
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

THERESA: Hi everybody. Welcome, first of all, to the 2016, the first facilitation call of the year. And we have a couple of folks who have dialed in, but we don't have the names associated with it. Could those of you who have dialed in, just let us know who you are?

DAVID CONRAD: David Conrad.

THERESA: Okay, we have David Conrad. There is a 202 number, 5836. A 301 5800 number. A 319 number, and a 38 related number.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Theresa, the 310 number maybe mine.

THERESA: Okay, wonderful. Good.

LARRY: This is Larry. I'm the 5836.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

THERESA: Hi Larry, how are you? Welcome. Thanks for joining. Wonderful. Good, I think we then have everybody covered. Great.

BRUCE [TONKIN]: And Bruce [Tonkin] on the call as well, Theresa.

THERESA: Hey Bruce, welcome. Thanks so much for joining. Good. I think we have, I see James is on. Welcome James. Thanks for coming in, and I'm glad you could make it. Congratulations again, on your new role in the GNSO. And I still have [CROSSTALK] from the ICG as well, and then León and Thomas from the CCWG.

Okay. Let's go ahead and get this started. Thanks for everybody's patience, I know we're a couple of minutes over the top of the hour. Just as a reminder, this is a call that we are doing on a monthly basis, just in order to share updates, and share updates with each other on where everything is.

Fadi is unable to join this one, and he sends his apologies and regrets, but I hope I can cover it as best as I can and we'll try to do it justice. So as you know, we had changed the schedule of this week's call from last week in order to really accommodate most of the holiday schedule, and make sure that we had an opportunity to give everybody a little bit of time to catch up, which I know many of you have been doing.

And I know Thomas and León, you have quite a bit to share with us too. Before we move into just hearing from everybody on some of their updates with each other, how that might impact the timeline and where

things are going, let me just give a few updates on some of our planning leading into Marrakesh and into the Marrakesh meeting.

I know that many of our teams our working with all of you on the different schedules, and as part of that we also have several sessions that are going to relate to the transition. I assume that's also going to be a topic for the different SOs and ACs moving into the meeting itself. I think as many of you are aware, we've also received unique requests from the CCWG to hold a pre-meeting session, which will be held on the fourth.

And we've been able to accommodate that. We've left the CCWG [inaudible] to also know the estimated cost of that, which is around 95,000, in order to have that additional day. And then we'll be having the additional 90 minute engagement sessions, both on the Sunday or Monday, and then a three hour session, working session, on the Thursday towards the end of the week.

I think in addition to that, the ICG is looking at potentially holding a meeting during the course of the Marrakesh meeting, as our some of the SOs and ACs have that on their agenda item. On the timeline itself, we've not posted an adjustment for this call. We're working still off of getting input and updates to the timeline that we've been talking about in December, and we'll build in the feedback that we get from the call today into that and then get that circulated with everybody to get that shared out to the wider community based on the input.

I understand, and I know that Thomas and León have been working very, very hard on a very aggressive discussion framework for the

month of January. And I understand also that ICG has a call coming up this week, and the CWG has had a call this week dealing with some of the outstanding issues that relate to the transition itself, and some of the specific areas including the IPR area.

But I'm wondering if I could turn it over to maybe Thomas and León, if you want to share with the group both this really remarkable schedule for the CCWG over the course of January. And I know you just got off of a very long call sort of during the night and during your early morning, and want to share that information as well with the group. And then we'll turn it over to the ICG chairs, and have a discussion, and open the discussion up for any question and further information sharing with each other.

And then we'll turn it over to [Tran] for implementation. Thomas or León, can I turn it over to you?

LEÓN SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much. This is León. And as you said, we have implemented a very aggressive schedule of calls for the month of January. We have been holding two calls per week, three hours each call. And we have also been having some additional calls for working groups, like for example, the mission recommendation working group has also hold a couple of calls to continue to address the different [inaudible] we'll receive in this public comment period.

So we're working very hard, as you said, the whole group is working very hard. And we haven't reviewed the different comments that has come in this third public comment period, recommendation by

recommendation. So we have some critical way forward, I believe. We have been discussing with the wider group, or with the whole group, as I've said, different concerns that were raised not only by the Board, but also by different [inaudible].

We can still use formal input from the GNSO and the GAC. We expect to receive the GNSO feedback this same week, I believe, and the GAC will also be coming in shortly this week or the next week, for us to actually have the full picture, the [inaudible] and be able to discuss the feedback with the larger group.

So, as you may be aware, we have time for a timeline that will [inaudible] to deliver our proposal by some time by the end of January. And that will most likely not be possible, but we cannot foresee an exact modified timeline at this point. Because as I said, we are still waiting to receive some input from some chartering organizations.

