points from the charter. And I'm going to hand over to Marika to let her talk you through these key points.

I should say that obviously or perhaps not so obviously to some of those of you who don't participate in this quite so regularly, we're all in Adobe, yes, an Adobe Room. And if anyone would like to make a point either question or remark by all means, please put your hand up in the Adobe Room and I'll keep an eye out for that and bring you in to make your comment or question so feel free to raise your hand in the - by clicking on the Hand Raise icon in the top left of your screen as Byron has just done.

Let me defer to you then Byron in case - more than just an example.

Byron Holland: I did want to just take the opportunity to make an example of it. Just if there's any participants on the call who aren't as familiar with Adobe that when you

put your hand up it will show to the moderator or the chair and also will put people in order as they put their hands up so it's also helpful there.

And I will just take the note to add one or two comments. I think Jonathan gave a good outline. I just like to remind everybody that the timeline is tight for this working group. We're working towards January 15th because we have to be sensitive to the ICG's timing challenge.

And as such for those who've worked on a number of working groups this one I would suggest may be a little different in that we are very pressed in terms of time. The participants in this work group will be all expected to do significant heavy lifting and work.

And I only speak from my experience that from time-to-time work groups often seem to work at the pace of the slowest participant. And that simply cannot be the case in this working group.

We do have a timeline. We will all have to do the heavy lifting. And we cannot work at the pace of the slowest individual.

And with that I will pass it to Marika for an overview of the charter. Thank you.

Marika Konings: Thanks Byron. So this is Marika Konings here from ICANN Staff. And I put together a couple of slides that just briefly take you through the main items of the charter.

And our assumption is of course that everyone has, you know, reviewed and read the charter in detail. So I wanted to make sure you're to capture some of those main elements and which also may give you an opportunity if there are

any specific questions you have about that you can raise them during today's meeting.

So basically the main items that are covered in the charter, it's talking about the problem statement, the goals and objectives as well as scope. It talks specifically about the deliverable timeframes and reporting required. It addresses the membership, staffing and organization as well as rules of engagement including a decision making methodology that the CWG is expected to take.

And I know that some people hear my line breaking up. Am I coming through loud and clear?

And I see, Byron you have your hand up?

Jonathan Robinson: It seems clear to me Marika.

Marika Konings: Okay, thank you for...

Byron Holland: Yes, it's clear. Sorry, I thought I put it down.

Marika Konings: Okay, no problem. Then I'll just continue.

So first of all, you know, looking at the goal and scope and think as all of you are aware and I think Jonathan and Byron both have shared as well here the primary goal really here is to produce a consolidated stewardship transition proposal that focuses specifically on the IANA functions relating to the domain name system.

The charter itself goes into quite some detail in outlining IANA specific functions and also indicating which of those are specifically related to the naming functions. The scope also focuses on the arrangements that are - noting that arrangements required for the continuous of IANA functions in an accountable and widely accepted manner after the transitions are within scope.

But nevertheless knows that work that is going on in relation to ICANN accountability and, you know, is closely linked and should as a result be coordinated to - with the joint two efforts.

And there's also a specific section that deals with deliverables and timeframes and we already briefly touched upon timeframes. And I think it's something that we'll be coming back to as well later in the agenda.

And so again, you know, core deliverable is the actual proposal. And as such the charter recommends a first step should be to develop a detailed work plan as well as timetable including expected and date for submission of such a final transition proposal.

In addition to that the charter actually outlines ten other specific elements that are expected to be included as part of the work plan such as, you know, agreement on definitions for example and how to ensure, you know, maximum participation and outreach to, you know, stakeholders that may not yet be involved in the CWG or ICANN and as well, you know, what processes and timelines need to be taken into account when communicating to the different groups that are participating in this effort.

And this was also already briefly touched upon in some of the comments made. Participation in the CWG, in addition to members that are appointed by the chartering organization and this you may have seen, you know, chartering

organizations can appoint between two and up to five members to this effort. And they're also - the group is also open to participants, anyone that is interested in joining this effort.

As I've noted here, you know, the charter formerly refers to that category of participants as observers. I've noted that probably the term was not very well chosen as I think to many the term observers denotes a very passive role while as you can see as well in the description of the charter it basically foresees participation on an equal footing and are only maybe a certain number of very limited circumstances only in those cases where a formal consensus call may be needed that this would be limited to members.

