DUBLIN – ICG Face-to-Face Meeting
Saturday, October 17, 2015 – 13:00 to 17:00 IST
ICANN54 | Dublin, Ireland

ALISSA COOPER: All right. Hi, everyone. This is Alissa and we are going to get started with our seventh face-to-face meeting. Nice to see everyone here again in the room. We're still missing a few people and I know some folks have conflicts today and need to go in and out or will be at other meetings, so we appreciate that not everyone can be here together, but we do have remote participants as well, and some of the time that we've booked later in the week will be to revisit a few of the issues from today, so hopefully folks can make it to the later meetings.

So we are looking at the agenda for today, slightly updated just in the last few minutes, but the bulk of our time today will be devoted to hopefully wrapping up the transition proposal, or making as much progress as we can, and I've just listed a few outstanding issues that I know that we need to touch on. There may be others based on folks having reviewed the proposal this week.

Then we'll take a break and then the second part of the session, we'll talk about the way forward and the role of the ICG during the implementation phase.

Could you scroll down just so we can look at tomorrow?

Thanks.

So then tomorrow we have three hours booked in the morning. We have a parking lot for anything that is left over from today. I'd like to just briefly talk about the engagement session on Monday and go over the slides and make sure everyone is on board with how that's going to work.

And then we have some time to talk about the public comments summary document which Manal has -- and Joe have circulated.

So that's for tomorrow.

And then Thursday -- really Thursday and Friday we've left pretty much open. I mean, I put some things here, but it really depends on how we do today and tomorrow, and also the other events of the ICANN week, so we will likely revise Thursday and we'll certainly revise Friday because right now Friday is empty. So we'll update these middle of the week, as we see how things progress.

It's quite possible that we will not need the full day on Friday, but not sure until we get further into the week.

So any comments on the agenda or any other overarching matters before we dive into the substance? No.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

Okay. So let's begin with the transition proposal.

All right. So everyone should have seen this V3 of the transition proposal, which is the latest version that I circulated a couple days ago. It contains all of the edits as a result of the public comment period, save for a couple.

I haven't seen really much traffic on the mailing list about this at all. A few notes. Paul had made some edits which I incorporated but not too much feedback otherwise.

I do have a few topics that we're going to go through, some text that Lynn has worked on with Patrik and sent recently, but does anyone have items that they know they want to bring up in regards to the transition proposal other than we will talk about the RZM and the implementation inventory?

No?

Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So I don't really -- I --

Oh. Michael Niebel. Okay. Go ahead.

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Michael Niebel, for the record.

I was just wondering whether it's the right place because I have still a formulation where I -- where I have my doubts in the proposal.

Is it the right place to raise that or just to flag it that I want to raise it later on?

ALISSA COOPER: What is -- what is it about? Like what is the text about that you want to talk about?

MICHAEL NIEBEL: This is --

ALISSA COOPER: Or which paragraph, maybe?

MICHAEL NIEBEL: This is about the GAC in 98. "A small" -- I'll just read it, so you -- you can see.

"A small number of comments expressed concern about the strengthening of the GAC in the new accountability

arrangements. The ICG notes that insofar as they justify changes to ICANN accountability, these comments are best addressed by the CCWG."

Now, my remark is because we don't know any accountability arrangements, so I -- at least I would suggest to say not "the strengthening." "A strengthening." Because that's then more open, if there is a strengthening.

And the formulation, "The ICG notes that insofar as they justify changes in ICANN accountability," I don't really understand that as a text, what's meant by this.

I mean, I understand that this is -- these comments are best addressed by CCWG. That's clear. But I don't understand the formulation "insofar as they justify."

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. That's a good point, actually. Rereading it myself, I feel like it would make perfect sense without that clause.

So if we dropped "The ICG notes that insofar," blah, blah, blah, and it just said, "These comments are best addressed by the CCWG," would that -- that would solve your problem?

Yeah. Okay.

I'm looking around to see if anyone is objecting to that.

I think this text originally came from Joe, so, Joe, if you have a chance to take a look at that.

And could we maybe just project this paragraph 98 briefly?

Okay. Joe says that he has no issue, so that's good.

It appears very difficult to find. There it is.

Okay. So what we will do is we will delete that first clause in the second sentence in paragraph 98, so it will just read, "These comments are best addressed by the CCWG," period, full stop.

Yeah, go ahead, Michael.

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Michael, for the record.

Just I suggested also to replace "the strengthening" by "a," because we don't know that yet.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Got it.

Okay. Go ahead, Paul.

PAUL WILSON: It's Paul Wilson here.

This is in follow-up to my latest suggestion that I made on the -- on the list last night regarding the timing, and I know we're going to be -- the timing of the ICG submission in respect of -- in relation to the CCWG activity. And I know we're going to be talking about that later, but it occurs to me that there seems to be some different ideas or some ambiguity about what the relationship actually entails and whether or not the result of the CCWG work is actually going to create substantial changes to the ICG's proposal or whether it is -- whether the relationship is simply one of the ICG proposal being acceptable or proceeding on the basis that the CCWG's output is acceptable.

So I'd just note in X14, for instance, that the clear indication of that paragraph is that there is not -- there's not an expectation that the ICG will change anything about the ICG proposal as a result of the CCWG result, just that the ICG will seek confirmation from the CWG that its requirements have been met, which is the -- the assumption that I made in putting forward that timing proposal.

So I'm just suggesting if there is some ambiguity about that relationship, then we should try and clarify that in some way with respect to the ICG document. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Paul. Let's see. Next I have Jari.

JARI ARKKO:	Jari Arkko, for the record.
	So one of the things that I was looking at, if we are completely and fully characterizing the various dependencies, and I think we have. But I was just wondering if the paragraph in Part 0 that talks about the relationship or the dependency of the names proposal to the CCWG proposal and then it has some text about the protocols and numbers parts not being dependent on that, if that could be lifted to the executive summary. I think that might actually be a useful highlight observation to make, and I don't have a specific text proposal in hand but I think the paragraph in Part 0 actually looked good almost as-is, if we could copy it to the executive summary.
	If others agree, of course.
ALISSA COOPER:	Thank you, Jari. Can you repeat the paragraph number? Sorry. I -- that's what I missed.
	Is it 47?
UNKNOWN SPEAKER:	(Off microphone.)

ALISSA COOPER:	Okay. Okay. Thank you, Jari.

Let's kind of run through people's comments and then we'll circle back as to their disposition at the end.

Keith Drazek.

KEITH DRAZEK:	Okay. Thank you. Hi, everybody. Keep Drazek.

In response to Paul's question or suggestion that we make sure we're all on the same page about the expectations, if I understood the question correctly, I think the ICG is simply going to ask the CWG that the CCWG's work met its expectations, full stop.

And I think that -- and as a follow-on, I think that is the expectation, also, of the CWG co-chairs and the CCWG cochairs is that -- and there is a clear recognition of the dependencies between those two groups.

So I think it should simply be asking the CWG for confirmation that, in fact, the CCWG's output or final recommendation does meet its requirements and that's all we need to certify. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:	Thank you, Keith. I'm hearing some agreement with that.

Paul, did you want to respond?

JARI ARKKO: Yes. Thanks, Alissa. Paul Wilson.

Yeah, I raised it because there was a clear suggestion on the mailing list in response to my message that there could be more to the response -- more to the actions that we take, based on the CCWG's result, that might imply or create some changes to the ICG proposal. And so that's not the way I saw it and I haven't seen the evidence of that in terms of our proposal or our past discussions, but as I said on the list when I sent the email, perhaps I've missed something. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: So I think the point is that to the extent that there's this possibility that the result of the CCWG process will cause there to be changes in the CWG proposal, that will all need to take place before we seek this -- before we take this confirmation step.

So it's not the case that we would, you know, go ask for the CWG confirmation knowing that there's like a back-and-forth going on between those two groups about changes that may be required in the CWG proposal, right?

So this is like at the very end when those things are solid, if they had to have been changed, then that's when we will seek the confirmation. And we will -- we will have had to incorporate changes into this proposal at that point because if the CWG proposal changes, then we have to make changes, too.

Does that make sense to people? Keith, are you back in the queue? But, Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, good afternoon, everyone. I endorse the statement of Keith Drazek. We should retain the formulation that he proposed. And I think after the discussion of the next agenda item at 1530, we will provide further clarification and if there is any need to change the statement made by Keith Drazek at the subsequent meeting, we try to change that. I think he clearly mentioned the situation that the only thing that we need to say that CWG need to confirm that the requirements mentioned in this report and communicated to CCWG are met. That's all, full stop.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. I think we have -- we're all in agreement on that point. So Jari's suggestion about raising paragraph 47 into the executive summary, I have no problem to do that. Happy to do that. We can take that as another edit to be made.

Anything else on the text of the proposal before we go into a couple of the substantive issues? Okay.

So let's go down to the implementation inventory, if we could. Scroll down to the very last section of this Part 0.

So what happened with this section is that there is a spreadsheet that has a lot more detail in terms of the implementation action items. And what we talked about last time was that perhaps -- or I think we talked about it on the mailing list -- is having a slightly more general bulleted list is the appropriate level of detail for this document, or at least for this section.

So I attempted to extract from the spreadsheet that Lynn has circulated just the list of what the items are that need to be completed for implementation. And then the question -- there's a couple of questions. First of all, like, is this list complete? Does it capture things appropriately? It's organized by community. So it specifies the items based on which community proposal they came from. So first question is, does the list look right to people? Is there any other sort of surrounding text that we need here to explain what this is? And then we can talk about what to do with the spreadsheet that has more detail if we think it should be included in the proposal as an annex or published separately or have something else done with it? Those are the

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

questions related to the implementation section. And I would ask folks if we can use Adobe Connect for the queue. I know I wasn't clear about that to begin with. You can feel free to put your flag up as well. But because we have remote people, it helps me to just keep track of the queue if we use Adobe Connect.

So, Kavouss, is your hand up for this? Yeah, okay, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Alissa. I think if there is no contradiction -- clear contradiction between the spreadsheet and this one, you put it in annex. If you think that there might be some little things that may be from the cautionary aspect point of view, you put it in annex for information. So both possibilities exist.

I'm sorry. I have not been able to check that spreadsheet due to other commitments. But I think that are two possibilities, in any case. It should be somewhere included, either as an annex or as a supporting document for information. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Kavouss.

Keith Davidson.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thank you. Keith Davidson speaking. Just potentially another small item that might be worth adding to the inventory, might be the implementation of the framework of interpretation on issues relating to ccTLD delegations and redelegations. I had hoped that implementation would have been completed by now, but it sort of stands alongside the item -- you know, the implementation of the service level expectations in terms of the importance to the names proposal and the names community. A number of the names community members gave their interim approval for the names proposal based on the framework of interpretation having been implemented. And there is now a slight fear in my mind that that implementation is being delayed and I'm not really sure why.

So if it could be included, I'm happy if other people want to discuss that. I would certainly like to see it included on the inventory if that's possible. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Keith.

I guess there is sort of a question here, which is this list is derived from the list we received from the CWG. So has this been discussed in the CWG as needing to be included in the implementation plan?

KEITH DAVIDSON: Good point. And, actually, no, it hasn't. But then it was assumed that the framework of interpretation would have been implemented sort of by now.

But you're right, I will take it back to CWG and elevate it through the proper channel. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay.

Joe?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Hi. I'm not sure -- am I coming through okay?

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, pretty good.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Okay. For me, the two questions -- one was implemented prior to the expiry of the NTIA contract, we had always thought about implementation as things that have to be due -- some things might be needed before the proposal was finalized. Some things might be continuing work. So I just want to make sure that we're clear that that's the time frame we want to look at and we

don't want to look at any other time frames that might be relevant.

And I think the last bullet point, we have to be careful that when we do the summary the bullet is clear as a bullet and can't be misunderstood. And establishment of issue resolution mechanisms could apply to everything and anything.

So I think in some cases, maybe we want to use a few more words to make the bullet more specific so people don't actually add to it because I think a lot of people won't cross-reference back to the more detailed solution.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Joe. So one note on your first point, I had added in the sentence in paragraph 100 to make it clear that these are only the items required or, in the case of the protocol parameters proposal, desired prior to the expiry of the contract and that there are -- there are other items that folks have said they intend to complete at some point. But they need not done before the expiry of the contract.

I left those out of here thinking that the audience for this -- this thing needs to get delivered to NTIA and, therefore, that's what's relevant. So hopefully that's clear from this.

There's, I think, as we can imagine kind of an infinite number of future things that will get done after the contract expires. So you have to kind of cabin it off somehow.

