

ICANN

**Moderator: Jonathan Robinson
December 30, 2014
8:00 am CT**

Coordinator: The recordings have begun.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you. And a reminder to everyone to please ensure that your line is on mute unless you are speaking. If you want to speak make yourself known by raising your hand in the Adobe room - meeting room. If for some reason you've been unable to access the Adobe meeting room please make yourself known via the audio and we'll put you in the queue.

((Crosstalk))

Lise Fuhr: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: I think that's it for the housekeeping before we can go straight on and proceed with the agenda. So this is the CWG Stewardship meeting. It's our 12th meeting. We missed a meeting last week recognizing that many people are otherwise involved and with - given the time of year and also that we had stream of public comments coming to a close and needing analysis. So welcome everyone to this our 12th call.

And I think the way we've done it in the past is we've recorded everyone as present who is logged into the Adobe room. So we will record you as present if you are present in the Adobe room. And it would be great if you would make yourself known otherwise. So let me pause for a moment to get notification from those who have only been able to make themselves available for the meeting on audio.

Eduardo Diaz: Yes, this is Eduardo Diaz. I am going to be in the audio only. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Eduardo. Any others present on audio only?

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Olivier Crépin-LeBlond.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr is trying to get into the AC room but I will try again and not being let in at this stage I'll keep trying that.

Jonathan Robinson: Great. Thanks all. And welcome regardless of whether you're in the AC room or not. The way we've set out the agenda is that we've got an opportunity for status updates from the different groups. We have got - we'll then go into describe the work that's been done to summarize, categorize and analyze the public comments to date.

We will go on then under Item 4 to talk about how we might move this forward, capture that all thereafter in a set of action items and have scope for anything to come up under any other business. Before we move ahead with that are there any comments or input on the agenda?

Thank you. So I suggest we then move on to look at the status updates from the different groups that have had the opportunity to meet in the interim since our last meeting of the whole CWG. So let me call for updates in succession

and first all then I think we should see if there is any update from - I think it's RFP 3; really it makes sense to hear from first if there is an update from the RFP 3 group in the meantime.

Greg Shatan: Hi, this is Greg Shatan. I can give an update for RFP 3.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Greg. Please go ahead.

Greg Shatan: We had a call yesterday. We did not have a call on Friday prior. We did also had a call the Monday prior to that. We've been working through a number of the questions and details on both the structure and the functions of the MRT and to a lesser extent the CSC.

We had a considerable amount of discussion on the structure of the MRT and realized that we needed to go back and clarify a number of points about the functions of the MRT before being able to move forward most virtually on structure again. So we went from structure to function and back to structure.

Recognizing of course that the comments that we received could have a significant effect on the entire framework of our proposal but felt that, you know, nonetheless, about the MRT and CSC showed up in a vast majority of the comments and even if they - the overall framework changed it was at least seemed likely that these would exist in some form. So we did continue forward, resolved a number of smaller issues.

I think one of the bigger issues that while we did not resolve I think we came closer to was in terms of the size and composition of the MRT the feeling of the call was that a smaller MRT was more appropriate than a larger one. Some of the proposals if you added - if you gave every group kind of what they wanted for themselves would have put somewhere around 27 people - as

many as 27 people on the MRT. And the feeling was that that was neither necessary or appropriate for the MRT.

And while there was no conclusion taken on the call an MRT more around the size of say, 11, was - seemed better. In that case it would be two from the gTLDs, two from the ccTLDs and one each from other ICANN structures.

There was also discussion of having non-ICANN structures that could also serve in part dependent on whether the MRT acted solely in the name space or might have a broader mandate but that's not for us to decide. But even if it were just in the name space at least liaising with the other communities or having input from other groups that perhaps have a stake in the IANA functions for names.

So I think, you know, definitely the leaning of the group was to make the - the group small and also we underscored that its mandate is limited and it would meet no more often than necessary to deal with annual reviews, contract reviews and the possibility of any escalation, you know, would cause the group to meet but otherwise it should not meet.

So I think there were a number of secondary points that were resolved and I will not denigrate their importance but I think don't need to, you know, recite them on the call. But I do think that a smaller MRT and also a small CSC that would be at least dominated if not exclusively customers was also discussed.

I think there's less - there is less of a revealing - of any point towards consensus on composition of the CSC although there was some discussion of perhaps having a - say a single GNSO non-Registry representative or, you know, very - or more of a liaison from the MRT from the non-customers on the CSC, you know, recognizing that the role of the CSC is very much

technical operational role and really should be largely given over to direct customers as long as there is appropriate oversight and accountability for that group.

I think that would - that's a fair summary of where we stand at the moment. We have another call scheduled for this coming Friday at 1400. And back to you, Jonathan and Lise.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Greg, that's a helpful summary. Appreciate that. I would like to ask for...

((Crosstalk))

Greg Shatan: ...I see a hand up from Alan Greenberg.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, yeah, I was going to make sure we asked and sought any questions or comments relating to that work. I can see that Alan has already got his hand up so let's go ahead, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I'll be very brief. Just a quick comment that although the MRT or an MRT-like structure shows up in a lot of the proposals the tasks assigned to it vary quite a bit. And I think the issue of who's on it, the composition, may well vary depending on what the task ends up being.

As Greg ended with in the primary model that was being considered by the CWG, it's a very small task list and it will meet only very irregularly. That's not the case in some of the other models. So I don't think anything is closed until we actually decide what it's doing. And I think that's quite reasonable that the function has to be determined before the composition. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Alan. Any other comments or questions for Greg and/or the work of the RFP 3 group? Good. Thank you. Do we have someone willing and available to report on the work of the RFP 4 group? Robert, I see your hand is up and I'm hoping you'll be the person who's available to do that.

Robert Guerra: Yes, I'm happy to do so. Hello, it's Robert Guerra for the record to - for an update on the RFP 4 group. We met on December 23 and yesterday on December 29. I'll go through very briefly in terms of some of the items that we covered and some of the pending tasks that we have and questions that we have for the larger CWG.

In our call yesterday, which is a good summary of the two calls, we reviewed some pending items. We - since the proposals from the other communities, IETF, and the RIRs is available, I did a very quick summary in terms of what's available and some of the text they've developed in regards to transition implications.

And then also have developed a - we've - RFP 4 has structured its work on four work streams, one of which is the current situation and some of the key terms; Work Stream 2, which is describing the transition path and, 3, testing the proposal.

Quick update on the work on those three work streams. For Work Stream 3, which is testing the proposal, Siva, who's the co-chair, developed a spreadsheet, a document that walks through and aggregates some of the different scenarios that have been identified and to try to classify them. We had some conversation in that in regards to that perhaps the list was too long and they should just be focused on technical security aspects.

We're waiting for the proposal from RFP 3 to finalize so we can identify critical periods and so we'll ask as RFP 3 discussions and the general discussions around the model takes place that the discussions also try to identify critical periods where testing perhaps should take place.

In regards to Work Stream 2, which is our transition path, there is a document that had been elaborated on on an earlier call in terms of how to describe the path from the existing mechanism to a new one.

There was no - there seemed to be consensus to adopt that but again we are waiting to hear if the model will change, get smaller, get bigger so it can be described and so an outline as to how that should be done was - there was consensus on the call.

And then for Work Stream Number 3 as well we had agreement on kind of key terms that should be identified going forward. So for our - I guess our key item for us is just waiting for the model to be more stabilized by the discussions of the larger group and then when that's the case it can be described; risks can be adequately documented.

