
DUBLIN – ICG Working Session
Friday, October 23, 2015 – 09:00 to 17:00 IST
ICANN54 | Dublin, Ireland

ALISSA COOPER: Good morning, everyone. Welcome back to Day 4 ICG madness. We're looking at the agenda for today. We're going to start again with the public comment summary document. We were hoping to have Joe, although I don't see him in Adobe.

But we will go ahead with this in any event. Hopefully he can join. And then we'll move on to the transition proposal. We'll have a break. If we need more time, we have more time booked for the transition proposal. Otherwise, we will just keep plowing through the agenda. Happy to finish as early as we can today, if possible.

And if we do, I'm assuming we will continue through lunch. We will have lunch. The food will be out -- the food will be in here. And we'll just take the last 15 minutes of the lunch break to do the minutes proposal that we postponed earlier in the week. And then if you scroll down.

We have a section later today to return to the topic of our scope of work during the implementation phase and a little bit talking

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

about our plans going forward. And then we'll wrap up. So any comments on the agenda for today?

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Alissa. Just to note that there are parts in the summary document that may be dependent on discussions that we're doing later, I mean, like the implementation and the reference to the CCWG dependencies. So we need to note this and we have to conclude on it before we leave, I think. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Other than the dependency, what is the one on implementation? I'm happy to sort of get the dependency one out of the way first using the text from the transition proposal. And then we can come back to the public comment document if that's the only one. But if there's others, then we can just note it.

MANAL ISMAIL:

I think there is just one more, if I recall. I'm trying to get the exact text from the document. It says potential future work and coordination for ICG and operational communities. And this had a note from Joe also, a comment, that maybe after our discussions in Dublin, we can conclude on this.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So maybe what we do is talk about the public comment document first; but then we can come back to it again at the end of the day, if necessary. Thank you.

Other comments before we dive in? Okay. I will turn it over to you, Manal, and we will start with the public comment summary document.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Alissa. And good morning, everyone.

The secretariat has kindly took note of all our comments yesterday. I tried to reflect them in the document. And apologize for the late circulation of the document. I think we will be starting today with the ICG RFP criteria.

So if we scroll down, yes, please, to the ICG RFP criteria, completeness and clarity.

And this was a text from Lynn. Does anyone have comments here? Actually, I have one comment here that in the paragraph that starts with "Another common point," the sentence before the last, it says, "in more detail in the implementation section."

So I'm not sure whether the reference here to the

implementation section has to do with this document or probably the proposal itself.

ALISSA COOPER: I put myself in the queue. I have a thought about this.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay, yeah, Alissa, please. Quick question, why isn't the queue showing here?

Go ahead, Alissa.

ALISSA COOPER: I think in this document, it would suffice to say that the work to be done to establish the PTI and associated structures will be further elaborated during implementation.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (off microphone).

ALISSA COOPER: True. Gets around all of this. That's my suggestion.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, makes sense. Thank you.

Any other comments on the completeness and clarity part?

Okay then. If we move to the next section, please, which is compatibility and interoperability. And this text comes from Patrik's emails.

Again, in the paragraph before the last, there is reference that there is more description "elsewhere." So I'm not sure again whether "elsewhere," this is here in this summary report, which I don't think -- or if it is here, we have to, I think, put the exact reference.

So, Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Manal. Keith Drazek. I agree that in this section where we say "elsewhere in the document," I think that was perfectly reasonable language during the drafting phase as a placeholder. But once we have sort of a finalized document, we should actually put in references. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thanks, Keith.

I have Kavouss next.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. If you do that, I have no problem. Otherwise, currently, you have "more fully," "fully" does not have superlative or comparative. Fully is fully. It is not more fully or less fully. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Agree. Thank you. But if we're going to have a reference here, then this is going to be deleted obviously.

Elise?

ELISE GERICH: This may just be personal preference, but I think saying "these people" when we refer to the people who responded is probably -- we should make it more generic and less personal and say something like, "The first trend were responses. The second trend came from responses that were concerned that the internal ICANN" -- just replace "people" with "responses" because some of them are organizations, some of them are people. And it makes it too kind of personal.

KEITH DRAZEK: Or you could say "respondents."

ELISE GERICH: That would work also. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, both.

Any further comments on this section?

Jean-Jacques, please, and then Alissa.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Good morning. This is Jean-Jacques. I haven't had my coffee yet. That's why I'm going to limit myself to a very minor point, which is the second paragraph, "another issue concerned," it's either "concerned" or "concerns" but not both. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, right.

I think it's "concerned." But the track changes doesn't know well. I think the S, it has a strike-through. Noted. Thank you.

Alissa, please. Yes, I'm sorry.

ALISSA COOPER: Just picking up on Elise's point, I think it would be useful after we go through the whole document when you're inserting the edits to just do a pass and harmonize the way that we refer to the commenters throughout the document, so call them commenters.

In the proposal, we call them "commenters" which would be fine. I don't care if you call them "respondents" or "submitters" but just use the same word in the whole document.

MANAL ISMAIL: I agree. We'll do this. We'll do the capitalization as agreed in the document itself. Yes. And I had a third thing in mind which I don't remember now, so...

We can proceed to the following section. Yes, Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSROM: I also had my hand up. Let me also just clarify that. The "elsewhere" reference is an internal reference in this document. That should be resolved. It's not an external reference.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. So now for the accountability part. So this shows up twice here. I mean, it comes once with the criteria that we've set. And it again indirectly also is referenced with the interdependency with the CCWG work. So I was wondering whether we should keep both or merge both in one bullet just to avoid redundancy. If not, again, here I think we would have more or less the same text again.

So any comments on this? Any preference? Milton?

MILTON MUELLER: I just wonder what you're suggesting. Do you just want to delete this section because it is redundant, or do you just want to go ahead and put a redundant paragraph in there? What are you actually proposing?

MANAL ISMAIL: Actually this was my question to the group.

MILTON MUELLER: You want us to decide?

MANAL ISMAIL: Yeah, yeah, yeah, I was asking because we have an interdependency section up that refers again to the CCWG work and the interdependency with the names proposal. So I was wondering whether we should merge both or not.

I have Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, sorry, Manal, I was busy elsewhere. I couldn't attend other of your meetings. What do you mean by "trends"? Second trends, first trends, third trends? Series of comments and so on?

And then the sentence is even if you quoted from people, put a sort of negative impression of what they are proposing, making the coordination with numbers and parameters harder than it is currently. It is hard and it makes it harder. So it doesn't give a positive sign. So we have to put it in a different way.

Throughout -- I will just make my comment general. Throughout all this document, we should try not to interpret comments in the name of the ICG and so on and so forth. I don't think it makes harder. It requires some coordination, yes, but it doesn't make harder. Otherwise, we put everything in the PTI as a sort of doubt and negative. You remember those who were in the CCWG -- CWG, Martin was, they were one of the core point. There was a lot of effort, and that was something as a compromise for the time being.

So putting some doubt on that means that we disagree with the compromise and put weight for other options. So we try not to weaken the compromise which has been reached, and that is PTI. So I have some inconveniency to agree the word making the work harder.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Kavouss. I think this was Patrik's draft. But, again, I think this is quoting what has been received from the commenters.

And "trends" here, I think the meaning is that we have three types of categories commenting on this topic. But, again, I leave it to Patrik.

I have Milton afterwards.

Okay, Milton first.

PATRIK FALTSROM:

Patrik Faltstrom here. I just want to say that what I wanted to say is that there are three -- over three different kinds of directions the comments are coming in. I don't know whether "trends" is the -- maybe that's the wrong word, but three general directions or three different groups of comments. That's what I wanted to say. Themes or whatever.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Then we can change into categories.

Milton.

MILTON MUELLER:

Okay. So I've looked over the dependencies paragraph, which I had not before. And I would say we want to keep both of these sections. I think in the dependencies, you basically want to flag accountability CCWG as one of the dependencies in that section. And then in the section we're on now, you want to say a lot of

the stuff that's been deleted here in the upper section. "That is dependent on and conditioned," blah, blah. "Many commenters in public comment period noted this dependency and associated difficulty in judging the overall accountability." This is way up in the dependency section that I'm reading from here, but it's all been crossed out.

So I guess that's my question. Why was this stuff crossed out in the dependency section, these two paragraphs, noting about the CCWG and the comments noting that there's conditionality here?

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Milton. There was one paragraph -- there was a language proposed by Joe yesterday, and he said he will circulate this over email which he did to replace this part. So this is why it is striked through.

MILTON MUELLER:

So I have to go hunting through the email list for Joe's email then? Were you planning to put Joe's email in the dependency section or the accountability section?

MANAL ISMAIL: It was for the dependency section. And it's already inserted in a version that was circulated very late last night. I'm not sure if this is the version you have.

MILTON MUELLER: I have the Dropbox version, 23rd October JHA.

MANAL ISMAIL: Actually, I circulated it over email. I don't think we have it on Dropbox yet.

Jennifer, can you help?

JENNIFER CHUNG: Hi, everyone. This is Jennifer.

The version we are projecting and the link I dropped in the chat is the one that was circulated by Joe after you circulated your version, Manal. And both versions are in Dropbox. So do we want to change the projected version right now?

MANAL ISMAIL: No, no. I'm just checking whether we have the version on Dropbox because I haven't put it on Dropbox. So thank you for doing this.

ALISSA COOPER: So the version we're all working off of has Joe's text in it on page 4 about dependencies.

So if you're not looking at that version in your local copy, then you are not looking at the most up-to-date version.

MILTON MUELLER: I'm looking at the link that was circulated by Jennifer on the Adobe. So that's the current one?

MANAL ISMAIL: This is the most up to date.

MILTON MUELLER: Okay. So I still think that all the text that Joe crossed out should be retained, perhaps cleaned up a bit, and put into this accountability section.

MANAL ISMAIL: I think we can do this maybe during the break and have it projected if we're going to come back to this later. I'm not sure.

So, again, thank you, Milton, for the comparison. So we will retain this which makes sense also because it was one of the criteria of the ICG RFP. So if we don't have further comments here, can we move to the workability section?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL: I'm sorry, Jean-Jacques and then Paul. Jean-Jacques, please.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Manal. This is Jean-Jacques. I come back to the comment by Kavouss which I found interesting, that we should as far as possible avoid interpreting, is the word he used, the comments.

The other thing brought up by Alissa I very much agree with, is that we have to use consistent language throughout. So if we find that in this or that part of the public comment review a word is strange but we think it really describes the feeling or the comment, why not put it within quotation marks.

In this particular case, you were referring, Kavouss, to the word "harder." And I agree with you that "harder" in this sentence seems a bit odd. But if anyone feels we should keep that word, well, just put it just as a quotation. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. Good suggestion, I think.

Paul?

PAUL WILSON:

I was going to make exactly the same point. It's something to be careful of throughout the document. I think that we should -- unless there's clearly a large number of comments that draw or point to something quite objective that we can include in the prose of our report, I think we need to be careful to use quotes, particularly when a word has been questioned.

I'd also -- I mean in this case, I'd note what's being described here are general trends. It's a bit difficult unless, again, this use of the word harder has appeared in multiple places. I don't think I'd even put it in quotes without explaining in one case described as harder because this is not just a reference to a particular comment. It's a statement about a whole theme. And so, again, being careful to distinguish quotations where it's important to do so but also to not take one quotation and draw a very general point out of it unless it really is something that's appeared multiple times. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Paul. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I agree with Jean-Jacques. The reason I said that was the following: Comments from commenter are something. And this document may be interpreted that is the views of the ICG which consists of the 10 communities. So we should be very careful not to give that impressions. So I agree we put in quotation marks, and I further said that quotation marks in italic form that knows that it is not from us. It's just quotation from those people. And they are responsible whether it is harder or not harder. But we do not confirm that it is harder. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thanks, Kavouss. So any further comments on this part?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Manal, this is Joe. I just wanted to let you know that I'm on the phone only. I'm in a car, so I'm going to put myself on mute. But, if there's any questions to me about the PTI or anything else, I'm happy to answer it.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thanks, Joe. Good to have you on the call. Thank you. So can we scroll for the workability part?

Do we have any comments here? I, personally, do have comments. But -- so I can start with my comments.

In the second paragraph, the sentence starting, "The ICG counted those as comments which indicated the proposal not workable."

I suggest that, to me, if this is the intended meaning, I suggest that this reads, "The ICG counted those among comments," because I think there are other comments also that -- I mean, is it -- is it the -- does this describe the whole category, or was this a subset of those who said it's not workable? I mean, I was suggesting "among" instead of "as comments which indicated." I suggest "among comments which indicated."

Does this make sense to others? I have Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Once again, I don't know whether you wanted "counted" or "considered." Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. Thank you, Kavouss. You're suggesting this instead of "considered"?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I don't -- I think it's better to not say be counting something and be considering it as a difficulty, so on and so forth. This is considerations. Counted is more stronger than considerations.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yeah. I think the intended meaning here was that we were counting, and we were coming up with statistics. But, again -- so I have Alissa and then Daniel. Alissa.

ALISSA COOPER: So my suggestion is that we delete this sentence that starts with, "The ICG counted."

It's not clear to me that we actually did count, specifically, the comments about workability at this level of granularity. I think the prior three sentences provide the appropriate summary. And I think, if it doesn't already exist somewhere in this document, we can more generally explain our approach to the comments received wherein it was obvious that the commenter was objecting to the transition overall. This is not an issue that's specific to workability, even though some of the comments that came in -- you know, we had a bunch of those people who put the same comment in response to every single question that we asked, which was don't let the transition go forward.

So I would suggest that we just deal with those in one or two sentences elsewhere that's not specific to workability. But just explain how we dealt with the commenters who were objecting

to the transition overall. And then we don't need this sentence and the other sentences provide a good summary of workability.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Alissa. Daniel.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Thank you, Manal.

This is Daniel. I -- as the originator of the language, I can live with both proposals, either to replace with "as" with the word "among" or to delete the sentence completely. I don't care either way. Both are acceptable.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Daniel. So I think maybe we can delete it. So, if this is agreed by everyone. Martin.