Fair point about the issue resolution mechanisms. Again, that came from the CWG so perhaps we should try to pull in some additional detail from the spreadsheet or the mail from CWG to clarify what that is. So that's point taken.

Next we have Martin.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thank you, Chair. Martin Boyle here. Firstly -- and these are all questions, by the way.

Firstly, I think -- I'm assuming that we are taking as read the implementation that will come from whatever the CCWG recommends under enhanced accountability that are necessary for the process.

But as this is a list of those things that need to be put in place before transition, do we need to at least put a placeholder here for that?

My second question is associated with the customer standing committee. I was a little bit surprised not to see it on this list. It

hadn't dawned on me before. It's on a following page, is it? Can we scroll down then perhaps, please?

Right, okay. If we see the establishment of the CSC as being also associated with the creation of the necessary bylaws or changes to the remit of the ccNSO and the GNSO, then I'm okay with that. Now I see it on the list. My apologies. I haven't got the document easily to hand.

Sorry, excuse me a moment.

Right. And my third question, I think, is going to come up later. And that's to do with the RZM PTI relationship where I think we do have a need to make sure that whoever at that stage is the RZM, they do actually have a relationship in place with the IANA functions operator and that that would then need to be maintained if there was subsequent change of the root zone maintainer.

Again, I think that's a contractual relationship that we just need to recognize will need to be addressed before transfer whoever is actually the RZM at the time.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Keith -- Keith? Martin. Several few behind in the queue.

EN

So I -- just a question on your first point, which is, well, first point and the last point, is your proposal as regards to the CCWG that we sort of include a one bullet catchall that says, you know, implementation items arising out of the CCWG process?

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks, Alissa. Yes, that's perfectly right. I think we just need to make sure that it is there as an innate memoir and that is a message to the other communities that we are looking for that to be implemented -- or in process in implementation.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. And then we can come back to the RZM point. But there's one bullet point that says the -- there needs to be an execution of an agreement between the IFO and the RZM. Are you looking for more than that in this list, in this implementation list?

MARTIN BOYLE: In my quick reading through of the list just now, I didn't think it was there. But that could just be it that I read it too quickly against the small screen. And now I have lost connectivity as well.

Yeah, all I'm looking for is that there should be that hook in there that we remember that that actually does need to be ticked off. No more than that. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Great. That's already there.

I have Lynn in the queue, and I have also lost the Adobe connectivity. We will go to Lynn and try to get the queue back to you, Kavouss. Go ahead, Lynn.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Thank you, Alissa. Lynn St. Amour. Alissa did a really good summary of the high-level items that were in the Part 0 here. I was going to comment -- I had two comments.

I was going to comment on the discussion that Martin and Alissa just had with respect to the CWG dependencies upon the CCWG. That was the only action item that came out as needing implementing before the proposal was sent. And I think we just need to be thoughtful about what we put in the proposal now because if that really is a critical dependency before the proposal can be sent, when the proposal is sent, we will provide presumably different text around that point.

My second point was to the annex. I personally think putting a more detailed explanation in -- I don't know if we need the full spreadsheet and all the columns that were there -- but I think something that talks to the implementation aspects and the responsibilities of the three OCs as we move forward to this transition would be helpful.

Maybe when we come to that paragraph or so we find that it fits in Part 0 itself and we can just do a simple annex of the spreadsheet. But I haven't had time to work out that text yet. And I haven't had time to actually cross-reference it to the current text in Part 0 either.

But I think if we look to the people that are reading this document and want to understand what the transition entails and its likelihood of a successful implementation, the more information we can put on how that implementation is going to take place and what the key elements are. Then I would assume that the more comforted they will be that this is all well in hand, as we believe it is.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Lynn. I think perhaps when we run -- once we're through the queue we should probably look at the spreadsheet and make a decision about what we are going to do with that information. Okay.

So I'm not -- I have completely lost Internet connectivity. Oh, now it's back suddenly.

So I had Kavouss. Is Kavouss next in the queue? Can somebody who is actually in it? We are looking at it right there. Okay. Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: That's me, in fact?

ALISSA COOPER: Go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I have no problem with the proposal of Martin. But I would like to see the exact structure of that because CCWG doing many things. We want to limit that to the activities related to the CWG and transition.   So I think we should introduce the word "relevant" or "associated" with CCWG but not putting very general because we don't want to open the things to many other items, which is not related to transition.

So could I have the exact formulation proposed by Martin? Perhaps I could amend that or you could amend it? Put in relevant information and so on. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Kavouss.

Martin, would you like to formulate something and write it into the chat perhaps? A suggestion -- suggested text for that bullet? And then we can come back to you in the queue?

MARTIN BOYLE: Okay, yeah.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks.

[Laughter]

So I believe we had Daniel in the queue? Daniel, are you there?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Sorry. I'm here. I wait for Martin to complete his work because it was on that that I wanted to talk.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Did we have anyone else in -- Lynn, are you back in the queue? No. Okay. All right. We're having all assorted technical difficulties here. No, I am in Adobe Connect now. Just various other -- they are having technical difficulties over there. Okay. So I think what we have -- so we're waiting on Martin to write a little sentence about CCWG, so we'll come back to that in a

moment. Joe has asked for more detail on the issue resolution mechanisms bullet, which I think we can provide. And Keith Davidson, I see there has been some back and forth in the chat and the FoI so can we just be precise about what we're doing about that. You are going to go back to the CWG chairs and come back to us, when?

KEITH DAVIDSON: Correct. One assumes by the Monday session.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So by Monday Keith Davidson will come back with a suggestion about what to do about the FoI implementation inventory. Got it. I'm just waiting on text from Martin. Kavouss, are you back in the queue. No. Okay. Well, maybe in the meantime we can also pull up the spreadsheet would be a good thing to do. Go ahead, Lynn.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Lynn St. Amour, for the transcript. While we're pulling up the spreadsheet, the spreadsheet that I sent around quickly before beginning my travels the other day included the update from CWG but it did not include the edits that we were discussing on our list with respect to the numbers and protocols. So it still shows some items there that we deemed were not critical for the

proposal, even though the -- some of the communities might in fact see some additional steps they would take during the implementation. So that all needs to be edited out. I would prefer to do that once when we all agree what we're going to do with the spreadsheet.

ALISSA COOPER: Got it. Thank you, Lynn. Okay. So now we're like running several conversations in parallel. Why don't we try to close on Martin's text and we'll come to the spreadsheet now that we have everything going. So Martin wrote into the chat, as a suggestion for an additional bullet point, implementation of any mechanisms identified by -- is meant to be the CCWG? Okay. Implementation of any mechanisms identified by the CWG as required to be in place before the stewardship transition. So I guess my question to you is, that's what the whole list is about. So how does it add -- this is like the list where we're supposed to get into the details about what the actual items are. So this then sounds like, well and also anything else. Yep.

MARTIN BOYLE: I see where my drafting is deficient. What I was trying to get over was that for the enhanced accountability, and perhaps if we now change that to implementation of any enhanced accountability -- ICANN enhanced accountability mechanisms identified by the

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

CWG, so in other words, the CWG role there is to take the issues that have been put forward by the CCWG but not all of them are necessarily relevant for the transition specifically of the stewardship role. Some of them will have wider or different implementation. So what we're -- what I'm suggesting is we go back to the CWG to make sure that they have identified the things that they need to have implemented and that that is then our list. And the -- and if there are other things that the CCWG need, then those are -- that are not identified specifically for the transition support, then those have to be dealt with in a different -- in a different way. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Martin. Daniel. So we cannot hear Daniel. Could we work on Daniel's audio? Thanks. Daniel, we'll come back to you. The room has left from the bridge, he says. Great. Okay. We'll try to get the room back in the bridge. Oh, are you there?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Yeah. The room joined again. The chop is still there. What I wanted to say is, I would really emphasize on where Martin was going here eventually and that is we should not at all mention in the implementation steps any specific steps of the accountability mechanism. We should just include one reference and say, this stuff also needs to -- needs to happen but

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

it's none of our business. Because if we get into that and leave the clear distinction between what we're doing, what the CWG -- what the CCWG is doing, then we create confusion and entropy, and we shouldn't do that. We should just have a one-sentence reference, there's this other stuff as well that's defined by another process that needs to be done and not get into any specifics. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Daniel. I think that was the goal of Martin's text, is that it's very non-specific. So hopefully that fits what you are suggesting. Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I'm happy with the text as put by Martin in the chat, without reference to enhanced. So initial text in the chat is sufficient, I think. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. I don't see anyone else in the queue. I guess my issue with the initial text is that it's -- it is the sort of open-ended catch-all. If it doesn't reference the accountability -- if it doesn't reference ICANN accountability then it sort of defeats the purpose of the list.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Say that without enhanced accountability, just accountability. Not talking about enhanced.

ALISSA COOPER: Oh, okay. But you're okay if it says ICANN accountability mechanisms. Oh, okay. And you -- so I put an edit in that makes the NTIA contract expiry the trigger for clarity, that's okay. All right. So we will add that bullet without the word "enhanced," and let us go to the spreadsheet.

So Lynn, do you want to say anything about this spreadsheet?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Redo the intro from a moment ago in case we've lost state? Sure, I can do that. So this spreadsheet was done with input from the three OCs, and again, the numbers and the protocol parameters have a couple of additional items in each one of them that aren't specific to the proposal but are actions those two communities would like to take as they go through their transition. So those are not included in the summarized list that's in Part 0. And if you were to scroll through the list, the only item that shows if there with an action due before the proposal is sent to NTIA, that will be in there post my next edit, would be the CWG dependencies on the CCWG accountability

work. And again referenced my point earlier that when we finally submit this presumably that text will change as well, once they have their confirmation.

So the -- the question is whether or not we cover this adequately with the summarized bullet list that's in Part 0 or whether or not people feel that an annex or as Kavouss suggested there were two different possible versions of an annex would be helpful. I do think that either in an annex or in Part 0 we should ensure that we've said enough about the implementation and the oversight responsibilities and the role of the OCs that somebody from outside of the community would understand and feel comfortable that there was, you know, a well-thought-through implementation, set of implementation activities underway. And I guess the floor's just open to see whether or not people have any thoughts on the annex or the level of detail on the spreadsheet.

ALISSA COOPER: Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. In Part 0 when we refer to this annex, perhaps we could see -- we could say further information provided in the annex or see

further information in the annex or for further information see the annex. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Other opinions on whether we should include this spreadsheet as an annex?   It's not currently in the document, so this is currently a separate document that has, you know, a bunch of -- somewhat more detail than what we have in Part 0. So the question is whether we want to actually add this into the transition proposal or if we think it should live separately or as Lynn says if we should just add a little more detail into Part 0. Okay. Have I a queue, so in Adobe Connect. Russ Mundy, go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY: Short input. Russ Mundy, for the record. Yes, I support including the spreadsheet as an annex.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Martin.

MARTIN BOYLE: I concur with Russ.

ALISSA COOPER: You concur with Russ. Okay. Good. Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: I agree that it should be in the proposal, but I think if it's going to be in a proposal I'd have to -- we'd all have to look at it a little more carefully, and presumably we'll ratify that, not here on the fly but over the course of the week or something, right?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes. I -- I agree with that suggestion for sure. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. No opposition. I think perhaps you should ask whether there is any opposition to make life simpler.

ALISSA COOPER: Fair enough. If you're in the queue to express support, get out of the queue. Seriously, it sounds like we have support for this so if anyone doesn't support it -- I know Daniel wanted to make this decision later. But Daniel, I have you in the queue, so go ahead, if we can hear you.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Yeah, it's Daniel here. That's my proposal because quite frankly, I haven't had an opportunity to actually read that spreadsheet.

And I was going to argue a little bit in the direction of Kavouss, let's first of all find out whether it might create some inconsistencies or more questions than it answers and then maybe include it in -- in a less binding way by just saying for information include it in our additional material. But if I'm the only one who hasn't read it, then I'll just stop here. Since we're meeting a couple of times this week we might decide that later when people have -- or at least I had the opportunity to digest it.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, it sounds like people could use a little more time with it, so does that mean until tomorrow or until Thursday? I'm thinking Thursday. Because nobody likes to schedule things for tomorrow, when it's today. So -- so shall we put this on the agenda for Thursday and everyone commits who is interested to taking a look at it? I have sent one note to the list on this, which is that I think we can get rid of the oversight column. I think it's a little bit redundant. So I think if folks look at it during the week, please do send your thoughts to the list, just so we can tee up the discussion on Thursday. But we will plan to come back to it on Thursday and hopefully wrap up on it. I see heads nodding. People seem fine with that. Okay. So we will -- we will add that to the agenda for Thursday. Okay. Anything else on implementation? Go ahead, Paul.