And that's it for our call. We have our next call tentatively scheduled for February 5. And the minutes and the materials from the RFP call for tomorrow are online already and ask please those that are interested to please review that documentation and please comment. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Robert. It's Jonathan speaking again. I expect that next call is January 5, not February 5 but thanks for that summary. Are there any comments or questions for Robert? Any feedback, comments or questions at this stage and on the work of RFP 4?

Yeah, and I note that Grace has confirmed in the chat that the next RFP 4 meeting is January 6 at 1400 UTC. Okay let's see if we have any input from the work of the group - the RFP 5 group then next? I'm not sure if anyone is prepared to give an update on any work that's gone on in the meantime at this stage.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It'll be very brief from RFP 5. We didn't meet last week so since our last meeting of the whole CWG we don't have any further update but we will be meeting at 2130 UTC later today. And certainly as ever welcome and all of the cross community working group as well as those already identified interested in RFP 5 to join us.

Just to remind you, however, RFP 5's work is particularly contingent on RFP 3 and 4 but we have started a wiki place and they're doing some (unintelligible) drafting of our material already based on what we know to date on the outcomes of 3 and 4. And that's it from us. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Cheryl. So that's around - just over five hours from now is your meeting, 2130 UTC today.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Correct.

Jonathan Robinson: Good. I think that concludes the updates before we go on to Item 3. I'm just going to pause in case I have missed anything or there are any other questions or comments relating to the work of the different groups.

Okay so seeing nothing that gives - I hope the group a decent update of where things have been going. And you can keep an eye out and are encouraged to participate or listen in to the work of any of the groups in the meantime.

Item 3 on the agenda now moves on to look at something I'm sure many of you are very interested in and that's the work that's gone on in the interim to try and summarize and analyze and categorize the input from the public comment period that we ran closing December 22, if my memory serves me correctly.

So I'm going to ask Bernard Turcotte who's working as a staff support on the group to present to you at the - the way in which we've tried to categorize and organize this. Then that's something which we'll share with the broader group immediately after the call. But any comments, feedback or input will of course be welcome now. And we'd love to hear as a critical part of the work is making sure we respond to the public comment input so it'll be very useful to get any input from the group at this stage.

Bernie, may I hand over to you at this stage?

Bernard Turcotte: Yes, sir. Thank you. Can you hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: Bernie, hearing you loud and clear. Thanks.

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you. Thank you for setting that up so my old eyes can actually see something, Grace. All right, we'll go over how we approach this for a statistical look at this. It obviously does not cover the depth and color of all the comments provided. But at least it should provide a good snapshot of what people were responding and how they were doing it.

So a few comments on how we did this. Basically the responses to questions which were not text questions per se were classified as yes, no, no comment or yes with reservations. What we did in most cases also is we removed duplicates.

We will remember Mr. Schreiber who had a number of submissions about his Supreme Court case. I did not remove them in the analysis of all the responses given he did not address any of our questions it ends up having very little impact.

What we did to try and get some sort of a picture that made sense given the no comment part were significant in just about every question from every respondent. We built up a model where we put aside the no comments as not counting to see if we could get some resolution on the data. And that seemed to work well.

However, when you do that you end up running the risk of over-qualifying certain replies, i.e. if there are 100 responses in total, 99 no comments and one in favor, you end up with 100% in favor using this approach.

So what I've started to do is assigning a weight to these based on the total number of responses versus the total number of actual responses without no comments to sort of give us a feel about what weight we should place on these answers, otherwise I think we were in danger of being completely blind to all aspects of the results.

Unfortunately, some parts of this report are incomplete because as I was entering it last night there were still some forms being entered. And what I will say is that I will try to complete this over the next two days and verify the data properly and make sure all the numbers line up correctly and then we'll

send this out to the whole group so you can have a look at it. And it will include the - how we basically sliced and dice the respondents so that they fit in the various categories.

So before I actually get into the data I'll be glad to take any questions if there are any. I'm not seeing any hands and so I'll take it as I've either been very clear or everyone is sort of trying to shake off the holiday fog from their brain and we'll give them a few more minutes as we go through the answers.

The responses we actually...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: Sorry, Bernie, just to...

Bernard Turcotte: I'm sorry.

Jonathan Robinson: ...it's Jonathan. I thought it may be useful just to reiterate how you stripped out those no comments and the reason for doing that or the - how they were - what the motivation and just to reiterate that I think it would - may be useful.

Bernard Turcotte: Well, basically if there were no comments people did not address the question that was being asked and as such if you're trying to - and I think as we run through the numbers I'll run through the first example in great detail and I think everyone will understand it with an example at that point if that's okay with you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: That's fine. That makes sense. Thanks, Bernie.

Bernard Turcotte: Okay. Thank you. Any other questions before we proceed? Just long enough to get a sip of coffee in and we're off. All right so the responses we looked at to try and classify under this scheme were: the proposal is too complex; no Contract Co.

And this is what you're seeing on your screen right now, the left top most column: not enough detail; not enough time; IANA performance is satisfactory; transition to IANA at start of transition meaning going away from ICANN; stronger separation of IANA from ICANN; applicable accountability in place before transition; external organization needed in case ICANN misbehaves and we want to transition; is the CSC a good idea? Is multistakeholder in the CSC a good idea? Multistakeholder MRT; MRT needed for major issues; binding IAP; NTIA authorization role replaced; and alternate proposal.

So these are the elements we looked at and we tried to analyze. Now we'll run through one of the lines and see what this actually gives. In this same table you'll see at the top, yes, no, no comment and yes with reservation.

So for our first line of "too complex" we'll see that we have 26 - my eyes are not that good - it may be 28 - 26, yes; 3 no's, 28 no comments and one yes with reservations. If we actually shift to the end of that line what we will see is you will have the yes in total, the no in total and the no comments in total.

And what you see is that the no comments on that particular point represent 48% of the input. And so if you're considering that in a bulk analysis then you end up with the numbers at the far right of the document which give you 45% for yes, 5% for now, 48% for no comment and 2% for yes with reservations.

But because the no comments are so strong they skew the picture so what I'm proposing is that we actually look at the numbers without the no comments to see if we can generate more substantial input.

What we see on that first line, removing the no comments, is we get 87% yes for the proposal being too complex, 10% no, 3% yes with reservation. So if we add yes plus yes with reservations we end up with 90%.

Now weight, as I said, if you do this you do have to account for the fact that if there's only one reply and it's a yes or a no and 99% of the replies are no comment it gives a very skewed picture of the whole thing. So basically I've looked - if you look at the bottom of the weight column taking in all the replies, yes, no and yes with reservations and you divide that by all the replies including the no comment, it gives you a range of what is the mean of replies that are given and that's 44%.

So I'm using this as a very general weight to say if you got 44% or above as a weight it's - the answer should be fairly solid. If you're significantly below that you're looking at issues that there's just not enough volume of replies one way or another to make that statistic very useful.

So if - I've got Steve Crocker that's asking a question and I'll go to Steve right now. Steve.

Steve Crocker: Yeah, send me the data and I'll send it back to you in a graphical form that takes the yes, no and no comments into a pretty sharp picture that tries to capture graphically what you're trying to say.

Bernard Turcotte: Yes, once we finish cleaning up the numbers and adding in the new entries, everyone is going to get a copy of the full data, Steve.

Steve Crocker: Actually, send me the partial thing; I'll send you back the spreadsheet and chart-making thing and then you can update it and you'll see it all work.

Bernard Turcotte: All right. We'll be sure to do that, sir.

Steve Crocker: Super. Thanks.