So I think based on feedback received, you know, you'll see that we started referring to this group of members as participants and, you know, versus the observer term that's used in the charter. Again, you know, still within the same spirit that it is in the charter but just to make sure that there's no confusion around by that, everyone's participating on an equal footing in this effort.

And the charter also aligns the decision making methodology. It is expected to be used by the CWG. And the chairs of the CWG are responsible for designating, you know, the level of support that eventual recommendations have and the two levels that have been identified one of which is full consensus which is a position where no minority disagrees which is identified by any absence of objection, and then there's also a consensus which is a position where a small minority disagrees but most agree.

And also this charter specifies that if applicable a minority viewpoint should also be included in the CWG Report so all that information and all the views expressed are available to those reviewing the final product.

And the charter is posted on the CWG wiki so if you would like to review in further detail here's the link where you can find that information.

And I think that is all I had. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Marika. Can I just pause for a moment then and see if there are any questions, comments or input relating to the charter of the group?

And I note to your point in the charter Olivia about the speed. I think we're conscious of there's an overarching pressure on all of us to get things done as quickly as possible and to utilize the time as effectively as possible.

And you are right. We need to make sure we do things carefully and slowly and bring everyone along.

And in fact I was mindful of that when I saw Phil Corwin's question in the chat about the ICG. I think we're deep in the level of acronyms. And it's not always clear to everyone what the different roles of the groups and so on.

And essentially the work or the significant chunks of the work as they pertain to the interest of different groups have been devolved and this is the work with respect to the IANA stewardship transition. And this - the focus of this Cross-Community Working Group is very clearly on the impact as it pertains to the naming community.

So I'd say, and ultimately this work will feed into that of the so-called ICG. And the ICG will perform a form of coordinated or clearinghouse function to coordinate all of the different inputs from the broader community.

And appreciate having one of the chairs of that ICG (unintelligible). Thanks for your posting in the chat later.

Any other comments or questions on the charter? I take your point Chuck that we should all become as familiar as possible as quickly as possible with the detail of this charter.

All right, I'm going to move us on then onto the third point which is how we form and make sure we have appropriate leadership of the group.

Woman: (Yes).

Jonathan Robinson: See - Byron your hand is up. Go ahead.

Byron Holland: Thank you Jonathan. I also just for the benefit of the group would like to raise a point to build on Chuck's comment about getting very familiar with the charter; I would also strongly suggest that we all also become very familiar with the NTIA contract as it stands, the contract with IANA. Because I think as we get into the heavy lifting of the work some of the very first work we're going to need to do is really understand what that contract says, what's included, what's not included?

And in order to carry out the work of the CWG I think it's necessary for us all to be equally familiar with that contract as we will be with the charter of this working group itself. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Byron. But I think that's an important point and we'll take that up as we go through. I suspect it's something we may even need to try and do some work on that familiarization and detail before we meet next in a week's time.

The Drafting Team was co-chaired by myself and Byron and the (unintelligible) really as existing chairs of the I - of the GNSO and ccNSO respectively. And it's co-initiated of the CWG if you like.

The charter provides for the group to select chair or co-chairs leadership of the group. Byron has made it clear that he is unable or unavailable to be - to chair the working group itself. I will be available to do so.

And so we're going to have to be sure that the group is comfortable with the concept of co-chairs, likely emanating from the GNSO and the ccNSO.

And I really call for - I think this is something we'll need to finalize probably in our next meeting. But I'd like to call for any comment or input on the leadership of the group at this stage and I guess highlight the point that was made earlier about the amount of work that's going to be required. I for one find it it's going to be a daunting (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Hello.

Jonathan Robinson: To get this done and in the time available. Any comments or...?

Woman: Hello? Hello?

Jonathan Robinson: (Unintelligible) your phone is on mute if you're not actively...

Woman: (Oh my).

Jonathan Robinson: ...contributing to the call - the meeting.

Chuck go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Byron. Chuck Gomes.

Woman: Hello?

Chuck Gomes: From the Registry Stakeholder Group. I don't know who's saying hello but are you waiting for a response from the - from Jonathan?

Anyway, with regard to the chair or co-chairs it seems to me that it would be very helpful if between now and our in-person meeting in LA that we discussed on the list whether or not people want to have a co-chair and if so that any co-chairs be identified so that early in our meeting in LA we can finalize the leadership of the group.