PAUL WILSON: Paul here. Just a suggestion to circulate the URL for that -- that matrix document so that we are sure we're looking at the right thing. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Sure. No problem. The secretariat has recently posted it -- no, you posted the link to the mail? Okay. Jennifer will get that out. Okay. Anything else on implementation planning in the document? Okay. So let us move on to RZM. Let's find the paragraph.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone).

ALISSA COOPER: Well, I'd like to look in the -- that's the executive summary. Let's find it. It's in the 80s, I think. 85. Yeah, 85 is where it starts. Paragraph 85, yeah. Perfect. Got it. Okay. So paragraphs 85 and 86 and 87 just contain all of the text that -- and 89 for that matter, contain all the text that Milton provided sometime ago. It's paragraph 88 which I think previously -- or the placeholder was elsewhere, but it's paragraph 88 that we have been editing

more this week after we received the feedback from the CWG, so if we could go down to 88 actually, that would be good.

So what we have here now I'd like to give people a moment to read it. So what we have here now tries to reflect what we got back from the CWG which is the CWG's, you know, understanding that the IFO RZM arrangement will be taken care of through a separate process and then our feeling about how that process needs to be conducted, namely that it needs to be transparent and provide for public input. And this is -- this is again reflecting what we heard in the public comments fairly loud and clear, that people think this is an important part of the transition and therefore it should be conducted in full public view. So take a minute and look at paragraph 88, and then we'll open the queue the talk about that or any other aspect of this RZM-related text.

I see people starting to look like they've read most of it, and I have Martin in the queue.

So go ahead, Martin.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks, Alissa. Martin Boyle here.

Yeah, I think for me, generally speaking, the text is okay, and I also recognize that this text appears -- or similar text appears in

X027, so what I say here would need to be also considered for X027.

And the bit that gives me a little bit of concern is the para- -- the sentence that starts, "The ICG believes that if it is to be," and then it says "legitimate and consistent with the multistakeholder process."

Now, this is not something that is within our purview. This, if you look at the NTIA statement, was a separate and parallel process, and therefore I find -- I feel rather nervous about us commenting on the legitimacy or otherwise of a process that has yet to be launched and that actually isn't directly within our purview, although it will have consequences for our work.

So I would prefer to see the words "legitimate and" deleted from that sentence.

The sentence then carries on and says, "This parallel process must be conducted transparently," and again, my earlier comment applies. I think "must" should be "should."

In other words, that we're putting up a flag and saying "This is what we would expect to see, please," rather than saying "You must do that."

So again, for "this parallel process must be conducted" replaced by "this parallel process should be conducted." Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Martin.

Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. Patrik Faltstrom.

I have a similar issue as Martin regarding the words chosen because, as Martin says, it is not part of the work that we are doing, and because of that, if we have anything that says "must" that is not resolved, would that imply that we are requesting the process to stop or requesting the NTIA to ultimately reject this whole thing going forward if it is the case that this is not resolved?

I'm also a little bit sensitive that, on the other hand, what we can do, I think, is to point in more general terms that multistakeholder processes need to be what is used for the -- let me talk about sort of the ICANN side or the technical part of the revolution of the RZM. And part of that, I think the only thing that is important for us is that a written agreement exists at the time of the expiry of the contract.

So we think that there must be an agreement but we cannot really go into details on how that is developed at this point in time because it's not part of our purview.

Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Patrik.

Joe?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. Can you guys hear me okay?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Okay. I don't have a problem with the suggestions being made but I do want to remind people that a number of the commentators had actually suggested that the proper conclusion of this through a multistakeholder process should, in fact, be a dependency of ours, and I remember Milton having made a suggestion that he was reading our mandate to have the potential not to be the ones who resolve this issue but to have an implication related to this issue.

ICANN | 54 Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

So I just want to make sure that we are all on board on that same concept because this issue is a critical issue to getting the transition right, and if it's not a dependency of ours, it is probably a dependency of the overall transition, and that might be something that we say. I agree that we are not the tiners [phonetic] or the determiners of legitimacy, but I think there was some of the rationale, both in the comments and in our conversations in L.A., that indicated that we could discuss this as a significant dependency of the system, including the process by which -- it's not just that an agreement results, but the process by which the agreement was achieved seems to be something that is legitimate to comment on.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Joe.

Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I have three comments.

First, I think "must" is a very strong word, so we try to do something else.

Second, it depends on the construction of the sentence. If the sentence put in the way of conditional, we have to exactly follow

the structure of the English language of the conditional things. You start on something, then you put the second part, "it would be."

But third question, which is most important, it says here "if it is." Who decides on that? If a decision is made. ICG will made on that or you ask for someone else?

So please carefully read the sentence. What does it mean, "if it is legitimate"? Who decide on that? This is the decision-making or this is investigations? Who is the body we expect to do that?

But in any case, we should not use the word "shall" or "must." We have to have something else. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Milton?

MILTON MUELLER: Sorry. That's a way to get your attention. Are you awake now?

[Laughter]

So I really don't have a particular problem with the minor language changes that Martin proposed. In other words, if you want to strike "legitimate" and you want to change -- if you think we must not use the word "must," we can put "should" in there. I don't think that's very consequential.

I do want to make sure we understand the reason, though, okay?

So, yes, I guess we possibly do not have the -- sort of an overarching right to declare something legitimate or not, although we can certainly have opinions about that. So we might, if we wanted to be a little bit more verbose, say "consistent with the public comments and the multistakeholder process," but I think "consistent with the multistakeholder process" might be enough. We may not need to do that.

But I do need to take issue, I think, with this statement -- which I thought we had moved beyond -- that everything having to do with RZM is somehow out of our scope. And I thought we'd settled that, that there's all kinds of things related to RZM that not only are within our scope but we have already done stuff about. And what we're saying is basically that there's -- these things that are impinging upon how IANA, ICANN, and the RZM are structured are very much part of our remit, and that has not been solved by -- completely by the CWG. Those parts of it that are within our remit had have not been adequately specified by the CWG. And therefore, it's in the hands of these private negotiations between NTIA, VeriSign, and ICANN. And all we're saying is if this is going to be consistent with the process that we've set out, that has to be somehow transparent to and sort of approved by the broader community.

EN

So if we make these changes with those understandings, I have no problem with them at all.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Milton.

Daniel?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: This is Daniel.

I propose, quite contrary to what Milton is saying, to actually delete the penultimate sentence of 88. All we need to do is to note the comments that we had, note the communication we had with CWG, and I don't think we should make any statements about a parallel process.

So just -- my proposal is just to delete the whole sentence.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Daniel.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Russ Mundy?

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy, for the record.

It seems to me that we have two parts to this that we have.

One I think we have general agreement on, and that is the need for the existence of an agreement between the IFO and the RZM.

The other part is how it's achieved and what's the mechanism, what are the processes and so forth, involved.

And I do believe that we have received at least some number of public comments that said this ought to be conducted in a visible and open way.

So I think it's very reasonable, in terms of what we say about the second part about reaching the agreement and the process that's used, that we've received public comment that says it ought to be done in an open and visible way.

Whether or not anyone takes note about the legitimacy or not, that seems inappropriate to me, but it does seem very reasonable to say exactly what has happened, which is, "We've gotten comments that says this," and we ought to include words to that effect.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Russ.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

I -- so I have Milton and Martin and then I -- I might put myself in the queue.

So Milton, go ahead.

MILTON MUELLER: Sorry. That's an old hand.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. My bad.

Martin?

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks, Alissa. Martin Boyle here.

The text as it stands in the sentence that Daniel describes as the penultimate sentence I think picks up, for me, the importance bit, and where the use of the word "must" is, in fact, correct, that there should be a written -- there must be a written agreement between IFO and the root zone maintainer establishing each party's role by the time of transition.

That I'm quite clear about, and that seems to me to be the bit that is directly in our purview.

There is another bit, I think, that is in our purview, and that is that if the transition -- if the expiry of the RZM contract with NTIA

happens after the transition of the IANA stewardship, that there needs to be some process for ensuring the effective transition, and that, perhaps, is, again, something that can or should be addressed in the contract between the IFO and the current RZM, should that still be the case.

So I wouldn't go as far as Daniel in deleting that particular sentence. I think that particular sentence is an important sentence. But similarly, I don't think I would go further in us specifying specific requirements that are not identified in the CWG proposal which has the contractual requirement but it also then has the fact that any changes of relationship would need to go out for wider consultation in the future, should these happen post-transition.

Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you.

Daniel, go ahead.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: My profuse excuse. I meant the final, the last sentence. I didn't mean the penultimate one.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. I think -- I think we understood, actually, which one.

Okay. Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Perhaps, Alissa, I would suggest, if you agree, to simplify the sentence or the text, not starting with "ICG believes that," but start with the fact that what you want to do, and that would read -- you take that part, "ICG" -- (making sound) -- starting that "consistent with the multistakeholder process, the parallel process should be conducted," and then continue the sentence "transparently" and so on and so forth. Very simple text without believing something or opposing something.   Starting that "consistent with the multistakeholder process, the parallel" -- in fact, we have two time processes, doesn't matter -- "to be conducted transparently is opportunity," so on and so forth. That is more simpler text to be perhaps meeting the requirements.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thank you.

What I would suggest is that if we can take two minutes for me to try to edit this according to this conversation.

I will get you, Keith, before that, but that would be my suggestion that we kind of wrap.

I have one other issue to bring up, but maybe we'll go to Keith and then I'll do my issue and then take a couple minutes to edit and review this.

Go ahead, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you, Alissa. Keith Drazek.

So in the interest of trying to move this forward and addressing the comments that I've heard so far, I proposed some language in the chat that I will read as a possible way forward.

I'm sorry, I'm losing scroll control here.

All right. So how about: "The ICG believes that a written agreement between IFO and RZM establishing each party's role must be in place by the time of the expiry of the NTIA contract, and that agreement should be made available for public review prior to execution"?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

KEITH DRAZEK: I'll send that to the list. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Well, I would -- it's in the chat and I would be interested in people's feelings about that.

I really like that. I think that simplifies what we were trying to say. So people should think about that.

The other issue that I was going to bring up is that I think this is something that happens sometimes when we have this back-and-forth with the communities. It happened a little bit before with the IPR. I think we've actually kind of waded into a detail about the parallel process that doesn't actually exist, because the CWG confirmed to us that --

Let me read it exactly what they said.

"The CWG understands that a separate and parallel process is occurring to deal with this aspect."

And then we then say that the process will be run by NTIA, which is kind of taking a further leap. NTIA has said that there is a separate process, but they didn't say that they were going to run it themselves, necessarily.

So I -- I would propose, actually, that we stop the -- the prior sentence at -- if I can bring it up properly -- "The CWG

understands that those relationships will be defined by a separate and parallel process," period.

Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I agree with Keith's proposal, provided that he replace "agreement by parallel process" and replace the word "must" by "need to be."

So could he kindly amend his proposal, which is simpler? But reference to "parallel process" is absolutely necessary. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Milton?

MILTON MUELLER: Sorry, but the NTIA did say that it would be running the process. It says that "This would require that NTIA coordinate a parallel and related" -- "related and parallel transition in these responsibilities." So --

ALISSA COOPER: So my question is: Is the NTIA running this process?

EN

MILTON MUELLER: What process?

ALISSA COOPER: The ICG -- the transition process.

MILTON MUELLER: No.

ALISSA COOPER: Then what's the difference?

All I'm saying is, I wonder if we need to leave it open, such that the community could run the process in the same way that the community has run the transition process overall.

MILTON MUELLER: The difference is very simple. It seemed to me the NTIA made it clear that ICANN would convene our process, and then there was a process for determining what the process would be, which gave us a lot of independence.

And they did not do that with this. They said, "We will coordinate it."

ALISSA COOPER: Do you want to foreclose that possibility?

MILTON MUELLER: Well, I think we need to be, first of all, honest and open about what seems to be happening which is that -- And also, by the way, it was the CWG itself in the discussions of this issue that said, "Oh, we're going to let the NTIA do that." But I realize that doesn't have quite the same formality of the other stuff that we're talking about.

No, of course, I don't want to foreclose that. But I think we do the best job of not allowing that to be foreclosed by using the original language we had, which was, We expect this to be an open and transparent process where people have some ability to comment on it. That is the best way to prevent that possibility from being foreclosed.