So as soon as we have that input and we take a look at it and see how that might fit into the puzzle, then we would be able to actually have a draft, updated timeline to discuss with the working group, with the CCWG. And if approved by this [inaudible], then we will be publishing that timeline for everyone to be on the same line.

We have been having very fruitful discussions with Board members across these many call for [inaudible], and I would like to send for those Board members that have been working along with us and of course, staff for different persons for the different document that we have been circulated in the list.

And that would be the update on the work that was done. And I'm not sure if you had mentioned this, but we will also be having an additional day of face to face meetings prior to Marrakesh, so that will also add to the many hours of work that the whole capacity [inaudible].

So that would be an update from our CCWG work so far, Theresa.

THERESA: León, thank you very much. I see that James has typed into the chatroom, James did you have any comments or any feedback?

JAMES: Hi Theresa. James speaking. Just to reinforce what León had mentioned as the component of, or his expectation of receiving GNSO feedback by this week, I think that we are on target to provide that, however I wouldn't expect the CCWG will see anything necessarily new coming from the GNSO except to note where the various stakeholder groups are aligned in their feedback on the CCWG recommendations, and also to note where the GNSO is divergent in their positions in their recommendations.

So that's the format that the feedback will take, and I'm hoping that that is, will make it more useful and workable for the CCWG. Thanks.

THERESA: Great. Thanks James, thank you. Any other points to share with... Thomas, I see your hand is up.

THOMAS: Thanks very much Theresa and hello everyone. I just had a question for James. James, you said that we should expect feedback from the GNSO specifying where there is support and where there is divergence. Is there any plan for the GNSO Council to vote on the individual recommendations? And should we expect that it's likely that recommendations will be voted down?

I.e. that there would be no support for some of the recommendations.

JAMES: Hi Thomas. Yeah, I don't want to presume any outcome, but that's exactly what we will be doing. It looks like there is significant degree of either unified support or unified conditional support for all recommendations except one.

THOMAS: Okay. Sorry for following up on this, but James, that's very helpful. So just to confirm, the council is likely to vote on the individual recommendations and not on the recommendations as a package, right?

JAMES: That is correct. That is correct. We've positioned... We've proposed both options for the council, but I think that's, given the significance of the CCWG's work, there seems to be a growing segment of the council that wants us to take the more formal route and vote on them

individually, so that we can record the level of support for each recommendation.

THOMAS:

Thanks. Theresa, if I may, I would like to ask one more follow up question for James. Thanks so much. James, where you say that there is conditional support, will the GNSO or the current council, offer alternatives that will help us better understand what measures need to be taken in order to receive or enjoy your unconditional support?

JAMES:

Well, let me back up a little bit. Each of those recommendations that are flagged as being supported with some conditions, will indicate which of the conditions will be required in order to receive unconditional support. In the event that one or more stakeholder groups have submitted a condition for their support, we've simply added those together as long as they were not determined to be incompatible or mutually exclusive.

So I hope that made sense.

THERESA:

Thank you. This is really helpful. Thomas, did you have any follow ups on that? Or any further...?

THOMAS: Thanks Theresa. I just typed in the chat that I'm thanking James, so this answered my questions for the time being. Thank you so much.

THERESA: Okay, great. James, thank you very much for sharing that update. Any other updates or questions, either from the other SOs or ACs, or from anybody?

Okay. Good. Excellent. Then Alyssa, I saw that you were also on the call. Do you have an update or anything you want to share from the ICG side?

ALYSSA: Sure, thanks Theresa. There is not a lot to say about the ICG, but as you all know, we completed our work at the last ICANN meeting, and have been essentially just waiting for the conclusion of CCWG work stream one. One thing that we said in the ICG when we met the last time was that the liaison to the CCWG and the chairs would essentially keep an eye out for progress in the CCWG work, and relay back any information or any kind of indication that the timeline that had been put forth most recently was not going to be in effect anymore.

And so, sort of observing that and public comments coming in December, we decided to schedule a call among the ICG for tomorrow, where we'll get a report from the liaisons, really just a status update, obviously not terribly concerned with the substance of what's going on in the CCWG other than the need for the CWG requirements to be met.

But we felt that it was important for the full ICG to get an update on the status of the work, and the fact that the existing timeline that had been published is not going to be met at this point. There is no further timeline that has been articulated yet. I think, as people know, there is communities represented in the ICG who are very anxious to have the transition proposal off to NTIA.

And so, you know, we need to be respectful of those communities and just want to get the ICG together and make sure the folks are on board with the current plan of basically hibernation and waiting for the CCWG, or find out if anyone has a different thought about anything else the ICG should be doing in the meantime while we're waiting.