Jonathan has said he's available to chair or co-chair. So I would suggest as a goal that we go into our meeting in LA knowing exactly who the candidate or candidates are for chair or for a co-chair so that we can discuss that and finalize that very early in the meeting and then let the leadership proceed in that regard. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Chuck. Robert, I see that your hand is up. Go ahead.

Robert Guerrero: Hi. This is Robert Guerrero. Just - I was just typing it on the Adobe chat as well. I just wanted to flag to everyone that the SSAC is finalizing a document that should be out for the LA meeting on stewardship of the IANA function getting a bit more into some of the contract details which follows up on the document that we had put out for the previous meeting.

So as soon as that's finalized inside the SSAC I'll make sure to share it with those on this list. And that might help in terms of providing a bit more quantitative comment and details on what Byron and others have mentioned on the existing contract. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Robert. I for one can say I'll look forward to seeing that as soon as possible. So yes, as soon as you and your SSAC colleagues are comfortable with releasing that in draft or final form, please let's have it. That will be great.

I will just make it clear that, you know, personally just to kick the discussion off on this and it seems like we may have no additional contributions for now but we'll pick this up on (list). Certainly to the extent that the group is happy to select or endorse me as a chair I would very much welcome a co-chair in order to both make this role more effective but also to spread the workload. I'm simply practically not necessarily going to be able to be in the front of this at every single meeting. And much as I'm committed to doing the work I will need help.

And it's been clear that, made clear already on the call that there's just a mass amount of work to be done.

Bill Manning: Good afternoon. This is Bill Manning.

Jonathan Robinson: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Bill Manning: I am not on Adobe.

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead Bill.

Bill Manning: If you're listening...

Woman: Hello?

Bill Manning: Hello. If you guys are looking for additional help as in you would like co-chairs or additional people to step up, I have some time and I would be willing to help.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Bill. Your help will be welcomed with open arms and we'll be shaping the agenda and the - for LA and the practical work streams that are going to come out of that in short order.

So as that starts to shape up by all means insert yourself as you see fit and make yourself available. It will be great to have your help.

Byron go ahead.

Byron Holland: All right thanks Jonathan. I just wanted to make the point that from the CC Community we fully intend to put forward a candidate for a co-chair. Our selection process has taken a little - for members has taken a little longer than anticipated or hoped for but we fully intend to have our slate of candidates made public today or tomorrow at the latest and flowing from that we fully intend to put forward somebody who can do the heavy lifting around the co-chair role. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Byron. That's helpful.

(Shawn), yes so your hand is up next.

(Shawn Genji): Yes. And hello and good afternoon, good morning, wherever it is.

I just want to be sure that we are on Item 3 on the agenda I assume. I want to understand. Is there actually a call for the leadership already (on readiness) of the mission? Is there actually a process to (assemble) the leadership of this Cross-Community Working Group?

Well it looks like this person is just - is the call already starting now? In other words we're doing (unintelligible) (mission) (unintelligible). Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: And (Shawn) I think there's - the group was initiated and kicked off by GNSO and ccNSO. And we fully expected that the GNSO and ccNSO would put forward a candidate for co-chair. The agenda item here is an opportunity to discuss whether that is adequate and whether there are requirements to do more than that or create say for example Vice-Chair positions.

And I expect we'll make sure those names or we'll do something on list between now as Chuck suggested, between now and the meeting in LA.

So should you have a candidate or candidates or a - to identify or a proposal for the leadership structure of the group, my working assumption is that there will be two co-chairs. But that's an assumption and I'm happy to have other input or thoughts relating to that.

I think my only practical point is we've got to have a leadership group that spreads the load appropriately but is not too big and diverse that we struggle to get direction and effectiveness given the time scales involved.

So that's my thoughts. But obviously welcome input and comments.

(Shawn Genji): Okay. Just - this is (Shawn) from the (Council) (unintelligible). Just one more thing I wanted to say.

So the nominations you're suggesting now should happen between (unintelligible) so just the - just those two communities, right? So it leaves the other two communities, the ALAC and the SSAC and other communities perhaps for this, right?

Is that what you're saying?

Jonathan Robinson: (Shawn) could you just repeat the last bit of what you said there? You said the SSAC and the ALAC.