Just saying -- using language which implies that it might possibly be happening that way but not actually saying it, I think, is doing our community a disservice and not preventing or encouraging anything to happen. Just kind of putting our head in the sand.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Maybe what would help is if we just use -- since "run by NTIA" was our words, maybe we should use their words, which is "coordinated by NTIA." And we won't be saying anything that

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

CWG didn't say. And we won't be saying that NTIA didn't say. Yeah? Okay.

MILTON MUELLER: Yep.

ALISSA COOPER: Russ, go ahead. I will try to get all this together so we can look at it with Keith's sentence and Jon Nevett's addition to the sentence.

Go ahead, Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Alissa. I was looking to get to the Web site where it originally was published. But the statement about this by the NTIA was in the FAQ part of the original March 14th announcement. So that's where the original NTIA position came from about the parallel process.

ALISSA COOPER: Correct.

Do we have anyone else? No.

Okay. Just give me a moment and we will get into the Adobe Connect the combined paragraph.

Okay. Have a look.

See if we actually got this right.

KEITH DRAZEK: Just noting Narelle's input in the Adobe chat, she suggests this be broken up into two sentences instead of one. At the end of "NTIA contract," period. And then begin the next sentence, "That agreement should be." Otherwise, it looks good to me.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay.

Milton, are you in the queue? Your flag is up. Anybody else? Going once? Going twice? Sold to everyone to benefits from this!

[Laughter]

Did anyone have any other comments on, you know, the other six paragraphs of text about the RZM? I will tell you, we will reflect this in the executive summary as well. We will fix whatever is X027.

MILTON MUELLER: Can I just make a quick comment about kind of procedure? When people put text that they want us to use into the Adobe

Connect room chat, that used to work. But now there's so many chats going on that things start scrolling up and it's almost impossible to find them again. So maybe they could send them to the email list instead.

ALISSA COOPER: Fair point.

Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Alissa, do we need the beginning of the sentence, "The ICG believes that"? Just start after that, "written agreement."

ALISSA COOPER: That's a fair question. I mean, I think we put it in because we wanted to make it -- it is a little bit of -- it does come from the ICG. I mean, the CWG says that it could be a written agreement and we are saying it should be a written agreement. So we are just kind of reinforcing it with our own opinion. So I think it's not for nothing is what I'm saying. We put it there for a reason. People seem to be nodding that they want to keep it, I think.

Yes, Russ and Jon are nodding. Do you have objections to keeping it?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: My problem is "believe," "the ICG believes." If you want to confirm something, but "believe," I don't think we are talking about belief here.

ALISSA COOPER: What was your -- "affirms" is not quite right either. Anyone have the thesaurus out? Go ahead, Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: "Considers."

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: "Reiterates." Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: I'm glad to reiterate.

We're not live editing. So that will be included in the edited document itself, "the ICG reiterates that a written agreement," blah, blah, blah.

Martin, are you in the queue? Go ahead.

MARTIN BOYLE: Martin Boyle here. If I can just pick up on something Kavouss said a while ago of just simply deleting "the ICG believes" and,

therefore, that sentence would end up reading, "A written agreement between the IFO and RZM" -- "a written agreement is necessary between the IFO and RZM establishing each party's role." So it ceases -- and I must admit, I have sympathy with what Kavouss says about our beliefs. Who the hell cares about what we believe or what we don't believe. What we are actually saying is that this is something that's necessary. So I think that's a simple change I hope meets Kavouss' concerns. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So we have some people who really want to take it out. Some people who really want to -- you got to move the microphone to get in the queue.

Go ahead, Jon.

JON NEVETT: Thanks. Jon Nevett. Real briefly, if you look at the sentence before, you are talking about the CWG. So I think the only thing of importance of having the ICG in the sentence, it shows the transition from the CWG. Otherwise, it looks like the CWG is saying that but not us. But I don't feel that strongly about it.

ALISSA COOPER: Everyone feels mildly strongly about their opinion on this sentence.

[Laughter]

Mary, did you -- can you break the impasse?

MARY UDUMA: Sorry. Yeah. I think Martin's formulation is correct because of the just stated views.

ALISSA COOPER: I think the people who want to take it out are more adamant than the people who want to leave it in. So let's take it out.

MILTON MUELLER: Could I just intervene?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, please.

MILTON MUELLER: If you are taking out "believes," that's fine. We did, in fact, say you need a written agreement. And I think we are very much within our bounds by saying that we are reiterating that there must be this written agreement. And we are introducing this

committee as the subject because as Jon pointed out, we were talking about what the CWG did before.

So just in terms of the flow and meaning of the document, I think it should be left in with the word "reiterates" instead of "believe."

ALISSA COOPER: Fair point. "Reiterates" is sort of just a meta comment on what is happening in the sentence.

Go ahead, Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah, I think Milton raises a right point here. The rest of the paragraph really is focused on the CWG. And as Jon points out, we need a way to make it clear in this paragraph that this is (indiscernible) perspective rather than the CWG saying something further.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. We're just going to look at it in again, see if anyone objects.

Here I have it. I have Joe with his hand raised. Go ahead, Joe.

We don't have any audio from Joe.

So can we work on that? Or, Joe, maybe type into the chat. I was just going to call for any final objections to this text. Oh, there we go. Go ahead, Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Can you hear me now?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, go ahead.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Just on the chat, there had been some conversation that we are not reiterating because it is our first iteration, which is kind of factually correct. The language to me seems immaterial. I think we are figuring out how many angels can dance on the head of a pin.

How about, "The ICG highlights the need for." Then we are not believing. We are not doing this. We are just drawing attention to the fact that this has to be done.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Joe, I don't want to compete with your English. But I think there is nothing wrong if we say we want to reiterate. We have discussed it several times. We formally reiterate what we have said. We don't want to draw attention over anybody. We just

reiterate the necessity to have this agreement to be done in place. So I suggest with your agreement that we retain the word "reiterate." Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: I think we can all agree that this 200-page document is not a picture of full English usage in any event. I think we should close on this. We're done.

Anyone want to object? No. Okay. Great. Thank you all for your engagement on this.

Any other topics to bring up on the transition proposal? Anything at all? I mean, otherwise consider that we are essentially done until we're going to talk about implementation -- oh, collaboration.

Lynn, oh, I forgot. I knew there was something I was forgetting. Okay. Yes. Let us move on to the text about how collaboration works from Lynn's email.

Lynn, do you want to tee this up?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Sure. It was touch and go for a moment whether or not I was going to whisper "collaboration" to you.

So the action item that Patrik and Elise and I were tasked with was to summarize how collaboration works today between the OCs. And as the introduction says up there, in some of those discussions, it became -- I guess we recognized a couple of things. And I should say this was actually built off of a subworking group from our last meeting in L.A, which had Manal and Michael and Joe Alhadeff. And I feel like I'm forgetting somebody else. But there was a larger group of us that actually touched upon this subject. Then we went away into a smaller editing group.

Some of the comments were that it was recognized that the three OC model had not really been fully explained in the proposal. So there was a suggestion that some text there would be helpful because that was, in fact, the underpinning for the entire process we put together. That was largely built on the comments that the IAB sent in to the first discussion on what this proposal should look like. So that's one component of the text that's here.

The second one touched a little bit partly because of that as well on some of the history. And Patrik was actually instrumental in including some of that text. But, again, that was building somewhat on the first point. And, also, the subpoint there was to show that that kind of collaboration has always existed and has evolved over time.

Some of the discussion on the list suggested we put a few examples in. And I tried to work in a couple of examples. One that just talked about some of the relationships -- personnel relationships between the various groups and structures. Another example was a very specific one with respect to I.P. address management.

So what we have up here is a pretty large group of new text. If we thought we wanted to include some of the sort of historical components and anything that introduces the three OC model, I actually reference some work that ISOC and the IAB did on what was then called initially a 3-by-3 model but it was a shared infrastructure resource. And they did a really helpful infographic. That and some of the SSAC work were the primary documents that actually served as some of the introduction.

So we could put some of that historical introduction text right up front. I think at that point we were suggesting right after paragraph 0, if I remember correctly. And then some of the specific examples might fit better somewhere else in the document under the collaboration section. There's a section in Part 0 which deals specifically with collaboration.

But maybe the first thing before we go away and wordsmith this a little bit more is to see when people read through the text -- it's, I don't know, five or six paragraphs, I think -- first of all, does

the text makes sense and if it's accurate because I did a fair amount of summarizing in terms of some of the specific examples around I.P. addresses? And maybe then just open the floor up for general comments in terms of whether or not this text is helpful.

We had a few comments on the list. A few said that they thought the historical and the context introduction was helpful. Most of the comments on the list just asked for more detail in some of the specific points of collaboration.

Again, that's by way of trying to refresh people's memory because this discussion has been rolling out the last month or so. So with that I'll turn the floor over to Alissa.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thank you very much, Lynn. Patrik, go ahead.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. I would just like to add one more thing to what Lynn just said, and that is one of the reasons why we decided to actually have this much text, that first what you see is sort of the background, how we wrote the text, but then from "start" that's where the real text is. It's also because we felt that we had multiple -- sort of multiple paragraphs that were sort of created based on different contexts. And we added all of them

there, so it would also be easy for people to say no, this one is not needed, that one is not needed. So this is sort of the maximum amount of text that we think should be needed. And then it would be easier at this session to decide whether these should be included or just removed. So it's a conscious choice to actually show you all -- everything we had.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Patrik. Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. The question for me is really the question of how this will be integrated into the document and exactly where. Because the idea is that we have -- sorry, I'm hearing my -- I'm hearing myself speak back into my headset so it's a little disconcerting. The -- much better. Whatever someone did was fantastic. The question is, the historical part is useful and should be in the document. But if we're doing a section that deals with coordination, people are going to read the first couple of paragraphs and not necessarily understand where this links to coordination. So, I mean, I would almost prefer to see the historical stuff be appropriately put in the document and then have the coordination start essentially -- stuff start essentially with a number of comments raise the need for coordination related to future work and implementation and

that we wanted to highlight that this coordination actually already exists as a -- as an MO across the various organizations, and then I think Lynn's addition of the -- the coordination at the infrastructure level by overlapping staffing participation is excellent. And then providing an example of operational coordination, which is the Internet addresses, is very useful, and then the last part is the continuing commitment of the organizations towards that, I think that answers all of the questions that have been asked.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Joe. Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Alissa. This is Jean-Jacques. First I'd like to say that I agree with Joe on some question about where this would best fit. I don't have a suggestion on that. The second thing is that I agree very much with Lynn's approach and supported by Patrik that some historical background is really useful. I don't know exactly where to put it, but I think it would be very useful.

A third little remark, very minor one about language. Just after the word "start," as you know I come from a Mediterranean country and believe it or not, I am for sobriety. So the word "incredible" seemed to me incredible in this context. All the rest

of the text is very, very, you know, square and non-emotional and everything. And then we say "incredible"! Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Daniel.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: This is Daniel. Just to speak to where to put this, and before I do that, I think this is excellent work and it speaks to some of the concerns that we've heard in the public comment period and outside.

I think we would do good in putting it, even all of it, into an annex for information to avoid the impression that we're going to be normative here or that people come back later and say, but in the transition proposal it said that this and that needs to -- needs to be there because it was enshrined in this proposal. So I think yes, we need to put these words and we need to address the concerns that were raised, but I think we should do it in a much more informational way than including it into the proposal proper. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Daniel. Milton.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

MILTON MUELLER: Well, I'm glad that Jean-Jacques made the point that he made because I was going to make that point, only a little bit more extensively, that it sounds like propaganda at some point, the first two sentences. Remember why we're doing this. People were saying, how do we know these folks are going to coordinate if there is a split of the IANA functions? What are the mechanisms they have for coordinating? And if we come back with a lot of happy talk about how incredible the Internet is and how great things are, if I had asked that question and I got that kind of a response, I would be immediately put off. So I think we do need to be very factual and get to specific mechanisms. And I also agree, I think, with Daniel, although he'll probably change his position after he hears this, that we might want to take this out of the document and make a reference to, you know, here are where these coordination mechanisms live currently and here's some historical precedent on why they exist and where they are. I think that would go a lot more smoothly.