Bernard Turcotte: So any other questions? All right so let's run through this. This portion is an analysis of all the responses, okay, so basically every response that came in - and this has been updated as of this morning so that we've got all the response that were accepted as per the ICANN email archives.

So if we move on to look at this, too complex, basically we've got yes plus YR of 90% and a weight of 52%. So we're saying that that's pretty solid and a great agreement.

No Contract Co, which is the second line, we've got 56% that support Contract Co. We've got 44% that do not and we've got a weight of 57%. What I'm saying a little lower, and we'll go through this analysis, is for anything to be considered significant support we're going to look at a minimum of 75%.

Our third point - third line is not enough detail. And basically we have 100% agreement with that with a 50% weight so again that's very solid.

Not enough time, we also have 100%. But here we'll note that the weight is only 15% that's really quite low. I'll also note in the analysis below that from my reading of all the responses there were quite a few people who misunderstood what we were trying to do with that question.

Moving on, IANA performance satisfactory, what we've got here is 92% support this and we have 44% weight so that's nice and good and significant.

The next point I believe is transition IANA immediately at the start of the transition. And what we've got here is 92% against that with a weight of 43% so again, very, very solid.

Stronger separation, so we've got 100% for that but a weight of only 14% so really a low number of answers have addressed that. And that makes looking at this very iffy.

Applicable accountability in place before transition, and what we've got there is, again, 100% but this time we've got a 41% weight and again so very clear solid support for this.

External organization needed in case ICANN messes up and we want to transition, we're only at 62% in favor there but a solid weight of 50%. And we'll be going through the major results of that right below once we finish going through that.

CSC is our next one. And we've got 91% support at 58% so very, very strong support for this. MS, multistakeholder CSC, we've only got 39% support at 53% weight so not a clear one which means 61% are against. So there's not clear agreement in the group if we use our metric of saying we require 75%.

Our next one is a multistakeholder MRT. And there we've got 71% so just a little shy at 60%. So, you know, although from a raw numbers point of view we're just below our defined level that's fairly strong especially with that 60% weight we've got there.

MRT for major issues, 62% in favor with 44%, similarly to the multistakeholder CSC, we've got sort of a division going there and that's unfortunate.

Binding IAP, 79% in favor at 41% weight; that looks to be a good consensus. NTIA authorization role needs to be replaced; we're at 69% which is low and only at 27% relative to a weight. So there does not seem to be any kind of consensus on that. Alternate proposal, we've counted the numbers but it really doesn't mean anything.

So if we look at this that there's major agreement at 75% or more, and I see the hands up in the thing. I'll just finish running through this table and then I will get to you since this is just a summary of what we talked about.

Too complex, we're at 90% agree that it's too complex. Not enough detail we're at 100% but the weight was way too low. Not enough time is 100% but people agreed with this. I'm not sure they all understood the question properly or at least we didn't pose it properly.

IANA performance satisfactory, 92% yes. Transition to IANA at start of transition, 92% no, very solid. Stronger separation of IANA from ICANN, 100%. Not a lot of weight for it so that puts that as a doubt. Applicable accountability in place before transition, 100%. CSC, 91% yes. And binding IAP, 79% yes. So these, using our standards, would be - or the proposed standards would be the major points of agreement if we're looking at all the responses together.

So now that I've finished my little speech how do you want to handle this, Jonathan? Do you want to handle the question queue and I'll just answer it or do you want me to handle it myself?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Bernie. I think it's okay if - well I guess I could help you. Let me help you with managing the question queue and then we'll take it as it comes. So let's - I know Olivier and Milton have had their hands up for a while so let's go to Olivier and we'll take it from there.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you, Jonathan. It's Olivier Crépin-LeBlond speaking. Can you hear me?

Bernard Turcotte: Yes.

Jonathan Robinson: No problem, Olivier. Loud and clear.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Thank you. Two questions, the first one is the do with the weighing of the input that was received. Has the weight of a single person sending a comment to the consultation process been taken as the same as one sent in by an organization like the ALAC or like the NCSG or the CSG? That's the first question.

The second question has to do with...

Bernard Turcotte: In this...

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Shall I - I'll give you the second question as well. The second one is to do with the - just clarification of the responses themselves. So when you say 87% for too complex and 10% of no for too complex does that mean that 10% of the responses that address this were saying we think this proposal is fine? Or - I don't understand how you would be able to calculate the negative replies on this.

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you, Olivier. The answer to your first question is in this current set we're looking at all answers have been considered at the same level. We've got the co-chairs did ask for a separate breakdown on categories which we've also done in other sheets. And if we have the time today I'll be glad to take you through those.

So basically without discounting anyone's input we have broken them down in groups of respondents to see if those categorizations - the exact same analysis but by the source group meaning groups, individuals or other breakdowns and how do they compare, will be in the spreadsheet. And if we have time I'll show you some of that today.

As to your second question, I mean, basically people, if you did this already, had to press the button so basically you said yes, no, you know, it was fairly clear in my mind when we were filling out - analyzing the responses is what I should say, that if people were not addressing the question in any way then we would give it a no comment.

To have a yes when reading the proposal and just to be clear, for those that haven't followed this basically there was a small team of Chuck, Greg, Berry and myself, which agreed to split up the work and Robert Guerra produced a Google form and basically we went through this and had to select one of the yes, no, no comment or yes.

And everyone read through the entire proposals, and some of us went through them several times, to classify those responses as yes, no, no comment and yes but with reservations. Does that answer your question, Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Yeah, thank you very much, Bernie. It's fine, yes thank you. And thanks to you as well for - and your colleagues for all the work you've done on that, very good especially at this time of the year. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Bernie, it's Jonathan. Let me let you just run through the queue since these are direct questions to you. And then I'll intervene if I think it's appropriate.

Milton Mueller: Hello? Hello? Hello?

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you, Jonathan, I will do that. Milton, you're up.

Milton Mueller: Yeah, I'm not...

Bernard Turcotte: Milton, I heard a crack and then you went away so I don't know if you've dropped.

Milton Mueller: Can you hear me?

Bernard Turcotte: Or if you've gone on mute. Very scratchy.

Milton Mueller: Can you hear me? Can you hear me?

Bernard Turcotte: I hear...

Alan Greenberg: Yes.

Milton Mueller: Hello.

Bernard Turcotte: Now I can hear you.

Milton Mueller: You can hear me?

Bernard Turcotte: Okay, we're doing good.

Milton Mueller: Okay good. All right so, yes, Bernard, thanks for your detailed analysis. I just wanted to say that we've done our own analysis. We have gone through all the comments and of course classified them in a different way. And I like some of your more elaborate methodology, in particular, you know, trying to weight things by the number of non-comments.

However, in certain cases I think you've gotten a bit too specific. In other words, if the comment did not specifically say something that you were looking for you've counted it as a no comment and a lot of the results you get depend on how you define a particular question you were looking for.

So for that reason we see certain discrepancies. For example, we found a lot of comments that basically said we basically support the approach that the CWG has taken but, and then they would go into particular points like the MRT is too complicated or the overall, you know, the composition of the CSC is not what they wanted to see.

But in the process they never maybe came out and said we support the NTIA role being replaced or we support an external organization. However, when in saying that they supported the overall model that was proposed they are in effect saying that they want an external organization and they do want the NTIA role replaced.

So for example, we were pretty surprised to see NTIA authorization role replaced. You have only nine comments saying "yes" and five saying "no." Now I think I know who the five saying no were, and incidentally one of those

five is a person who wants the status quo to remain in place. In other words, they are completely against a transition. So we threw that comment out as being, you know, not really relevant to the plan. They're basically saying stop what you're doing and just stick with the status quo.

