Transcription ICANN Los Angeles
CWG to Develop an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal on Name Related Functions
Monday 13 October 2014
Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.
On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#oct

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Jonathan Robinson: Hi everyone, if we could come together to start the session now.

So welcome to this meeting, the CWG meeting to develop the IANA stewardship transition and the proposal on name and related functions.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. Just give us one moment to get the recording going. I'll get it - wait for a confirmation till we've got the recording going.

So in advance of that I'll apologize to you for this small room. There was - it's just the way it's been scheduled. So hopefully everyone who needs to can fit in and participate.

There are a couple of seats I'll see, perhaps at the table but, okay we're good to go with the recording now.

So my name is Jonathan Robinson. I'm here together with Byron Holland. We were co-chairs of the Drafting Team. And I will remain as a co-chair of the

Community Working Group to do this work to develop the IANA stewardship transition proposal on naming related functions.

So we as you know the group is structured to enable as broad a possible full participation. And so to that extent it's open to participation from anyone. But there is a structure where there are members from the different charting organizations.

And to make sure that we have an understanding of who is here from as members from those charting organizations we're going to run a quick roll call just to record who is present. So (Grace) if I could ask you to sort that out please?

(Grace): Hi everyone. So we're not going to do a full roll call. I've passed around little sheets like this. If you checked your name off that's how we'll note your attendance.

I will do a roll call for the members who are present. So if the ALAC members (Shen), (Fuad), Olivier, (Fatima) and (Eduardo) could please raise their hands to indicate that they're present?

Two okay. Could the ccNSO members (Lee), (Erik), (Paul), (Vikka) and (Stephan) raise their hand please? Okay, could the GAC members Elise and (Juanawit) please raise their hands? Thank you.

Could the GNSO members (Jonathan), (Greg), (Graham) and Avri please raise their hands? Thank you. And could the SSAC members (Robert) and yeah, please raise their hands. Thank you. We're all set. Thank you very much.

Byron Holland: Well thank you and welcome again. My name is Byron Holland and I am from the ccNSO, ccNSO chair and was the co-chair of the drafting team. I will continue to be a participant in this CWG.

Jonathan and I as well as other members of the Drafting Team had discussed how we would - how we wanted to this group to come together and set out some cultural norms.

Obviously the time is short for us. And the work is significant and substantive. And in order to make sure from a logistical perspective that we are able to come to the end goal at the time that we envision we thought it would be important to articulate what we would like to call some cultural norms for this working group.

And recognizing that we've only discussed it in sort of in these very, very early days and that this working group will continue to evolve and develop its cultural norms we wanted to put out a few elements that we thought would help us move forward with the substantive work in the time that we have allocated.

First I think it will be the intention or the co-chairs will certainly put forward the intention to rotate the meetings from a timing perspective so that it is reasonable and that we all share in equal amounts of pain for late night calls, et cetera, so that there will be a rotating meeting scheduled from a timing perspective.

Also given the very diverse, geographically diverse representation that we have for the members of this working group that we would not expect to take firm decisions without the substance of those decisions having been articulated and discussed over the course of two meetings so that for those who potentially are not able to make a meeting that any substantive decision would have the opportunity to be discussed at a second timeslot. So I think that will be important for this group going forward.

And recognizing also that the members of this working group have been appointed or elected by their various constituencies according to their own

processes to represent the views of that community into this process and this working group.

But just to remind us all that it's not just that, that this is a two-way communication process and that the members of this group and the participants more broadly are expected to flow back into their communities the information and the discussions and the decisions that have happened within this working group.

So just a reminder to all of our members and our participants that this is a two-way dialogue bringing input into this group and sharing information back out of this group.

So at - trying to set the stage for a successful outcome we would like to suggest as having been co-chairs to this point that those would be some basic cultural norms that this working group would hopefully adhere to and would therefore facilitate a successful outcome in the time that we have available to us.

I just did want to pick up to make clear of something that Jonathan had said. Jonathan will be continuing to co-chair this working group. I am co-chairing just this first meeting and then we'll be stepping back to be a participant going forward and enabling one of my colleagues from the CC community to step into the role of co-chair.

That person hasn't been identified yet but will be identified shortly. And with that Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Byron. So I guess there's one other principle of operation for today's meeting if we can try and encourage all participants in the meeting to focus as much as possible on any substantive issues that will inevitably be procedural points. But to the extent that we can deal with those in other ways other than with the valuable face to face to time that would be appreciated.

Are there any comments or inputs or frankly additions to those principles or principles of operation that anyone would like to make, any further input on that?

All right well it sounds like it's a - it's sort of a useful set of mechanics to work with. We - Byron touched on point three of course which is this confirming the mechanisms at least for the leadership.

We did discuss on our previous call the possibility of introducing vice chairs. And I think my suggestion here is that we retain that open as a possibility.

We can start off operating immediately. And given again the recognized time pressures that we need to get going with this work I suggest we move forward with the co-chair structure but remain open to any proposals for vice chairs to come in from the other chartering organizations.

So Item 4 has us then looking at the revised timeline. And I think it will be useful to get that up and start to understand the mechanics of what's involved there. And...

Marika Konings: And this is Marika. Maybe just to note as well if it's difficult to read from where you're sitting the document will also be uploaded into the Adobe Connect Room so there you can zoom in and zoom out as appropriate.

Jonathan Robinson: So perhaps it's useful to talk through the timeline. Marika are you willing or able or expecting to do that?

Marika Konings: Yes. So this is Marika. And as you may recall on our first meeting we had an initial draft timeline that we put together outlining some of the basic steps that we foresee based on the charter and as well of course the RFP of the ICG.

We had some feedback at that point from (Elisa) in relation to the deadline which is currently I think 15th of January asking whether there was any kind of flexibility in that regard.

And I think we got the indication that there was very little flexibility but maybe a little bit. So we've revised the timeline to actually have a proposal delivered at the latest by the 31st of January. I'm hoping that that is something that is acceptable to the ICG.

And on the base of that work backwards to look at where that would take us in relation to the different steps of the process.

So basically I think as you all know one of the requirements according to the charter is to have an initial report that goes out for public comment.

So there's the first major milestone that is in there. And based again on the timeline that we have in front of us which I think we all recognize is extremely short we did at this stage suggest to maybe shorten the original public comment forum from 41 or 42 day period to 21 to allow for, you know, substantial time as well for the work for the group to actually develop their proposals as well as review the input received from all the communities.

And again I think one of the reasons why, you know, we want to have such a time earlier on in the processes that we can basically put everyone as well on notice on what is coming.

Because this will really require everyone coming together and being aware of what the timing and timelines are so that everyone can plan accordingly for that.