So that's one topic of discussion for us tomorrow, and then the other one is we had planned, as of our last meeting, not to have another face to face meeting, and you know, we will have a piece of work at the very end, where we need to take out all of the highlighted sections in our report that talks about the dependency and its outstanding conclusion and change that language to reflect hopefully that the dependencies will have been met.

And approve the final proposal to go off to the Board and on to NTIA. We could easily do that on a phone call, which is basically been thinking what we would do, but if there is something that changes, as regarding the CCWG timeline or the outcome of the work, then we, among the chairs, had talked about setting up a couple of hours to have a face to face meeting in Marrakesh in the event that there is anything that the ICG needs to discuss.

I will say it's pretty difficult for us to determine whether we really need that meeting or not. Certainly, if there is a lot of people who are going to be there face to face anyway and we, the timing is such that we otherwise would have had a conference call that week, then, you know, it will make sense to me.

But we, I think, need to be a little bit proactive in terms of the scheduling to get some things on the meeting agenda in the event that we do need it, even though we don't really know at this point whether we will need it or not. So that's the discussion to be taken up amongst the ICG tomorrow. And I think that's all that I have.

THERESA:

Great, thanks Alyssa. Any questions on the ICG or [inaudible] to Alyssa on the process that they're running, and obviously they're looking and waiting for the confirmation of the interdependencies that have been identified in order to finalize their report coming up?

No? Okay. So I think those are the key updates with regards to both the ICG and the CCWG. And unless there is any other questions on those specific two processes and where we are, and any of the interdependencies there, then I will turn it over to [inaudible] for the implementation of status report.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Thank you Theresa. Hello everyone. I hope everyone had a nice holiday break and are ready for an exciting year ahead of us. For today, we've prepared for you a few slides to update you on the process of

implementation. Those of you that were on the CWG call that took place at 16:00 UTC are going to be hearing the same update that we provided on that call.

So we apologize for the duplicate update. It's just an unavoidable side effect of our efforts to disseminate consistent information. But let's go ahead and move on to the next slide please. So, this slide shows you a dashboard for three of the projects that we're undertaken right now, the [RZMS], [RZMA], and the names [SLD] project.

Let me just take a quick minute to sort of explain what's on this slide here. The top table provides the name of the project, a brief description of the project. The planned completion date for each of the project, and then sort of a status [inaudible] light, if you would, and then the percentage completion of the projects. The middle table shows select two dates for each of the projects, that the color coding of the bubbles on this table correspond to the color coding to the left of each of the project name in the table at the top, so that we can identify which bubbles belong to each project.

And then the bottom table has an update in terms of anything that we've done since the last update that we provided to you, and the upcoming activities, and as well as any open items. So as it relates to the [RDM] changes to remove the RZA role, we've actually completed that work ahead of schedule. That work was previously anticipated to be completed at the end of this month.

It is now in fact done, but before we can start parallel testing, there are two other things that need to happen. The first thing is for us to right

some additional code to replicate the ticket, and [inaudible] in the parallel system.

And the second thing is for VeriSign to complete the changes that it needs to do to RCMS in order to support parallel testing. So we currently anticipate that the remaining work for us, will take about a month to complete.

And VeriSign anticipates that it's going to have all of the co-changes that it needs to do done by the end of March. So that means that if we complete our work in about a month, which would take us to early February, we still wouldn't be able to start parallel testing until beginning of April when VeriSign is done with its work.

So because of that, what we've done is we've reprioritized development efforts, and we're putting off that work until February, with the anticipation that we'll be able to complete that work by the time that VeriSign completes its work, so that we can start parallel testing in April, and we redirected all of our development efforts to the second project that you see on the slide here, the names [inaudible] project.

And by doing so, we anticipate that we are going to be able to pull in the completion date for the names [inaudible] co-changes by a month. So right now, it's anticipated, we're anticipating completing that work by the end of February. The reason why this is important is that it would allow for an actual six month long collection of [inaudible] metric, which is one of the requirements that has been expressed by the CWG.

So that's the update on the [inaudible] related side of things. The other track of work on the SLAs, is we're also working on partial existing data

to see if any of the data that we currently collect, you know, can be used to approximate the SLAs that have been defined.

The thinking behind that project was that, you know, if we weren't able to get the [inaudible] code changes done in time to allow [inaudible] data collection prior to the transition occurring, perhaps we can use any existing data to set the performance target. So that's why we embarked on the secondary track of work.

So that's still going on. We anticipate that we're going to be able to, by the end of this month, have a determination on whether or not, or how closely existing data approximately what SLAs have been defined. And then the other piece of work under the names SLA track is the dashboard to report the SLAs.