ALISSA COOPER: Just to clarify, Milton, when you say out of the document, the proposal from Daniel I thought was for an annex to this document. That's what you mean. Okay. Okay. Thank you. Martin. And I'm going to close the queue. So if you want to be in the queue, get in the queue now, Keith Drazek. Keith Drazek will

be the end of the queue then, and I'll put myself at the end. Martin, go ahead.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks, Chair. Martin Boyle here. I'm sort of torn. I actually find the text a good read and it fills in a lot of the background, but less is always more in documents like this because people skim if the text is too long. And therefore, I wouldn't object to the text going into an annex. But what I wouldn't want to see us lose is the last paragraph. I'd like to see the paragraph that starts "Coordination across the OCs is clearly an essential component." So if we leave it in the main body of the text, I would like to see that paragraph go up to the head of the document -- the head of that text so that people see immediately what it is we're getting at. And if it goes into an annex, then this text is retained in the main body of the text because this is what we are saying is necessary and it contains the keywords about each community, clearly restating their ongoing commitment to cooperation. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Martin. To just -- I just want to get your thought on one thing before we go to the next person in the queue which is, we already have in the document, in the section about the PTI, a statement that each community has explicitly committed to

coordinate with each other and with ICANN. It's framed in the event of a change in operator. So do you think we need something more general than that because that is solely framed at the situation where you have a change in operator?

MARTIN BOYLE: Martin Boyle again. No, I think actually making sure that we have got -- because here we are talking about coordination in the document, I'm seeing this as being a proposal for early in the document. It seems to me to be useful to be flagging the fact that the communities have said they -- they would work together. That's not necessarily in the context of PTI. It is, though, in the context of the operation of the IANA functions and the exchanges between those communities. So I'm not really sort of strong about this, but if we're wanting to make a comment about collaboration, then that is the paragraph that is the most important paragraph in -- in the document. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Mary.

MARY UDUMA: Thank you. I just want to make a confession that the writer made a lot of meanings to me and it was very, very informative.

So if I'm a newcomer, the document is a good point for me to understand the history, the -- where Internet has come from.

I don't know about their words and incredibility and all the rest of them. I'm not talking about that, but the fact still remains that our newcomers will appreciate this, you know, as they're going through the document. It made a lot of meaning to me. And I want also to say -- I wanted to say what Martin has said, that the last part should be up. Even if we're not taking the new part, that last part is very, very clear. It makes the -- the -- it makes the first impression. And then I'm not worried wherever is -- is put in the document, but I think me as a person it made a lot of difference to me when I read it. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Mary. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I almost agree with everybody, but the only thing that I would like to maintain that in the annex. I don't think it is harm to put in it the annex. It is information, it is useful, and I think you should put that, and I have more or less the same culture as -- as my friend, "incredible" and so on and so forth. Not to exaggerate anything, but having said that, it is finished. I owe an apology to Joe that I have not agreed to his word "drawing

attention."   In the meantime, I found another word, he said "reiterate" and that is "emphasize."   I want to be clear that I have good relation with Joe, and I want to maintain that relations. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Kavouss. Joe is next in the queue. Go ahead. Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I'll defer to Kavouss' English, how's that? The -- the question I had was for me the importance to maintain this in the document and not just in an annex to the document, apart from the arguments that Martin used for the one paragraph, and I would argue for the three paragraphs that deal with the examples, is because the requests in the comments were actually for a mechanism to be specified. I think all of us agreed it was a tremendously bad idea to try to force a mechanism onto the OCs. I think absent a demonstration to people who are less knowledgeable that there are coordination mechanisms in place, not just an intent to coordinate in the future, and that they have had operational effect in the past, you're going to find yourself with more requests to impose a mechanism. And I don't think it does the OCs good for that. And this is actually a direct response to questions that were specifically raised. You know,

and unfortunately we know the reality of annexes is they are not the first thing people read, if they're read at all.

So I would argue that the three paragraphs at least that deal with the commitment as the last paragraph and the two examples are useful to maintain in full text, and the historical stuff can be part of an annex or background material but, you know, we're referring to the annexes as if they're FYI and don't really count as part of the proposal. And if we're referring to them that way, then imagine what people who are going to read the document think of them.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Joe. Keith Drazek.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Alissa. Keith Drazek. Just one small but important clarification or edit. On the top of the second page on the screen, "identifiers" should probably be changed to "registries" or "databases," in terms of terminology.

ALISSA COOPER: Got it.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Okay. So here's my suggestion. I was sort of going through the document trying to figure out what to do, where this could fit, because it sounds like people will value having -- it's not really the last three paragraphs, but the paragraphs that give the specific examples which include, I think, the paragraph that's -- let's see if I can number them from the bottom. So the paragraph that is fifth from the bottom that starts "Currently there is a multitude of collaboration mechanisms in place" and then the last three paragraphs, it sounds like the content of those rearranged such that the -- the point made in the final paragraph is actually the first point that gets made, it sounds like people feel there is value in including that in the text of the proposal itself. I would propose that we put this in the workability section, because I think there's already really good text in the workability section that came from Daniel and Paul about the subsidiary principle and how -- you know, why we decided to distribute the RFP out to the communities. So I think we can build on that and put this into the workability section, to be a more general elaboration about the history of how the communities cooperate and how they've committed to doing so going forward. And then in the introduction have a note that says there's more history and context in an annex and include all the rest of the text in the annex. How do people feel about that

proposal? Nods. Thumbs ups -- thumbs up. On the first day of the meeting I can't talk. Okay. I don't see any objection. So I will try -- I will do that tonight, and we will look at it again tomorrow and see if people think it flows properly and if we've caught all of the other line edits that were suggested today. Sound good to everyone? All right. We are now taking a break, and we will be back at 3:30. Local time. Half an hour break. Okay?

[Break]

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

ALISSA COOPER: We're going to start again in one minute. So one minute.

Okay. We're going to start again, come on back and join the fun in the ICG meeting.

So just as a matter of process, we have some action items from this morning on the transition proposal. We will make all of those edits that we can before the meeting tomorrow, and we will take it back up for another review tomorrow. But my assumption is aside from the implementation matrix which we have put to the agenda for Thursday that after we look at the changes tomorrow, that may be the only outstanding item on the transition proposal. So just wanted to flag that for people, that if we can be essentially done with all of their editing by the time that we've finished the parking lot tomorrow, that's the intent.

Oh, we have our GAC friends back. Welcome back, GAC friends. Just two.

Do you know if the others are coming back?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Fadi was starting, but I said that I must be here. I don't know whether the other ones come or not.

ALISSA COOPER: You chose us over Fadi. Oh, we're so delighted.

[Laughter]

So we were going to switch the order of these because you guys weren't back. We were going to talk about implementation, what is the role of the ICG before talking about CCWG. But since you guys came back, I think we should do CCWG first unless you think Manal and Jandyr are going to come back. You don't think so? They chose Fadi over us, basically.

Let's go with what we have on the screen then. So the next topic we were going to talk about -- oh, we do have Narelle actually. Why don't we do -- it's very late for Narelle. Why don't we do implementation phase first, and then we'll do CCWG dependency. Thank you, Narelle, for reminding us how late it is.

The topic is the role of the ICG during the implementation phase. Narelle has a proposal and proposed, I think, charter text that she just sent to the list not too long ago that suggests that the ICG that have some sort of role during the implementation phase. We talked about this a little bit in Los Angeles, and we said we are going to come talk about it again because we wanted more time to think about it.

And here we are back perhaps. If we have Narelle on audio, it might make sense for you, Narelle, to give us your thoughts just to level set on this topic.

Are you able to speak in the audio, Narelle?

She said she's dialing back in. Okay.

Let's give her a moment to dial in.

NARELLE CLARK: Hi, everybody. Narelle here. I just dialed back in.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Narelle. We can hear you.

NARELLE CLARK: Okay. I just muted my other speakers so hopefully I can't hear myself.

So I sent some text through to the list. It's just a small change to the larger charter that I've proposed here. And that is simply because I'm just sensing a fair bit of disquiet that people are not really ready to let us sort of just pack up and hand the proposal over and walk away just yet.

So what I'm proposing is that we do stick around for that a little bit longer and track the implementation phase just to the point where implementation seems to be sufficiently done.

And I suspect we may need to put together a checklist for that. The implementation checklist that we do within the spreadsheet is probably more than adequate for that task. But without wanting -- without using the word "oversight" but perhaps "coordination," there is need for some sort of a clearinghouse within this whole process. I just don't think the people are ready for things to just go on by themselves just yet. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Narelle. So the floor is open for folks who have opinions about what our role should be, either in reaction to Narelle's proposal or otherwise. I have a few opinions but would like to hear from other people if you have them. Go ahead. We have quite the queue. I saw Jean-Jacques' hand go up. Go ahead, Jean-Jacques. We will use Adobe in queue in general.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: I raised my hand because for the time being I still have a connectivity problem.

I think that we should make clear that our existence or the pursual of our role is dependent on the decision or the advice by

the NTIA because we got our mandate only from one authority. And we're bound to that same authority.

So I don't know how to formulate it yet. But that's the idea we should convey in writing, that it doesn't depend on ICANN board or the weather; it depends on NTIA. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you.

Lynn?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Lynn St. Amour for the transcript. Safe to say I struggle with this myself because as an individual I feel a lot of responsibility -- I have a lot of vested interest in making sure the transition happens and obviously happens well. But when I think about the ICG as a body being engaged in, you know, a clearinghouse or to give comfort to the rest of the community, that that is completely contradictory to the model we're working in and the one that gave us this process and the one that gave us this proposal.

At one level, if we believe the implementation really depends on the items that were in that spreadsheet, then that's a relatively small list of items. It is certainly easy to track. We can do that

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

publicly. You can do it on Websites. People can report out individually. But ultimately with almost every one of those action items, it is one of the operating communities that has the responsibility for implementing and implementing it well and the other ones that would be the ones that would be responsible for addressing any questions.

You know, if we're just here as a mailbox, then I don't think that adds any value at all.

I think my main point is that I think if we think this process requires that, to me that's antithetical to the process we have been working in in the last year which actually has put everything back to the OCs. And we've simply acted as a body to ensure that the pieces all came together to make a cohesive whole.

But the operational responsibilities have always -- operational activities have always been the responsibilities of the OCs themselves.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Lynn.

Milton?

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah, it's odd because everything that Lynn said I agree with; but we seem to be reaching different conclusions, which is that, of course, yeah, the actual operational implementation that goes on now is in the hands of the OCs but the problem is that the OCs have their heads buried in their own particular implementation details. And there's lots of discoordination or lack of knowledge about what's going on in the whole picture.

And so Narelle mentioned the sense of disquiet. And maybe because I'm in the names community, I get the same sense also that people just don't feel confident that they will know how to monitor the overall situation once we're gone, that it will all be based on being extremely deeply embedded in any given operational community and there will be no public exposure or transparency.

So I do see it exactly as Lynn said, as essentially a meeting point or clearinghouse for information, which is in our charter. And I think it's simply because I think when we initially went into this, we assumed that the proposal development stage and the implementation stage would be kind of a flash point cut where we would say, okay, now we are done with the proposal and we are in implementation. And, in fact, those things are very blurry and they are spread out across each other. So some parts will be easily implemented before we've actually finished the proposal and other parts will be continuing on.

I just see a need for some very lightweight clearinghouse functions for us to continue as we go forward. And I don't see that it actually changes our role or our relationship to the OCs at all.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Russ Housley.

RUSS HOUSLEY: This is Russ Housley. And I want to speak to the text that Narelle provided which actually used the word "oversight." I'm very concerned about stepping beyond coordination into oversight.

Each of the operational communities already has oversight mechanisms, and we should not in any way try to trump or interfere with them.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you.

Patrik?

PATRIK FALTSROM: Thank you very much. What I wrote to the list, which I would like to clarify a little bit, is that I think if it is the case that we are going to continue, we as an ICG, after we have finished our

proposal, I think the request should come from the operational communities.

One of the reasons for that is that it is quite an easier thing to say that, yes, it would be good if a coordinating role -- and I agree with Russ about how careful we are to be working there. But just like coordinating role or something like that, not oversight, I agree with that.

But what exactly should we then do? What is it that's needed? And I think that need regarding coordination be a -- I don't remember what words you used, Milton. It was sort of a place where the various operational communities could report to each other or whether they could bring up questions to the other, like a broker here for questions, even if that's what we are going to do.

I still think the formulation of that, what we're going to do, if we are going to continue, should come from the OCs. That said, maybe we should sort of trigger that and ask that question because as you said, Milton, maybe it is the case that each one of the OCs don't see that need at the moment unless we sort of ask them. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Patrik. Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. Wolf-Ulrich. I'm close to Milton and Patrik in this regard. As I explained sometimes, I think the ICG is a body providing and sending the proposal has also -- seems to me has a kind of responsibility to look at what is going to be done with that proposal and how it works. So that's a general approach from my side.