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

Just addressing that point immediately, I think one of the -- one of the things that that last sentence does that might not be covered elsewhere is to indicate that in our category of not workable is a group of comments that nothing would have been workable. They had a matter of principle about it. And, while

I'm quite happy with Alissa's suggestion that we delete it, we will miss the fact that in our list of comments that say non-workable, there are some that, no matter what we said, unless we said we keep the status quo, would have been counted as being non-workable.

That sort of -- the reason I put my flag up was that earlier on in that paragraph -- and we've deleted, to my pleasure, one of the "flatlies," but I would suggest that we remove the other flatly as well right in the middle of the second sentence. Because that does rather sound like we're being dismissive of the people who put the proposal in.

And the sentence works, I think, quite well if we just remove the word "flatly."

My second comment is more of a suggestion.

I have a recollection from reading the comments -- but, as Alissa pointed out to me yesterday, my memory is failing more and more as I get older. There were a whole group of comments that came in with their own solution. And I think there were about three, might have been four of them that said, you know, this is the way you do it, which wasn't very helpful because, you know, well, it was just one person or one organization's view of a way of doing it.

Now, what I don't know is whether that group of comments, because it was unworkable because it wasn't my solution, are included in this -- the second one of these or whether we need to just mention the fact that we've received some comments that proposed a specific way of doing the transition that would, in their minds, make it workable. But these were just comments from those organizations, so they were always sort of isolated comments.

Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Martin. So the first question is whether to keep this sentence or delete it. So this is one thing that we have to agree on.

And the second is whether we should list a third category of people -- of comments or propose their own solutions? Or are they counted in here?

So maybe, Daniel or Paul, can you help? Because this text was prepared by you. Whether this category has been considered in this text, the category that proposed their own solutions.

DANIEL KARREBERG:

This is Daniel. Thank you, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL: Go ahead, Daniel.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Thank you.

When we analyzed this, we took the ones that Mark mentioned. They proposed their own solution; and, therefore, any other solution wasn't workable -- as saying non-workable. Because that's, in essence, what they did. I don't think we need to call this out specifically.

There weren't many of them. And still we have the clear majority who said that it was workable.

So I don't think -- I understand what Martin is trying to do. But I don't think it's significant enough to waste any language on it.

The second thing is about deleting the whole sentence. I'm quite happy to delete the whole sentence, if, as Alissa has suggested, we deal with it somewhere in general. And, basically, said there were a number of commenters who, basically, said we don't agree with the transition. And, therefore, we -- it's not workable. It's not accountable. It's not anything.

And then we can get rid of this sentence. Otherwise, if we don't do that, I would like to keep the sentence with your amendment of "as" into "among." Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Daniel. And I think, according to the criteria we were following, we never made a category of just one comment. So, if there are really a few and they don't compose a category, then it makes sense that we don't have them in a specific group. So Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. Manal, my comment is general.

All of these things put in here will be associated or connected with one of the conditions of NTIA and that is broad support of the community. Anything we put here should not give misinterpretation of that and then goes to the vigilant eyes of those groups, NTIA and others, and taken as does not have support, broad support. So one single comment in one way, first of all, we should not interpret it that. We should put it as it is. And we should see the weight of that and put it in the language that does not end up that the proposal does not have broader community support. This is general sense of my intervention. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Kavouss. And, for the sake of time, I would also like to move on. But first I think reference to Alissa's word on this can be deleted, right? I think this is a reference that we can delete.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Yes.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. Thank you. And I have a question. The very last sentence, we noted that at least several commenters also submitted -- no, I'm sorry. This is not the part. Okay. I'm sorry. So I'm sorry.

There is another paragraph that doesn't show. Can we scroll down, please?

I was wondering whether we should note also the joint statement that was made by the operational communities at the public forum. Is this something that should be noted here?

Because the paragraph reads, "Based on all comments received, the ICG has not identified any major workability issues with this proposal provided that the operational communities ensure appropriate coordination both during and after the implementation."

And I think this was, again, reassured at the public forum or the joint statement. So should this be noted by us here again or -- any suggestions? I mean, if not, I propose to note it. So Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER:

I think in the interest of trying to finish this document, we should try to stick as closely as possible to providing a summary of the comments. Like, there's going to be continue to be new developments. I mean, the longer we work on this, the more there will be new developments we can cite to and point to. Because the implementation is proceeding.

And I think, if we try to do that, then we won't finish it. So I think it's fine as is, and we don't need to -- we can just be backward looking and say this is a summary of the comments we got. So just trying to make less work for you, basically.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Okay. Thank you. So, if we move to the NTIA criteria now, again, the first part is from Alissa's email and then the criteria, the first criteria broad community support. Again, this is from the ICG report. So, if we don't have any comments here, we can move forward. I have Demi.

DEMI GETSCHKO: Just very short following what Kavouss said. I think the broad community support is nowhere -- not well represented by the majority who submitted. It's a little bit weak to be supportive of broad. Just a comment. Maybe the vast majority or great majority. Don't know.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. Alissa.

ALISSA COOPER: For this whole section on NTIA criteria, one thing that I noticed is that -- and I think this is just a feature of the way that we went about putting this document together. Several of these sections only note the concerns that were raised by the commenters. And they don't provide a general statement of the trend of whether people generally thought that the criteria were met or not.

And so I think that needs to be added to several of the subsections here. Because it's not really complete if we only cite the concerns. And there may be words from the transition proposal that would be useful in some of the subsections. I just wanted to flag that -- I know you're going to go through each of them.

But that's a feature of several of them where we just jump into saying one person had this concern or that concern. And we don't generally say that, indeed, almost all the comments felt that the proposal supports the multistakeholder model or -- just to give an example.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. Thank you, Alissa. Any -- Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. If you're on the broad community support. When we talk about majority in legal terms majority is 50%+ 1. That's all. If you go up to two-thirds is supermajority. If you go up that one, then you have significant majority, overwhelming majority, so on and so forth. If you say "majority" means 50%+ 1, they are supporting. So we should be careful of how the term is used. Thank you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, at least you could have significant majority. Not more than 50% plus 1. That is that. Not overwhelming but significant majority to distinguish between 50 plus 1 and the rest of the 50 -- 49. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. Thank you, Kavouss. Noted. So if we move forward to support for multistakeholder model, and I think we will be deleting the reference to the specific questions we had in our public comments, so this should be also deleted. So this is the text from Joe. Any comments? So can we scroll down, please, to the security and stability part? And again, this comes from Joe. So I have Alissa and then Milton. Alissa. Old hand? Milton, go ahead.

MILTON MUELLER: The support for the multistakeholder model is one of the subsections that simply lacks contextualization. So we need to start out with a statement that almost every comment that addressed the issue said that this did support the multistakeholder model. Even some comments that were actually kind of against the proposal said there's -- it supports the multistakeholder model. And what you've done here is you've gone into some fairly detailed descriptions of concerns but you've never come out and said, hey, there was overwhelming support for the -- that this proposal supports a multistakeholder model. So you just need a starting statement like that. And I think the description of the concerns could be tightened up quite a bit, also.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Milton. So we'll try to work on this also. And so if we don't have further comments, can we -- Kavouss. I'm sorry, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, not to disagree with Milton, but in CCWG everything is based on multistakeholder approach. Everything. If you try in one part of the proposal to NTIA weaken that and in the other part pushing for that, that would make more or less sort of contradictions. So we try to make a balance between the two. Once again, not opposing to Milton's proposal but just because of the -- my CCWG involvement, and Keith may -- is here or left? We contend that the whole thing is based on multistakeholder bottom-up approach and there was this issue. So I leave it to you to make such a balance.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay, thank you. Just to reiterate that this text, again the whole thing is based on text that was circulated and approved on the mailing list. So -- and it's a copy and paste. So that's why we --

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Manal, this is Joe, and I'm fine taking a shot at Milton's edits, especially the proactive sentence. And I'm about to go through security, so I'm going to lose you in a second. I --

MANAL ISMAIL: So this was quick. Okay. So we hope to get Joe back again. So can we move until -- can we move forward until we get Joe back with us again? So do we have comments on the security and stability part? We had redundant text and Joe has provided us with the most recent. Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Sorry, I may be a bit slow. This is Jean-Jacques, but coming to Milton's point two minutes ago, I agree that it would be useful to draft a chapeau for that paragraph, and I just put on the chat here something like a first remark needs to be made. Whatever their more detailed comments, supportive or critical, an overwhelming majority of commenters stated their belief in the value of the multistakeholder model, something like that.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you for helping with the draft. So Milton, is this an old hand or a new one? Alissa.

ALISSA COOPER: So I just wanted to do a time check. There's five minutes left and then we're going to move on to the transition proposal. So we

will have a -- we can come back to some issues on this later, but just wanted to flag that for you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. Martin.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thank you. Just to be very quick. Yes, Jean-Jacques's input is fine, but I think it actually also misses the fact that I can only remember a couple of proposals that specifically said it didn't have multistakeholder support. And so, you know, it's almost that we should be saying this was not -- there was no significant level of input that challenged the multistakeholder nature of the process that was being followed. And I think we should be as strong as that. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thanks, Milton -- sorry, Martin. I'm sorry, martin. So can we move to the next section, please? Can we scroll? So again, this part was tackling both criterias in one paragraph and then we have the -- not to replace NTIA with a governmental/intergovernmental solution. So for the sake of time, if we can review both quickly and if we don't have comments, we can move forward. Alissa.

ALISSA COOPER: So are you going -- or one you or Joe going to write something for the meets needs and expectation of IANA partners and customers section? It's empty.

MANAL ISMAIL: Actually, this is the text that was provided by Joe and it -- it mentioned both the openness and expectations.

ALISSA COOPER: Oh, I see. I was wondering what the expectations meant. Okay. I understand. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thanks. So the potential future work and coordination for ICG and operational communities, do we have any comments on this part? Again, I think this -- this is one of the parts that we may need to fine-tune after we finish our later discussions today. But Michael, please.

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Thank you, Michael Niebel, for the record. The last sentence on the role of governments, on my text there has not been a change as we had agreed. "The ICG notes that insofar as they justify change in the proposal."

ALISSA COOPER: We changed this in the transition proposal and it didn't get reflected into this document.

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Yeah.

ALISSA COOPER: So you can find it and copy and paste.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. Thank you for noticing this. Any comments on the potential future work and coordination? Or the process issues? Can we move forward? Yes. So here I was just wondering whether -- because this is the first time we make a specific reference within a URL to a specific comment, so do we want to keep this? Should we put it as a footnote, a hyperlink? I mean -- Patrik?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: The reference is not to comment. The reference is to the document that described the criteria from NTIA. ISOC sent in a separate document with comments that also referenced this. It's an external reference.

MANAL ISMAIL: So contribution here, I mean, in the text itself, contribution here is not one of the comments that were submitted during the public comment period, right?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Correct. This is not something that was submitted in the public comment period, no.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. So this should either come as a foot -- the hyperlink I think should come either as a footnote at the end or a hyperlink, so we'll take care of this. Thank you. So if we don't have further comments on this part, we can proceed to the complexity of the proposal. So this is the text provided by Daniel and Paul, yeah, if we can -- do we have any comments on this part? Kavouss. And then Milton.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: When you refer to complexity, you refer to complexity of the transition without taking account of the accountability process or taking account of the accountability process? Just a question. Depending on the answer, I have further comments.

MANAL ISMAIL: Paul. I'm sorry.

PAUL WILSON: Well, I think this was always intended to be the complexity -- refer to the complexity of the ICG proposal itself without regard to the CCWG.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. I have Milton, Patrik. One page left and two minutes late.

MILTON MUELLER: I'm moving you backwards because I'm going back to this process concern. I would prefer to eliminate the reference to the ISOC paper. I don't think it's appropriate for us to cite that as an authority. I think we are the authority here. We discussed this and decided that that's not a case. I don't understand what we get by citing a paper written by somebody else. No matter how good it is, it's -- I just don't get that. It's not like it's an RFC or some kind of authority. It's just a -- it's a white paper submitted by one particular organization.

MANAL ISMAIL: Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yeah, I'm -- I think it's okay to remove the -- remove the reference, that's fine with me. Specifically, I can agree with Milton that we're following that -- sort of that process. I think that reference, for example, was helpful for me while developing this document that we can read it just like we could read other things. So remove the reference and we also -- that releases us from the problem with the word "contribution" because people might be confused whether this was actually part of the comments or not.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Patrik. So thanks for the flexibility. Can we move forward, please? Yes. To institutionalization of NTIA --

PATRIK FALTSTROM: No, I still have my hand up for that section.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay, sorry. Go ahead. I thought this --

PATRIK FALTSTROM: That's okay. I think there's a suggestion from Lynn to remove that paragraph because it doesn't add anything. The text is actually kind of complicating and might confuse the readers, so I support Lynn in removing that paragraph.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay, thank you. Noted. Any further comments? So any comments on the institutionalization of NTIA criteria.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone).

MANAL ISMAIL: We can scroll up, but I'm afraid we can't wait five minutes. So if you can also look on the free speech. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Is it a strong statement by ICG that it will be met throughout, we'll be met all of the time? Can we talk about what is the nexus of it and now generally the many things? Couldn't we soften that? Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Actually, it's a copy and paste from the ICG report. So had this changed in the ICG report itself?

ALISSA COOPER: I think this is exactly what it says there. I mean, we could say they both help to ensure instead of serve to ensure, if that would -- yep? Okay.

MANAL ISMAIL: Any further comments? Either on this or on the free speech? So --

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Excuse me.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Difference between freedom of speech and freedom of expression? Speech, expression?

MANAL ISMAIL: We chose the title. I mean, we were trying to find the theme for the comments received, so --

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, we discussed that hours and hours and even days in CCWG on the working group for -- under Leon and that we don't have that free speech and freedom of speech in the two different things. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: So do we have a -- a suggestion here to change the title or --

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yeah.