So we found quite a bit more support for the overall plan, something like 64% of the comments supported separability in some way. We also found almost 70% of them had some concerns about the definition and composition or size of the MRT.

And I think that it's, you know, it's good to have different interpretations available for these comments but I think the main point I'd want to make here is that, you know, things like stronger separation, external organization, NTIA role being replaced, in many ways those are all the same thing.

And if the comment didn't specifically address that you kind of have to look at the overall meaning of the comment to know what position they're taking on the overall model that is proposed by the CWG. I'm not saying that there was consensus on any of those points but I think the - there was a preponderance of the comments expressing basic support for the overall approach and that really isn't captured by your comments.

The only other minor issue I would have is the issue of IANA performance is, again, not terribly relevant. I mean, if everybody in the world was saying we hate the way IANA is operating now that would obviously have some implications for what we're doing.

But many organizations that said, yeah, IANA is doing fine now, that really doesn't have a lot of bearing on what plan they supported. Some people who think IANA is doing fine don't want there to be any change; some people want

- do not want a contract company, some people who think IANA is doing fine do want a contract company. So it's not terribly relevant to determining what plan we come up with that particular statistic. I guess that's all I have to say for now.

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you, Milton. A few points in response. I think we've tried to be, as I said earlier, this does not reflect the color and the depth of all the comments, nor is it meant to. We just tried to boil the ocean, as it were, to a certain extent to give people an idea of where they are. And I think everyone has tried to be diligent in separating these things.

Secondly, I understand your point of view but I think if we look at no Contract Co, which is the second line, you're seeing 56% in one case and external organization at 62% in another case. It matches up pretty closely to what you were talking about. So I think, you know, it ends up being not that far off and ends up expressing some views of the community...

((Crosstalk))

Milton Mueller: Well but in that case, Bernie, your weighting is off because you have the majority are no comments. When I think that if a group or an organization or individual said, yeah, we support the basic approach taken by the CWG, but they didn't specifically say yes or no contract company, I don't think that should be counted as a no comment.

Bernard Turcotte: I think we - quite a few people in this room know, myself being a mathematician, the argument about how you can slice and dice these things is probably best done over a glass of scotch with several people and may take a while.

But - and we're here to take input. I mean, this is why we're presenting this. But trying to keep it very Cartesian, as I said, to provide some input and get a sense of where we're at is what we tried to do. And I'm certain, given we've only been beating up on this for about 48 hours, that it could be refined in all sorts of ways. But I think as a general picture it may not be bad. But I note that you're not satisfied with that.

Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. And let me, again, compliment you, Bernie, on an incredible amount of work in a very short time period. First of all, let me make a general comment and then I want to talk about the no comment issue.

The - we shouldn't look at this as if we're determining our fate and what direction we need to go. This is good trending information. It's an effort to try and provide some overview of the comments that will guide our efforts going forward, not determine them.

And I think it will be very helpful in that regard and this analysis regardless of any imperfections I think will help us do that. But we shouldn't look at it, okay, now we've got 100% in something so that's the way we're going to go. We're not there yet, okay. But I think this is very helpful.

Now let's talk about no comments. Bernie, correct me if I'm wrong but when you're saying, "responses to the questions," I think you're really talking about the questions that those of us that did the review and summary of certain subsets of the comments answered based on our review of a particular comment.

And so...

Bernard Turcotte: That is correct.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah. And it's very important to recognize that. So for example, let me use not enough time as - to illustrate my point. When we say that there was no comment on not enough time that means that 45 people did not say anything about the amount of time.

We did not ask the question, "Was there enough time?" of the - in the public comment period. If we had I suspect we would have had 100% of people said there's no enough time to respond to this. Maybe we could exclude one or two of those.

So keep in mind that we - except for three or four cases in the request for comments we didn't ask the public to respond to specific questions. We didn't ask them, "Is the proposal too complex?" But 26 people totally on their own did make the statement, not in response to a question but made the statement, yeah, we think the proposal is too complex.

And so those of us that did the review and recorded our interpretation of their comments found that 26 people of all those who commented, which is nearly half, said the proposal is too complex. So as we're using this data, and this is some, I think one of the points that Milton made as well, is so that no comment column is - it's not that they ignored a question, it's just that they didn't say anything about that issue in almost all of these cases.

Now that said, if we wanted to get more clarity in terms of people's positions on any of these issues we could get that probably with a fairly simple poll with very direct questions. And if we had had enough time to prepare for the

public comment period and not be quite as rushed as we were, maybe we would have done that.

Certainly if we have any public comment periods in the future we could ask very direct questions and ask for specific responses in those which would give us even more guidance than we have so far. But, again, let me go back to what I said at the beginning, I think this is all very useful information that will guide our work going forward.

Let's just be careful when we - how much weight we put on the no comment understanding that we didn't ask these direct questions of the public and so they didn't necessarily think to respond to those in all cases. And I'll stop there. Sorry for going on so long.

Bernard Turcotte: No, I think that was very useful, Chuck, and thanks for that. And I actually strongly support everything that Chuck said. So thank you and I think that clarifies quite a few things. But I will repeat what you said, this is not a question that this states categorically what we have to do. This is trending information to give us an idea how it's looking.

All right, moving on - Chuck, can you put your hand down if you're done?
And Alan Greenberg, please.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I largely agree with what Chuck said. If there had been a question explicitly asked, "Do you have enough time to write your comment?" as opposed to the proposal having enough time, I would have said there's not enough time. So clearly all of us who created comments, or at least many of us who created comments, did not have enough time to do as thorough a job as we might otherwise have wished.

So part of the no comments is simply lack of time on the position of the commenter in addressing things and in many cases simply highlighted the ones that seemed to be at the top of the list.

The reason I raised my hand though is a question. In items such as multistakeholder MRT or major MRT issues or ones related to CSC, a number of the alternate proposals did not have a construct by that name. It might have had something that you could draw an analogy to that was similar. How did you treat those? Were those no comments or did you try to map what they were proposing onto the constructs that you have identified in your table?

Bernard Turcotte: Yes the mapping was really pretty much one for one. I can just answer for myself. The team that reviewed and coded the proposals to be analyzed like this did not have time to do a debrief. We had some basic guidelines and I think we used them to the best of our ability. Part of those guidelines was not what you just talked about.

I can answer it for myself, if there was a one to one mapping between CSC and what was being proposed then it was - I took it into account as being a CSC-like answer. If it was slightly more complex I ended up putting it in no comment.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, thank you.

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you, Alan. Yeah, (unintelligible).

Man: Yeah, hi. I join others in thanking Bernie and everybody who worked on that. It's very useful too for discussion, as Chuck and others have said. It's a way to check whether it reflects what we felt when we read all the different contributions.

In that regard, what I note at the bottom and it completely fits with my feeling reading the contributions, is that there are a few threads that seem to be supported very generally. The one on complexity was present in a lot of documents.

The two elements that are important are the affirmation that the IANA performance is satisfactory and that no transitions should take place at start is something that we probably did not document enough in our own documents as a starting point. There is a strong motion towards, I feel, the notion of keeping IANA as the IANA operator because it has been performing correctly.

And the other element that seems to have consensus is the link with accountability. That being said, the analysis here should not be taken, as was said, as pure quantitative voting that determine the future. It just highlights the different issues that have to be explored further such as the scope of the MRT, the - under the label MRT has major issues was one key element is whether this is a permanent or an only exceptional committee.