And, on the other hand, I would also agree that the operational communities are the ones who are going to implement that. They're responsible for that. And since at the time being, I can only speak for my community -- I was appointed from the CSG as part of the naming community. There was not any detailed discussion about that at the time being. But I'm sure if we put that forward and trigger that in that direction, it will come up. And the GNSO as usual will come up with a kind of bottom-up approach that sets what I respect with regards to the implementation as well. And then we can see a reaction from them what are their requirements towards the ICG.

And I'm fully with you then, Patrik, that we say it must come from the OCs. But we should a little bit trigger that process. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you.

                          Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, thanks, Alissa. I think it's good you raise this question. First of all, I agree with Russ Housley that we should not change our role as in our charter. We are not oversighting group. We are coordination group.   ICG should remain if we are going to continue as a coordination group but not oversighting anything. This is point number one.

                          Point number two, it is early to have any conclusion on that. But also it is early to decide on the sunsetting of activities of the ICG because there are many, many things will be discussed this week and continue between now and end of November. If there is, there would be no third public comment of the CCWG. Let's take the issue and continue to discuss that.   But it seems it would be a need that not only house clearing but maybe some other activity that may arise from the development of the things and perhaps the next step that we have -- that CCWG may clarify some of the points where we would stand. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Daniel?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: So this is Daniel. I said it before on the mailing list. I think we should not extend our charter. The last note from Narelle that I have seen on this was from the 8th. So I may be missing an email with concrete language.

But nevermind. I think we should finish our proposal, should publish it to the wider community saying this is the conclusion of our work. And then we should go into hibernation until the CWG tells us that their requirements are being met, and then we should submit our proposal. And we should stay around for sometime after that to answer any questions or coordinate any further work that might be needed on our proposal based on feedback we get from the NTIA or maybe even, heaven forbid, the ICANN board were to transmit it.

So that's what we should do. I don't think there's any further role in this unless some unforeseen circumstances require a redraft of our proposal. And that's it.

Furthermore, if we are really trying to do something else, I'd like to see it specified in a very concrete terms, like change our charter to say this.

And then I agree with what people have said. We should probably go back to at least the OCs or maybe even all the

organizations that send representatives here to get an agreement on that. And, yes, I totally agree we are not an oversight body. We should not even go near it. We should remain a coordination body no matter what we do. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you.

Martin?

MARTIN BOYLE: Thank you, Chair. Martin Boyle here.

I think I'd like to go back and say, What has been asked what's been our job? And our job over the last year and considerable amount of time has been all about empowering and pulling together the input from the operational communities.

So I find it a little bit strange that we should, having encouraged the operational communities to think about making sure they put in place what they need, that we should then start talking about substituting ourselves for them.

Because the second question I ask myself is: If we are involved in some sort of coordination of implementation role, what would we do? We haven't actually got the powers to be able to do that? All we'd be able to do is going back to the operational

communities and say, Well, are you happy with what you have done? To which the answer I hope would be, "Yes, of course, we are" because that's why we've done it.

And then there is the risk that we start to second-guess the operational communities as to what they want to do and what they need to do. And, you know, the -- there is the saying in English about too many cooks making a right mess of the meal.

So I get the feeling myself that our best role at this stage as we start leading towards producing the proposal that will eventually go forward is to find some wording and have some dialogue with the operational communities to remind them of what I think must be pretty obvious to them, that they need to consider implementation and coordination between the operational communities.

We can have that discussion with them, and if they were to say "well, actually we find it useful to have somebody in the middle who can be the honest broker between the communities," then perhaps we have a role. But I am struggling to know what we do that couldn't end up being damaging to the process, and certainly I would be entirely reluctant if the operational communities were not to be the source of that request for our involvement.

So my feeling is that we produce the proposal, that's what we were set up to do, we hang around a little bit as was it Daniel just said, to answer any questions, and to make sure that the groups have properly considered implementation and coordination between them going forward, and at that point I think you could all imitate me and retire. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: If only. Thanks, Martin. So just -- can I just ask one question for clarification? I have assumed, from looking at the implementation inventory spreadsheet, that the CWG intends to remain chartered until implementation is complete and then it considers that -- itself as the voice of the names community in matters of implementation. Is that correct?

MARTIN BOYLE: I think Wolf-Ulrich already made mention of that, that discussion needs to be had, whether you maintain CWG through implementation phase or whether you now set up a new cross community working group or some other device of doing it. But I don't think that discussion has yet been had. And it's an obvious and very important step for them to go through, because the implementation phase is going to take a whole bunch of people quite a significant proportion of their life for

sort of six months or nine months after the decision to go ahead. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thank you. So I have Demi and Russ Mundy in the queue, and then I had mentally inserted myself. I have some thoughts I will share after Russ Mundy. And then we'll continue with Lynn, Milton, and Kavouss. So Demi is next.

DEMI GETSCHKO: Thank you, Alissa. This is Demi. Just to begin with what Jean-Jacques said, I remember that our group was in some way convened by NTIA and it is quite a distributed and maybe representative group and is chartered with in some way coordinating this transition process. Then I think very useful to offer ourselves as a -- a lightweight and, as I said, representative body in some way to -- to deal with cross community operational community issues in the transition period. I think the -- of course, the main actors in the transition period are the operational communities. But we are facing a new IANA after this transition. Of course some cross community things will appear, and I think we as a group are -- can be very useful to make this glue between communities and maybe try to keep them together in this transition time.

Then in this way I support very well the -- the words of Narelle and not to -- make our charter bigger or expand in some way but just offer ourselves as a way to maybe coordinate or oversight in a very light way the process through the -- the transitional phase. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Russ Mundy.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Alissa. Russ Mundy here. I feel on this particular issue that I have very much two separate perspectives that I haven't decided in my own head which I think is the better. You know, it's on the one hand we're set up to pull together the proposal, get the proposal submitted, and then get it in, and once it's approved our job is finished, which was the original envisionment. But on the other hand, my -- one of my personal dilemmas is something I've faced several -- a lot of times in my professional career and that is when you have a policy that gets established without us being implementable from a, most of the times technical basis. The policymakers say this sounds wonderful, this is great, but from a technical basis you just can't actually implement it and you need somebody to be there when the actual implementation starts and say well, that's not really what we meant. And is this the operational communities?

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

Primarily, yes. In our case this would be the operational communities. But is there -- do I believe there will be conflicts or inconsistencies or coordination problems between the operational communities? I think they're entirely possible, that from that perspective the ICG structure as it sits could very much provide that role. And what would we be active -- how much activity and would we be actively doing much? I don't think there would be any directive actions in nature, but I think it would be keeping track of what's going on and just watching and as questions come up, if they don't come through the operational communities, if they come from the general public or businesses or enterprises that, what about this, something happened, something just broke, where do I go, what do I do, to be the clearinghouse that points them the right direction. I could go either way on this issue, and I don't have a strong feeling, but I agree with Patrik's suggestion, we should go ask the operational communities if they think it would be useful.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thank you, Russ. So that was helpful because that was one of the questions I put into the chat which was, you -- you interpreted Patrik's suggestion as, we should actually go pose the question right now or whenever, I guess right now, to the operational communities and what -- if they think that there's a role that we could have that they -- that we could play, that they

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

would find useful. Was that what you were actually suggesting, that we ask the question? Okay. Okay, good. Okay.

So Russ, I think your position as to you could go either way on this is a good summary of how the whole group is. We're a little bit all over the place on this. One thing that I -- that would help me understand this a little bit better -- Patrik kind of asked for this as well -- is if someone could give an example, like an actual concrete example of something that we would do that's specific to the proposal. Because when I read the proposal, I do see one area where coordination is clearly necessary and that relates to the IANA IPR because the communities collectively need to feel comfortable with a new holder of the IANA IPR and -- but, you know, on that one, they're already coordinating it amongst themselves and, you know, leveraging all of these great mechanisms that we have agreed to put text into the proposal about.

For all of the other areas where there is overlap, I actually think the model follows well from what Lynn and others articulated which is that, you know, the numbers and the protocol parameters committees have said that the PTI construct is sort of a decision by ICANN to subcontract and as a result it's unclear to me that, you know, they need some higher body to come appeal to if something that -- that happens within the creation of the PTI doesn't seem right to them or something along those

lines. Again, I would expect them to kind of coordinate amongst themselves, and I don't know what we would do if -- if that arose.

So if people could think about that, like give an example of what we would actually do that wouldn't be us substituting our judgment for any of the communities, I think that would be helpful because that's really what I can't figure out.

My other question is, when does this end? Because the implementation of the names proposal in particular has pieces that won't get sorted out. You know, the special IFR, I think there's aspects of it that are not deemed to be created until two years after transition and so forth and that are specific to the names proposal, and so I think it's always a good way -- if we're thinking about reopening the charter or just reinterpreting the existing words of the charter to understand what the stopping point is. And if we just say, it ends at the end of implementation and implementation is something that can go on for quite some time, does that mean -- you know, what does that mean about the life of the ICG. So I would encourage responses to some of those questions, if people can work them into their answers. And I have a queue of only ten people, so I'm sure we can work some of that out. Milton is next. I think. Demi, that's an old hand. Yeah. Milton, go ahead.

MILTON MUELLER: Yes. So good. I was glad that you brought up the question of what is specific examples because I think particularly based on Martin's comments I see this -- you know, Narelle and the supporters of what she's saying have asked for very limited kind of a function here and people are reading into it all kinds of things. You know, we -- we are not proposing -- at least I am not proposing to change our role in any way. In other words -- and we would be doing exactly what we have been doing, which is serve this sort of clearinghouse and coordination and meeting point function for a little bit longer. And it's also a very good question, as to when you see this end. This is actually a question I want to ask the people on the other side of this debate at some point also. But, you know, this is kind of a contradiction when people say okay, we were there to enable the OCs to develop this proposal. On the other hand, they're saying the OCs can now do everything by themselves. Why were we needed to coordinate the proposals? Why did we need to bring them together? What was the function there? Were we telling them what to do? Obviously not. So there was some need for a spot where these proposals came together, and it's not like the ICG is this sort of completely independent entity pulled out of the air. The people represented here are from the operational communities, right? So I -- I just think what's happened is, the

proposal is more complex and the articulations among them possibly more uncertain for the next six to eight months than we originally assumed. And that we want this sort of clearinghouse meeting point function to simply continue. The idea that we could tell anybody to do anything is completely off the table. It's -- nobody's proposing that. We could document a lapse in implementation. We could look at things that are falling between the cracks. We could say oh, this way this is being implemented is a deviation from what every -- certain people in certain communities expected. Once we documented that, what could we do? Nothing. We could document it and make people aware of it, including the general public. And then the operational communities would have to do whatever they do, based on that clearinghouse and informational role.

So there's really no change in our role. It is simply a continuation of it, a little bit beyond the point at which we just send off the proposal to NTIA. And I guess that's -- that's what I want to ask the people who are so worried about this idea is, what do you see happening? Do you see that as soon as we send the proposal to NTIA we just stop, flashpoint, we're no longer in existence? You see no need for any kind of informational clearinghouse function, no need to bring formal representatives of the OCs together in the same room during this implementation phase?

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Milton.   Just one question for clarification.   The examples that you gave, documenting a lapse in implementation, documenting where something fell through the cracks or where something has deviated from the proposal, is your suggestion that we would follow along and document those upon our own initiation or that, again, back to this other point, we would wait for one of the communities to come to us and say hey, this isn't getting done the way we thought it would, this is missing? Is it a reactive or is it a proactive role?