So on the basis of that it currently foresees that an initial report would be published by the 1st of December which would basically mean let me count one, two, three, four, five, like six weeks approximately to actually - well

seven weeks if we count this week as well to actually develop the initial proposal that would then go out to the public comment for a 21 day period and following which the CWG would actually start reconvening at the same time to actually start looking at, you know, what input is being received as the public comment forum is open.

We've also foreseen there are a number of Webinars for example again to maximize outreach and really make sure that people understand that it's really important to obtain input from a broad number of participants on this process.

So after the public comment forum closes its first season a number of meetings that are used by the CWG to receive - to review the input received take into account, modify the proposal as appropriate and then basically takes us to early January and foresees a submission of the proposal to the chartering organizations for adoptions through their perspective processes by the 19th of January.

And again of course this foresees again that all chartering organizations foresee their processes to align, you know, with this scheduled to be able to allow - to consider and adopt proposals as accordingly.

And that would hopefully get us then to the 31st of January with the final proposal that could be submitted to the ICG.

I think this is what we currently have as a draft proposal mainly being driven by the deadline of 31st of January for submission of a final transition proposal.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Marika. So it's undoubtedly an extremely aggressive timetable. We've taken it as read save for the representation we made to the RFP in exchange - to the ICG and the exchange of letters and accepted at this point

that a two week extension to the originally proposed deadline is possible. And they're going to try to work towards that.

Clearly what that throws up is then the mechanics of how we try and meet that timetable which is envisioned by a series of weekly meetings.

And the whole mechanics of how those meetings work will need to be - we'll need to operate those according to some quite challenging principles producing the outputs, reviewing those outputs and being in a position to deal with them substantially on each successive call.

As Byron said recognizing that should a decision be taken will create the opportunity for that decision to be brought back to the meeting at least once or once again if necessary if someone if a member has been unable to for whatever reason sign off on that.

But we would encourage everyone to work towards those principles of operation whereby we work through this as speedily as possible.

One of the things, Chuck go ahead.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks Jonathan. I think it would be really helpful for us to hear from a representative of each of the sponsoring organizations regarding the ten day or I guess it's 11 days that they would have to approve any recommendations that are made.

So I'm look in at the next to last row of the schedule there. That seems very difficult. And I personally would like to hear from the - certainly from you too and your organizations as well as the GAC and SSAC if you can and ALAC and with regard I mean is that even realistic in some cases to give a ten day turnaround for approval?

And then the second point with regard to the schedule -- and I'm not trying to say we shouldn't be as aggressive as possible in getting this done, it seems to me that the toughest part we're going to have as a working group is the accountability piece.

And to get that piece done and to coordinate with the other work that's going on and hasn't even started I'm kind of baffled how that can happen.

I think this, just putting that aside this is an aggressive schedule when you add in the accountability work.

And I'm not just saying we should try to work toward this but it seems very difficult to do the accountability part of it in this time frame as well.

But again first of all I'd be really curious to think what is realistic in 11 days for each of the sponsoring organizations to approve whatever recommendations they come up with?

Jonathan Robinson: While the respondents to that question -- it's a good question -- think about that I mean there's certainly - I lost my train of thought now. Olivier go ahead.

Olivier Crépin-LeBlond: Yes, thank you Jonathan. Olivier Crépin-LeBlond here of the ALAC.

I think that the document, if the document was to just come up without any prior notice and a document that of course no one would have read by the 20th of January it would be extremely difficult to get our community in that large to comment on it or to actually agree to it within ten days.

That said there are previous or there would be hopefully at that time several previous versions of that same document.

So the only things that would have to be carefully looked that would be just the modifications and the reviews and the amendments which were made based on the comments that were received previously.

So I'm - as far as the ALAC is concerned I am not too concerned, too worried about the adoption in ten days. We have to - we would have to conduct a vote on this which would be a five day vote.

As long as the document is provided to the ALAC perhaps earlier than those ten days or draft documents 80%, 90% done would be provided to the ALAC this is something we could play with.

But I'm particularly concerned though about the rest of the schedule, the timetable which looks extremely tight indeed. And certainly having it running in parallel or somehow connected with the accountability process looks like a real, real challenge.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Olivier. I know Greg you want to speak but just to make just a point of clarification Chuck I mean it is not intended that this group does substantial work on the accountability. That's the work of the - of another group to be charted.

Is that your understanding or you - and the assumption, the understanding I have is that this - the work of this group will need to be coordinated with that group and linked to it but it's not that the substance of that work on accountability will be done in this group.

Chuck Gomes: Well this is Chuck again. And Jonathan what I've heard almost unanimous from the community is that accountability has to happen before the transition happens. So I guess I don't assume the same thing you're assuming.

Jonathan Robinson: I think we're talking cross purposes. I'm not in disagreement with that point but just that the work isn't done in this group.

Chuck Gomes: Okay so Chuck again. The SOs and ACs are supposed to approve our recommendations without knowing that some accountability. I guess they can do it conditionally. Is that what you're thinking?

Jonathan Robinson: Well they need to - the - in effect what this says is that there would be a parallel equivalent timetable that would need to be - at which that - and in which that work would need to be done.

But Greg and then (Elise).

Greg Shatan: Greg Shatan, from the IPC and CSG and the GNSO. Two points, first following up on the accountability point. If we're talking here about replacing the IANA, the functions of the NTII - NTIA one of those functions in regard to the IANA functions is a function of accountability.

So I'm not sure that - how we're going to be able to - where we're going to kind of cut off what is our responsibility regarding accountability and what is the responsibility of the larger kind of governance and accountability discussion which in many ways, you know, involves - they involve things that go beyond the NTIA currently offers in terms of accountability.

But if we're talking here about what is the world post NTIA I'm not sure that accountability is truly off the table here.

Secondly I would point out that in terms of timing the first time that we would really be looking at a document with our communities would be prior to the 1 December publishing of the draft transition proposal.

So, you know, back in that time there we have our last deliberation on the 24th of November. So maybe it is proposed that the draft would be circulated back to the stakeholder groups and ACs for approval before that's published.

I don't think we would at least in, you know, in the GNSO land would not, you know, publish a draft proposal without going back to our constituents.

I would also note that I believe that's the American Thanksgiving week. So that will also add a little extra challenge. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay I've got a hand up in the Adobe and it - is...

(Elise):   Thank you, just a comment. I see that there has been sent out a transcript of the discussion we had in the GAC on Saturday and then they see - would discuss the timeline. It's early.

And we had - of course we have a challenge that have to deliver and produce a result before the next face to face meeting in Marrakesh. That's the challenge itself for the GAC. We work from a face to face meeting basis and that we also cannot speak on behalf of other countries and so on and so forth. You know that the GAC has procedures on this.