(Shawn Genji): Yes. I'm just asking what are the co-chair selections (unintelligible), do they expand to those who are actually part of the - this working group or is it just for the GNSO and ccNSO alone, that's where the co-chairs and the leadership, the chair and the co-chair are selected. I just want to know that, understand that. Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: I think it's a really good question (Shawn). Potentially what's happened is that the Drafting Team was co-chaired by myself and Byron respectively of the GNSO and the ccNSO.

The assumption if I might put it that way is that that - is that a structure like that could continue but that's the purpose of this agenda item to check that. To challenge that if necessary if that's not adequate in some way. I think it's the default if you like.

And so that's really where we're at. And the charter does say that the CWG will select a chair or co-chairs.

Olivia I see your hand is up. Go ahead.

Olivia Crepin-LeBlond: Thanks very much Jonathan. It's Olivia Crepin-LeBlond speaking for the transcript. And I think that as far as co-chairs are concerned anyone from the chartering organization so that the GNSO, ccNSO, ALAC and SSAC I believe at the moment having signed the charter would be a possibility for a co-chair role unless I'm wrong and I would like to learn. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: No. Olivia or go ahead Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: That's okay Jonathan. If you want to first respond to Olivia and then I can talk if you'd like.

Jonathan Robinson: No. Go ahead, in a minute (answer).

Chuck Gomes: Okay. Just wanted to - this is Chuck Gomes. Just wanted to share something that we're doing in the GNSO Policy and Implementation Working Group where we actually have two co-chairs and then we also have a couple of Vice-Chairs and then we work together as a Leadership Team that's working quite effectively I think in terms of that getting several heads together.

And that's another approach. I'm not necessarily advocating that. But it has I think worked pretty well in that particular working group in the GNSO.

So that's another way we can approach this. I do think that it's very important for the GNSO and the ccNSO to have co-chairs and if there are more than two co-chairs that's probably workable.

But the reason I say that is because the ccTLDs and the gTLDs are direct beneficiaries of the IANA functions. And they both also have existing structures to provide - to facilitate receiving input and working on consensus and so forth. Doesn't mean it has to be restricted to there - to them. But very critical I think that those structures are able to be led by co-chairs of the working group itself. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: And thanks Chuck. Thanks Olivia and others. I think that's precisely the point of this was to tease out. There are various structures. And we don't have a, aside from what it says in the charter, we don't have a prescribed leadership function designed.

So I think it's quite clear that I would expect that the GNSO and the ccNSO would put forward a chair or co-chair candidates.

And to the extent that other chartering organizations would like to put forward leadership candidates either as co-chair or as Vice-Chairs that may well be a very practical solution.

And I note that Graeme's pointed out that the Privacy and Proxy Group has a single chair and two Vice-Chairs. And it's - my experience is it's quite useful for a leadership group to have two or three people that can act as sort of a clearinghouse for preparation of draft agendas and structure meetings and so on.

So perhaps that's enough on this topic for now. And we can take up suggestions or proposals on list for either co-chairs or Vice-Chairs and how we might best handle this unless there are further comments. And I just feel

that we haven't dealt with this adequately. There's a stream going on in the chat covering some of the history and so on.

Yeah, so the reference is made to the different chartering organizations and the supporting organizations and advisory committees that have chartered the group as Olivier made reference to as well, ALAC, ccNSO GNSO and SSAC.

Byron, go ahead.

Byron Holland: Okay. Thank you, Jonathan. I just also want to remind people that - well, sorry, let me back up. There has been a list of the chartering organizations which included ALAC, SSAC, GNSO and ccNSO. Also I just remind that the GAC has also signed on.

But that the ccNSO and the GNSO were the two catalytic organizations in getting this - or structures in getting this working group going. And the reason, really, that we started this was because we compromised the directly-affected parties of the IANA services in the sense we are the directly-affected customers and that's where the genesis of this all began.

The draft - or rather the charter does demand co-chairs; I just want to remind us of that. So a single chair is probably outside what the charter requires. I would just like to surface something that we've touched on is that the charter is silent on vice chairs. So if there is a real need to have other folks outside or beyond just two co-chairs there is certainly the opportunity to also have vice chairs and perhaps that's something that we can contemplate as we move forward towards LA.

Thanks, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah thanks. And I'd say - thank you, Byron. And I take the point on line. So let's leave it at that point. I take the point in the chat that we've got other things to be getting on with as well as the structure and organization. My experience though is that one can't just drive straight through these things, it's important to listen and understand so it's a fine line between making sure we hear people out and ensuring effective progress.