MANAL ISMAIL: Change it to?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Freedom of expression is something that is all around since many, many years, but not free speech.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. Noted. Thank you. So in the absence of any other comments, I thank you all and hand back to Alissa and apologize for the delay.

ALISSA COOPER: No, thank you. Thank you very much, Manal, and also to Joe who put a lot of work into this. I guess, do you need time later today, do we need time later today to return to anything or -- there's obviously a lot of edits that need to get made as a result of this discussion, which I don't expect you to do during the meeting today, so how would you like to proceed?

MANAL ISMAIL: I think we -- we can try to do most of the edits and see where we can -- I mean, we have the one hour lunch break. We can use it and I'll get back to you after lunch with the status.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Okay. Thank you. Okay. So we are going to -- yep, go ahead.

MARY UDUMA: Thank you, Manal, and your group for the hard work. Looking through the other paragraphs and the summary, I wonder whether we should be stating what ICG thinks at the beginning of the paragraph or the comments or we state opposition after we have stated exactly what commenters presented to us so we'd be consistent. Is it for us to put our own comments first or we just put -- you know, present what we've got and then state what we think? Some of the paragraphs we did that. Others, you know, we're not consistent. I don't know whether that will be considered. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: So I agree that some of the paragraphs have more of an ICG view on it and again, that's because it came from different drafters, but I don't think we have the time to -- to have this drafted for all of the -- I'm not sure. Alissa, do we -- I mean, because this is

something that I cannot draft offline. I mean, we have to discuss here to come up with an ICG view on each and every missing title, I mean, so...

ALISSA COOPER:

Yeah. Again, the ICG view is in the proposal and I don't see a strong need to say the same thing in too many different places. So the more that we can just have this be a summary of the comments, the better off we are, I think. So I would say if there's any question about the -- the inconsistency across the sections, that we take things out rather than put things in. That would be my recommendation. But at this point, I really want us to move on to the transition proposal, so we will come back and figure out the way forward on the implementation -- on the public comment document after lunch. Okay? I know that people just got in the queue, but if you got in the queue to talk about that, thank you for taking yourselves out of the queue.

Okay. So we're going to move on to the transition proposal. And before we start, I just wanted to get people focused on the fact that it is within reach for us to complete the transition proposal, other than our one outstanding known dependency, today.

So we have some time allocated on this agenda. But we have some other things we need to discuss as well. So we need to be

efficient in our use of time today. And I just want people to think about that before they get in the queue or start wordsmithing something in the document. If you can live with it the way that it is or if there's things that don't absolutely positively require all of us to engage together in a face-to-face meeting today, please think about that before you raise your hand and get in the queue because we do have some substantive things to get through, but I think we can get through them all today. So seize the day.

Daniel, do you have a comment on that?

DANIEL KARREBERG: Thank you, Alissa. I would like to agree with you that it was within reach for us to finish the proposal. And I would move that we postpone all other work so we don't get to any of the rest of the agenda before we are finished with the proposal. I think we should focus on this because this is our main purpose. It is all good and well to discuss what we might do like the agenda suggests, but I would move that we keep at it as long as -- until it's finished or we run out of time. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes. Thank you. That's essentially the plan. Okay.

Okay. So we're not going to start with -- the document status thing we'll come back to at the end.

So I wanted to come back to the things that we discussed yesterday to get closure on them, the substantive items. The first one is that we agreed to make the explanation of the dependency generic so that we could use the same generic words everywhere that we talk about this in the document. And that is what I have attempted to do here in X13. So we're just looking at X13 right now.

So the wording about complete, about the proposal being complete, is gone. And now it just says that the names proposal is conditioned on the accountability mechanisms. And that is the same verb that the CWG proposal uses itself, that the proposal -- their proposal is conditioned. And then there also has been an edit in the second sentence to reflect that we are sending it to NTIA via the board.

So comments on that? First I have Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: My comment was the status of the document. You come back to that at the end, right?

ALISSA COOPER: We will come back to the status.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I put my proposal in the chat so if somebody could capture it.

ALISSA COOPER: The secretariat could capture it from the chat because it will be a while before we come back to it.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Any issues with the way that we describe the dependency now?
Okay. Good.

We will move on then to the implementation inventory text. The proposal was that we should -- we are looking at paragraph 107. We wanted to make it more clear that this list might change in the future or it's just the current list. It's not necessarily complete. We have dropped a footnote -- let's see if I can get it on the screen -- to the place where we will be linking to the spreadsheet that Lynn has circulated the updated version of. And we have added a sentence about all the stakeholders being involved in the implementation.

So comments on this?

MILTON MUELLER: Alissa, just a reminder that some of us are actually still catching up uploading the document and finding the part where you are. So the reason we're not responding is because we're not even there yet.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. No, I don't want to take a break.

[Laughter]

This is just one paragraph. So I am happy to give it another minute if people want to absorb it.

Go ahead, Lynn.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Yes, Lynn St. Amour. In the inventory spreadsheet I sent last night, since it's going to be a stand-alone document somewhere not with a Web page, a reference, I actually put a header in it that says, "This action item inventory was developed through submissions from the three operating communities and was used in the ICG's assessment of achievability and completeness for the combined plan. It represents a snapshot in time and will not be further updated. For authoritative implementation plans, please see the OC community resources and/or the ICANN IANA resources." Maybe there's -- some of that text, it's not quite

appropriate for here. But maybe we can suggest where people might look if they want to see what the current status of implementation is. And I recognize that we don't necessarily have agreement on that yet, but -- which is why my language is quite general as well which is simply referred to the appropriate operating community resources or the ICANN-IANA implementation resources.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks, Lynn. I'm really glad that that's in there. And I think we could maybe look at putting some of it in the footnote, if that makes sense. Okay. I can take the action to do that.

Have people had more time to look at this? You feel okay about it?

MILTON MUELLER:

There is a seeming difference here. I'm looking at Part 7. The text as far as I can tell with my poor eyesight is about the same, but there's no comment. No comment in the document I've pulled up from Dropbox. All I see is black and white text instead of the blue highlight with a comment visible. There's no little quote mark up there. So am I looking at the right version?

ALISSA COOPER: It might be the view that you're looking at in your own client. So you can hide and show track changes. But this is -- there you go. Jennifer is going to come help you. This is the version that was in Dropbox, so...

So we can come back if you need, Milton. But it sounds like people are okay with this.

So the next item, I just wanted to check, is that we have -- so we have this implementation section in Part 0 and we have also added as people remember the history section in Part 0. Neither of those are reflected in the executive summary which I think is the correct -- of course, I think it's correct because I didn't add them. But I just wanted to check that people think that's okay in the interest of keeping the summary executive as we had previously discussed.

Go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, one comment and one question. I think in the proposals of the CCWG, the workstream 1 are those accountability should be in place or committed to be in place before the transition happened. Would it be possible to have some reference to that? This is one.

And now the question is that all of these issues that you put here you want to be implemented before the transition. The contract is expired. If you look into the time line generally, 20th of January, send it to NTIA. Three, four months for that. Finished and then send it to the Congress 60 working days of Congress to remove -- to review that. And then you have end of September 2016. And you want that -- this will be implemented when? This is not very ambitious. Could it be worded differently? There's some questions of the implementability of this implementation. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you. So, first of all, just one correction, I believe it's obviously not set yet because the DOTCOM Act hasn't passed but it is 30 legislative days. 60 legislative days is, like, the whole year. Thankfully it is not 60 legislative days. So we were trying to be precise with this, which is that these are the items that need to be implemented prior to the expiry of the contract whenever that takes place. It doesn't include the ones that don't need to be implemented prior to the expiry of the contract including, like, the establishment of the IFR. And it says that in the text.

And this last bullet in paragraph 109 right there above paragraph 110 is the catchall for the mechanisms arising out of

the ICANN accountability process. So that is included in the names community list.

Go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Thank you. As you know, I'm not American. So I don't know these things. I heard from Larry that 60 parliamentary days. You said 30. It has been changed. So you take the responsibility of Larry that now 60 has been changed to 30. I have no problem. But if you read the first, in the beginning, it says, "The operational communities have indicated that a number of items will need to be implemented prior to the expiry of the NTIA contract." I'm just putting on that. So whether these have some impact on the remaining part, which one you want, a number of items, which are those number of items that you want to be implemented before the contract is expired. And contract currently is foreseen to be expired, foreseen, of 30th September, 2016. Just a point of clarification. If you see that 30 days is the legislative time that is required, so far so good. I may be in favor of five days. But this is not mine. This is the Congress. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

So I have Keith and then Daniel.

Lynn, is that an old hand? Oh, sorry. Keith and then Lynn and then Daniel.

Go ahead, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Alissa. Just to clarify on the legislative days question, it is 30 legislative days which could be 40, 45, or 60 actual calendar days depending on where those legislative days fall on the congressional calendar. So the actual language is 30 legislative days, and the variable of actual calendar days is dependent on the actual scheduling. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Keith.

Lynn.

LYNN ST. AMOUR:

Lynn St. Amour. Back to the question you asked a moment ago with respect to the fact that the history section, which is in Part 0 was not also reflected in the executive summary, I think that that's actually some useful background. But perhaps we can just put a note in paragraph X003 saying "for a more complete view of" -- I don't know -- "key history" or something, "please see Part 0" or something. So not suggesting we pull any of the

text up. I think that would make it a little unwieldy. But I also think that many, many people won't read behind the executive summary.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thanks, Lynn.

Daniel.

DANIEL KARREBERG: This is Daniel.

I sense a lot of contention on paragraph VII, so let me make a radical suggestion. I don't think it adds to the substance of our proposal. So if it's contentious at all, I would move to just completely remove it. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Just to clarify, the Section 7 or paragraph 107?

DANIEL KARREBERG: Section VII. My sense is there is contention about it, that it is more than just Kavouss.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thank you, Daniel.

Russ?

RUSS MUNDY:

Back to the question that you asked and Lynn responded to earlier, I was looking at the executive summary and noticed that in the way that it's laid out, the first part really is focused on process. And then we get to proposal summary, and we don't have any words present currently in the proposal summary that talks about Part 0, even existing. It jumps right to Part 1.

So perhaps a sentence or two that says the initial part of the main proposal is the ICG assessment including a brief -- a very brief summary of history in context related to this or just a sentence or two that would be, I guess, inserting a paragraph there right at the beginning of proposal summary. Just looking at the parallel structure.

ALISSA COOPER:

That's a good point. It's a little tricky because in some ways the executive summary, it's very much a summary of Part 0 plus the rest.

[Laughter]

So it's a little circular. But I understand what you're getting at. Would appreciate other people's thoughts about whether that

would make it clearer or less clear and also thoughts on Daniel's proposal to delete Section VII.

Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. If you not making any further changes to 107 and the subbullets, I have proposed to add -- to consider adding additional subbullet and put it in the chat. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thank you.

Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah, I would argue in favor of retaining Section VII. I just think we need that kind of very public documentation of what's expected at this point. I don't know where people are going to get that elsewhere. So I think we should retain it.

I don't view it as controversial. I'm not sure why Daniel got that impression.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Is there anyone else who wants to delete Section VII? I'm sorry, I didn't see -- I'm only following in Adobe. Everyone put

their flag down when I asked that. You guys want to keep it. Okay. Everyone wants to keep it in the room.

Sorry, Daniel.

I think that's a good idea.

Let us come back to the suggestion of Kavouss.

Kavouss, so I think -- if I understand your suggestion correctly, this last bullet in paragraph 109 doesn't capture what you want because you want us to refer to other things in the CCWG proposal that are not specific dependencies from the CWG. Is that correct?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. I put any other relevant that may arise or arising from. I just disqualified both qualifications. So if the CCWG output related to the transition directly would have any relevant item, that would be added to that. That is just a placeholder without saying what that would be. It would save us, that we are taking into account that, in fact, you have established or designated two layers onto CCWG. And it is the duty of those to indicate that it might be something that you just cross-reference, or it may be nothing. But is there any other relevance? Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So what do people think about this? Have people seen the bullet? So I'm assuming it would go -- well, but there's only -- this is only relevance to names. Yeah, see, that's the thing? It's -- I don't know. I fear we've tried so hard the whole time to be very strict about the fact that we're cabined by the CWG proposal. And that's the proposal that's in here. So to go down the path of now linking to the CCWG work, I think, is a little bit of a slippery slope for us. And I -- and, again, I think we've -- what we tried to do at the top is say that this is just the current list. It's not the definitive list. And I expect that, out of the CCWG process, there will be a whole other list of whatever needs to happen as a result of the implementation of that proposal. So I think it's just much simpler for us to leave this as is. Yeah. Go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: If you want to leave as it is, perhaps you should put a day chapeau paragraph "including the following." That means there might be something else. I don't know whether that "including" is there. But -- so -- this list is non-exhaustive. Maybe something else coming. Either you put it there or you write "any other." And that "any other" does not strictly relate to the naming. It is the whole thing. There are many things that may have some impact on this. Because you're talking of the termination of contract. The national contract is not about the naming only.

There are many other things that are discussing. So either put "including the following" and then no problem or add that one, "Any other element that may arise" instead of -- "that may arise."

Yeah.

ALISSA COOPER: Tell me if I'm doing this according to what you're expecting.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Put "include" after items. "Items including." Okay. I don't know. I'll leave it to you to find a good place that covers that is non-exhaustive.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. People look at that and think about how they feel about it. Lynn.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Lynn St. Amour. I was going to say, basically, what you just said with respect to not adding that extra line under names. But I think we've moved on since then or are in agreement that it's not appropriate to include that reference to the CWG there. If we feel a need to put something there, then perhaps we add, you know, a phrase or something up here. But my preference

right now would be to leave this as is. And it reflects work at a point in time that we use to evaluate the proposal overall, and it's not meant to be something that we continue to track new items going forward.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Lynn. Martin.