So in two weeks additional time is not much but okay. So I just want to emphasize that we have to consult results and reports with the administrations at home so just to say that ten days is a very, very short time.

But we don't have a conclusion on how to respond to the timeline now. We have to discuss it a bit more in the GAC I think this week now that we heard and will hear more for the rest of the year on the timeline. Okay thank you.

Byron Holland: We're going to come up this side. So the gentleman at the very end because you did actually put your hands up as far as I can see in sequence so we're going to work our way down to three people on this side.

(John):   Okay thank you. This is (John) from (Farlu) ALAC. I'd like to record and Greg said in relation to the accountability process.

I think the outcome from that accountability side will determine how fast we get it plus one from our communities on a timeline.

If we have an idea of what the accountability outcomes going to look like I'm sure it will be - to make it faster for the communities to give a plus 1 on the proposal that comes out of this working group.

That being said I'd like to make a comment, one or two comments on the timeline. December is very, very crucial for residually after month.

From the 15th you oddly see people get to work as fast as possible because it's (unintelligible) anniversary month.

I don't know how easy it's going to be to move within from public comment as trade into consideration by the community.

So I think I will suggest a week should be put in between 19th so before - so after report the comment on the 19th I suggest a week should be put in-between to actually have the final document I guess given to the communities (unintelligible) discussed.

Because it's not going to be easy to be getting new comments on a particular on the draft and still discussing these new comments which - with the communities. It's - because it's not going to be just us there.

So I think it will be better we get the actual document that we'll get to discuss with the community before. And I also suggest that if we could have two faced comment period it's - I think it's very important after we got the comments from the larger community, the update of that comment will have to rescinded because it could be on just this our (unintelligible) working group.

So I think if we could have two faced comment period it would be really very helpful in this process. Thank you.

Byron Holland: Thank you very much. Can I just take this moment to remind everybody that when you speak as the group is getting to know each other, can you identify what group you're from, what your affiliation is and your name please just before you get started. And for the transcript just remembering there are number of people online who don't have the benefit of seeing us.

(John): I hope I did. I think I did.

Byron Holland: You did. I'm strictly saying it as a reminder. Thank you very much. You set the example by which the rest of us need to continue to follow. Thank you. (Robert)?

Robert Guerra: It's Robert Guerra for the transcript from the SSAC, just wanted to reply very quickly to a couple of the comments.

In regards to the schedule and adoption by the SSAC usually we have a period of about five to seven days if I'm not mistaken.

I think what's key though is that we circulate and share drafts that can be circulated with them so those comments can be shared. But our approval process tends to be about five days or so.

I think in regards to the earlier comments in regards to accountability I think it's going to be important to hear from everyone here is the parallel group that's being set up, will that feed into this group and will this group have to review those results or will it report out separately?

That being said because our timeline is really short I think we should identify what are things that we can produce ourselves, develop that text.

And if we have to wait for processes not wait but actually produce some of the text.

And then again going into the adoption phase I think it's really important to highlight and to make sure everyone knows what text are going to be internal for this group and when they can be shared with some of the groups so we just are very clear that so we can go back to our groups and things like that.

And so I think it's a general comment as I shared on the list with some of you. We do have a very tight timeline in identifying when we can start developing some text that we have consensus on. Then we should do so.

And if we need to meet again this week in some capacity, then we should do so because face to face time is rare and incredibly valuable. Thank you.

Byron Holland: Thank you very much. Since accountability in general is definitely a topic of discussion at this moment I would just like to remind all that the charter by which this group is chartered is fairly specific on this subject.

And of course I'd encourage you to just re-familiarize yourself with that as well as in terms of a timing and what we're delivering to. It is delivering to an RFP set forth by the ICG.

So both of those things of course I just encourage everybody to be very, very familiar with because that sets to some degree the scope and timing of our work.

But on accountability there is specific language and guidance in the charter itself.

I believe we're going to Milton now.

Man: Go ahead (unintelligible) to the chat.

Byron Holland: I'm sorry. There is - then we're going to go to Becky who is online after.

Milton Mueller: Yes this is Milton Mueller. I'm a Professor at Syracuse University, part of the GNSO and also on the ICG.

I just am a little bit concerned at the way in which you are getting bogged down in process again not that that ever happens to GNSO or the ccNSO.

But first of all this is not an ICANN PDP okay? You don't have to follow any particular preordained process. Secondly the time requirements are not arbitrary. They are grounded in certain political and organizational realities.

Third, it seems like your mindset is too stuck in past practices. So this idea of going back to your own community and getting consensus at that level why does that have to happen at all?

Your community people should put you in this spot to do the work. You should do the work. And then when you have a draft you send it before the entire community, not a bunch of little silos that think that they're all acting independently of you.

There should be one general public comment period on our draft. GAC can respond to that either individually or collectively.

The SOs can respond to that. Individuals can respond. Anybody can respond to it. Why are you talking above this siloized (sic) framework in which everybody independently goes to their community and then comes back and you renegotiate again? I just don't get it. We don't have time for that.

And the main point I want to make is that you really need to start talking about the substance about what is accountability, how is it going to work post NTIA?

This is going to be the last face to face meeting you have before the deadline is it not? Now of course you can do conference calls and so on but hopefully at some point in this meeting this group will be talking about the substance, the real issues that have to be addressed regarding the transition.

Byron Holland: Thank you. Becky Burr online. Is Becky going to speak to us virtually or is it text based?

Becky Burr: No I'm speaking I hope. Can you hear me?

Jonathan Robinson: Byron let me respond to a couple of points from Milton there. I mean certainly this - you're right we - given the aggressive nature of the timescale we need to be as innovative as we can and thus recognizing that there may be constraints.

But I certainly think your suggestions are well taken.

I do think we have the opportunity and we've discussed them. And there's a number of things we've picked up on one. Was the time line originally and the initial pushback got us the two weeks.

There may well be some more work to be done there. But for the moment the working assumption has been that this 31st of January deadline exists.

The second is, is it possible to have some face to face meetings one or more in-between now and the end of the timeline?

And we've talked with ICANN about providing the resources to do that. And there is a proposal that we've got to be able to do something like that.

But certainly one of those meetings would need to take place before the end of the year. If there's another one we may need to do something in January.

And the willingness and ability to support a face to face meeting I don't think it's - we've got in excess of 90 combined participants and members.

So I think the reality of relocating all of those 90 participants to one location is probably too ambitious.

But certainly I think we could comfortably say we could bring the members together and have the participants facilitate the participation of the participants as best as possible via the various remote tools at our disposal.