So at the current time we'll hold it at that where there is a provision for co-chairs, a suggestion that we accommodate vice chairs and we'll pick that up from here.

So Item 4 then, moving us on, deals with outreach and participation. And this includes a possible letter to the ICG and any other thoughts as to how we might make sure that we ensure outreach and participation. And these are more than just nice words, they are there because the legitimacy of the proposal that we make will be dependent on our - on the extent to which we have been seen to and actually had effective participation.

So, one, we had a discussion of - there was some discussion earlier about, prior to this meeting, with some members of the drafting team about how we might undertake outreach and one suggestion was that we - that this is a perfect - one perfect area or one good area in which we could work with the ICG and work with the resources and in fact the remit of the ICG to seek their help in ensuring we have effective participation in that part of the sort of remit of the ICG is to serve as a central clearinghouse for public information and to have a communications function and provide information about ongoing work being distributed both early and continuously.

So we felt, in that discussion, that it would be perfect opportunity to write from the CWG to the ICG and encourage the ICG to work with us on

enhanced participation bearing in mind that this, whilst there are - there's a definition as to contributions of members, to this cross community working group there is no restriction on participation.

So having made that and clarified the point on the agenda are there any other comments or points at this stage on how we might ensure - as I said at the outset, we do have an effective membership already, it's a good group.

Chuck, I see your hand is up, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jonathan, I appreciate that. I just thought I'd share what we're doing in the Registry Stakeholder Group. Our plan is to reach out to those registries and new gTLD applicants who are not yet participating either as an observer or a member in the Registry Stakeholder Group and inviting them to participate fully as part of the Registry Stakeholder Group processes in terms of providing input into the cross community working group.

So we will be reaching out to those who are not yet members or participants in any way with the Registry Stakeholder Group and inviting them to participate fully. Obviously they don't have to but we're going to give that opportunity so that they can do that. And I would certainly encourage other groups within the GNSO to do the same for comparable members that would normally be eligible for membership in their organization.

And I know - I won't speak for the ccNSO but I know they've done the same thing. And so if all of us do that we can do a lot to encourage outside involvement. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, Chuck, thank you for that. And I could get that captured as another action item for the group then that's for all participants within the group to actively encourage and facilitate participation here.

And as you pointed out, and I hope that was perhaps understood is the right word by the group that the intention there is to sort of reach out to parts of - to organizations and individuals who may not normally participate and who wouldn't necessarily normally participate within our groups and structures. So it's reaching out as broadly as possible so that would be great.

And I note - I think that was the main point there to capture. Any other comments or questions on outreach and participation? Sorry, I should note that there was a comment to support a letter to the ICG defining or recapturing the purposes of this CWG and also in line with what we've just discussed to, I think, seek the assistance and cooperation of the ICG in reaching out perhaps beyond the ICANN community but in any event as effectively as possible to encourage participation where appropriate.

Elisa, go ahead.

Elisa Cooper: Thank you, Jonathan. This is Elisa Cooper. Just one follow up question and I'm just curious since the ICANN meeting is coming up next week, I mean, certainly right now we can happily share with the full ICG the announcement of this group and the instructions on how to sign up, I mean, that's how I figured it out not being really an ICANN person.

So, you know, I'm happy to just forward that to the ICG and say please make sure that each of your communities is aware of this if you don't want to wait to have a formal letter in the interest of getting people signed up in case they will

be at the ICANN meeting and wanting to participate in the face to face meeting.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, thank you very much, Elisa, that's a very welcome suggestion and a welcome shortcut. I mean, I think we could easily follow up anyway with a letter but I for one have no reservation about that. And I think the critical point, in case it's not 100% clear is that the ICG is much broader than the typical - as a reach beyond the typical ICANN constituencies and groups and organizations. So it's very useful in that - to that extent to have that outreach. And, yes, thank you that would be great.

Elisa Cooper: Okay, will do.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, I think I'll keep moving us on then to Item 5 which is some of the moves now onto some of the logistics and practicalities of getting this - of keeping things moving.

The ICG has requested a timeline in which seeks formal input and contributions by the 15th of January, 2015. We've taken that notional deadline, if you like, and have a look at what that might mean for this group. And I think, Marika you may be able to share with us a high level view of what that actually means in terms of the work that the group would have to do to get there.