The second element is the composition of the CSC which is related with the (unintelligible) in CSC. And the two elements regarding Contract Co or no Contract Co, there was, to my surprise, much more comments that did not support the notion of a Contract Co than I expected. I know it's a contentious issue but it was interesting to see that reflected in the (unintelligible).

And finally, when we deal with the question of binding IAP, there is a qualifier here because a lot of people support binding IAP but there were also many comments regarding the scope of the independent review. So I support the comment that Olivier regarding taking into account the weight of

respondents. I think qualitatively whether it's the whole group or individuals, it is hard to quantify.

But generally speaking I think the contributions to (unintelligible) were both endorsing the different building blocks but many comments and more efforts than I thought were undertaken to propose alternative mechanisms and some of which can probably reconcile when we define more clearly the scope of the MRT or whatever other work is used, the role of the CSC and the appeal mechanism. So I think it's a very good tool but just to try to get the level of consensus that we felt with the different elements and the documents and the contributions.

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you (unintelligible). I see the question queue being empty in Adobe. I don't know if there is anyone who is phone only. I am not hearing anything. I think we've gone over the full analysis section. As I said, we've got breakdowns per other categories and I will refer to Jonathan to see if we have enough time to take a quick look at those to give people an idea. I think they are interesting, but I am not in charge of the timing. We do have a lot of work so I will ask Jonathan for a ruling here.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Bernie. First another thought. I mean certainly it has been interesting to hear the responses and in particular this poking around the fact that this is – and not determining an outcome but actually in guidance as to where things are trending. And so it strikes me that any further input should either be as it has been in the chat to some extent and audio constructive criticism of this methodology and to the extent that there is an alternative methodology such as that discussed by Milton, it feels to me that what we really need to know there is – does alternative methodology produces substantial in this particular case and without discounting that in any way if we treat this as guidance of various trends to the extent that there is common

guidance I think we don't need to be too concerned to the extent that the arrows point in different directions. Then there is cause for concern and we need to hone in on that. But right now, I wasn't hearing that, so that's encouraging which is good.

I am a little - it feels to me like there is a good opportunity here to move on to the (white) board but I think we can probably - we have a full hour left in the call and we could probably spend without compromising the other parts of the call. We could probably spend a little time on breaking down by category so let's go with that for another 10 or 15 minutes and then start to focus on the way forward.

Bernard Turcotte: All right, in that case, what I will propose is Grace can we go to the spreadsheets on analysis by type and we will do a quick look at that and then I think we will have a general picture. There are other ways we have sliced and diced this, but I think Jonathan's point is fairly good that given that this is high level at some point it is diminishing returns to try and go too deep into this. Grace will you be able to put that up or am I just putting you on the spot too much here?

Grace Abuhamad: No I am going to be able to put it up. It is going to be a little bit smaller than usual so give me a few minutes.

Bernard Turcotte: Yeah and the same size we've got here will be fine. Thank you, so this one we will be looking at. We looked at trying to separate this out by the type of input, i.e. individuals, companies, registries and groups so that this goes back to a little bit of the discussion we had earlier on. When I started doing this last night it became fairly clear that it was not very useful to do governance and companies given there were low numbers, so I ended up when looking at all of the inputs splitting it into groups. ccTLD

registries and individuals to have a look at this and then what we needed up finding we will look at when it shows up on the screen.

The individual responses - there is no convergence as we would expect. There is significant divergence and I really - someone - I am getting quite a bit of echo. Is someone not muted?

Okay, we - I am not seeing that sheet up Grace so I will talk to it for a minute. As I was saying, the individual responses presented quite a bit of divergence in between them. When we looked at comparing ccTLDs versus group responses, overall I can say that there was a lot of convergence and I am going to go from my own sheet here. And basically, where there were the most significant sets of differences was multi stakeholder in the CSC where the ccTLDs were no at 88% and the groups were yes as 56%, which is fairly significant.

A multi stakeholder MRT, the ccTLDs were in favor at 63% and the groups were in favor at 92%, so there is not a huge worrying trend there. And finally, the one that I noted was very significant was on the NTIA authorization role to be replaced. ccTLDs at 75% were no and groups were at 83% yes. So I would say that those are probably - it is good that in the majority of cases there was a lot of concordance between these things, but those two issues of the group versus ccTLDs seemed to be significant and those are a multi stakeholder CSC and the NTIA multi authorization role needs to be replaced.

Boy is that small. I think I covered it. As I said at the beginning of the presentation, we are still finishing adjusting things. I do not think that the extra data we will put in will significantly vary the results we've talked about but we will finish doing the homework properly and once that is done over the

next 24 to 48 yours we will be sure to distribute it. And that's going to be pretty much it for me so I will go over to questions. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Bernie. And the point you made about the differences between the ccTLD views and others is a very good information point and something I think that most of us knew already is that one size doesn't fit all. The ccTLDs are a very different situation than the gTLDs with regard to some of these issues and so the fact that there is a difference there is very good information for us, confirming what many of us probably already suspected. We probably can't design a solution that treats them both the same.

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you Chuck. Yes, I think this is my feeling also and maybe I will just take a sec. I know we don't have that up, but what we did was compared the ccTLD responses to the registry's proposal in the analysis and in the only issues of any significance and this will be in the documents that will be provided will be MRT for major issues where the CCs had 86% in favor. And as far as we could tell from our (WISEC) proposal that was a no and the NTIA authorization role.

So it is nice to see that there is constituency across those sides but I think the most important part as we have said is these are trends. These are to inform our discussions. These are not to settle our discussions. I see we have a few more questions and then I will hand it back to our co-chair.

Jonathan Robinson: So Bernie just before we go to those questions to make sure that everyone is aware that at the bottom of the spreadsheet there is a zoom function. So to the extent that the field is too small you can independently zoom and scroll. Everyone has the scroll function as Grace has said and you can zoom down below. Thanks. Go ahead and dealing with the questions.

Bernard Turcotte: (unintelligible) we are not hearing you if you are speaking.

Man: are you hearing me now? Are you hearing me?

Bernard Turcotte: Yes, we are.

Man: Okay, so yeah just a quick follow up on Chuck's comment regarding one size does not fit all. I think we can distinguish layers there. The distinctions between what was commenced by the ccTLDs and the gTLDs is not necessarily against the overall architecture. It may only mean that there would be differences in the workflow or in the criteria that are being undertaken for the different delegation processes.

As for the overall appealing regarding the architecture I think there is a possibility to reconcile and I am not sure that there is a need to add many different elements there that would probably be compatible. The other thing is that it is very important at that stage that we take into account all of the different comments. And as I said earlier, there are significant expressions of unease by the complexity notion of the comments regarding the need for contractual or not and we should not take the general trending as was said a determination that the overall model is completely endorsed.

There are - there is a (real) with this group especially given the time that is available. It does not too completely rush into considering that the model as a whole has been endorsed. Because as I said before, I was surprised that there were significant expressions of concerns and in particular significant expressions of much more trust in the capacity of ICANN and accountability mechanisms within ICANN to cover some of the concerns than I would have expected.

So I think it is a matter of fairness to make sure that we do not take the small majority as the overarching expressions of consensus. And I don't think the work that Bernie has done has gone many ways in that direction. Quite in the contrary. It provides a very nuanced approach, but I would certainly express a note of caution here regarding not rushing to conclusions too quickly and taking into account all the comments.

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you. Given that we are getting near the end and these may be more general comments, I will hand it over to Jonathan to manage the queue.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Bernie. We've got three more in the queue, so let's go to Steve Crocker and then we will follow that from there. Steve Crocker go ahead.