That's another thing that we have on a list of things to complete by the transition. On the RDMA work, we're continuing to work with VeriSign to finalize the draft of the RDMA. Once ready, it would be published for community review, the completion date that you see there, January 31st, the end of this month, is the previously communicated timeline.

And we're working very hard towards meeting that timeline. Next slide, thank you. On the PTI, this is around the PTI formation of the PTI entity as for the requirements of the CWG. What we have been working on here is drafting of the PTI implementation plan, and once that is done, we will be sharing that with the community for review.

Part of what will be included in the implementation plan will be things such as articles of incorporation for PTI as well as the PTI bylaws, and

the conflict of interest policy, you know, the documents basically that require for the legal formation of PTI. Next slide please.

On the agreements with RIRs and IETF, on the RIR side, we've been working on scheduling a meeting with RIRs to discuss the remaining items on this document. There are several [inaudible] that we're trying to accommodate, so it's taking us a bit of time to nail down a time, but we're hoping to get that meeting scheduled soon.

And to get this document finalized, on the IETF MOU supplemental agreement, that document is essentially done, you know, we just kind of do one final review in the context of everything that's happened since that document was last reviewed in March, was to ensure that nothing is impacted.

But essentially that document is done already in execution once we have approval of this proposal. These are four other projects on CWG side that we have not yet start [inaudible], ITR, on that one we are awaiting implementation requirements from the community. [Inaudible] is the root evolution review committee, that is a committee referenced in the CWG proposal that would be advising the ICANN Board on architectural and operational changes to the root zone.

And the CSC, the customer service committee, those two projects we are looking to start drafting up the implementation plans for them fairly soon, and as with the PTI implementation plan, those will also be published for community review. Escalation processes refer to the IANA operational complaint and escalation processes, and updating of those processes, and that will anticipate that work once the proposals are

approved, and for them to be completed obviously by the time of transition.

And the last one, these are the four pressures identified around the enhancing ICANN's accountability. Three of the projects are just in the identification state right now, obviously we're awaiting the final details from the CCWG proposal. And the bylaws woke and the [inaudible] that's [inaudible] there is essentially illustrate the timeline that we had previously communicated in, the bylaw's timeline that we previously communicated within the context of the larger transition timeline.

So we believe that that timeline is still, still works. And again, that timeline, as soon as the proposal is delivered in January, if that date changes we'll obviously take a look at the timeline and adjust accordingly.

I believe that concludes the implementation update portion. So Theresa, I'll hand it back to you, and will be happy to answer any questions.

THERESA:

Great, thanks. And thanks for this really good overview on where we are with all of the different moving parts. I think it's helpful for all of us. Anybody have any questions, or any additional observations on where we are with the implementation and what [inaudible] has just presented on?

No questions? No discussion?

Okay. Is there any other topic that anybody wants to raise on the call relating to either one of the areas or any questions that you might have relating to the transition?

Okay. Well if not... Oh Alyssa, I see your hand is up. Yes?

ALYSSA: Yeah, thanks Theresa. I was just curious to hear from the NTIA folks in terms of the timeline, you know, given some of the potential flip with the CCWG, if you guys have any sort of updated sense on your end of, you know, whether things are getting compressed too much or, you know, anything that you're thinking about for 2016, given that the last published timeline is unlikely to be met.

LARRY: This is Larry. I guess, I don't know how much, what the CCWG projecting, and I don't think they knew today either. But I've told them, and I'll just say publically, every week the thing slips increases risk. I mean, there is just no way to avoid that. So just people need to keep that in mind.

ALYSSA: Okay, thanks.

THERESA: Okay great. Any other questions? Comments? Okay. Well then, we'll give a little bit of time back. Just as a reminder, we have the next will be

scheduled in about a month. I'm not quite sure with this adjustment in the schedule what date we had identified, but we'll send out a reminder for everybody around that.

Given that it's going to be cutting so closely to the ICANN meeting in Marrakesh, I know that as all of you are planning your different sessions and everything, Hilary, who is on our team here, is more than happy to be of help if you need anything, and she'll let you know her email information.

We know you have that, but let us know if we can be of any help there. And then, prior to the meeting once we have all the different scheduling areas locked in, we'll be sending around an overview of the transition related discussions that will be happening at the Marrakesh meeting. And that's available to everybody and you have an overview of the different community dialogues and the different moving parts on that.

Just in conclusion for this call, let us know if this is the useful status update, or if there is anything else you'd like to see on these calls as we start preparing for the one next month. And we'll obviously incorporate any feedback that we get from the CCWG or the ICG with regards to the timeline in an updated timeline version that can then be shared.

These are useful status updates. And is there anything else that anybody would like to see on these calls? You can also let us know offline.

Okay. Great. Well then thank you everybody for joining, and happy 2016, and look forward to working with everybody this year. Thanks. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]