So on your screen in the Adobe now you will see a timeline which talks about a first meeting taking place on - in fact it assumes that it took place on the 29th of September but in fact it's taking place really today and leading up to the 15th of January and what that might mean.

Marika, would you like to speak to this? Please go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. I just wanted to note, as you already did when going through it that, you know, I developed this, you know, a couple of weeks back, you know, when this group was starting just to, you know, try to see how we would fit everything into a potential work plan that would get us to a 15th of January deadline.

So you'll see, you know, we basically already missed our - the first according to this, you know, the draft plan, a first meeting that, you know, was initially perceived to have taken place already but basically we're now here at the 6th of October, it already perceives a face to face meeting on the 13th of October.

But in order to meet, you know, what is I think as well outlined in the charter or at least the understanding that there would be an initial report for public comments taking into account, you know, the 21 days plus 21 days requirement that currently exists, that would basically take us to a 10th of November deadline for publication of an initial report assuming that, you know, after that we would need a couple of meetings to of course review the comments received, you know, update the report as needed and then in order to get to as well being able..

((Foreign language spoken))

Marika Konings: I think we need - all right, there we go. And of course also taking into account that, you know, as per the charter any final proposal will need to go back to the chartering organizations for approval before being able to submit it to the ICG. And, you know, that would proceed and probably all groups would need to, you know, take that into account in their planning as well, finalization by the 5th of January to be able to have final submission by the 15th of January to the ICG.

And I think as you can note that of course leaves very little time for discussion and deliberations. So this is something that, you know, you may want to think about as you start planning your work and thinking about how to organize that work accordingly.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks very much, Marika. If it didn't look like a daunting task it now does. You can see that the very - it's a simplistic timetable but as Marika has highlighted there's some - it's particularly challenging to get through the work in the time available.

Are there any comments or questions? I see that there's a sort of ongoing stream of discussion in the chat. Would anyone like to ask anything or, yeah, I mean, Phil, I take your point given that the implication of this is to produce a plan within a month.

And I guess it really ties on to the next point which is a related point under Item 5. And this is - we've had an invitation extended to us to meet with essentially meet with ICG members in LA. And the question really is, is what would be the purpose of such a meeting and the value and to make sure that the group was supportive of that.

Certainly it immediately strikes me when we have this conversation that one such component of that discussion, although to be fair it's been discussed already on email, is the nature of this timeframe and the stretching and challenging nature of that and to have a sort of mutual empathy with one another's pressures, both that of the ICG and this CWG.

It highlights perhaps issues of resourcing and what support there can be to resource this work. I see the point about potential additional meeting time in

LA. The challenge with the meeting time in LA is that these meetings tend to be jam-packed with all sorts of scheduling. And if you try and insert something in you invariably upset someone who feels that they've been prejudiced or unable to participate because it wasn't prescheduled.

So we have a prescheduled session. And certainly one of the key objectives must be to make maximum use of that. And I say prescheduled session I mean for the CWG, not as yet any face time or interaction with the ICG. I mean, to that extent, again, I'll thank Elisa for being here because it's very helpful for Elisa to see firsthand, I'm sure, what the challenges and issues are.

There's a suggestion to meet each morning at 6:00 am. I'm not quite sure whether to take that seriously or not although from Avri I suspect it is serious but it would be.

Are there any other comments on the logistics and practicalities and the substance of the work, if you like, between now and LA? Alan, I see your hand is up, go ahead.

(Alan McGilvray): Thank you, Jonathan. This is (Alan McGilvray) from dotCA from the ccNSO community. I think flowing from our previous discussion about the very tight timelines we're under and having I guess been involved in the drafting teams I've been immersed in this a bit since the summer.

I think there are some immediate tasks that we could turn our minds to maybe between now and our meeting in Los Angeles. I think if one refers to the so-called request for proposals they are a P from the ICG itself. It calls for a number of what I would call background information, in other words, they're looking for material from the naming community aside from a specific transition proposal.

And this includes, for example, a description of existing pretransition arrangements, a description of existing policy sources and oversight and accountability and also a description of the community's use of IANA functions.

So I would put this out to the community that this is work that could be started right now, it's pretty descriptive and I think that we should be looking for volunteers to start this material. In addition, I think just following on Byron's comment earlier, I think our work is going to focus at least initially on the specific IANA contract itself.