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

I must admit I feel very, very nervous about -- at this stage with this sort of list suddenly introducing something that almost introduces a randomness into what somebody might put in later on. It seems to me that we've got a very clear definition of what is needed. And we've got a very clear way of knowing whether that has been met. And that is the CWG turning around and saying, "That's fine. Go ahead."

Therefore, in this particular case -- normally, I think I would be on Kavouss's side on this. But, in this particular case, I think making it sound like there is more is not in our responsibility. And, therefore, I think we limit the list. And then that last bit I do think needs to be there, because that is our test. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks. Mine is related to bullet point number 4: Transfer of staff. Yesterday I heard some discussion about that, about whether this is feasible or not. So this brings me to the question whether it should be taken as-is or just saying staffing is PTI and transferring the resources to PTI rather than transferring the staff.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. I was actually just realizing myself that that is an edit that I failed to make.

If I could scroll properly.

So I had a back and forth with Lise Fuhr about this. And this is what we came up with. Can people see that? No. Can't see it? Can I post it in the chat? I can read it. But I think I should write it to. It says, "Coordination of staff PTI including transfer of resources to PTI." I'll type it in the chat, and I'll talk about it.

So I think Lise had suggested something a little simpler yesterday, which was staffing and resourcing of PTI or something along these lines. Lise felt that -- I mean, she's sympathetic to the overall concern. But she wanted to kind of

separate the staffing from the resources because, while the issue that Elise raised is very true for the staffing, is not really true for the resources. So that's where this came from. Why does the mouse hate me? Okay. So I'll put that out there. People can think about it. But thank you, Wolf, for raising that. Daniel is next.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Thank you, Alissa.

So on that score CCWG as a communicator, at least the chair of the CCWG, I'm in support of that change. I'm also totally in support of what Martin said. It's beyond our purview to introduce anything else under the heading ICANN's required by the names proposal. I also think that paragraph 107, the language there is the current list of such items is totally sufficient and doesn't need to be further change of that. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thank you. Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. For the item of the staff, I suggest that we don't put coordination. Staffing and associated resources. I don't think

the coordination required. So this is different to the ICANN. The only thing we could say as our part that PTI should be staffed. So staffing of the PTI together with the associated resources. Thank you. So delete the coordination before.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thank you. Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah, I just flagged that I must have missed the part where you discussed what was the problem with the PTI's separation of the resources. Was it a feeling that the resources could be transferred but the staff would take longer than the next year?

ELISE GERICH: There's not a problem with staffing the PTI, per se. The language indicated that all staff must be transferred. And people have free will of working in the U.S. And so you can't make people -- so it was more of a mandatory statement of what staff had to do.

MILTON MUELLER: So it's not a question of people straddling the fence between ICANN and IANA. It's just a question of nobody can tell Elise that you have to go work for PTI. As much as we would like to.

ELISE GERICH: Exactly. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So I think this -- staffing of PTI including transfer of resources to PTI. Is that what you were suggesting Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Daniel is next.

Go ahead, Daniel.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Thank you, Alissa. I would caution -- since Alissa discussed this with the chair of CWG and they came up with wording, I would strongly support to use that wording, unless you have a real, real, real big reason to change it. Because it just is not good to first do coordination of the change and then deviate from it. So I strongly support the original wording that Alissa put in because it's coordinated with CWG. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: So that's fine. I think, if everyone feels that they can live with the coordination of staffing language -- put it back. Is that what it said? I think that's roughly what it said -- I will do another confirmation with Lise and Jonathan, since, you know, we're going to have to clean up this document and so on anyway. But just to make sure -- but, if people can live with this, then, unless I hear otherwise from them, I think we should stick with it. Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, Alissa. I am sitting in the ICG, not on the CWG. I don't like the coordination of staffing. It has no meaning. Coordination. What coordination is to be done? The only thing that PTI should be staffed, that's all. But coordination of what? What does the coordination mean? CWG made many statements, but does it mean that we convene all of them? Has no meaning coordination. What does PTI should be established. Should be staffed, that's all. We should staff that. Staffing. But not coordination of staffing. Coordination of staffing means what? Go with the staff and coordinate them? What? What does coordination of staffing?

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So I think, because we have to go back to them anyway, I will just take this issue back to them and see if the more clear

language works for them. And we can resolve this after we hear back from them.

I don't think they're -- is there any objection if -- to the bullet without the word "coordination," if we can get the agreement of the CWG chairs?

ELISE GERICH: Could I just suggest maybe saying assigning appropriate staff and resources to PTI as a proposal to them? Just as a proposal to them?

ALISSA COOPER: I have Alan in the queue. Alan, save us.

ALAN BARRETT: I'm sorry Alissa. I don't think I can save you right now, but I have a related point. In the FAQ we said something about we expect all IANA staff to be and resources or something -- I don't know the exact words -- but we expect all of that to be transferred from ICANN to PTI. So, if that's not accurate, let's fix it in the FAQ as well as in this document.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thanks, Alan. Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I think we should remember that the issue we have in ICG is that there is a very specific wording in the CWG proposal. And, just like Daniel said, if we're going to write something different than from what the operational community told us, are to be very careful. So I think I'm happy, as a member of ICG, not as a vice chair, to just ask Alissa to talk with the CWG chairs and just resolve this issue. Because we know what we want, and we know what the goal is. And we have no idea whether this would be new employees of PTI, whether, actually, we'll be moved there, whether there will be consultants that are actually employed by different organization. And, if that case, maybe that organization they are still hired by is ICANN or whatever. We have no idea.

But the wording in the CWG proposal is a little bit unfortunate. So I think we should just move forward and ask Alissa to talk to the CWG chairs and come back with a text that they're happy with.

ALISSA COOPER: Alan, are you still in the queue. No? Okay. Daniel.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Thank you, Alissa. What Patrik said. Absolutely. And, in the unlikely event that CWG doesn't want to change the language, we should keep it as it is right now. And then quite confident that you, Alissa, can solve this with the CWG chairs. And let's move on. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Paul.

PAUL WILSON: I was just going to suggest a move on as well. I made the comment yesterday that I think this section is useful but, in fact, optional because implementation is not up to us. And all we're doing is providing some helpful indication of what we understand the implementation steps to look like. So I really don't think wordsmithing is particularly important, because it's not authoritative or definitive. If it comes across to anyone in that way, I'd like to clarify that exactly that it is not authoritative or definitive. It is simply a list of what the ICG at this time of writing sees as a general list, a non-definitive list of implementation issues. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Kavouss and then Mary, and then we will move on.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Everyone wants to move on. I want to move on. If you could like to take whatever the CWG said and -- I don't think that talking with the chair of the CWG is reflecting the view of the entire group. I think if you want to quote what they said, put at the end "as appropriate," leaving that appropriateness of doing that or not. I don't think that the whole staff will be transferred.

That is something thought as ambitious work for staffing. Put "as appropriate," and you cover the situation. And somebody decides on what is appropriate and what is not appropriate. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Mary.

MARY UDUMA: Mary, for the record. Please, can you read what you just typed under.

ALISSA COOPER: Staffing of PTI, including transfer of resources to PTI.

MARY UDUMA: Something that is proposed. I think staffing and resourcing of PTI works. But I don't know about the works, but resourcing -- staffing and resourcing PTI makes a lot of sense, because you don't have to add any other thing. And I think this section is very, very important because it's part of RFP. We ask them to give us -- what is it called? -- implementation of the proposal. So I think it's important for us, this section. But, as Kavouss said, if we're retaining the words of the CWG, we can put the "appropriate" at the end.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So I think this is, apparently, sufficiently contentious that we never should have gone down the path of editing it in the first place. So here's what I think we have -- here's what I think our options are: I will write to Jonathan and Lise. I will say this is the language in your proposal and that you gave to us in the implementation inventory. This is the issue that Elise has raised in the ICG, which we all agree is a real issue.

If you believe that is an issue, offer us alternative words and we will put those in. And, if we don't like exactly what you suggest, we will stay with what they have in their proposal, which is transfer of staff and resources to PTI. I think those are our only choices at this point. Because we can't agree among ourselves

what this should say. So that is what we will do. I will take an action to write to Jonathan and Lise.

Okay?

Okay.

Let me look at my list of what else we had to talk about. So I believe we are also closed on paragraph 107. I haven't heard anybody else come back to 107. So my intention is to leave 107 as is. Now I have people back in the queue. Paul, are you back for more? No? Okay. Kavouss, are you back? And Russ Mundy, go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY:

Russ Mundy, for the record. Actually, since we're right here physically in the document, I put it in the chat a little bit ago. But the section just prior to the section VII where we're at in the document is -- and I think it's a result of how we've structured things and gotten here. The actual ICG recommendation is buried as a subparagraph above it. I think we should take the ICG recommendation and whether we -- even if we delete section VII, whatever we do with section VII, I think we should use the exact wording and the exact naming. But that should be the very last standalone section, Section VIII or whatever in part

0. So it's clear, it stands out distinctly, and it's at the highest level we have in the outline of this section.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Russ. So the proposal is that we would take this section E and it would become a new subsection, VIII after VII, assuming we keep VII. I agree with that. Does anybody disagree with that? Okay. I will make that change. I won't do it now because the formatting of this document is very fragile.

Okay. So I consider our discussion about section 7 to be complete. And also the discussion about adding history or implementation to the executive summary, it sounds like there was not strong support for that, although I will go look and look and see if there's anything we should say to point to the history section in the executive summary. So those items are closed.

Just want to check, I think I got confirmation from Paul that we're good to go on the .ARPA references, the new .ARPA reference? Yes, Paul is nodding. Okay. Good.

So then we come to -- I think there's four people, or I guess there's sort of five sets of -- well, somewhat editorial changes that came in last night. I had Mary sent some, Alan, Lynn had some, and Daniel has proposed some and then we have the question on capitalization of the words "names," "numbers"

and "protocols," "protocol parameters." So what my proposal is here on these is, I would like the people who are suggesting these edits to think about if there are any of them that require substantive discussion. So I'm happy, as this sort of editor of this document, to take -- you know, Alan had a lot of -- there needs to be a comma here and there. I'm happy to go look at those and insert them but didn't have time to do it before today. But if there's any of them that you feel weren't substantive discussion with the group, then we will move to those now. I definitely think that Mary's and Daniel's are in that bucket, that we should discuss them as a group. The capitalization one, we should -- we'll sort out for sure as a group. But Alan, think about if there's any of yours that we need to have that sort of discussion around. Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Could we easily resolve the issue of capitalizations? I just ask, is there anybody against it? I think it should be capital naming, protocol, and so on and so forth. So please take one of them out. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

So that's fine. I'm happy to take it now if people think it's straightforward. My question is, do people want those terms

capitalized only when they appear before the word "proposal" or in every instance? Go ahead.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Alissa. This is Jean-Jacques. As the person who brought this up, I'd like to say that it's very easy and I'd like this cleared up so that you can attack more substantive questions.

As someone from the user community and not from the technical community, I would say that it makes more sense for the users to see capitals in names. If you see in a sentence names with a small n, you know, it takes times an effort to understand what it's about. So I'd suggest you put throughout names with capital N, protocol parameters with two capital P's and numbers with a capital N so that it becomes absolutely clear for the user community what it's all about. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, thank you. But just one more clarification, this would only be in the executive summary in Part 0, because we're not editing the contents of the community documents.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: This is Jean-Jacques again, I think that it should be, for the sake of consistency, really throughout the two documents. If the

commenters forgot or thought preferable not to put capitals, that's another business. We owe it to the overall community to make things absolutely clear. So I suggest it be the same in the two documents.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay. I'm not sure what you mean by the two documents. I just meant through the whole 200 pages, but I think this is going to be more contentious than it should be and we have other substantive issues to get to. I thought maybe we could close on it, but if that's the proposal, then I don't think we can right now, unless Manal is going to save us. Manal, last word on capitalization and then we're coming back to it later.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Alissa. I think there's a misunderstanding. I think Jean-Jacques is referring to the summary report, right? I mean the ICG report, Part 0 of the proposal and the summary report of the comments, right? Those are the two documents you're referring to. And not the operational community proposals. This is what I understood. Thank you.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes. Actually, I'd go a bit further than that, Manal, and suggest that we harmonize the whole damn thing. Because after all,

we're doing this not for our fun. We're doing this for the whole community. So make it readable for the whole community.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay. Thank you. We'll come back to this later.

We were due to have a break right now, and so I think we should do that and tee up -- over the break we will tee up the remaining substantive issues, Mary's, Daniel's, anything from Alan, think about if -- we'll come back at 11:30 and I'll ask you if you have any -- and Lynn, if there's any of yours that I know didn't make it to the list, think about if we need to discuss those, and then we'll come back to capital letters. So we'll break now and we'll come back at 11:30.

[Break]

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Can we please get seated? Can we please get seated? So I would like to -- I've been talking a little bit with people and would like to try to close the issue with capitalization because we have some major issues to talk about later this afternoon. So I would like to hand over to Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. This is Jean-Jacques. Alissa, coming back to the position I defended earlier on, I'd like to make a statement that after thinking about it and again and discussing it with some colleagues, I can accept the proposal, the compromise which was suggested by Manal which is to have the capitalization certainly in the Part 0 of our text and the summary of review of comments, and for the rest I would leave it up to secretariat and yourself to decide within the proposals of names, numbers, and protocol parameters whether you'd do it. But certainly in those important introductory parts which are our own work, it should be clear. And in any case, in front of the word "proposal" I think there should be a capital names or numbers or protocol parameters. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I agree with that, and perhaps we should end this discussion, go to the other items immediately, and the proposal of Jean-Jacques has a logic because the proposal from naming and number and the protocol coming from them, perhaps we should have less input on what they have sent to us. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Is there anyone that objects to the proposal.

ALISSA COOPER: I'm sorry.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Just no.

ALISSA COOPER: Only in front of the word "proposal" or not?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: I'll have to call my lawyer.