So that is a realistic possibility. And I think we need to put out a proposal for a date for that and a location based on the location of the members and get something like that out as soon as possible.

Now if participants did want to participate in person there's no reason why that should be not permitted. There should be every reason to encourage that.

But there are certain logistical issues like whether they'd be able to - I mean ICANN offered to fund the travel of the members to participate in person.

We would need to know if other participants were planning to attend how - in advance so that we can secure the right facilities for - and a large group. But that's possible and in fact in my opinion something we - that's necessary rather than possible.

So those are some responses. I'm not sure if Becky is available.

Byron Holland: I think Becky is ready to go. Becky.

Becky Burr: Yes. Can you hear me now? Can you hear me? Apparently not.

Byron Holland: So apparently the people on the phone can hear her talking. Unfortunately we aren't hearing her in here yet.

So perhaps Becky if you can hear us which I believe you can you could type in your question and then we - I will read it out on your behalf until hopefully we can get the logistics coordinated.

Jonathan Robinson: So I suggest we - I mean the point about substance and process I mean clearly we've got to get the process right so that it accommodates the participation and substantial input.

But it feels to me like we could - we're taking some significant input on the timeline and logistics and maybe we should move now on to Item 5 which is to review the RFP and to remind everyone that the basis of this work is in response to an RFP from the ICG.

So it's perhaps worth expanding that out. And you'll see that that's done for you now on the slide up above is to actually segment out the detail on that on the RFP.

Byron Holland: I've got Becky's comment.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay.

Byron Holland: Just before we move on to that I did want to read out Becky Burr's comment which is to respond in particular to Milton and remind the group that the Drafting Team itself spent considerable amount of time discussing the process piece and in particular the need to go back to the sponsoring organizations for approval.

So that was something that the Drafting Team spent time on and had a very intentional discussion about.

So that's why it ended up there. Take your points. That's personal, not Becky's comment but Becky is just reminding us that there was significant discussion about that at the Drafting Team level.

Jonathan Robinson: So I'm not sure if there is anyone from the ICG who might be willing to talk to this. So we haven't prepared anyone. But I wonder if there was anyone in the room was available and be willing to talk to these key components of the RFP?

((Crosstalk))

Byron Holland: Yes for participants and that does bear mention for participants who are sitting around the room just as you can see we have a standup mic if you wish to make a comment.

Elisa Cooper: Better? So I'm Elisa Cooper. I guess I'm from the technical community. I don't know how I would identify myself in ICANN usually. And I'm the chair of the ICG.

So what you see on the screen are the six or I guess there's seven actually sections of the RFP that we put out in September for all of the operational communities.

And the first couple of items are fairly self-explanatory. We just ask that the community gives some background on how it uses whichever of the IANA functions its proposal is aimed at.

So for this community it would be names. We'd like a description of the existing arrangements pre-transition both the ways that policy is developed and also the existing oversight and accountability mechanisms.

The policy part obviously is not really in scope for the transition but we just want to have it complete so that everyone's on the same page in terms of understanding with the policy processes are.

The third part is the proposed post-transition oversight and accountability mechanism. So this is the section where you say here's what we're proposing in terms of what we think needs to be in place after the transition occurs.

The next part is the transition implications. So this covers things like what the operational implications might be of the proposed transition measures, what legal framework needs to be in place for the transition to be successful, what some of the risks are to the continuity and operations -- those kinds of things.

Then we have a section where we'd like the community to explain how they met the criteria set out by NTIA in its original announcement in the development of this community it's proposal.

And then we also have a section where we want reporting on what process the community followed so all the things that you guys have been talking about today and the level of consensus that was achieved before sending the proposal to the ICG.

It's that good?

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you Elisa for responding to that. So maybe if you could just hang around at the mic in case there are any questions or comments or requirements for clarification?

Everyone was happy with that setting the agenda? Okay Robert?

Robert Guerra: It's Robert Guerra again. Elisa if you could just maybe specify in terms of point number three the accountability arrangements how much of that as was

mentioned before, how much do we need to develop and how much might come from the parallel process that's working on that as well? Thank you.

Elisa Cooper: Sure this is Elisa again. So this RFP was generic. It was issued to all of the operational communities, not just this one which means that it doesn't speak specifically to the fact that there are separate parallel processes which is something that's happening in the naming world but is not necessarily happening in the other communities. So it doesn't really give specific guidance as far as I can remember.

I will say that it's in so far as there are parallel processes here there is somewhat of a similar precedent at least I know in the protocols parameters community which might be of help to folks here.

So in the protocol parameters community and in the IETF we handle - there's separate entities that handle different aspects of the IETF operation.

We have a separate entity that handles issues related to intellectual property and contracting. And so the way that the process is running in the IETF is that the working group developing that proposal is including in its proposal guidance to those other bodies that say we'd like this to be part of the transition plan but we know that it's not within our purview.

And so that might be a model that could be considered here where this group says, you know, overall these are the accountability mechanisms that we think we need.

Some of them are specific to ICANN. And we think those need to be handled by this parallel process. And so you can kind of join the two by sort of pointing at each other. That's sort of the path that we're going down in the ITF. I hope that helps.

Jonathan Robinson: Any other comments, questions from this Item 5? Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Chuck Gomes from the registries. And this isn't a question so you're free but this is a suggestion.

It seems to me that Sections 1 and 2 of the RFP are something that we should be able to get done.

In fact if we could have a at least a roughed draft of those before next week I think that would really help us and especially Section 2.

Because in that description of the existing processes is that part that NTIA does where we're going to have to zero our focus.

And it would help us focus where we really need to focus rather than some of the administrative and straightforward details.

So my suggestion is that we make it a goal to get some volunteers to write. And we already have one on the list and I won't talk for him.

(Alan) volunteered to start some of this and some of us from the GNSO may need to help in that regard. But that's something very concrete that we could get going after we leave this meeting today.

Byron Holland: I'm just going to say I think that's a very good suggestion. And without trying to do a volunteer call right here in this meeting I think immediately after this face to face we will put that call for volunteers on the list.

And since (Alan) works with me at (Sera) in Canada I know for a fact he's going to be willing to work on this.

But obviously encourage other folks who would be willing to go through this critical work in terms of surfacing what we know to be true today.

And making it available and accessible to the broader group will be very important baseline work to get us going. I think that's a good suggestion Chuck. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes agreed. And it seems to lead us nicely into Item 6 on the agenda anyway which I think, you know, (Alan) has done some work there already.

So I suggest that we have a look at that and make the call for volunteers to join him on the list as you suggest Byron.

But we might as well just go straight and have a look at some of these key points here now in terms of substance. (Alan) would you like to walk us through this?