MILTON MUELLER: I think it's somewhat in between.   I'm sorry to sound wishy-washy, but we would have a checklist of these implementation points like this spreadsheet.   And insofar as we have a conference call, we would say, you know, where things are on this -- on this spreadsheet, you know, what's been implemented, what hasn't, where does it stand. And that function would have an informational role for the general public that's trying to track this process. But it would also -- somebody in an operational community could say at this point, yeah, this isn't happening. Or you think this isn't happening, but it is happening. Or they could say, you know, I'm really upset about how this is happening. I think it's really go off track. But -- so when it

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

comes to off track or failures or deviations, I think we have to rely on the operational community people to bring that to us. If it comes to simply informationally telling the public what's happening in a comprehensive overview way, then I think we can do that on our own.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Kavouss walked away. No more Kavouss. Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. I guess I'll take a slightly different view than Milton, though, to a degree. Not really in terms of to opposition. And that is, we were specifically constituted as a group to actually be more than the operational communities, to actually be the representatives of the multistakeholder communities. We were also given a charter that was fairly specific and we knew what our mandate was within that. I don't think it's improper for us to think about implementation, but I think if we want to then be part of implementation, then I agree completely oversight is not a word we should use in a relation to that. I -- I do think it is useful for us to spell that out and for that to be something that is either validated by the multistakeholder communities or the operational communities because otherwise it looks like we might be self-appointing ourselves to do something that was not in our original charter, and I don't think that helps us. Because I

think one of the reasons we've gotten trusted is the people have -- have seen us as being transparent. The fact that we were assembling proposals rather than creating them meant that we were living to the both letter and spirit of our organizational mandate. So I think we have to be a little careful about self-appointment.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Joe. Lynn.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Lynn St. Amour. I'm going to use some of Milton's words earlier in that I actually agree with what he said with respect to most of the tasks, but I still find myself in a different conclusion. I mean, if it's -- if it's largely about documenting, making visible, by identifying issues, being there to be responsive if people bring things to us, those are things that the OCs and this whole process can do very, very easily without needing another formal structure on top. And Jari said in the chat room that he's the head of one of the OCs and that he feels that they can implement fairly easily and responsibly their requirements and numbers would probably say the same thing. So if we're really talking about names, which I think is what we're largely talking about, and if I were to stand outside and look at this, I would say the two organizations that are only mainly impacted were

names and ICANN. And I guess we're saying we don't count on the two of them to work together in good faith across the entire ecosystem in a model to implement this appropriately and engage the communities appropriately, and we need to be there as a backstop or, you know, an appeals body or something.

Now we're creating new roles and new structures. I'm not even talking about what the ICG becomes going forward. Those are new roles and structures for this whole model and this whole ecosystem.

I still come to the point where -- I mean, I haven't heard any concrete examples to say there is no other better place for this work to be done than the ICG.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Lynn.

Paul?

PAUL WILSON: This is Paul Wilson. This question came up and it was discussed briefly by the RIR CEOs in our EC last month. We were, I think, generally comfortable the ICG should go on until the point -- until some point -- some predefined point in the implementation, preagreed point.

And I think it's a shame Elise isn't here because she did express some concern about the workload involved with implementation and the challenge that IANA would have in sequencing and prioritizing all of the different parts of the implementation and plan. So I think that actually is a very good example that ICANN -- IANA may need help in working out priorities and sequences of the specific parts of the implementation, not to mention also the possibility of conflicts or other interactions that might -- that might come up in the implementation process.

So I think if you imagine the implementation going ahead without the ICG here at all, then we leave ICANN as the only point of coordination of that implementation process. And I'm not sure we want to saddle them with that responsibility or for that matter the sort of power to be that single point.

So I'm in favor of some role going on for the ICG, just because I think it really leaves a vacuum where ICANN is the sole person with a sort of oversight and a sense of the three sets of potentially competing implementation aspects. So as I say, the NRO EC did agree, I think, to my recollection, maybe not formally but we appeared to agree that there was a role to be played. We did suggest that we would want to consult with the communities about that. That was a month or so again and we haven't actually done that yet.

But I think this would be the point, if we can decide something at this meeting, it would be at the point at which the number community would be consulted about that. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Paul.

Jari.

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko for the record. So first I wanted to say that the way you, Milton, described this, I think that sounds reasonable. And certainly I have no problem with that. Although, the question may be whether it's useful enough for us to work on that, that kind of exercise. And I certainly think that the key thing here is to underline the role of the OCs. As an example, I think the CWG should have a fairly big role in their part of the system. As Lynn noted, I had said that from our perspective, we feel quite capable of implementing as planned, including, you know, raising issues to the broader community whenever there's a problem or if there's a problem.

So, I mean, from a personal perspective, I don't feel I would get that much out of it. But I don't think it's a problem either. So we certainly do trust the ICG. It's been very good.

Anyway, I think the key thing is to have the OCs up and running, do the bulk of the work. And if we can do something for that, let's do it now and not necessarily hang around two months later.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Jari.

Michael?

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Thank you, Michael Niebel for the record. I agree a lot with what Milton has said, also as Joe has said.

I want to just say something about the feeling -- what really should be the role is not concrete thing.

I've grown up in an institution which for a long time in its life, European Commission, didn't have a very defined role in many aspects. And the operational communities were the countries, member states. And we were there just moderating. We couldn't tell them what to do. We were just moderating. But it was very useful to get things prepared or implemented.

So you couldn't really define it in the engineer sense, but it had a purpose and a role.

The second element I wanted to raise was to see where we have established already a consensus. I don't want to do something you do it later on, Alissa.

But I remember a discussion -- and I'm listening now to what Daniel is saying that we have hang around a little bit and what Russ saying we have to hang around until it gets approved. So I think there are already some elements where we say, it's not like we are picking up in Dublin and we go and leave it. But we have said there might be questions even before it is sent to the NTIA and there might be issues which we can't foresee. I mean, we cannot foresee everything -- issues until it gets approved, which come up in the process in D.C.

So I think there are some elements where we have agreement which don't go into that implementation phase where there is a little bit of clear obscure at the moment.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Michael. That's a good point. In some ways -- I mean, I understand why we're having this conversation now. But it is a little bit of a far-in-the-future kind of thing because assuming we have agreement that we want to stay in sleeping mode between when we submit the proposal and when it gets approved -- which I think we have pretty broad agreement, but I will ask again at the end of today. But if we have that

agreement, then what we are really talking about is what is our role after approval and before implementation is complete. Because there are some implementation steps that won't take place until after approval. So that's a good point.

I have Patrik next.

PATRIK FALTSROM: Thank you very much. I think we are -- first of all, just like you, Alissa, I do see some convergence here in which direction we are going. I just want to reiterate that I do think we still should explicitly confirm with the operational communities on more specifically what we're going to do.

I do see, though, some need for -- some potential need for coordination. For example, when we are coming towards inside implementation steps, when we're coming close to, for example, the contract actually terminating, I do presume that there are certain things, if nothing else, for legal reasons that can be done before the contract expires and then certain other things, even after the contract expires. So there might be some coordination that is needed that we have not -- that the operational communities have not had to explain or talk about in detail as you just said.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

It's also the case that specifically for the CWG -- I must say that I think that maybe the question is how to keep track of where the operational communities are.

I think it might be the case that the more global Internet community would like to know status of where things are specifically for maybe CWG inside ICANN. I do respect the IETF and the CRISP team and RIRs to be able to do their stuff specifically for ICANN.

And the question is then: Is it something ICANN staff should do and report back at the ICANN meetings? Or should it -- do we have a responsibility to sort of -- we as an ICG -- to continue to be the clearinghouse where the status is reported back or reported back via us or something?

I do see some interesting -- could be some interesting need for us in a much more lightweight mode. For example, it might be the case we decide to do just -- more or less just the mailing list and maybe one hour sort of session at the ICANN meetings. Maybe we have to discuss the interpretation and other kind of things. That also drives cost and our time, of course.

And then the final question, Alissa, that you asked: For how long should we do this?

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

I think very good next checkpoint is when the contract actually terminates because I think that is the goal of this whole process, that the NTIA said we don't have an intention to extend this contract. And maybe that is the point in time when we should, once again -- if we decide to continue after we're done with our proposal, maybe the next time when we should reevaluate is when the contract between NTIA and ICANN actually expires.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. I have Wolf-Ulrich, Daniel, Martin, Mohamed, and Michael and then I'm closing the queue. So Wolf-Ulrich, go ahead.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Alissa. Wolf-Ulrich speaking.

I just would like to come back to some points Lynn was raising with regards to the different perception of the communities, of the operational communities with regard to the finalization of this whole thing.

I fully understand that. That's what I also understood in January already when they were all ready, the numbers and the protocols community, with their proposal and the names community was not ready. And they were of the opinion now, it's almost done. I understand that from their point of view.

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

But I also am convinced there's more an overall role because it was also the case that the NTIA wouldn't have accepted that those communities provide their single part of the proposal during that time. So rather than we have a combined proposal, so there is this whole -- this combined role to be done.

But I would like to say that perhaps in working out -- if you come to that point that the ICG will play a certain role during the implementation phase, if we then elaborate on more detailed terms of reference, let me say it in that way, then we could take this into consideration, the different balancing with regards to the different issues in the proposal. And I don't have a solution for the time being how to do that. But that should be discussed when we are discussing that the terms of reference, how the work is going to be done with regards to that different perception.

On the other way, I find in addition the finalization of the whole process, I think that's a good idea. So contract ending. So I would agree to that because that's a very clear point. If that comes to that point, that should be the very -- and we should also have been finalizing our work. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you.

So Kavouss is back. I know have you been in the queue while you were gone. So go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you very much. I hope I have not overrided other people's right. But I want to mention that we are working under the community commandments. We have a charter. If we want to exist, continue to exist, we need to have assignment from the community and we need to have a charter. Either we amend the existing charter, put existing charter in the background and amend new. Otherwise, we could not extend our work ourselves. It is not appropriate.

The community should say that now we need that you must be on alert, on standby, and so on and so forth. So we have to take necessary steps in order to continue to work. Otherwise, it is not the self-continuation. That is not appropriate from legal point of view. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Kavouss.

Daniel?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: I'm still helpless by the sort of lack of concreteness in the discussion. I understand there is some uncomfortable feelings with people that we might wind up too quickly. I still miss sort of a concrete proposal for what we should be doing in terms of what's our charter.

So on the status quo for me, just to answer Alissa and Milton's question, clearly we are chartered to produce a well-specified proposal to the NTIA, period. That's our charter.

When will we be done? We will be done when that's done.

And, of course, one could say that's when proposal is complete and supported by all the OCs and submitted. One could also say it is when NTIA says, "We have no further questions," which is the position I had before.

I could probably live with when the proposal is implemented, i.e., when NTIA is out of the business and the contract is done. But then I would argue strongly for being in a sleeping mode and not -- so continue actively meeting.

The reason for that -- the rationale for that for me would be in case it becomes clear in the process that the proposal needs to be modified. Then we should certainly be ready to continue our role in making -- compiling our revised proposal.

Anything beyond that to me is absolutely dangerous specifically to echo what other people have said, if we recharter ourselves, basically.

Also, I might want to point out that if some people have argued this and there's an additional coordination or even oversight body needed, that's a totally illogical contradiction to what our proposal says which basically says that we're happy with the existing coordination methods and the commitment by the OCs to continue coordination.

So either we believe that, or we believe that additional coordination is necessary. To me, it sounds illogical.

So I still remain convinced that we should take our current charter as it is and only if there's a clear signal from the OCs that they want us to stay around for specific focuses. We should consider that. But it should be very specific.

What is it specifically that we should be doing? Otherwise, there's no real possibility to consider it and decide. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Daniel.

Martin?

MARTIN BOYLE:	Thank you, Chair. I can actually see with those on. But you get the point.
	Thank you, Milton. Martin Boyle here. There was a comment earlier about at some stage in implementation. And I think that perhaps gives us a way of starting to think about when do we see our role finished and when can we expect the people who are going to live with this to pick it up and run with it themselves? And I guess what we're really looking for is that we get to a stage where we have an implementation plan. The teams have been identified and put in place by the different operational communities for so doing and that there is a coordination process that has been established in some way or another to iron out differences between those groups. That I think is sort of a logical place for us to say, Well, we've down our work and we can step back.
	But I do pick up the idea of becoming a sleeper and being ready to be awoken should things go -- start to go more complicated.
	What I would be particularly concerned about, though, is us ending up becoming the judge, jury, and executioner of the process where we are called upon by one community who feels that their interpretation is being misunderstood in documents that are quite finally balanced calls. And I certainly would hold up my hand in fear of that and say, No, that is not our role.

But, unfortunately, I see that the more we get involved in implementation, the more likely that is to be the case.

So I would go back and say what I said earlier about we need to draw attention -- the attention of the operational communities just in case they haven't realized that they haven't finished yet to making sure the three items I just mentioned are properly put in place and to ask them whether they think that we can do anything to help in ensuring that they are properly coordinated -- coordinating moving forward. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you.

Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Alissa. That is Jean-Jacques. This is not the first time that we are discussing what our group will become or should become. But this is the first time that we are giving enough time to it. I must say that I have had a change of mind in the course of this discussion, especially this afternoon.