[Laughter]

No. I mean, we're joking. No, honestly, in front of proposal, yes. And in our summary, as I just said, we should put capitals. I don't see, by the way, why it would pose a problem because --

ALISSA COOPER: No, I just want to know what to do.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Right. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So that is how we move forward. Thank you very much. And Alissa, over to you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. I would like to first -- do we have Daniel back? Yes, Daniel is back. So Daniel, you had sent, I think, two proposed edits to the executive summary. Do you feel that we need to discuss those or are you willing to sort of allow editorial discretion in the final editing of this document to decide whether those get in or not?

DANIEL KARREBERG: Thank you, Alissa. This is Daniel. To be just very clear, I had suggested to strike two sentences from the executive summary but retain them in the related paragraphs in the proposal

proper. These are just for readability and as soon as there's one person objecting to them I'm quite willing to drop them. Since Russ has already objected to one of them, which is the X016 one, I withdraw my proposal. And the other one, either speak now or hold your peace and then I would say if nobody objects, make that change. But I don't want us to spend any more time on this. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay. Thank you. So the -- the proposal was in X16 and 17. And 16 we will leave as is because Russ has objected to the change, and 17 the proposal was to delete the part after the comma, this part that we're -- where Daniel's comment is already existing. So the question is, if -- so the proposal from Daniel is to delete the highlighted portion only from the executive summary, not from the Part 0 where it also exists. Does anyone oppose this proposal to delete.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

(Off microphone).

ALISSA COOPER:

I don't know. I don't recall the motivation. He didn't actually list a motivation. Daniel, can you speak to the motivation?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Yes, I listed the motivation. It's purely readability. I leave complexity in the executive summary, in my opinion.

Did that get through?

ALISSA COOPER: Go ahead, Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: The paragraph -- the highlighted paragraph needs to be shortened, but I don't think it can be deleted. You do have to note a dependency there. I'm sorry.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. We have one objection.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Okay. I'm withdrawing my proposal.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. We'll leave those in. Okay. So then the next one I wanted to turn to was Mary. You had a proposal to the mailing list regarding the executive summary as well. Do you want to leave it to editorial discretion or would you like to discuss it?

MARY UDUMA:

-- to put up my motivation for proposing. If you can put it up. They have it. Okay. I read through the summary first and second time. On my third reading I felt that the aspect that the proposal summary should be done in such a way that even if you don't go through the rest that you know exactly what each of the -- of the communities -- what they're coming up with, what their proposals are. So I tried to put bullet points so that if you're not -- for the executive -- for the business executive and the newcomers, up front you know already what their proposal are and they're eye-catching and they make impression. As you continue to read the rest of the -- of the document you'll always remember that there are three proposals from the names, there are three from the numbers, and there are two from the -- from the protocol parameters. And you can -- they can easily refer back to it and say okay, this is what we're talking about. And I kept reading until I got to where we had a diagram. The diagram became so confusing in my head, but when I came back there, I was able to trace that this is what we're talking about. Those are the proposals -- I mean, the main -- the key proposals from these communities. That's why I said it's easier for -- for reading and it makes a first line impression of what we're talking about. Thank you. I'm happy to withdraw it if people don't accept it.

ALISSA COOPER: So just a follow-up question, Mary. Did you delete any words or you just changed the formatting into the bullet format?

MARY UDUMA: The -- I just changed the formatting. I didn't delete -- delete most words except to change verbs that are -- you know, instead of saying creation, I said create.

ALISSA COOPER: All right. Okay.

MARY UDUMA: I didn't change most words.

ALISSA COOPER: I understood. Okay. Okay. So the floor's open to -- to have thoughts on this proposal. Do people want to make -- so this is just a formatting change, essentially, in the executive summary. What we have now is paragraphs of text. Mary's proposal is to change these three paragraphs to lists of bullet points.

Go ahead, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL: If it's just a matter of format changes from a paragraph to a bulletized list, I think I'm fine with it. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Michael. Michael is nodding as well. Yes, Lynn? Nods all around. Milton likes it. Looks like we have consensus to make this change. So we will do that.

All right. So next, Alan.

ALAN BARRETT: Right. Alan Barrett speaking. I sent some updates to paragraph 069. And I see -- my comments were based on Version 5. But, Alissa, you've already edited that paragraph in version 6. I'm not sure if Jennifer is ready to project my suggestions. We've been struggling to cut and paste the right text. Let me just wait a minute to see if we can project that.

ALISSA COOPER: Is this the jurisdiction text?

ALAN BARRETT: No.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay.

ALAN BARRETT: This is about the -- sorry, yes, yes, it is the jurisdiction. Yes. I wanted to make the language sound a little more positive. And, Alissa, your edits have already done that. So I think I can withdraw my suggestion. But I would like to project it anyway before we finalize that decision.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So, yes. This was, again, difficulty of trying to do all of this overnight.

So, Joe had sent updated text to the mailing list about jurisdiction because we had the conversation in the context of the public comment summary document. But it's the same -- the three paragraphs that were in the public comment summary document were the same as the three paragraphs in the transition proposal.

So I had gone ahead and taken Joe's text which seemed to have good support and replaced the first of those paragraphs with his text. So that's what you saw in version 6 of the transition proposal.

ALAN BARRETT: Okay. Thank you, Alissa. I'm satisfied with your edits. And so I'll withdraw my proposal for edits to this paragraph.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. We will all look at that together after this. But did you have any others in your list? I know you had a lot of editorials.

ALAN BARRETT: Most of the issues in my list were very small, punctuation changes or very minor wording changes. I think the largest change was the addition of some clarification around IANA functions operator. So there was several places where I said please change "IANA functions operator" to "IANA functions operator for names" or "IANA functions operator for numbers," that kind of thing. Those were the largest changes. The rest were even smaller than that. And I think they should all be non-controversial.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thank you. Then we'll add those to the list of editorial changes to be made.

So why don't we look at jurisdiction text. So can we go back to the transition proposal?

Okay. So paragraph 66, 67, and 68 deal with the issue of jurisdiction. We previously, as you can see had a different paragraph 66 which we discussed yesterday because it's in the

public comment document. And Joe had sent a suggestion to the list for a replacement of paragraph 66 which now appears in this document. I had seen a lot of people chiming in on the list saying that they liked this change that Joe had proposed, which is why it made it in to what we're looking at now.

So I just want to confirm that people find this acceptable and there's no objections to that change or anything in 66, 67, or 68.

Go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Could you kindly clear them one by one? It might be better not to have difficulty take them. 67, and if no comment, you go to 68 and do 69. It might be better.

ALISSA COOPER: Sure. 67 and 68 were not changed just so people know.
Milton, did I see a hand? Go ahead, Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Just a general question. If we see sort of missing articles or copy editing kinds of errors in these, what's an appropriate place to do them because I'm not sure I will go through the whole thing again and pluck those out. So if we notice them in this

discussion, should we flag it? Or should we just shut up and do it on the list?

ALISSA COOPER: Send them to the list today.

We'll talk about the final edit process. I don't know what it is yet.

Michael?

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Michael for the record. I don't know whether that falls in the basket of Milton, but "consideration proposal." Yeah, okay.

ALISSA COOPER: Ah, okay. I see.

Is that what people believe it was intended to say? Yeah, go ahead, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL: Probably it was "a limiting factor in considering the proposal." But, again, same meaning.

ALISSA COOPER: I will flag this as turn it into English later. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: If you are finish with 67, I have some comment on 68.

ALISSA COOPER: So any other comments on 66 or 67? Okay, go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: On paragraph 68, we need to capture what is in 66. So the last but one line when we say "identified by CWG," I suggest to add "to address the jurisdiction in workstream 2 seems to be an appropriate way of continuing this work." But not "is," seems to be put it in this way. But after the CCWG we could add "to address the jurisdiction" -- or "the issue of jurisdiction" and then replace "seems to be an appropriate way of continuing this work." Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. Any other comments on this? No? Okay.

Lynn, did you have edits that you think warrant discussion in the group? I know they haven't appeared on the list, but...

LYNN ST. AMOUR: I have just two, I think. One was in paragraph 7 on Version 6, the last line, I think, talks about legacy. And it's not about legacy

but more about the operating reality. Right there. It's on this history and legacy. And I think it's actually built on the operating realities. I just thought that was a slightly stronger comment. I mean, again, that's not a huge one.

ALISSA COOPER: Is that the suggestion?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Yeah.

And then the other one, in paragraphs 14 and 26, I think those were the only two places. It actually says, "The ICANN PTI IANA functions contract," and I was actually suggesting that we change it to say, "The IANA functions contract with ICANN" or "PTI." But, again, that's just more in terms of keeping consistency with the way we...

Right, it is the second line from the bottom of paragraph 14. So, again, just rather than saying it is the ICANN PTI IANA functions contract, again, this isn't a big deal. But I think in keeping in the spirit of how we were talking about it, it is the IANA functions contract with ICANN-PTI. And if the ICG wants to make that change, then that would be in paragraph 26 as well.

ALISSA COOPER: So I just want to confirm with the names folks that that still accurately reflects the contract. I just sort of thought the contract was with PTI. And this ICANN-hybrid PTI thing is a little confusing. Go ahead.

MILTON MUELLER: I think Lynn is right. It should be IANA functions contract with PTI or just the contract with PTI. "The IFR would have the ability to recommend a separation process that could result in termination or non-renewal of the IANA functions contract with PTI."

ALISSA COOPER: Any other comments on that? I think that's a good change as well. Go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: What is IANA functions contract with PTI? Talking of ICANN contract with PTI for IANA functions. So what you're doing, ICANN will have a contract with PTI IANA functions in that sense but not the reverse, yeah.

MILTON MUELLER: It's true. We could say, "Termination or non-renewal of ICANN's contract with PTI" or if you want to be more precise, "ICANN's," possessive, "IANA functions contract with PTI."

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Both of them are good. I have preference for the first one. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: I'm sorry. Can you repeat the first one?

MILTON MUELLER: It was just "ICANN's contract with PTI."

ALISSA COOPER: Everyone okay with that? Okay.

All right.

And 26, Lynn, you said is the other place a change needs to be made?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Yes, paragraph 26.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay? I believe that brings us to the end of people who had suggested things on the list yesterday. Did I miss anyone who suggested something on the list or in the meeting that we haven't discussed? Yes, go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: If I remember, Joe had something when his line was interrupted and we don't know what he wanted to propose. This morning, yeah.

ALISSA COOPER: That was on the other document.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Manal, could you please refresh our mind?

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes. This was on the other document. And apart from that, he wanted to say something. I don't have anything more to add because I didn't hear really what he was trying to say. So I hope maybe when he gets connected, he can send it over email. But this was the summary document. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you.

Okay. Oh, Mary. Go ahead, Mary.

MARY UDUMA: Thank you. This is Mary. Paragraph X004, when I read this paragraph, it seems that it downgrades what we actually do. It said, "The ICG was tasked to help." The word "help," I don't know if it's the correct word.

Should I wait for people to get to that paragraph? It looks to me like it downgrades the mandate and the task. Are we just helping?

ALISSA COOPER: The proposal is to delete the word "help" in X004. I certainly feel like we did a lot more than help. Happy to delete that. Elise?

ELISE GERICH: So in paragraph X009 --

ALISSA COOPER: Oh, can we maybe -- I thought you were responding to Mary. So comments on Mary's proposal to delete the word "help" in X004. Manal is two thumbs up. Kavouss -- oh, the whole GAC is thumbs up.

[Laughter]

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: No, I'm not representing the whole GAC. But never, ever anyone could assure or ensure anything, nor assuring, nor guaranteeing. That is a fact. I'm not opposing to Mary's proposal. But perhaps you say something else.

If you want to retain the word "assure," you have to put another word before that, not "help." But I cannot hear, Alice. "The ICG assure the proposal met the articulated NTIA requirement." We would never be in a position to assure that. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: What was the second thing you said, Milton?

MILTON MUELLER: "Ascertain."

ALISSA COOPER: Maybe it's easier to leave the word "help." "Ascertain"? Kavouss? "Ascertain."

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Slightly better, "ascertain," yeah. Ascertain or assure. I want to say "endeavor to assure." But you say "ascertain" -- I don't want to. It's okay. Yeah. Mary, I apologize to you. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Are you good with this? Better? All right. We got rid of "help."
Okay.

ELISE GERICH: So I did send some email, and nobody liked the idea. But it's about X009. And, since we did have the conversation about the administrative staff and related resources will be moved illegally to the PTI, it's the same topic. But I don't know if we could soften the way it's said.

I also don't think that that it's explicit that the other two proposals said that they would -- that they agreed with that concept. But, you know, we've interpreted it offline that they would.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So I want to understand the nature of your issue with this. Because I think maybe I didn't quite get it still. So is this back to the issue that some of the staff might not want to be transferred? Or is it a different issue?

ELISE GERICH: Well --

ALISSA COOPER: I understand the second piece about it not being in the proposal. But the first one --

ELISE GERICH: Yeah, first, if this language -- it says, "Under the combined transition proposal, the administrative staff and related resources" -- yadda yadda -- "currently covered by the NTIA contract would be legally transferred to PTI." So we're making an assumption -- and I think what we're saying is that the PTI will be appropriately resourced. The fact that we're saying that we're transferring staff again, that's my concern on that sentence. It's really all about appropriately resourcing the PTI, right?