(Alan Gilvary):   Thank you Jonathan. It's (Alan Gilvary) with DotCA, the CC community. I'll just say in respect of the previous item I did volunteer on the list. So if anyone wants to join me that would be most welcome.

I know that SSAC has produced a couple of documents so they could be good kind of source text to start populating that.

So I want to acknowledge the work of SSAC in that area and see if we can work with that as well.

So IANA contract, so this is really what we're here to talk about. The IANA transition I think if we look at the actual contract itself it is 65 pages but it's not actually that formidable.

And I guess, you know, if I could use the metaphor baking bread if the final product is a nice loaf of bread and I think that this is the wheat we have to grind through to get us the flour to get us there.

And so I think it represents maybe 80% of the work we have to do. And in a sense as the parameters for I guess the first level of investigation.

So I'm not going to walk through this but I - all I did was cut and pasted the titles of all of the headings in the contract into this piece here.

You'll see the guts of it that we're mainly interested in are in Section C. But if you go through in other areas there are issues like intellectual property, terrorist financing and issues like that.

And so I think we have to do a triage process of going through and identifying those provisions of the contract that we likely will want to see continued. And then that can kind of form the focus of our work moving forward.

I guess the other thing I would note is this contract and I think there have been a couple of minor amendments from this version but it is not - actually the contract has evolved over time.

And certainly this version benefited from a substantial consultation that NTIA undertook in 2011.

So I certainly don't see this process as an attempt to capture the static contract to make sure it continues but rather to identify the key provisions we want to see maintained and also ensure that that process of improvement that has been encouraged and I guess to a certain extent forced by NTIA is also captured in what we do.

So in terms of practically speaking I would propose just to go through and to do an initial triage of all of these sections and just to undertake just a first pass of what we think is relevant to our exercise just to make sure we're not going to miss anything.

And I suspect we'll end up mostly with those sections in C but as I said there were some others on security and intellectual property, et cetera. So that's my proposal to the group.

Byron Holland: Thank you (Alan). While we let people digest that and come back with comment we do have an online comment. (Grace) could you read that out to us?

(Grace): Sure. We have a comment from (Gua Charra). His comment reads the SSAC report draws our attention to the fact that the IANA's functions contract incorporates by reference of 550 page long ICANN response to the NGA request for proposal.

For example the ICANN response provides a description of the policy establishment processes it intends to follow.

Therefore in addition to the IANA functions contract we also need to go through the ICANN response in detail and identify what aspects relate to the names community.

Byron Holland: Thank you, so much for just 65 pages. Okay are there - does anybody have any questions or comment? Please sir.

(Philip Subamonian): Yes (Philip Subamonian) with Sony from At-Large. I want to know why we are paying so much attention to the clauses of the contract because it's not the contract that is going to change but only the oversight that is being transitioned. So even if NDIA has (off) for an RT or (off) to examine this. I feel that it's not necessary to pay attention to the contract. And this is not in transition. Only the oversight is in transition. Can you tell me why?

Jonathan Robinson: Would anyone else like to make a stab at answering that? Greg?

Greg Shatan: My understanding is that the contract is going away. And that therefore, the contract and the requirements that are set forth in the contract need to be replaced.

There's not going to be a new counterparty that is being assigned a contract by the NTIA, or rather the contract itself will evaporate. And the concepts that need to be captured from the contract need to be place elsewhere. And that's a key part of our job.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes, that simply a great answer. And so my opinion is that the contract therefore forms - and I think this is where (Evan)'s coming from, a natural framework for rather than us starting with a clean slate, especially given the time pressures, but also given the substantial evolution that's got into that contract in the past. That it provides us with a natural jumping off point with - of a framework to work with. Any other comments or related points?

Man: (Eliz) and then the gentleman at the far end.

(Eliz):   Okay thank you. (Eliz) from the GAC (Liam). And now I wanted to comment on the comment from ALAC because it's also been discussed in the GAC, not in the hallways.

It's going to be placed elsewhere, these responsibilities. And where? So we, as a contract, that is deleted.

Man: Microphone.

(Eliz):   Okay thank you. The contract is deleted. But the functions and responsibility of the IANA is not. The - so how - where will we place these responsibilities?

(Unintelligible) as I said, you want it just to be replaced. But someone else is going to have that other side of the function today with the same descriptions, the same responsibilities as they have today.

If you delete it and you piece it up and you want to take some of it out, where? And why do you want to take just some of it out and leave other things to be? You know, we have to sort out what concepts we are going to work on.

So is that another contract or just a description or - because somewhere it has to stand what IANA is going to do.

(Philip Subamonian): Okay, my thoughts on this...

((Crosstalk))

Byron Holland: Just as a quick point of order. We'll definitely allow clarification. So please continue. But in general, we want to continue to follow the order. But as a point of clarification, please go ahead and then we'll go to the gentleman at the end.

(Philip Subamonian): My thoughts on this is that we don't have to make the oversight transition complicated by looking at contract and assuming that there is going to be change. And whatever changes that need to be made in the clauses of the contract can happen post-transition.

So any way the functions as you see are not going to change. So the contract doesn't need not change, except for the title, from NTIA to ICANN. If so far it has been a contract from NTIA.

And not it's going to be a contract between ICANN and the operator. And so the same thing could continue. And final changes could be made post-transition.

The focus of the oversight transition could be more on people. How that's going to - how the oversight is going to be organized (throughout) nuances

and intricacies like this. And so these are relatively unimportant commercial aspects. And these are my thoughts.

Byron Holland: Thank you. Just a reminder that even if you've already once said your name and affiliation, there is a transcript and there are people online. So please, every time you speak, state your name and your affiliation.

I'm going to enable one comment on this. And then I'm going to go to my very patient friend at the end here.

(Eliz): (Eliz) from the GAC again. Now, that's - I think that is what we have to discuss. It says - I don't think it's going to be a contract. But we don't know that. We haven't discussed that. So we have a contract today. It's that (advance out). So...

Man: It will be terminated.

(Eliz): Yes.

Man: Unless it's the decision of this group not to terminate it and to...

(Eliz): This is what we have to discuss. Yes, thank you.

Byron Holland: Thank you. The gentleman at the end, and I will apologize to a number of the people at the end. I have to admit, I forgot my glasses. So even the people I know I'm having troubles with.

But one thing I can say is you're all a lot better looking at this point. So please, the gentleman at the end.

(Eduardo Diaz): Thank you. This is (Eduardo Diaz) from ALAC. I have a suggestion about when we look at these contract, if we can categorize the items. Like for example, when we look at responsibility and respect for a stakeholder, that to

me, that looks more as to an accountability type of function instead of a related to the naming function as such.