Steve Crocker: Yes, just a quick comment on the ccTLDs versus the gTLDs. The ccTLDs said that they don't want the NTIA authorization to be replaced. They are the only ones that are currently affected in terms of the actual approval process. When a gTLD changes at least the big one in delegations they don't really go through NTIA. The day to day changes do just like the ccTLDs do, but the ones that affect the ccTLDs the most the delegations and re-delegations are the ones that are most concerning from an NTIA point of view and the Gs are just completely unaffected by that.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Steve. Milton let's hear from you.

Milton Mueller: So yes, I think can people hear me. Hello can people hear me yes?

Man: Yes, we can.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes Milton you are fine. Go ahead.

Milton Mueller: Okay, on the question of the ccTLDs this is where there is a pretty big discrepancy between what we are finding and what Bernie's results show and I think it is without again being too specific in the no comment (section). So the - hello.

Jonathan Robinson: Milton we hear you fine still.

Milton Mueller: Okay what Bernie says is that 75% of the ccTLDs don't want the NTIA to be replaced but in fact that six of them did not comment at all on that issue according to his statistics and one said they did and three said they didn't. So you have really six out of ten allegedly not commenting on an issue. Now the way we analyze it is we see (outer) NORID and (Nominet) and (Sidan) saying we would like some kind of - we don't support your contract company models specifically but we do want some kind of separability and we think maybe that could be achieved either through some kind of external entity or internally. They are somewhat skeptical about it.

On the other hand, we see (Danic), the Danish Internet, (SERA), lacTLD, and (CNNIC) all basically express - and Internet and (Z) all expressing support for the basic model, although having qualms about particular elements of it. For example, (CNNIC), the Chinese ccTLD says they want the contract company to be in a neutral jurisdiction. That tells me that they don't object to having a contract company. They are just concerned about the jurisdiction it is in. So although their comments would not specifically address the NTIA role, I think it is pretty clear from their overall meaning of their comments that they do want there to be an external contracting authority to replace the NTIA.

And you know based on what I know about China and their approach to the U.S. government's control, I wouldn't be surprised by that conclusion. So I

you know think that we need to be very careful about how we classify these no comments and not draw any serious conclusions from that particular one.

Again, I want to say that it is very good that you try to weight these things by taking into account when there was no comment, but in certain cases, I think you were too narrow in your interpretation of somebody not commenting on a particular issue. That's all. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Milton. Bernie did you want to comment with respect to the methodology at all at this stage or should we just continue with the queue?

Bernard Turcotte: Just a quick reply. As noted earlier, we haven't finished the spreadsheets and the weighing was not completed on the cc analysis. So Milton certainly has a point there, but until we finish putting all of the data together properly, even the analysis team has some homework to do before we can close this down. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay thanks and then perhaps before we go on, I wouldn't mind just picking up on one of the points. There is a question in the chat responding in relation to Steve's point. Steve I think there is an understanding that the gTLD - that whilst it is not necessarily invoked. That ultimately there is an authorization role that the NTAG plays and this is what is being referred to with respect to gTLDs as well. I don't know if this is a detail we want to go into now, but there is certainly as I understand it an overlying or overarching understanding that there is an ultimate authorization role that is played that this question is addressing. That you seem to suggest or say doesn't occur. So I don't know if you want to come back and clarify that or if it something we need to pick up elsewhere.

And I will wait to see if Steve comes back on that. And in the meantime Steve and Milton your hands are up from previously I think and do let's go to then Alan.

Steve Crocker: This is Crocker. I didn't quite understand what it is you wanted me to expand on.

Jonathan Robinson: You said in your comment NTIA did not play an authorizations role with respect to gTLDs and then there was the question from Donna Austin in the chat saying could you clarify. Her understanding is gTLD delegations do go through NTIA for ultimate authorization.

Steve Crocker: Well there was an awful lot of detail and I might be not 100% definitive here in my knowledge. The ccTLD delegations and regulations are heavy weight operations that go through both the board and NTIA. The gTLD decisions go through the global domains division contracting process and that's pretty much the end of it. I don't believe that NTIA gets involved in those although one could always argue that they have the option of doing that.

Now at a finer grain level, every single transaction in the root zone or the associated WhoIs database goes through NTIA these days and I mean has for the current state of affairs. That's somewhat different than the contracting process or I mean that is just the operational day-to-day stuff. So in that sense, there is a similarity but the concern I think that the cc community has is if there is an issue, how do they deal with that and some of them. I mean there is a split issue said, but the - some of them very unhappy with the idea that they would have to deal with the U.S. government for things that they consider to be purely their own concern. The Gs know that their only path is through ICAAN because they are all contracted, so it is quite a different relationship and that's my main point.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great, that's helpful. Thanks very much Steve. All right, let's move back to the queue. I am conscious we are coming up towards the half hour point, which will leave us with only 30 minutes left to talk about the way forward, so I think we should try and deal with the last couple of comments or questions and then move on to looking at Item 4 and the rest of the agenda.

Alan Greenberg. Go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. Two points. Regarding Milton's comments and I guess I would like clarity for the record on whether he is using the royal we or he is talking about his organization or some other we that has done the analysis. It would be nice given the number of times he used the term we to know who it is.

With regard to the specific comment, Bernie pointed out that there are differences between the CCs and the gTLDs and in turn between the individuals. I will point out there are also differences among the ccTLDs that are on essentially two different sides of the same issue, so I look forward to the next section on how we are going to go forward. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay Alan I will note that posted in that chat that we I believe refers to analysis by IGP.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I presumed that also, but it would really be nice to know at the beginning who the we was. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Alan. Thanks Milton. Okay, (unintelligible).

Man: Yeah hi just one clarification to Bernie. The line that says NTIA authorization role replaced. I understood it as being the role of NTIA in the workflow of delegations with delegations, which by the way as the NTIA clarified even more in the recent weeks with their issuing of this slide deck is a very clerical and notarial function of very fine procedures, even qualifying that the authorization is probably a misnomer. It should be qualified as a validation or something that looks less like making a decision.

And in that regard, the bulk of the work of checking how the procedures regarding ccTLD delegation and particularly delegations are being done is actually done by the IANA department and the validation function of NTIA in this workflow is relatively light. But if I understand correctly that in the table that we are being presented NTIA authorization will replace means this role in the workflow, the clerical validations of the workflow, I think Milton was alluding to something different when he mentioned the comments by (CNNIC) and so on.

Because this has nothing to do with the question of whether NTIA should be replaced by a contractor and I think it is very important that we distinguish those two elements very, very clearly with the arguments that are being used from one slide that actually applied to something else. So here, NTIA authorization role in the process of delegation and I think what Milton was alluding to earlier was (CNNIC) is related to whether there is a contractual or not that the other role of NTIA which is awarding a contract or rebidding a contract on so on. Am I right in making this distinction and clarification Bernie and Milton maybe?

Bernard Turcotte: This is Bernie. From my point of view, the description you give to a certain extent I am perfectly fine with. Yes, what we've seen from the NTIA published slide deck is rather clerical. However, it is our belief that even if it

is clerical currently they do have an authorization role. Because if they don't approve it, it will not go through. So I am not going to carry on and I think Steve has said quite a bit and I think people have the general understanding of what we are talking about. And yes indeed what Milton was talking about may have been slightly different. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, well I think we have made it pretty thorough thanks to you Bernie, but prior analysis or discussion of that analysis or opportunity comment on that analysis and presentation of potential alternatives or variations on the analysis. It feels like we have covered that pretty thoroughly. It clearly leaves us in a position, which is what Item 4 seeks to start to discuss and take input on, is where we take this next and how we move forward. Now we've got a couple of overarching points I suppose.