ALISSA COOPER: Use the cue and your mics. Daniel.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Thank you, Alissa. I think it's important to note that there's a transfer of resources. It's not about resourcing PTI. But some resources need to be transferred to PTI, specifically, the registries. And I think the CWG is recognizing that. And that's why the language we were discussing, like, an hour ago was like it was. So let's just differentiate very clearly between staffing

and resourcing PTI and transferring resources from ICANN to PTI. Because they are separate issues. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks, Daniel. And that's a good reminder. Because we had this conversation on these bullet points that, again, here this is text directly from the CWG proposal, which is why it's written the way it was. We didn't write it. We just copied it from their proposal. Next, I have Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, Alissa. I think we referred to CWG for the third time there. They're not the people properly aware of administrative issues in the ICANN. Transferred of staff of the ICANN to PTI was very vague things. I think we will discuss that, and we talked it was staffing PTI with associated resources. That means budget and so on and so forth. And that was naming. Sorry, I was absent in some of your discussions whether the two other communities they have agreed. But in the CWG report it says this is up to two other communities to indicate or pronounce what they wish and how they wish, whether they want the current situation in ICANN remain unchanged or whether they also want that the staffing relating to dealing with their activities of those two communities will also be, let us say, an inverted comma, transferred to PTI. So the issue are two dimensions. First dimension is not transfer

of the staff. It dealt with that issue before. Staffing the PTI with associated resources. What will be done, how will be done, it is not up to us to discuss. That is an issue is entirely depending on ICANN because PTI is affiliated part of the ICANN for the time being, if it is not separated.

However, that is the CWG naming. Whether the two other communities are also supporting or endorsing that situation, that, I just leave it to you because you're dealing with everything. I was not there when we discussed that. Sorry, I was always in CCWG. But I have maybe missed that situation.

There are two issues. Please, kindly, address them separately. The first one I think we have separated and dealt with before. Staffing the PTI with associated resources. Very general. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Kavouss.

Daniel, you're back in the queue? No.

Oh, sorry. I'm sorry. I'm using Adobe. Go ahead.

ELISE GERICH:

Yeah, so maybe -- I feel like I'm not communicating well. So I'll try one more time.

This section is called, "Proposals Summary." That's the title. And paragraph X009 seems to be a summary. And, if we took this summary from the CWG proposal, then that's the language they use. But I thought what we were doing is a proposal of the combined transition proposal. So this paragraph says, "Under the combined transition proposal." I don't know whether the CWG wrote those words. I thought we wrote those words.

So, under the combined transition proposal, we're saying that the administrative staff and related resources, processes, data and know-how currently covered would be legally transferred.

So the only suggestion -- and I think Daniel hit it on the head -- is that this is to say that in the combined proposal, the expectation is from this group, the ICG -- because this is our summary of the proposal -- is that the resources necessary to do the IANA functions will be transferred to this legal entity.

We may have taken the list that was from the CWG wording -- and I'm just saying that's potentially not the right list, because it says staff, et cetera. Do you see what I'm saying? I don't know that this is CWG language, because it's our proposed summary.

ALISSA COOPER:

Yes. So the CWG language starts with "the administrative staff." That's for sure. I think the issue is that the transfer of the

resources, processes, data, and know-how are sort of unequivocally supported and a very important component of the names proposal.

The transfer of the staff, I think, is the difficulty. Because, perhaps, although it was written that way, people appreciate that you can't force someone against their free will to be staffed, right? So I guess the question is: Is there a way to convey that here? And are we comfortable doing that? Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Just coming up with a way that would duck that whole issue. Basically, here it is hot off the fingers. "Under the combined transition proposal, the IANA functions operator would become a separate legal entity, PTI. ICANN would contrive with the PTI for the performance of the naming functions."

ALISSA COOPER: I see. Okay.

Can you say it again? Or I guess it's up there.

MILTON MUELLER: Yes, I have it written. Do you want me to send it to the list?

ALISSA COOPER: Just put it in the chat, so we can look at it.

MILTON MUELLER: Okay. Essentially, you're just not talking about transferring, which is for the lawyers to work about and the staff members to worry about. The whole point of this is not to transfer things. It is to create a separate legal entity.

ALISSA COOPER: I'm just putting it in so people can see it. I understand it's not agreed. Go ahead. Sorry. I have a queue. I missed the queue. I will put you in the queue, Kavouss. Martin.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks, Alissa. Martin Boyle here. Yeah, I'm reasonably okay with what Milton is proposing. It's nice and short, which is always an advantage. But I got us a little bit of a question in that I think this paragraph was primarily about ensuring that the new PTI had the necessary resources for it. And I think Milton is a little bit ducking that as a question.

Meanwhile, I certainly agree and accept Elise's comment. And I suspect that, in the pressure of trying to get this done, nobody ever thought that we couldn't just tell staff that you've got a new job and you're starting Monday.

But I wonder whether we could get around it by just including a specific reference to the availability of resources to the PTI. And then the operational detail is how do you make sure that you get those resources into PTI. And that is a sort of level of detail that I have got no desire to get involved in whatsoever. It's the fact that PTI should be able to do its job independently when it is created. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: So is the proposal that we return to the language that was there but we delete the phrase "administrative staff"?

MARTIN BOYLE: Well, staff is, obviously, an issue. If staff don't want to transfer, as Elise has pointed out, you can't make them. But then that leaves the PTI with the job of making sure that they have recruited staff to do the job, which --

ALISSA COOPER: I'm just asking about the text. I understand your intent. But you didn't answer the question.

MARTIN BOYLE: In that case, repeat your question.

ALISSA COOPER: My question is: If we revert to the old text and just delete the words "administrative staff", does that solve everyone's problem? I understand you were in the queue. Does that solve Martin's problem?

MARTIN BOYLE: It ignores my problem. But I'm quite happy to do that, because it gets us through this stage of the drafting.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Alan.

ALAN BARRETT: Alan Barrett. My suggestion was very similar to the one you just raised, Alissa, just at the meeting starting. I would suggest to say, "The necessary resources, processes, data, know-how," et cetera, et cetera, "will be legally transferred to PTI or from ICANN to PTI." So not exactly deleting the reference to staff but replacing it with the word "necessary."

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

JARI ARKKO:

Jari Arkko, for the record. I think I agree with Alan's suggestion. What we can do easily is to abstract the text and include all the details that were in the original piece. But we should not individually pick items out of it, but we should try to replace with the necessary resources or all necessary resources, some such. And I think that's, actually, the right thing to do here. I also like Milton's text. But I was kind of like -- you know, independent different change.

And, you know, we can certainly do both, if needed. But I do want to see the resource part listed here, because it is important that the resources get transferred and not get left behind. Because, otherwise, it will be kind of pointless.

And, finally, I just wanted to say that I very much sympathize with Elise's point. And she's right, of course. And all of us were a bit too quick in composing this thing. But I do want to point out that we're still -- we're editing the beginning part of the document. And this -- the full thing will be later in the document. So, in some sense, we're doing the right thing. But it's a little bit of a feel-good measure, because it will be elsewhere still. And we don't change the rest.

ALISSA COOPER:

Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Sorry. I agree with everybody. But the text proposed by Milton, if it's amended to say that "together with necessary staff and associated resources." That's all. We wanted to establish an entity, legal entity, PTI. That legal entity, if it does not have staff, has no meaning. That entity, if it had a staff without resources, also is nothing. So should have entity with staff and the resources. That's all.

How it is transferred, that is on something else. And that is we don't get into that business. Because we're talking of the combined proposals and so on and so forth. We should just start with the subject but not the modality how it's done.

And I have some doubt about we're talking about transfer of know-how. This is a critical issue. We leave it to them. So we say, Milton, plus together with necessary staff and associated resources, all required resources. We address all the issues. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: So I think what I'm hearing is that people like using the word "necessary" to describe what should be transferred. And we don't want to just take the phrasing that's in the CWG proposal and take one thing out, because that would be awkward. So I

used Milton's further suggestion and added the staff back in. Go ahead and get back in the queue. Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: We're back to saying that staff are being transferred.

ALISSA COOPER: That's a problem.

MILTON MUELLER: Just take staff out. Or what I put in the Adobe chat was maybe more acceptable. There was -- where did it go?

ALISSA COOPER: I think this is exactly what you put.

MILTON MUELLER: Not quite.
Where is it?

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, the necessary resources would be transferred from ICANN to PTI.

MILTON MUELLER: No, no. Later than that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Under the combined transition proposal.

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah. This is so hard to find things. There it is.

MILTON MUELLER: "Under the combined transition proposal, the IANA functions operator would become a separate legal entity, PTI, with the necessary staffing and resources."

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I can live with that.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. I have Kavouss and then Lynn and Alan in the queue.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I agreed with that, because that was exactly what I proposed.
Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Sorry. It's hard to keep track. Thank you. Lynn.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Lynn St. Amour. I like these words as well with respect to the staffing wording concerns. But now I'm wondering if it conflates a little bit the IANA functions for names with the other operating communities as well. Because it starts out with "Under the combined transition proposal."

But I've gone back and forth in my own mind about some word suggestions to change that. And I'm not -- I don't know if I'm reading too much in the fact that it starts "Under the combined transition proposal, the IANA functions operator." And maybe the question is to the numbers and protocol parameter communities. When somebody says, "Who's your IANA functions operator for numbers or for protocol parameters," do you say ICANN, or do you say PTI?

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Lynn. Other people want to comment on that, that would be appreciated. Alan.

ALAN BARRETT: Thanks. Just two comments. First to address Lynn's question. I think in the numbers community we say that our IANA functions operator is ICANN but that the work will be subcontracted to

PTI. So I don't have concrete suggestions for how to word this in X009, but I think we could find something.

And then on to the reason I raised my hand, could we say something like "The staff will be given the opportunity to transfer"? Does that address Elise's concern?

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Okay. Go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: We don't get internal business of ICANN staff should be given. That is not our business. We are coordination group for that. The point raised by Alan I raise it before. What we're doing up to now is the naming proposals. Whether the two others we have to add something, maybe in the next paragraph, that ICANN would have a contract, so on and so forth, I agree something is missing here to deal with the requirement of the two other that they want that there should be a contract, continuation of contract with ICANN, however ICANN could subcontract that to PTI. Sorry.

ALISSA COOPER: Alan, are you back in the queue or still in the queue? Okay. Elise.

ELISE GERICH:

So that's sort of -- Alan's and Kavouss' leads to my second point with this paragraph which is a sentence that's in about the middle of it. It begins with "ICANN would subcontract to performance of the protocol parameters and numbering functions to PTI." I did raise this piece on the list. I don't think I was clear what I meant. But neither the protocol parameters nor the numbering functions proposals said that they would subcontract to an outside group. I believe that on the list people said that there have been side comments that indicated that the numbering community and the protocol community -- protocol parameters community do not oppose subcontracting to the PTI, but is this something that the ICG is saying will happen or that is it like the IPR issue where one community said that, you know, that the IPR issue must move to someplace else and the other two communities said well, they would agree with that but it wasn't part of their proposal.

So that's just a question because this is the upfront summary, and anyone who doesn't read the 10 pages or 50 pages or however long this will be usually will read through the executive summary and the summary proposal, if nothing else, and that will leave the full knowledge of what they think the proposal is.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Oh, we have the two fingers? It's really -- if people can use Adobe for the queue, it would help me out a lot. I'm really losing track of the order. But go ahead, Alan, and then I will try to establish who I think is in the queue.

ALAN BARRETT: Thank you. I'd like to respond to Elise. I think that ICG made the determination that the way to combine the three proposals was to put it all into PTI and let ICANN subcontract to PTI. But we're not explaining it very well. This paragraph needs some wordsmithing, and I don't have words right now. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. I have Demi, Michael, Kavouss, Milton. Demi, go ahead.

DEMI GETSCHKO: Yeah. This is Demi. In the same line as Lynn said and Elise also, I think we are assuming that this -- that this is the composed -- the combined proposal. And this, of course, came from the CWG, the necessity to have the transfer functions to the PTI. The other two communities accepted the possibility to do that. But we -- we are being too much affirmative on this based on just one of the three proposals. And it's better to find a mild language on that, in my opinion.

ALISSA COOPER: So for the other people who are in the queue and anybody else, I'm getting a little confused here because I think someone's going to have to decide who's going to perform the functions. So if we are saying that the proposal is unclear about whether all three function will be performed by the PTI or not, I would like to know. I thought we were very clear on the fact that all of the functions will be performed by the PTI. Yes. Yes. Go ahead, Elise.

ELISE GERICH: That's actually my question. It's the ICG that's very clear because the written proposals that we've included do not say that. Our summary says that we've made the assumption that all three functions will be done by the PTI because the numbering proposal says that they will have an agreement with ICANN. They do not reference any third party. The protocol parameters proposal says that they will have a contract or an agreement with ICANN. They do not reference -- and I know it's a nit and if the ICG decides that this is the position they will take in reviewing it, that's fine. I just think, like Demi said, it's a little more affirmative than what the proposals themselves say.

ALISSA COOPER: So I don't think this is a nit. I think this is actually very core. And I think we had a long discussion about this and we had back-and-forth with the communities and we have comments from them on the record where they all say exactly this, that the PTI will perform all the functions. So I don't think this is like the ICG is suddenly making this up at the end of the process. I think this -- we had a substantial debate about is this the way it's going to go and we had a lot of back-and-forth and we have confirmation from everyone. So if we need to make that more clear here, that's fine. But that's --

MILTON MUELLER: Could I just say something? Elise?

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah.

MILTON MUELLER: The reason those proposals don't say anything explicitly about it, because they were written six months before PTI was concocted by the names community. That's why. So after the names people came up with the idea of separation, we went through the process Alissa just described of consulting with them and it is no doubt about the fact that the description of what's going to happen in this paragraph is accurate. All we're

doing, all I thought we were doing was trying to clear up this issue of transferring resources. So there's -- there's just -- I don't like the way we've been -- sort of gotten balled up in substantive issues when all we're trying to do is fix the wording related to the transferring of staff.

ALISSA COOPER: Go ahead, Elise. Yeah.

ELISE GERICH: So I had two issues, both of them, they were both. I apologize if I missed the consultation that went with the numbers and protocol like -- I followed the one where we did it with the IPR, where we sent out an official request to them, we got back official answers. I missed that we had that official communication in an email thread with the CRISP team or with the IANAPLAN where we asked this explicit question. If that's officially been done on our list, I'm sorry and I apologize for that. We can move on, then.