That would help, you know, look at these things from two different perspectives. Thank you.

Byron Holland: Thank you. Any other comments? And just I would again remind the participants from around the room, we do have the stand-up mic. So if there's any further comment from the folks not sitting at the table, that's also very much welcomed.

Any further discussion on this? I think the important thing to note is this is a jumping off point. It's not meant to be the end-all, be-all framework. But it does provide some structure for us to really initiate the conversation. No further comment on this point? All right, Greg.

Greg Shatan: Greg Shatan again for the record, CSG, GNSO. The comment at the end of the table presupposes that even the accountability functions that are core to the NTIA contract are somehow not going to be part of our discussion.

I'm again not convinced that that's the case. But I think that's something that we need to decide and clarify. Thanks.

Byron Holland: Avri I think. Thank you.

Avri Doria: Yes, Avri Doria, NCSG, GNSO. I think that the, not only are the accountability issues part of the current contract, but indeed they are part of our charter in terms of ensuring that they are included.

So unless we are just changing this contract from NTIA to ICANN, you know, to some other entity to ICANN, and whatever we present we have to deal with those accountability issues.

Now that will have to be connected to the parallel process. That parallel process will have to go through its determination to figure out which of them are critical to the IANA and which of them are ICANN beyond IANA.

And that will be separate. But then and somehow, liaison in between these two parallel processes, we have I think three parallel processes if we include ourselves.

Basically we have to make sure that their notion of accountability that's relevant to IANA and our notion of accountability that's relevant to IANA are the same.

And so, you know, we have a lot of cross parallel process work to do in doing this. But I think it has to be part of it all. Thanks.

Byron Holland: The gentleman from Iran.

(Irosly): Thank you. My name is (Irosly). I am not representative of GAC, but I'm GAC member. And I would like to comment. Unfortunately we cannot agree that the contracts remain as it is, but just change the title.

Contract has been agreed to between NTIA as a policymaker and ICANN as a policy (inventor). Now the situation has changed. We have to review the contract. If we change the element which is necessary, delete element which is not necessary and add the element which is not included in that. And it is required to be included when the transition is made. Thank you.

Byron Holland: (Lisa).

(Lisa Full): (Lisa Full) for the record. I'm from the CCNSO group, but I'm not a member. I agree with Avri that we really have to connect the processes with - of accountability with our process. And I think it's very important that the solution

we end up, or solutions, are really tightly connected to the accountability process.

I don't hear opposite from anyone, but I think the coordination, as Avri also mentioned, is very, very important. Not for this first step, but from our next steps. This history writing we're doing now I don't think is as important with the accountability. This is showing the present accountability, but the future we really need to be in line and in scope with the two groups.

Byron Holland: Thank you. And speaking of in scope, I think given where the conversation is going it might actually be worth reflecting on what is in scope for this group in the charter that has been agreed by the relevant constituencies.

And I would just draw your attention to the final sentence, which does provide I think some clarity here, although there is more that of course I'd encourage you to read.

And that is and I quote, "Accountability for the administration of the IANA functions is properly within the scope of this working group." And it's makes specific reference to the implementation and operational accountability of the IANA functions. And that is separate and distinct from the much broader ICANN accountability discussion that's going on in a parallel track.

The charter recognizes that parallel discussion and that there needs to be coordination between the two -- coordination between the two. But the scope here is around again, the administration of the IANA functions, the operational implementation and operational accountability.

So I have Robert and then Milton.

Robert Guerra: Again, it's Robert Guerra from the SVAC. I just want to quickly want to endorse I guess the comments from Alan in regards to what parts of the text

that could be developed, Sections 1 and 2, over the next week. And I think others had mentioned it that as well too.

I also just heard something in regards to reviewing the history of the IANA and the work that this group may want to do. I would like this group then to reference something that I posted on the work party - on the main list that SVAC has already done this.

SVAC 67 that came out in August and SVAC 68 that just came out today reviews the IANA functions contract, both the short 50 plus version and the 500 plus page version. And so now that's available.

So I think, you know, let's get to what's on scope. Let's get writing as well. And, you know, and so I'm keen to, again as I mentioned earlier, ways that we can talk about a work plan on the text that we - on existing stuff in the history. And write that would be great to do on time. Thank you.

Byron Holland: Thank you Robert. And I would also just reiterate his comment for those of us on this - involved in this issue. The SVAC documents are well worth reading and very informative. Please take the time to do so. Milton.

Milton Mueller: Milton Mueller, Syracuse University, NCSG and ICG. I want to address - go back to the coordination between the two accountability groups. The - I want to emphasize the degree to which the plan that you come up with affects very strongly the level of coordination required with the other group.

Let's assume that the proposal coming out of this group says we don't have to do anything. Basically NTIA just gives IANA to ICANN permanently. There's no replacement for their supervision.

Then I think the message that the other accountability group has is that its outcome - the whole ballgame rests with its outcome. And possibly other

members and the community would not want the transition to take place at all until that other group was finished.

Now let's go to the other extreme. Suppose the - this group that came up with a proposal says we're taking IANA completely out of ICANN. It's no longer part of ICANN. It's a separate organization.

Then you could say to the other group, take your time. Fix ICANN, but don't worry about the IANA transition because it doesn't really affect ICANN's accountability anymore.

Now those are deliberately to extreme examples. But I think you're going to probably end up somewhere in between those two things. But the question is, the broader accountability process for ICANN could take a very long time.

Suppose they decided to reincorporate in Geneva. Suppose they decide to revamp the membership structure. All of that will take years - two or three, four years maybe.

Many of us would be quite unhappy if the transition was delayed for that long a period of time for some rather indeterminate exchanges that would be taking place in the future.

So part of the coordination process would be what kind of things can we do that would obviate the need for linking to tightly the outcomes of these two processes?

Byron Holland: Thank you Milton. And I think that's a very good observation. Again, and not to bore you with reading, but within the charter itself it does speak very specifically to recognizing that the two processes are interrelated and interdependence. And we should appropriately coordinate their work.

And I reiterate that one to say that there is a distinction between coordinating and doing the work of accountability. And we will need to be very cognizant of that in this workgroup. Kieren.

Kieren McCarthy: Hi. Hello, Kieren McCarthy. I have a couple of pragmatic questions. So I'd like to help how I can with this. What I can do is I can write stuff and I can, you know, communicate to people these things are happening.

So in terms of actually producing the work, how are we going to do this? Is it going to be all on one mailing list or will it be broken up into different groups question going to use interactive online tools or will we have a group of people who focus on keeping on track?