And, again, I think this is where we could - we're in a position to start working immediately by looking at the contract and either going through it to say is this a provision that we somehow want to capture and bring forward for example? So I would like to put that out to the community but - and say that I'd be - I would be prepared to lead on something looking at the IANA contract and if others would like to work with me on that I'd be pleased to welcome the help. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Alan. That's some obviously very practical suggestions. And I'd love to see that laid out if you feel willing and able to do so on an email proposal to the group to try and capture those key work streams and key items of activity. That would be helpful.

Chuck, I see your hand is up, go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jonathan. I'll also volunteer to submit something to the CWG list that will, in very simple - intentionally simple steps give some ideas with regard to

a work plan which is one of our first deliverables and would appreciate discussion on that.

Again, it's not intended to fill in all the details at whether there be a high level overview of a approach to the work that is ahead for us.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah thanks both. That's both very helpful. The more we can get into this sort of sleeves rolled up practical work of doing this and actually initiating the activity that will be very helpful.

I see some practical suggestions around Dropboxes and Google docs and so on. I think, you know, we have some technical support already, staff support, to get this going. And if there are practical methods for doing this by all means let's do so; let's get the tasks out lined as effectively as possible and some of the steps and the tools we can use to do them.

I note Olivier's point about the group potentially meeting face to face at any time between LA and the report to the ICG. Truth is, Olivier, at this stage we don't know but we will be meeting and need to think carefully about perhaps whether resources are available for elements of - or some sort of face to face meeting.

Obviously the current timetable doesn't envisage any ICANN meetings of such taking place. I also notice the point suggesting two-hour calls and I think in reality that's probably very sensible so I'd steel yourselves for those as a prospective way of working and getting through the volume and detail that's required.

Byron, your hand is up, go ahead.

Byron Holland: Thank you, Jonathan. I'm also going to suggest that we task staff - ICANN staff who are on the call with us today - with starting to aggregate all the relevant documents regarding the various policy issues that are contained within the IANA contract so be it policy around delegations or all of the other respective information that is going to be relevant to the substance contained within the IANA contract and start to aggregate it one place so it's available for this group and others to reference easily.

Basically the policy related information that's contained within the ICG RFP and that is work that I think could get started immediately and be very helpful and relevant to this work group as we head into LA. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Byron. The combination of that, if you like, resource library plus the proposals from Alan and Chuck on active work plans will be very helpful. One thing that I think this group might benefit from in thinking about all of this and, Elisa, I don't know if you're willing to speak to this or if I'm unfairly putting you on the spot, but it might be useful if you just put a couple of sentences around the 15th of January deadline.

So if the group is to interact with the ICG either informally or semiformally in LA we can - and if this - clearly this timeline is going to be one potential topic of discussion that people are well equipped to talk about that with the perspective of the ICG as well.

Elisa Cooper: Sure. This is Elisa Cooper for the transcript. So I think when the development of the timeline as the ICG did obviously we had many factors that we had to take into account. There's the transition proposal for the naming-related function being developed here; there's also portions of the proposal being developed in the other operational communities, the RARs are developing

their piece on numbering, the protocol parameters piece being developed in the IETF.

Those processes I think got off the ground a little bit sooner than this one. And so in terms of, you know, the timeline of putting out the RFP we wanted to make sure that everything that we needed to do was in place so that any of the communities that were ready could proceed with their transition planning.

I think on the backend, if you look at the full timeline you'll see that the, you know, the January 15 target was not sort of plucked out to thin air but actually was chosen based on all of the following timelines and target deadlines that we will need to accommodate in order to eventually get a proposal back to the NTIA in time for the September 30 deadline.

And that accommodates, you know, periods during which the ICG has to assemble a final proposal, possibly come back to this group and to other operational communities with questions and comments. It includes a global public comment period on the full proposal. And as we all know those things can take time.

And so, you know, we left the January 15 as the target deadline with all of those different steps in mind and I encourage people to look at the timeline and the graphic and see how those are related. The testing phase is also included in there and so if you back it up from September 30 backwards and include time for the NTIA to do a review and assessment, you know, prior to accepting the proposal then you can sort of see how we ended up with the timeline that we did.

With that said, you know, we made them targets and not, you know, strict deadlines. It's not as if, you know, if this group doesn't provide a proposal

exactly on January 15 then, you know, we're never going to communicate with you again or something, so there is a little bit of flexibility but I think as I said in my note to Jonathan and Byron, you know, how much of that there is is difficult to say. There's, you know, there's probably not a whole month's worth I would say and we don't want to get that far behind.