ALISSA COOPER: We didn't ask. They just said it in their comments. That's what -- we didn't have to ask, hopefully. So I know that we have a queue. We're also trying to get to lunch. So what I'm wondering is if we could maybe a few people sit during the lunch and try to

-- try to clarify what -- what is not clear in this paragraph. If anyone who's in the queue objects to that, I understand. Kavouss may, but that was going to be my suggestion, rather than continue. You guys all want to go in the queue? Okay. We'll run the queue instead. You've been waiting a long time. So I think I had Michael next actually.

MICHAEL NIEBEL:

Thanks. Michael, for the record. I was -- I have one proposal and one -- one question. The wording what you used, Alissa, before, I think can be used on the combined transition proposal. "The IANA functions will be performed," rather than "become an operator." So we get the -- Lynn's problem, who is the operator, out of the way.

The second element that I would like to raise is, I've -- is the question to the community -- the operating communities, is it sufficient to say "with the necessary resources" or is the word "transfer" which was in the -- is that essential of data or whatever it is? And that's a question also if you tried to fix the new text in the break.

ALISSA COOPER: So I think the -- does that first suggestion resolve the operator issue? "The IANA functions would be performed?" No? Okay. Well, you're next in the queue, Kavouss. Go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Alissa. I don't think you need to do anything more than what you have for the following reason: One, the first one is say "under the combined contract," then you said that there would be a need for a legal entity. Good. That legal entity has staff. Good. That legal entity and the staff have resources. So everything is placed there.

Now, coming who do what, you could do it in the sense that ICANN would contact with PTI for what? For performance of the naming. Good. Then you quote the requirement of the protocol and the requirement of the numbering. And then at the end you say that ICANN would subcontract for these two things. You have said everything you wanted to say. You don't need to add anything. Read the text again. It's perfect. Read it again. Just with one minute before lunch, delay your lunch for one minute and you have everything there.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Michael, are you -- Michael, I think you are -- I had you out of order in the queue, so I think we have Daniel next.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Thank you, Alissa. And just for the record, I would express again very clearly that you made a good summary of what transpired in our communications with the numbers and protocol parameters communities. I think the paragraph described that - - originally drafted version 6 described that very well. I support keeping it as it was when it was originally drafted in version 6 and just move on based on that -- the discussion about the staff issue is very well on the record now and just -- just please move on before we sort of change the whole basis of the proposal. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thank you, Daniel. Milton, are you -- your flag is up from before. Okay. I don't have anyone else in the queue. Lunch. Lunch! That's what I heard. Lunch! Okay. We're going to leave this as is. People seem happy with it. Okay. Something to think about over lunch. This paragraph, I believe also existed in Part 0. So do we propagate the edits or do we leave it as it is in Part 0? Think about it over lunch. Go get your lunch. We'll talk about it when we come back.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone).

ALISSA COOPER: 1:15. Lunch is in the corner and we will -- we will resume at 1:15.
And if you're still eating, that's fine.

[Lunch break]

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. We're going to start again. I was going to take the minutes at the end, but we are having a little bit of technical difficulty so I was curious if anyone has any amendments that they were planning to suggest to the minutes of the prior two calls.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone).

ALISSA COOPER: No, don't project them. Get this projected in the right version. Anyone object to approving the minutes, calls 23 and 24? Michael Niebel, your hand is up. Okay. Then the minutes are approved. And pretty soon we're going to go back to the transition proposal.

Okay. So back to the conversation we were having before lunch about X009. A lot of people thought that what we had come to in terms of the edit was okay. Some people did not feel that it was okay. So Alan very helpfully sent a suggestion to the list, which I modified slightly and am hoping that this alleviates the concerns, or at least is something that everyone feels that they can live with. So the main innovation of Alan was that this paragraph was sort of jumping into under the combined proposal, ta-dah, ta-dah, ta-dah, previously. And so he has

added a new first sentence which makes it clear what the disposition is of the two communities, other than the names, towards the subcontracting question. So have a look at this and get in the queue if you think that you can't put up with this. I realize there may be some sort of grammatical issues in the paragraph that I will deal with offline, but this is on the big substantive issue. So if you have a problem with this, put your flag up or get -- actually put your hand up in Adobe, please.

Okay. Good. Then I believe we can move on. Thanks. Thank you, Alan, for solving that issue for us. So the other one I wanted to come back to briefly was the bullet points because we talked a Lise in the airport on her way home from Dublin and the bullets in question -- what we talked to her about was coming back to this question of these bullets about the staff and the transfer to PTI and the solution, what we came up with is now there are two bullets, one about staffing of PTI and one about transfer of resources. So Elise is okay with this, yes? Anybody have problems with this one bullet becoming two? No. Martin says it's fine. Okay. No other issues with the bullets. Okay. Good.

So the other thing I just wanted to flag and the secretariat reminded me and we won't look at this today but now in this section, because we are, as you can see on the page actually in the footnote, referencing by URL the spreadsheet, when this

goes out for -- when we clean it up and send it to everyone for one last look on the mailing list, please take a look at the spreadsheet as well because we're incorporating it by reference now in the footnote.

So I think we are back to the question of whether there is anyone who has a substantive issue that they think requires face-to-face discussion of the group. In the whole proposal. Anywhere in the proposal. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Sorry. I apologize. I was absent then. You add staffing of PTI, right?

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, sorry. So we split the one bullet into two so we now have one bullet which is staffing of PTI and one bullet which is transfer of resources to PTI.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Okay. If you would (indiscernible). But staffing is not sufficient. If you have two different bullets, no problem. So it's staffing and resources, yes.

ALISSA COOPER: Good. Okay. So yeah, go ahead, Elise.

ELISE GERICH: I haven't done a search, but I think we repeated some of the language about administrative staff in a different section. So if we could just be consistent and find wherever that is and try to make it consistent with what's in the -- that we've just agreed upon. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Will do.

ELISE GERICH: I could look for it right now if you like.

ALISSA COOPER: That's okay. I'll just put it on my list of things to do. Thank you.

ELISE GERICH: All right. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Alan, you're not -- you're out of the queue? Okay. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. As I do some financial things in my country, I think transfer of resources is not proper term. Are you talking of transaction? I

think provisions of necessary sources, but not transfer of resource. Maybe ICANN has X amount of dollars. You want to transfer that (indiscernible) sufficient for PTI? It is not what you asked. Because one of the issue we're discussing in the CCWG and CWG was necessary budget and in fact we put as an empowerment of community. If budget is not provided sufficiently, then we have the -- the power to raise it and so on. So not transfer of the budget. Providing budget, necessity of budget, provision of budget, but not transfer of budget.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Okay. So the term "resources" has to do with the databases and registries that today is with IANA with ICANN that should be transferred to PTI.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Patrik. I would also again say like per what we decided we were going to go back to the chairs. We got Lise on the phone in the airport, and she concurred that this is acceptable. So those are the choices. We either go with what they say or we go back to what they had in their proposal but we don't really have another choice, I don't think. Okay.

So again, last call for other substantive topics that people believe require a face-to-face discussion on this proposal. I was wondering, Milton, yep, go ahead.

MILTON MUELLER: I submitted something regarding RZM. Basically see if I can dig it up on the -- it should be on the email list here. Yes. We had this sentence in the discussion, it says, "The CWG understands that those relationships will be defined by a separate and parallel process coordinated by the NTIA." Here at the meeting I asked NTIA about this, and they said, we're done. What's going to happen now is that ICANN and NTIA will -- I mean, ICANN and VeriSign will negotiate a contract, and that was confirmed in the public forum yesterday. So I tried to put in a sentence there that reflected that. So now I would have it say "ICANN and the NTIA have made it known that prior to the transition those relationships will be worked out through a contract between ICANN and VeriSign."

ALISSA COOPER: Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, Alissa. With all due respect with those whom you talk at the airport by phone and so on and so forth, for me transfer of

resources is good. Thanks for -- to Patrik to raise that. But we should add and necessary budgets. It's not only data you have to transfer. It is not only the staff that they have to provide in whatever they want to -- new staff or transfer. It is the budget as well. So that is important issue. Resource does not mean only the data. Resource means also budget. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Would you get in the queue, please? Can we let -- we'll come back to the RZM. I would like to close on this. Again, like I don't think we have latitude with these words. Would someone over here like to speak to that? Go ahead, Martin.

MARTIN BOYLE:

Martin Boyle here. I am quite clear in my mind that it is perfectly possible for ICANN to transfer its IANA budget heading and the revenues and costs that go into that heading to its affiliates PTI. And so I think that the wording that is being put up on the screen in English makes very, very good sense. I would defer to any American who has a different interpretation of the English language, because they often do, but in this particular case, certainly in English that is quite acceptable that you are transferring resources which includes the budget. So the wording has my full support. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. So in the queue I have Keith, Russ, Martin, and I'm not sure if you were in the queue to say anything else. Keith and Russ, are in the queue to talk about the RZM? Both. Okay. Can you -- can you talk about this issue first, and then we'll come back? Okay. Go ahead, Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Alissa. I -- I am in full agreement with Martin's statement that from the American version of English that this represents well in this section as far as the depth and the amount of words and the description that -- the concept that we're trying to get at here. Because the words that were actually used by the CWG proposal were difficult words, and I think these are an excellent replacement for them, to do the -- to do exactly what -- what was negotiated over the phone.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. Daniel, are you talking about the bullets or the RZM or something else?

DANIEL KARREBERG: Bullets.

ALISSA COOPER: Go ahead.

DANIEL KARREBERG: I'd like to confirm that transfer of resources includes budget, even in the German version of English, and I fully support using the language that has been aligned with the CWG chairs and we should move on. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. In British version of English, American version of English, and German version of English, they all said that include budget so why not you put including budget to have -- to confer with American, British, German, and all other languages in English. By the way someone says Australian English is the least corrupted English. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. I think -- I think everyone else is in agreement, except for Kavouss, that it -- the budget piece is understood by use of resources, so the proposal is to leave it as is. If you can live with that, Kavouss, I think it would help everyone out.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: To -- I hope if it is the case that you look at the following budget after the transfer of resources, it talks about development and approval of PTI operating plan and budget. So budget is already mentioned in one of the things that needs to be resolved.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, I -- let us consider this one concluded.

[Applause]

Last try. Good luck. Go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I agree because now is in the report that we including budget as well. So we'll leave this with the report of the ICG.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Got it. Great. Okay. On the RZM issue, I was going to ask if anyone objects to Milton's change. Do people want to see it on the screen? You want to see what the change would be? Okay. Give me one second.

Yeah, I -- I know. Sorry. In theory there is a way to choose, but yeah. So I would -- I'm fine with this. I would suggest one friendly amendment, which is that I think it should say "prior to the expiry of the NTIA -- of the NTIA contract."

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone).

ALISSA COOPER: Yes. Sorry. Sorry. It's on the email list. I just pasted Milton's email into the chat room. So just giving people a minute to read it.

So since I offered an amendment, I should probably run a queue. So go ahead, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Alissa. Keith Drazek. I have no objection to the language that Milton suggested. I think it's a good clarification. But I did want to raise one other point, some language that's in here. Is now the time to do that, or are we still focusing on this particular --

ALISSA COOPER: Let's focus on this and come back if that's okay. Yeah.

KEITH DRAZEK: Perfect.

ALISSA COOPER: Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah. I think that I would actually prefer that it not go in, and the reason for that is that we've been quite -- I think quite astute and predictable about things that are in our proposal are somewhere, somehow documented in writing. And the, you know, NTIA has made it -- and, you know, that's -- that's hallway conversations. Although it's probably accurate, we don't really have any kind of basis for it, like we do almost every else -- everything else in the proposal. And so I think we are better off just leaving it as, you know, this will happen without being specific about what we think is going to happen, from what people have said.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thanks. This is Jean-Jacques. I agree with Russ Mundy's explanation, and if we go the way he suggests to strike that out, fine. Otherwise, I would very much like Alissa's proposed friendly amendment to be in there, which is now included in the yellow almost invisible text which is prior to -- to the transition.

Third point, a minor point of language. Those relationships will be specified in a contract because worked out, I mean, it's very vague. It has no legal meaning. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thank you. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, Alissa. There is a difference between that I made known something to the public to that I do that. I made known to you that I invite you for dinner tomorrow night, but I do that is something else. Making known is different from doing the job. So perhaps you have to put it in a way that it is not only made it known. This is a declaration or this is an invitation, a statement, but is not commitment. So we have to say that I'm expected to do that. So that is the situation. I am not of favor of putting that. That is an essential element. But not made it known. Made it known may change tomorrow without any assurance of commitment. Perhaps after that the yellows made it known and are expected that and so on and so forth. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Lynn.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Lynn St. Amour. I actually put my hand up for another point, but I will come in on this one as well. I actually like the addition of the text in general. I also support Kavouss' point, and wonder if we could just replace it with have agreed. If they made it known isn't that equal to they have agreed to do X?

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. I don't --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone).

ALISSA COOPER: Oh, sure. Thanks. Yannis is going to save all of our eyes. So I guess I have two questions. One is if we changed the text that you can't see to -- ah! It's okay. It doesn't matter that much. As long as it's something.

Let me ask my other question which may be directed towards Milton. Do we think like citing a transcript of some particular ICANN session would provide Russ Mundy what he's looking for? And is that appropriate, or would that not work? Go ahead.

MILTON MUELLER: We could certainly cite the statement of ICANN in the public meeting. There would be a transcript that we could cite, yes. I have no objection to doing that.

This is not, though, hallway scuttlebutt. And, indeed, it is an incredibly essential part of the transition. And I think the fact that I said "made it known" is in some ways an accurate reflection of the informality of this process and the -- you know, what I consider the problematic fact that the CWG never dealt with this. So this is how we've learned.

I don't understand what the objection is here. It is an accurate reflection of what has happened and what is going on.

ALISSA COOPER: Go ahead, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks. Again, I will just reiterate my comment earlier. I have no objection to this language. And I will actually say I support the inclusion of this language because I think it is an accurate representation of the comments made this week and sort of the ongoing increased illumination around this topic. And I think that there will be transcripts that we can reference. So I think -- I think this is an accurate statement.