How are we going to do it? Because my eyes glaze over the philosophical discussions. I'd like to sort of get into the weeds. That's what I like to do. I'd like to be told where to go and when to do it. I'm sure some others was well. So if you hear some pragmatic details and focus attention that would be good.

Byron Holland: Thinks for that offer Kieren. And I think you've already heard coalescing around one piece of practical work, which is the work that Alan had just kicked off.

I don't have a view yet. And I'm open to suggestions as to how we break this down into smaller parcels of work. Currently we are all on one mailing list. But clearly will be others - we will need to segment the work and take volunteers such as yourself who are willing and able.

ICANN has also made it clear that they're willing to support this effort with the relevant staff support should we need it, or even they had said some form of experts or other skilled assistant. So I think that's something that we need to determine quickly like everything else, but nevertheless still to be determined. Greg.

Greg Shatan: I'm Greg Shatan again. I think maybe it would be helpful, and we could even put it back on the screen is to look at the list of the deliverables or deliverable sections that were required by the RFP.

Maybe think about setting up subgroups for each deliverable section. And revamping or adding a column to our workflow document to where it says continue deliberations for six meetings. We can also have a workflow for drafting of those.

Maybe those would be decided, you know, more granularly by those subgroups. But I think overall, we have to set some milestones for submission of deliverables drafts within the group, et cetera.

And we may decide it's not - some of the deliverables may have a longer timeline than other, you know, the historical look back documents being factual.

I think, you know, as somebody suggested, I think (Byron) that we even try to get them done by next week in the rough draft. But obviously the core deliverable of what the future is going to look like is not going to be done by next week. So we put something longer on.

But I think that's kind of the suggestion is one, identify the deliverables; two, set up a timeline and some teams to work on them. Thank you.

Byron Holland: Thank you. That seems like a good suggestion. We have an online comment. (Grace)?

(Grace):   Sure. We have a comment from Eric Iriarte. His comment is the impact in gTLD and ccTLDs will be different. This separation could be a practical way to work.

Byron: Thank you Eric. (Matthew).

(Matthew Vey):   My name is (Matthew Vey). I am the CEO of (Ethnic), the ccGLD Manager for (.for). We're also operating in a gTLD space.

I think we are sort of going around the key issue here because when I listen to what's been said earlier, it's obvious that people are operating under different assumptions.

Some people in the room apparently assume that's a contract with IANA - between IANA and ICANN will disappear and mixed into something. And others have different expectations that it's going to be transferred to an external organization.

I think Milton summed it up quite well with his extreme scenarios. And I don't see any work being currently (entered) onto scenario, onto building at those scenarios, elaborating upon them. And my main concern, I don't see anything about how you will decide which is the scenario or the scenarios that you propose.

So I would like to suggest things we could (cure) like action. First thing would be list the scenarios. I think Milton started this. A number of people around the table, and I can definitely contribute to that, can list scenarios.

And how the (power) will track about what would be the decision criteria. I may have missed this in the charter. I haven't read this very thoroughly. But I don't - I'm not sure there is consensus about what makes a scenario better than the other right now.

And that would definitely be needed if we want to suggest something with a rationale that this scenario is better than others. And so I would definitely encourage a specific track, maybe a specific subgroup to work on building those criterias. Thank you.

Byron Holland: Thank you (Matthew). Scenario analysis is a good suggestion. I would draw your attention to Section 5, which does speak to the decision-making process. So does give some guidance on how the decision making will transpire.

But it certainly doesn't speak to scenario analysis, which would seem like a good idea. Any other comments?

Jonathan Robinson: I'll just respond to that point from (Matthew) and others, you know, Greg's segmentation of the work, scenario planning feels to me like a sort of review of this meeting afterwards and trying to move in some very, very helpful pragmatic suggestions, as well as some problems and issues raised.

And it feels to me like a sort of structured review of the meeting. And an attempt to produce what might be seen as a communiqué or a digest. I put that out to the list in short order.

So I think that's something we can work together with staff on. That's probably - and then try and pull together the goodwill and the volunteer time that seems to be available to support those.

And, you know, I think that seems - that feels to me like a good way of getting like practical outcome that others are seeking here. So I think we can try and do that and produce something which may require some tweaking once it's been sent out to list. But I think a careful review of what's been discussed here and the very helpful input would be the way to go. Thank you.

Byron Holland: Any other comments? Milton?

Milton Mueller: Milton Mueller, Syracuse University. The scenarios, (Jordan Carter) of ISOC (NZ) has already done a very useful diagram carving up the different

functions and showing how they might be sliced, diced and divided among different organizations.

So that conversation has been happening since March. And of course there's proposals on the table from our organization in that governance project as well, which could go into that.

But the low systematic mapping of options was indeed this diagram by (Jordan Carter). So I would encourage you to look at that. And it's posted on our site and probably on ISOC (NZ) site also.

Byron Holland: Thank you Milton. I believe we have (Paul Kane) on the line. And we're going to try again to actually hear from him. And then Keith after (Paul Kane). Unfortunately it doesn't appear we're going to be able to hear from him directly. So I would ask (Paul Kane) if you could type in your comment. And we will read it on your behalf. In the interim, Keith Davidson.

Keith Davidson: Keith Davidson, .(nzed), CCNSO. Just to follow up on Milton's comments regarding the Internet (nzed) paper, I would be happy to post that to the ICG list and the CWG list. And therefore make it a reference material to those groups if that's okay with everybody. Thank you.

Byron Holland: Thank you Keith. That would be very helpful. Do we have (Paul Kane)'s comment? He's typing. So we're eagerly anticipating that. (Martin).

(Martin Votamont):   (Martin Votamont) of the constituent registry. I'm speaking on my own behalf. And observer or participant, not a member. Basically I like where this is going. We're beginning to move to more clarity.

I think in general, just two remarks. One is let's set it up as what it is for. It is to get the IANA function properly set up. Not per se how to make sure it can stay in ICANN. So the scenario fits very well on that.

Let's think of how we can best set this up so it serves the information - the Internet community. And I don't see a better solution than ICANN. But hey, if you set it up like that and that is the outcome, it's even stronger.

Second thing is what do we call - how we call it contract or maybe even information or whatever, it doesn't matter. What we do need is a very clear description of what we understand (that issue). Just those two points.

Byron Holland: Thank you. Do we have Mr. (Kane)'s comment yet?

(Grace): This is a comment from (Paul Kane). ccTLD community is very diverse. Some have number attended an ICANN meeting. Asking ccTLD managers for the type of solution they would like may be useful.

We would - they could conduct a survey as there may be a number of solutions. I am willing to assist in the drafting.

Byron Holland: Thank you. (Paul), please go ahead.