My approach, you may remember, was very institutionalized and legalistic, and that's why I have repeated more than once that our only mandate could come from the NTIA and nothing else,

and therefore, we relied entirely on the NTIA about any future arrangements. But this discussion has brought forcefully to me the fact that in fact there may be a need. Of course, NTIA's all wisdom and knows everything in advance, but maybe not. So in that case, I think it would make sense to at least put the question, first to ourselves and later to our communities, to -- about the continuation, with mainly two questions. Why and how.

The why would be is there enough reason for us to suggest or be amenable to some continuation, in what role? And the how would be how to proceed.

So I'll take the why first. This would mean that we would have to consult. This has been said this afternoon on several occasions, we would have to consult the operational communities. But I would add, as someone who's not from the operational communities, that our group, the ICG, was set up on a certain set of rules of wide representation, where it became obvious quite quickly that the OCs had a special role but they should not be alone. And therefore, in any sort of hypothesis of continuation I would say, I would plead for the inclusion of the not necessarily operational communities -- does that make them knock -- to be included in the consultation and in thinking about continuation. All parties should be represented, as they are today, including for instance the ALAC.

Now the third thing is about how. I think that was it Russ Mundy who this afternoon suggested a word which was to indicate our availability. Rather than say we consider that or we reiterate that we find some usefulness in the continuation of ICG, perhaps put the question in another form to the communities we represent and that would be in our -- in the course of our discussion and in the preparation of the plan for transition we became aware of a certain number of issues which might take a bit longer than we thought. And in order to address that real issue, we would like to make known our availability to pursue this task, which is not one of coordination but to pursue the task of bringing things together and to make sure that they are evenly debated and forwarded. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Actually until you spoke I thought we were at a place where we had -- had a sort of proposal emerging for what to do, but maybe I'll try to put it out there and see what you think. And this is sort of based on something that Lynn wrote into the chat.

So it sounds to me like how -- we could proceed as follows: We could at this point decide that we're going to keep our mailing list open for our own use, as we've used it in the past. I would say until September 30, 2016, which is not the same as until the

contract expires, but I think we should commit to keeping it open until that date and revisit our decision if the contract doesn't actually expire. We should ensure that the communities know how to reach us so we have, you know, a -- I mean, I think they do know how to reach us but just make sure that they know and that they can, you know, send us queries or requests for us to do things, if they think that's appropriate. And then ask them an informational question right now which is, you know, we're debating what to do, if we should have a role, and we would like to hear from them of what they think our role should be, if any. If they think they need us, we would like to hear what they think they need from us. Because we have time. We don't have to decide this today. Obviously we're not done with our immediate deliverable yet. So that's -- that's my proposal in terms of what I think is the minimum that we have agreement for in the -- around the table.

The other item that has been raised is this sort of dashboard to keep track of the implementation status of the transition. That I'm a little less clear. I still -- I heard some -- you know, some people wanted us to be proactive and monitor and maintain the thing ourselves. I would only feel comfortable doing that if it essentially just was input from all the communities and that when they finish something they would let us know and we would change the status of the item. Although, I mean, on the

other hand, that's even more proactive than what some people sound like they want. It's -- other people sounded like they just really want the ICG or some representation of the names community to maintain that dashboard for the names proposal since it's one that has a complicated implementation staging process. So on that piece I'm not real clear on what our consensus is. But maybe I could ask about the other pieces first, if people would feel comfortable with keeping the mailing list until September 30, 2016, making sure the communities know how to reach us, and then right now asking them -- you know, just sending a question the way we have before, to the three communities, we can formulate the question and come back and make sure people feel comfortable with the question formulation. But the idea would be to ask them what they think our -- if they need us in the implementation phase, what they specifically concretely would want us to do. So I see Daniel first in the queue.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Old hand. Sorry.

ALISSA COOPER: I did not understand what he said. Old hand. Okay. Joseph.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I think he said old hand. Yes, this is Joe Alhadeff, for the record. For me, I think I want to focus on a comment Daniel had made which is I think we need to get some clarity. So number one, I think we need to clarify that we are committed to remain operational and that doesn't include the potential for being dormant until we need to do something, through NTIA accepting the proposal because we always have the concept that NTIA could come back to us with questions. That doesn't mean I think we need to be proactive in that period, but we do need to be active until the proposal is accepted.

I think if we're going to write to the communities about what may go on beyond that, I think I would like to give them a chance of roles. Because if we get back three different answers from three different communities and we have no idea what that means. And I think we do need a little bit of specificity and a little bit of detail to determine whether or not that role is within keeping. And if we're defining what those roles are, we can make sure they are then within keeping with what was in our mandate to begin with.

The last thing is, none of us know if NTIA plans to have an active role in determining whether implementation is complete and how well it's been completed. So I don't want us to appear as if we're stepping on what their role might be in their own determination.

So at a minimum I think we need to be more specific than just asking open-ended questions and seeing what we get as feedback.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Joe. I will just say, on the NTIA point, I mean, the one thing that they do have is that ultimately they get to decide whether to extend the contract or not. So I find that it's a bit orthogonal to whatever we would do because if they don't feel the implementation has been satisfactory then they have an option open to them which is to keep the contract. Lynn.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Lynn St. Amour. So I support the -- the way forward that you outlined, Alissa. Would also point out that in whatever kind of set of engagements we open up with the OCs, we need to think about some sort of engagement with ICANN as well. ICANN, as ICANN, and ICANN is the current IFO operator. They would certainly have probably questions of what our role was and what we were doing versus theirs as well. So just another -- another player.

ALISSA COOPER: So you would want us to send the same question to ICANN?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: I actually think it's probably a different question, but I'm not sure I still have in my mind the question we're considering sending the OCs because I think to the point Joe just made, do you think the ICG should continue, can we be helpful? One would probably say no, the other would say, I don't know, maybe, and the other one would probably say please. And again, you know, I actually think -- and obviously I'm talking about the names community saying please in terms of looking for perhaps more -- more support and more structure. But I think we need to be -- I think that's going to be a long discussion. I don't know what their current position is now, but I know some of the things they were sort of expecting the ICG might do were beyond what I think we've thought our role was. And I still think that there's some sort of elephant in the room here if we think that the ICG -- sorry, if we think that the CWG and ICANN can't work together to implement this appropriately and engage with the other communities appropriately and all communities raise hands or flags if they have some questions or queries about a direction, then I guess my concern is, I don't know how this process continues to work for the next two, five, ten years. I'll also point out that it's the way this whole model has actually worked for the last 30-plus years, so I have a lot of confidence in

ICANN | 54
Dublin
18-22 OCTOBER 2015

it. But it doesn't appear that some other parts of the broader community do.

ALISSA COOPER: So Daniel, are you back in the queue? Or are you still an old hand?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Yes, it is. I'm an old hand but it's not an old hand.

ALISSA COOPER: Ha, ha, ha. Okay.

[Laughter]

I thought I saw Mohamed in the queue. Do we have Mohamed?

MOHAMED EL-BASHIR: Yes, thank you very much, Alissa. Mohamed El-Bashir here. I just want to echo the point made by Joe. I think we need to have more details in terms of even trying to envision what our expected role from our point of view and then put that forward to the operational communities. I really like what Lynn said about ICANN definitely having more role (indiscernible) as well in the future IFO operator than the CWG or the communities (indiscernible). I think ICANN as a corporation, as an entity, we

need to coordinate with them. But I think it's not just about question. I think it's about we need to have further discussion through the week to at least try to come up with maybe a couple of proposed, let's say, roles. It could be lightweight. It could be something in the middle. And I think that we need to guide the operational communities in terms of giving them an idea of what we're thinking instead of just asking them are we useful for you in the future because things might change, but I think a little guidance would help. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Mohamed. Daniel, go ahead. Sorry, I was confused before.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: No problem. Daniel here. I think -- I am not concerned about getting different answers from the operational communities when we ask them for potential roles that we could take. Basically say should we stick around and can we be helpful. I would see it as a simple test of whether they're actually capable of coordinating. We could ask the question in a way, basically saying, should we stay around in case, form an opinion that is coordinated with the other operational communities, and I'm very confident that we would get a coordinated and consistent

response and it would actually be a demonstration of the fact that they can talk to each other. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you. So here's what I would suggest. I think people have different ideas of how to formulate this question to the communities. I would like to see those ideas in black and white on the mailing list. So if you want -- if you think we should suggest three different roles that we could play and send those to the communities and ask them which of these is your preference or none, if you think we should ask a general question, whatever you think we should ask, write it to the mailing list and we will discuss it via email this week and come back to it on Thursday. Now obviously people who have hallway conversations about this topic as well, feel free to reflect those on the mailing list or Thursday. And we can -- we can take it back up and see if we have something to actually ask. Does that seem reasonable? And otherwise, perhaps we can document our decision to at least remain as a body with a mailing list and an email address where people can reach us until September 30, 2016? Yeah? No objections to that? Daniel, is your hand up from before? Yes. Okay.

The other thing I was thinking, maybe one -- one other piece of that document I forgot to mention, is that no -- we will not have

any standing meetings. Like we're not going to schedule meetings after this probably or after -- if we finish the text of the proposal this week. So the policy would be, if you think we need to have a meeting, you send mail to the mailing list, but we otherwise would not schedule meetings. Any objections.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone).

ALISSA COOPER: After this week or -- well, we need to see what happens at the end of the week, but there would be some chunk of this that is -- you know, that is another piece of the hibernation aspect. Okay. People seem okay with that. Joe. Go ahead, Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Alissa, it's just an operational question. Since the mailing list will be open, if we get inquiries to the list will we just deal with those asynchronously, you know, on email? I think a number of us would probably feel okay with the chairs using their discretion to answer or forward or if you needed input convene the group, but we should just understand what that process is because with an open mailing list it means we will have some traffic. It might be minor, but we should know what we're doing with it.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Joe. Yeah, I think we would just proceed as we have in the past for those things. So if something arises and, you know, we -- we should -- that's why we have the mailing list. We can discuss it over email. If it seems like we're not making progress or we need to all come together in realtime, we can have a call. But it won't be like before where we, you know, put the invites on the calendar for every couple of weeks between this face-to-face and the next one because there probably won't be a next one.

Okay. So I think we are done with this topic. So cognizant of the time, we did not get to talk about the way forward given the CCWG dependency, which I don't think we should start now with ten minutes left. So maybe we can do minutes approval. Can we do minutes approval right now? And then we will edit the agenda for tomorrow to make sure that we are keeping track of everything. Did I miss something?

KEITH DAVIDSON: No. I just -- Keith Davidson, for the record. But the minutes only just came out so a lot of us I don't think will have had a chance to peruse them.

ALISSA COOPER: I thought we had a previous set. Two sets? I'll let you -- please, tell us.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Hi. Okay. This is Jennifer, for the record. There are two sets of minutes, one for call 23 and one for call 24, and Keith was correct that the ones for call 24 came out very recently. The ones for call 23 came out a few days prior to that.

ALISSA COOPER: Oh, I see, they came out on the 14th so people were traveling and what not. So Keith, you feel you need more time for the call 23 minutes?

KEITH DAVIDSON: I'm happy to defer to other's wishes, but I would like to read them properly.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. We will -- we can defer -- can we defer to tomorrow? Yep. Okay. It was on the agenda for tomorrow anyway. So all right. We will defer to tomorrow. And I think -- I don't think we have any other minor business, right? Okay. We gave you nine minutes back. And yeah, so that's for tomorrow. We will be back in this room, I think. Right? At 9:00.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone).

ALISSA COOPER: So between 9:00 and 10:00 we will go back to the proposal. Yep. The proposal will be edited, it will be in your inboxes tonight. Maybe. Hopefully tonight. And that's what we'll do in the morning. And then we have to come back to CCWG dependency. So we might actually change -- that might take more than an hour and a half together, those two things, but hopefully not. We'll find out tomorrow. Go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I think it would make my life easier if tomorrow at 9:00 you start with CCWG and then after that releasing me, if possible, then you continue the rest. Just a possibility. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah. What is your cutoff time?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I think you said that first you start something else and come back to the CCWG issue. I don't know when that would be because today I went four times back and forth and still we are not that point, so I would like to know to arrange my agenda for

tomorrow. It would be more easy for me if the other distinguished colleagues are okay, to start tomorrow with the CCWG dependencies and then go to the other part of your agenda.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Keith, go ahead.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah, Keith Drazek. As the other CCWG liaison, I agree with Kavouss. I actually have a series of conflicts tomorrow. I could be here between 9:00 and 10:00, so if we could lead off with the CCWG dependencies, that would be very helpful to me as well.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. No problem. Can do. Any other comments? Okay. See you tomorrow. Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]