And we also, in the ICG, are in the position where we have to coordinate amongst these multiple communities and so if one community gets too far behind the others then we may be in a position where we are, you know, putting forward a proposal for comments or for public comment or globally for communities to look at that only has, you know, one or two components and a third component is missing and so on and so forth.

So in any event happy to talk further about this if we do meet face to face but those are just some of the considerations that we had. And I actually, unfortunately, have to leave the call now because the group in the IETF that is working on IANA transition is having its interim meeting right now as well. So thank you for having me and happy to answer more questions going forward.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you very much. It's Jonathan. Just before you go just one more minute, thank you for the contribution and thank you for that answer. And the steer I'm getting at the moment is that we may not meet with the ICG as such. And I would hate that to be in any way reflected as some form of snub or unwillingness to; the driver is really to get the work of the CWG done.

I'll correspond with you offline anyway and be available to you as will anyone else I'm sure who is - becomes co-chair and/or vice chair of this group. But just to make it - just to give you a heads up on where I think that's going.

Elisa Cooper: Completely understood. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Elisa.

Elisa Cooper: And I - the other thing I should say I really appreciate you putting together an aggressive timeline and showing it on the screen and having people debate it, I think that's a great first step and I appreciate the willingness to do that so thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, thanks again. So my sense for those remaining on the call - I see, Byron, your hand is up and I'll come to you in one moment - is that we're going to try and close this out now. And we have a set of actions which guide us in terms of confirming next steps and the next meeting which I'll highlight.

Let me pause, Byron, and - oh your hand is down again. So the next meeting is scheduled for the ICANN meeting in LA at 1215 local time, that's 1915 UTC on Monday the 13th of October.

So that's what we're heading to. We've captured a set of actions which I'm sure our capable support staff will circulate immediately afterwards. And it seems to me that that's been a useful hour and I'm tempted to call it quits at this point.

Can I just see if there are any other hands or comments required? Olivier, go ahead. Olivier, you may be n mute.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you very much, Byron, it's Olivier - Byron - Jonathan, it's Olivier speaking. I was trying to unmute myself and for some reason it just stuck. Two questions quickly, one is to do with this call and future calls. Are there any plans for interpretation to be afforded in Spanish and in French?

That was one thing bearing in mind that there are people who are non-native English speakers.

The second one - the second question is to do with the attendance of the call. I noticed that there are some people who don't appear on the open quotes official, close quotes, list of participants. Are these calls open? Is this a closed working group? We have to be a bit more clear about this because I have read some concerns outside these walls that this process is not transparent.

And I'm not quite sure whether it is, whether it isn't and how this is going to be dealt with especially with regards to the membership of this working group. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Olivier, those are two good questions. I see Marika's hand up so I'll defer to her first and then come back if it's necessary.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika. Just basically in relation to the last point Olivier made or asked about - it's my understanding that, you know, these calls are transcribed and recorded so anyone who doesn't want to join the working group and, you know, be actively involved or engaged but just follow the conversations they can do so by, you know, reviewing the transcript as well as the recording.

But as far as I understand the calls themselves are for those that are subscribed to the group as a - either a member or a participant. And of course, you know, anyone can join at any time. There's, in that sense, no restrictions.

So I think it's partly as well to make sure that, you know, those that are on the call are there, you know, to do work and those that want to listen they can do that, you know, at another point of the meeting. So I think that's at least the approach we've taken or maybe that's as well some background. There are

very many GNSO groups where we do it in a similar manner. So I think that's where, at least from staff perspective, I think where we currently stand.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Marika. So it is open and probably sufficiently open that it creates an opportunity for it to not be 100% transparent and some can may be able to participate but the intention is to have it - everyone who does wish to participate registered and recorded as participating.

There are no current plans to undertake translation simultaneous or offline in French or Spanish, Olivier, but that's in part, at least, the resourcing point and it's something which we may need to revisit.

All right with your permission and seeing no other hands I think we'll bring this call to a close. And I feel it's been a productive hour. And we will look forward to working together in the meantime and of course on Monday the 13th in LA.

Thank you very much for your contributions and suggestions. That's great.

Byron Holland: Thank you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Byron. Thanks all.

Coordinator: Thank you, this concludes today's conference. Participants may disconnect at this time. Thank you.

END