Man: (One week) from the GAC. I'd like to ask about the Item 3 of the RFP of ICG, on the post-transitions oversight. How it will be addressed. You know, Item 3, as in Item 3.

Jonathan Robinson: Well I think, I mean that seems to me to be the purpose of the group, right, is to deal with that. And with a suggestion that we break these down into - as being substantial work streams as the work of the group.

So I'm not sure there's an answer to it yet, if that - I mean that's the RFP. That's the requirement, unless I'm misunderstanding. But that's the work that's got to be done in response to each of those points. I hope I'm not misunderstanding your point. But that clearly sets out the scope of work. And that's one clear in effect work stream of this group based on the direction of the RFP from the ICG. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Chuck Gomes from the registries. I see Number 3 as our work stream. I'm not sure that's like minimal. Am I missing something?

Byron Holland: My only take, yes. That's the core deliverable, 100% right. But there is other work to be done like a review of the documents or surfacing of other. Those are other streams of work. But clearly Number 3 is the key - is the mother lode. Greg?

Greg Shatan: Greg Shatan, IPC, GNSO. The - I think that probably makes sense. But it's subject to further discussion that Item 3 be taken care of by a committee of the whole rather than leaving out some people here to work on the less core deliverables. Thank you.

Byron Holland: We are quickly winding down in terms of our time. I think we have another five minutes allocated. And not to put my co-chair on the spot, but some wrap up comments.

     Are there - before we do that, can in canvas the room for any final comments or thoughts? And of course our friends and colleagues on the line, any final comments or thoughts? Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Chuck Gomes from the registries again. I think we need to decide, and we can do this on the list or we can at least get a sense today how long our teleconference call is going to be.

     My own recommendation, even though I know it's not very popular is to accomplish what we need to accomplish. We probably need to look at two-hour calls.

Jonathan Robinson: That's a very practical point. I mean I'd come into this meeting thinking there had to be at least 90 minutes, certainly in excess of an hour. So that's a working assumption. I mean I'm not quite sure if we want to set

(unintelligible). But I don't mind if anyone would like to make any comments on that.

And clearly, we've got compressed time scale, frequent meetings. And length of meetings is one way of getting more work done. It's a question of productivity. So any comments on that? Great.

Greg Shatan: Greg Shatan, IPC. I'd agree.

Jonathan Robinson: With the two hours.

Greg Shatan: I agree with the two hours. I was on a two-hour every week working group. I think it actually was very helpful because we really could dig into the back and forth much more without, you know, having to look at our watch and kind of speed along on things before we got to delve into them. Thank you.

Byron Holland: Final comment, Keith and then we'll go - (Jonathan)'s going to wrap it up for us.

Keith Davidson: Just Keith Davidson, .(nzed), ccNSO, ICG. Just emphasizing their point. I think two hours is the minimum, just given the complexities of the technology and times and so on. It takes 15 minutes for a meeting to start properly and so on. So one-hour meetings fail to get to meet or substance. I think two hours is a fine timeframe. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay. So I don't think I can do a fully coherent summing up, and nor do I want to. But I think it's quite clear there's a number of a very practical suggestions. There's some goodwill and concentrated effort in the room.

And I sense a lot of willing volunteers, which I think is very encouraging because certainly in it from a kind of GNSO perspective. And I suspect to some extent - I shouldn't presume to say this, but from a sort of

communitywide perspective, we all are suffering generally from work group fatigue and issues.

So actually the fact that there are the level of competence and enthusiasm and willingness to participate is great. And so I think it's incumbent on probably myself and (Byron Darsaid) together with the staff that is supporting on this to try and come up with a sort of summary and capture some key outcomes from this as a sort of action list if you like.

Including some of the very practical suggestions like the scenario, planning to obviously recognize the whole interrelationship and codependents subject to the sort of spectrum analysis that Milton talked about that this end stretches of the whole of the end parameters of how this might work.

We need regular and frequent meetings. So it feels like to me weekly two-hour meetings. We'll come back to you right away with the proposed face-to-face meeting and timing.

I'm not sure we're going to be able to do something like subtle it's as democratically as we might like to the via a typical doodle poll or something. I think there's going to have to be a bit of direction given. Have people move their agendas as best as possible and/or participate remotely.

But, you know, I'm highly sympathetic to trying to accommodate everyone's positions. But at the same time if we're going to work with the kind of time pressures, and frankly size of task in some ways that we may need to just push on as it were.

So to the extent that you feel you haven't been able to be consulted about the specific time or timing of meetings. (Byron) did talk earlier about rotation. I'm not sure that (equally) distant participation at for argument sake eight hour intervals in a 24-hour day is the most sensible.

I think an analysis of where participants are coming from, and attempt to recognize that and then stagger things. So I think we'll do some real practical things and try and drive this whole process forward.

That's enough from me for now. I think Greg, it sounds like you want to make...

Greg Shatan: Just actually a mundane question. I had heard some discussion, or maybe it was in the GAC that there might be a meeting with the ICG perhaps on November 10. Or is that - or am I just hallucinating?

Byron Holland: We have not heard anything to that effect as yet. I think you're hallucinating. And it's only the first day. So the member from Iran.

Man: Yes participant of this meeting. The reply was given to the representative of GAC relating to Item 3, which have two elements. One element is oversight and the other element is accountability arrangement. It was not quite clear.

Let me just a second one -- accountability arrangement. A group is being formed with two track. Track 1, accountability relating to the transition. And Track 2, overall accountability of ICANN. With respect to the Track 1, what is the arrangement and liaison of this group with (.track) or with activity of (that track), Number 1?

Number 2, the issue of the oversight, (gentlemen) said that this is adjusted the whole community. But you are among those community. How you will see the oversight after the transition as far as the names are referred? Who will we take up that one? And how it will be done? What would be the entity responsible for that? The answer was given was not convincing. Thank you.

Byron Holland: Thank you for that. I would just like to say there is a - the other group on accountability. That track is being formed literally as we speak. And the first open session where ICANN is going to speak to it and we can have

community input will happen today at 4 o'clock. So I would encourage you to participate in that one. Greg?

Greg Shatan: Greg Shatan again. My understanding and listening to the two tracks described by the gentleman from Iran is that Track 1 is our responsibility. That there's not a second grouping formed for IANA related accountability.

And the second, as far as what the, you know, the other questions that were asked, those are very appropriate questions. And those are really the questions that this group has to deal with. Thank you.

Byron Holland: Agreed. I took it as the general ICANN accountability issue. And the substance of Question Number 2 is the substance of this working group. So with that I think we will call this meeting to a close.

Thank you very much. I think it was very productive. And look to your list as the information starts to flow. Thank you.

END