That is, first of all, there is in effect a single proposal that there has been significant comment to and part of those comments produce the prospect of alternative proposals or a second formal proposal. So one of the challenges we've got is how to reconcile either working on and modifying and continuing to (revise) an existing proposal and dealing with the fact that there have been alternative proposals and proposals and how to reconcile these.

One of the things that the group of RFP Coordinators and the Co-Chairs have looked at is that if you break things, the proposals, down into modular components it's arguable that some of those modular's exist within more than one proposal. So the opportunity here exists, perhaps, and this is what's being referred to in this agenda item as a considering a polling concept is that in breaking down the modular, for example, the MRT. The MRT may be a common component of many proposal - many variants of the single proposal or indeed go across any alternative proposals.

So one mechanic that we've talked about going forward is taking out those modular and seeking to refine the modular's independent of which proposal they might start in. So I think that's something we'd like to have discussed or any other thoughts about how we move forward and take this direction and trends that we've discussed that have come in through the public comment, the existing CWG proposal, the work that you heard that's gone on in the interim and how given the time constraints we are working with and the pressures we are under to work within - we move this forward. So I think that's perhaps enough of a preamble.

It would be great to hear your input and thoughts of the CWG as to how, you know, what constructive mechanics and methods that we can take to reconcile the existing proposal, the public comments and perhaps the - any alternative approaches. So I see I've got a couple of people whose hand is up already. It would be great to hear your inputs and kick off the discussion on this. So go ahead Phil.

Philip Sheppard: Yes, thank you Jonathan. I assume you can hear me. I'm not sure I have an answer here, but I just - I'm trying to understand the process going forward. We have in the responses - the somewhat ironic fact that many people felt there was not enough detail and yet they thought that the detail already there was too complex, which is not surprising.

It takes a lot more time to boil down something to simple fundamentals than to come up with something that's multi-faceted, but the one thing - the one impression I got in reviewing many of the comments and reading through them was that many many commenters said this two track process is kind of putting the cart before the horse. We're being asked to judge a transition proposal before we know what the overall ICANN organizational

accountability proposal will look like and it's impossible to make a final judgment on the transition before we have that.

So I guess I'm just asking the question. My understanding is that this group has to get something final to the ICG by mid-January. That may be enough time to make the proposal somewhat simpler to reduce the complexity if you feel there's a enough backing for key components, but it's certainly not enough time to know what the final accountability proposal is going to be because that group has just gotten started and it's going to be months before they're at the same stage that this group is at.

So I guess my question is am I correct that something fairly final has to go from this group to the ICG by mid-January and if that's the case what ability does this group have to keep refining that once it's been handed off to the ICG? I'm trying to understand the logistics of how all this is going to work. I apologize for that offering solutions, but I'm just trying to wrap my head around the actual process going forward.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Philip. It's Jonathan and I'll take a crack at that and I'll pause to see if there are others who would like to contribute to that from either Lise or anyone else, but essentially, yes, you are correct. That the ICG has asked for a proposal by mid-January. We signaled pretty clearly to the ICG that this group is on a timeline that's close to that, not identical to that and what they would expect to produce a proposal by the end of January. So to that theory there's already some margin built in. It may be possible that there's further scope, but there's no indication of that at this stage.

Now in terms of linking that to the accountability work there's no doubt that's both a very strong foundation in many participant's minds and indeed is baked into the charters of both this group and the group working on the

accountability linking is in many ways very firm. So the question is how to reconcile that as you rightly said. I'm starting to do that, but this is only my personal view at this stage.

It's not something that's been thoroughly socialized or even anywhere near agreement, but it feels to me that what it's going to be incumbent on us to do within the CWG is to make it very clear what the - and I guess I should say one of the precursor, we, that is to say Lise, my Co-Chair and myself have setup and are undertaking weekly meetings with the Co-Chairs of the accountability group.

We may well start to actually attend their meetings and try and be as closely in touch with them as possible. We hear from the accountability group from five of the Co-Chairs a very receptive tone as to not working independently, but making sure that the group's works are strongly and effectively coordinated. And to that extent that coordination could be achieved by this group - and this is where I start to think about a solution is that this group could build in conditional links, if you like.

So our proposal might be made subject to, or having the strong conditional links on certain critical accountability components being in place associated with particular components of this proposal. I will say that that last point, just to reiterate, is the view that I'm thinking of. It's not something we as a CWG or indeed even the Co-Chairs have formed or a strong view on.

So I think if you permit me and others in the queue I know Avri, Alan and Staffan your hands are up, but let me go to Lise whose hand is up now as a Co-Chair and then I'll come back to the queue. Lise, if you'd like to speak let me give you an opportunity to speak.

Lise Fuhr: Thank you Jonathan. It's Lise Fuhr for the record and while I agree with most of what you're saying I'd also like to stress that we don't make this like a deadlock situation where we are awaiting for the accountability team and holding back on our proposal in order to have that synchronized. In the ideal world this would have been done differently, but it's not and in the group that we're dealing with the comments yesterday we discussed this and it's very important to move on and as Jonathan said try to build in some mechanisms that insures that what we're trying to have fulfilled by the accountability group is done by the group if that's - that being to consult with afterwards or whatever.

I'd just like to stress that we cannot say, well, we have to wait for the accountability because there's not enough time and they're asking us for our views on what should they focus on regarding the IANA transition. And we don't know that before we have the proposal. So it's like a catch-22. Don't get deadlocked in this one. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Lise. So that highlights that last point you made, the receptiveness, to hear from us where we would like to see the accountability hooks and to my mind that helps break the deadlock or the prospective deadlock. Avri, you've been patient. Let's go to you.

Avri Doria: Thank you, Avri speaking. And while I didn't raise my hand to comment on that last point I do want to say that I do agree with you and in fact there is one of the work areas within the accountability that's also looking back at this group and trying to make sure that some sort of linkage can be built. So, you know, I think it's possible to avoid the deadlock or, you know, deadly embraces I've been called it in the other meetings, but I really do it will take attention.

I wanted to get back to your discussion of the modular's where you had asked the question and I've been looking at the various proposals, looking at these alternates and looking at what has been the sort of mainstream proposal to now. I tend to think that the models are somewhat analogous from a system design perspective. That their architectures aren't all that similar.

So I agree with you that they do seem to contain similar or analogous modular's and working on those is a good idea. I think when you look at these architectures what you start to see is that they have the (unintelligible) perhaps they're grouping them differently. They're sort of drawing the separation line in different places. In some cases it's a dotted separation line versus a solid line.

So I think in going forward not only working on the modular, but looking at trying to produce sort of visualizations of how these various models are indeed analogous and in doing that that will highlight the sort of points of difference, the place where the separation line is put, the grouping of the various modular's. So I guess I'm supportive of your way forward plus a little. Thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Avri, that's helpful. Let me go to Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. A couple of comments. First of all, on timing. I really don't see how we could make our - the timing we're suggesting. Earlier in this meeting we talked about the next comment period. Well assuming the final proposal is - somehow reconciles the vast differences between some of the input we got this time I don't think - I don't see how we could do it without at least one more comment period and claim that there's community consensus.

So I really think it's - the chairs of the various groups, including the ICG, need to get together and look at whether we need to revise the timing. Given the timing in Washington is clearly changed we have an opportunity for doing that and I think we need to take away what I think is a completely artificial constraint of a January deadline and make it more realistic so we can do our job properly. That's number one.

Number two, on accountability, there is this deadly embrace and earlier in our discussions when I had mentioned some potential accountability alternatives I was told that that's completely out of our scope. I think it needs to be and I think Jonathan just said that it needs to be in our scope to make suggestions.

I think we need to give the accountability group enough substance of targets to work on so although they may not be able to come up to detailed accountability proposals that they start roughly looking at things including the board people who are participating in that process and be able to provide a reasonable degree of certainty that they will be able to succeed on specific types of accountability. That they won't be vetoed at some later date by the board and their recommendations do go to the board. So I think we need to work in concert like that and, you know, make sure that when we do finally come to closure we have something that's rock solid.

And lastly, just a suggestion going forward and this isn't what you are asking for right now, but I wanted to put it on the table. Although the contract code no contract code seems to be an absolute deadlock, timing indeed may change that in that some of the proposals, and certainly the ALAC one explicitly said contract code may be a viable alternative, but let's leave that - those details for, you know, the disaster type situation or for further consideration and not use it as the model going forward right now, but keep it as a backstop in the future. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Alan. I will say that from the point of view of the sort of leadership group at this point our view on timing is not withstanding interpretation to what else is going on in the picture, nothing has changed at this stage so we are working to our existing timetable understanding that there are real challenges for that and some may see - view those as insurmountable, but that's the task we're working to at the moment, but thank you for that input on all three of those points. Staffan, go ahead.

Staffan Jonson: Thank you. To start with to answer your question - what kind of work method are we considering now for the future and the idea of a modules is to my view a good start. The (let go) of the proposal to have the modular as a working method is a good idea. I've been asking around a bit in parts of the community with extension of deadline beyond the 19th of January is at hand or not and I've met very little support for this idea.

So - but I see more support from it when we're talking right now. If there is no extension of deadline beyond 19th of January I suggest a work method for the weekend coming up 10th -11th of January where we actually sit down in real-time draft a written real-time drafting sentence by sentence and getting consensus on every sentence per se. May be tedious but very effective way of actually getting forward and since our output is conditional for accountability discussions, etcetera, I believe we need to get something out and at least written down what we do have consensus of so we don't start the process - the whole process the same. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Staffan and, again, to support that I mean certainly that's the - we haven't necessarily talked about the sentence-by-sentence method that you've talked about. Certainly the objective of that weekend of the 10th and

11th is to have a highly productive and focused set of four sessions that do produce real consensus output. Elise, let me go to you.

Elise Lindeberg: Okay, thank you (unintelligible) also just a short comment on the working methods and on the way forward and...

Jonathan Robinson: Elise, can I ask you to try and speak up a little or closer to the microphone if possible?

Elise Lindeberg: Can you hear me better now?

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, thank you. That's better.

Elise Lindeberg: I have a really bad microphone, but okay. And, you know, this is just on the working methods and the way forward. I don't think it is fair to assume that our work is done when we deliver this to the ICG. I think we have to assume that they will come back with a lot of questions for us because we worked in quite a detailed level and we had a lot discussions behind.

That's also - we had discussed this online not on the conference call and to have the work done again and doubled up by them by the ICG. I think it's fair to give them our attention and tell them what we have been discussing and be up for a dialogue with them after we deliver this. So maybe that could be done through you, through the chairs and our chairs and so on, but I think we should have more work done after we deliver this. Okay, thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Elisa. That was helpful. Bertrand?

Bertrand de la Chappelle: Yes, sorry. Just on the way forward. I think we - as I said at the beginning, almost the beginning of the call, the series of comments have

highlighted a certain number of things where there is a relative convergence and the modular approach probably remaining is valid. I think for the contribution to the ICG the way we can organize work is, first, to document the (unintelligible) that have clearly emerged from the contributions. The fact that there is clearly an emerging consensus on the fact that there will be no change of operator on the occasions of transition and that generally speaking the INF performance has been satisfactory.

Then we have the four components, the four building blocks, and I would suggest to order them in the following order - first of all the CSC or whatever it is called, there are two elements regarding to sub-elements on this fee (unintelligible) whether it is only the customers or the INF function understood restrictively or (unintelligible) stakeholder group - sub-question one. Sub-question two is the scope of the role of the CSC. I think that a certain number of contributions pointed in the direction of the more extensive role than was understood at first and I see it as mainly the role of ongoing supervision and ongoing accountability of the INF function.

The second topic would be the scope of the MRT and as a consequence it's composition, but the question of the scope and whether it is relatively permanent body or on the contrary something that is exceptional is, I think, a good way to frame the question. Then there is the question of the binding IAP. There is an agreement apparently on the notion that some binding appeal make it so that there is no consensus on what would be the scope of those IAP and there is concern that the scope might be too extensive.

And, finally, keeping as a last element the question of whether the contract is the right solution and the absolute and or if it is (unintelligible) on that first element of transition or not. And if we order this in this way I suppose that we

can move forward by documenting progress or at least the different options in the relatively easy manner.

The final point is I'd recommend that the contribution to the ICG ideally is relatively short and there is a lot of documentation in the draft proposal that was circulated and if we could make something that is relatively clear (unintelligible) on the basis of the discussions (unintelligible) online or on the next call. I think it would be easier for both the ICG and the rest of the community forward. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Bertrand for that very well structured input and to everyone who contributed to that. That's very high-quality input we've had throughout that section. So that's very very useful, both in support of some of the methods and guidance and additional information. I think that helps a lot.

We're coming up very close to the top of the hour so I'd like to capture any action items that result from this. It feels to me like we've got a reasonably clear guidance to push on with a modular approach, to keep it structured and to work with the group within that. So I think that we can take that onboard. I'd like any other comments as to any other actions that I should have captured or that Grace should have captured in minuting this if there's something else that's been missed or should have been captured it would be useful to capture that at this stage.

Noted Bertrand on the detail - you talked to us about keeping the order scope of MRT then composition rather than reverse. Waiting to see if there's anything else that comes up in the chat on suggestions for key action items. I've got that from you Bertrand. CSS, MRT, IAP and then contract curve. Thanks Donna. Donna notes that she's unable to come through on the audio, but one is we need to (unintelligible) absent to contract curve and in essence I

think (unintelligible) to my understanding included in the four points that Bertrand (unintelligible) where we tackle CSC, MRT, IAP, and then contract curve including the need for - or the need for contract curve as a backup option and so on. So I believe we are dealing with that, you know, and then Avri makes the point that other proposals have at least a (unintelligible) contract curve function.

So I, you know, I want to presuppose the outcome of that discussion, but it's really, I guess, contract curve and dormant contract curve if you like and shadow contract curve. Maybe three variants at least to be considering. Well we're coming very close to the top of the hour. I think we have got a decent way forward. A good discussion of the analysis. We've had some very good input onto the way forward. I see the discussion continues then - yes, okay (Unintelligible).

So there is some further discussion in and around the nuances of the contract curve and internal to ICANN or not on the chat because those are recorded there. All right, well I'll call now for any other items of business that we haven't had the opportunity to cover right now within the last two or three minutes. Okay, I'm not seeing any right now. I do know that we will clearly continue to have these discussion on lists. I think it's been a very constructive meeting and it would have been the case in and of itself and particularly so given that we've just come through the holiday season.

So thanks very much in particular to those of you who worked very hard over the last week or so while some of us were able to take some form of break. I know some of you have pretty much worked throughout. Thanks very much and we'll be in touch over the lists and we'll be scheduling the next series of meetings, including those intense meetings over the 10th and 11th and trying to build up agendas, content and productive output for them. Okay, I think

we'll call the meeting to a close at that stage. I look forward to working with you all in the very near future. Thanks very much.

END