ALISSA COOPER: Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: I would be fine with including the information as long as we get the wording so it's viable and have the pointer to what eventually shows up as the transcript that gives some public documentation for the fact that this is going to happen. The other -- that ICANN has said that's the plan.

The other more general reason that I raise it as an objection is that it's -- it's not clear that, in fact, the vehicle that will be used to reach an agreement would be what would be a formal contract in the U.S. government sense like we have today. It may well be but some type of agreement, you know, memorandum of understanding.

So tying it down to explicitly contract in a way makes it more restrictive. And if we as the ICG believe that ICANN and VeriSign are committed to that, then I'm certainly not going to object to it.

But this really becomes I think an ICG statement based upon information that we have. So I'd be okay with including it as long as we, if you will, get it more tailored for pointers. Yeah.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. One second. Jean-Jacques, are you back in the queue? Are you still in the queue from before? Okay.

Keith, go ahead.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks. Just responding to Russ, I seem to remember that a few days ago, we actually dealt with that same question and we ended up using the language that's just below of a written agreement. And that's my understanding, is that -- my full understanding is that there will be some sort of a contract or a written agreement that will, as we said earlier, be made available for public review prior to the execution. So I think -- whether we use contract or written agreement, I think we're fine either way.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks.

Lynn, are you back in the queue? Go ahead.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Lynn St. Amour. My comment goes to the last statement up there that says, "That agreement should be made available for public review and input prior to execution" because I think in

yesterday's public forum, there were a couple of very clear statements from Fadi with respect to the fact that this was an implementation.

And I'm wondering if we either need more clarity on the fact that there doesn't appear that there will be a public comment in that sense or if -- and this is why I'm hesitating in my construction here a little bit. I thought the interest from people in this room was more to ensure that whatever requirements they had that they wanted to be seen in that contract was, in fact, known. So I don't know if we simply strike "input" or we say -- I don't know. I'm lost a little bit in the construct here between the text.

But I think my two points are, I think it's pretty clear there's not going to be a public comment period. And I guess if the ICG has a strong opinion on that, we should probably get clear on that. If we think that's a true statement, then we either need to strike or change "input."

And I guess the second question is: Does this room believe that they actually want something more visible, if not more formal, with respect to the ability to state the sorts of things one would expect to have taken into account in the contract negotiations?

I think my point of clarity here is I don't think anybody expected to see proprietary information. I don't even know how kind of hell bent people are on seeing financials or any other

information. I don't think that was the intent of the request for additional transparency in the negotiations.

But I'm just not sure that right now this set of collective text we have on the RZM kind of captures, I think, what was made fairly clear in the public forum yesterday.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Lynn. Can we try to close on the yellow sentence and come back? Okay.

So I was going to ask if I could just take a moment to come back because we had a few suggestions. I think Jean-Jacques had asked to change "will be worked out through" to "will be specified in."

I think -- Russ Mundy, I was going to come back to you and ask if you find "written agreement" to be more acceptable than "contract" or if it doesn't matter.

RUSS MUNDY:

I would prefer "written agreement."

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay. It sounds like that would help things.

And then, Milton, I'm going to give you an action to find the link of what we should be citing when we say "it was made known." Is that acceptable? Okay.

Kavouss, you are on the yellow sentence still?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yellow sentence is okay but provided that you do not delete the last part, which is in the blue sentence. Public comment was something important. Public review means public comment whether for ten days or 21 days. It's important.

I suggest if you retain what was before, I have no problem with the yellow sentence as amended. Yes. I have no problem.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. So I think Lynn maybe -- so I think -- let's hold on the yellow sentence. It sounds like we have hit everyone's points? Okay, good.

So, Lynn, maybe to put a little bit of a finer point on it, my understanding is that as a contract between two corporations, there may be portions of this agreement that are not appropriate to be disclosed as part of a public review. And so it would be helpful perhaps to refine what it is that we believe

requires public review and input. Is that the essence of what you were saying?

LYNN ST. AMOUR:

It's close but not quite. And we may need to go back to Fadi and get some clarification. I thought Fadi was pretty clear that this is staff-level work, it's implementation, and that there would be very little consultation, public comment, seeking input from the broader community. That was my take-away from his two specific interventions.

And the last sentence actually says "input." So I guess I was trying to smoke out whether or not there's a clear expectation from people in this room that there would be some kind of request to the broader community for input. And then depending on the answer to that, we would need to reflect that in the text here. That was one formulation.

The other formulation is I never heard this room -- and I don't think when all is said and done in the community that people were looking for those things to be disclosed, the proprietary information or financials. I think it was more about engaging to ensure that the things that the three OCs feel that they need to be reflected in an agreement that provides services to them have, in fact, been heard and are either implemented in the contract or, if not, that there's actually feedback and

engagement to ensure that that loop is closed. I mean, this is after all a service that's actually done to the three OCs. I don't know if that was any more clear. If not, maybe somebody else can help.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks, Lynn. That's helpful. I would just say I know we're about to have a giant queue here. So, again, coming back to seizing the day and making sure that we're trying to finish this, so keep that in mind when you make your comments.

I would just say to come back to the fact that this is us stating what we believe the requirement is, which is maybe different from what actually happens, because we have acknowledged that some of this is out of our hands.

So I think we need to remember to focus on that despite new information we may have received this week. This should still in the end be a clear statement of what we think the requirement is and reflective of what we heard in the public comment period.

So I have Russ, Kavouss, Michael and Jean-Jacques. Russ and Keith. Sorry.

RUSS MUNDY:

Thanks, Alissa. Russ Mundy again. It was, I guess, a couple of phone calls ago when we were talking about the particular RZM issue. And I tried at that point to sort of lay out the taxonomy that there's two significant and substantially independent pieces to the issue. One is does the ICG believe that a written agreement is required to be in place prior to the termination of the contract? And I really believe we have full agreement on that. Getting the words right, okay. Fine.

But the other piece of the amount and type of public review or public input, public insight of any sort into the agreement prior to its being actually executed is something I think it's less clear that we have within the ICG full agreement on.

And yesterday in the public forum, I heard Fadi say more than once that -- I understood him to say there wouldn't be any insight to it before it happened. It would get done. As part of implementation, it's just going to happen. And it will keep moving along. But no public input or review. That's what I heard him say.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks, Russ. Sure, I missed you in the queue anyway. Go ahead.

KEITH DRAZEK:

That's okay. Thanks, Alissa. Keith Drazek. So I think Russ has that half right. What I heard is that there will absolutely be an opportunity before the contract or agreement is executed that it will be posted for public review. The transparency will be there.

But that there is not an intent to have a formal public comment period in the ICANN sense.

And so -- I think -- to Lynn's point, I think the concern -- the last sentence there I think is fine except for the concern that the word "input" might lead people to believe that there will be a public comment period on it. And I think we heard very clearly multiple times yesterday from Fadi in response to the dozen inquiries on this topic. He was pretty consistent throughout that this is a staff-level implementation issue, not a policy question that's going to require sort of a formal public comment period.

So maybe the way to address this is to either remove the word "input," which was suggested by Jon Nevett of this group three or four days ago. And I, at that time, accepted it. I thought sure, no problem.

But, based on Fadi's comments over the intervening couple of days, I think that may be a little misleading now.

So, if the word in input" is the problem, then maybe it's something else, like consideration, feedback. I don't have a

word right now at the tip of my tongue. But, anyway, that was my takeaway from the public comments that I heard this week. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I -- first, irrespective of what, who said at any time, we are ICG. And we have to be clear.

I agree with Keith Drazek that "input" is a little bit very vague. Perhaps a public review and comment but deleting the input. But I don't want to delete the whole thing. This is important.

It should not be -- it should be clear and transparent. And it is not on the operational community. It is an entire community. And they want to have an opportunity, if they deem appropriate, to comment on that. So public review and comment. Delete "an input" because input may be less than input and so on and so forth. But comment may be anyway. I do not want to delete that portion. This is very, very important this public review and must be retained. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Michael.

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Michael, for the record, I concur with Kavouss and with Keith and with you, Alissa. This is what we say. And it's not so important that we get instructions from one of the contracting parties what we have to think.

So I think -- but always taking into account the -- any confidential information that is proprietary to the contracting parties.

ALISSA COOPER: Are you proposing that as an amendment to the text? Or do you think that is understood, the part about the confidential information?

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Our discussion is on the record.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. I'm not -- I didn't quite get that. But that's okay.

Okay.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Can you be more precise? Do you want text -- do you suggest a change to the text that is currently there?

MICHAEL NIEBEL: No.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Russ Mundy.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Alissa. Russ Mundy again. Just want to make clear to the group that I -- I'm not opposed at all to having this be -- the sentence be present and so forth. And I think it's very good that we're aware of what the CEO has said with respect to these issues.

But I'm in 100% agreement with those before me that have said this is what the ICG thinks. And that's where I guess I was trying to push us towards earlier is the decision of does the ICG believe or not that there should be some input of some sort or some insight into the agreement prior to it being executed?

I've actually heard a couple different people say a couple of different things. And, personally, I'm -- you know, I'm in no opposition to it at all. But I've heard people say, well, it's a contract and -- you know. So I think that's really our first thing.

We need to make sure we clarify if anybody objects to having a statement by the ICG that input or review before execution or whatever the right words are present. Because this is our document.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks Russ. Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Yes. So I agree -- it sounds like we're all agreeing that we should not be trying to effectively chase what we think is going to happen and put it into this report. While we do need to accurately -- the reason I proposed this change originally was simply that the statement in there was wrong. And I put something in there that I thought was a correct statement of facts.

But, when we get into these normative, you know, statements, has the word "should" in it, we are speaking -- or what we're saying should be defined by the proposals and not by what we think ICANN and NTIA is going to do.

So, in that respect, I would still support my proposed language with the additional minor modification. But I think the problematic sentence becomes the last one.

Now what we were contemplating, when we talked about public review and input, was any major change in the roles and some kind of understanding of the long-term nature of this relationship between ICANN and the RZM.

And I think that that's what the proposals are calling for, even though the CWG again did a bad job of specifying that for the short term.

I think we have to say that, for the long term, you know, these things do need not only to be transparent but they need to be subject to approval by the community through the new accountability mechanisms.

So I think that means that we do have to rewrite that last statement, perhaps, to clarify the distinction between the short term and the long term.

ALISSA COOPER: Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I don't know why we are escaping from some facts. And that is that it should be transparent and this transparency requires to have public review.

We may replace "input" by "comments." We may replace "input" by "feedback." But the structure of the sentence is correct, and we have to retain any of the two, either -- any of the three. Either input or comment or feedback. Any of the three. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Keith, go ahead.

KEITH DRAZEK: So thank you, Keith Drazek.

Yeah. And it's probably getting into semantics at this point, and we probably need to move on. But I would agree with Kavouss' suggestion which may have been reflecting my suggestion in chat that "feedback" may be the better and more descriptive term than "input." Input suggests that you will be giving something ahead of time or providing, you know -- submitting something ahead of time. Feedback is having the opportunity to review something that's been posted before execution. And I think that's the more accurate statement in this regard.

So either remove "input" or replace "input" with "feedback" or leave it as it is and let's move on.

ALISSA COOPER: So this is clearly a fraught area, as we've noticed over the last several weeks of discussing it in various times. I'm wondering if we should just take the temperature and say is there anybody who can't live with what we have up there right now, who really feels that this is an inaccurate representation or that it's -- you know, the ICG's abdicating its responsibility if we do this? Okay.

Russ. No?

RUSS MUNDY: Is "feedback" the word there now instead of "input"? I can't read it.

ALISSA COOPER: Sorry. Yes, feedback is the word there. Input has been replaced.

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you. I'm in full agreement with that.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thanks, Alissa. This is Jean-Jacques. A quick remark. I agree with feedback. But I just want to remind that, in the ICANN context, "review" is a very specific and connotated term. A

review is something which is initiated by the ICANN board. It requires the composition of a working group, et cetera. So I would avoid the word "review" and stick simply with "feedback."

Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay.

Milton and then Elise.

MILTON MUELLER:

Well, I think the public review versus feedback question is not that serious. I think I would prefer to just eliminate input, feedback, et cetera, all together. Because in cybernetics, which I studied, feedback does mean you're affecting the outcome. You're not actually just sounding off about it.

But -- and I didn't think, Jean-Jacques, that the term "public review" implies a major bureaucratic requirement. That it just simply means to most people transparency, that you get to see what's there.

But all of these suggestions, I think, can be easily resolved. The problem for me is I think we need an additional statement that says something to the effect that going forward -- in other

words, the long-term/short-term distinction, going forward, any changes in this role has to be subject to, you know, a community approval process

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: If I may rebound on that. Review has two meanings in the ICANN world. I'm speaking as a former board member. One is public review. And, in that sense it is called, actually, public comment. So there's a specific process for that.

The other meaning of review is the review -- periodic review, which is initiated by the ICANN board. And that is under the leadership of one of the members of the Board.

So it's just to avoid confusion that I'm proposing that feedback, in that sense, is probably -- gives more latitude. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Elise.

ELISE GERICH: I find myself at least partially in agreement with Milton about the word "feedback."

I think that, if we say for review and feedback, there's an expectation that someone's going to act on your feedback.

They'll either come back and say we don't accept your feedback, or we will adopt your -- you know, or make modifications based on your feedback.

I do think what we can interpret from what we've heard in the public comment time yesterday or were the statements that Fadi has said is that it will be available. And, Jean-Jacques, I don't know if this is the right use of "review" -- available for review for transparency purposes. It's going to be posted. It will be available for people to read so that people know the details. But I don't believe what I heard in the public comment is that, you know, any feedback after it's posted will be taken into consideration to change that agreement. So I would hate people to be misled by the use of "feedback" in this sense

ALISSA COOPER:

We'll go back to Keith. But just, like, one more time. This is what we think the standard should be based on public comments received and our own consideration of the matter. Like, the parties might not deliver on that. And then we individually can harangue them about having not delivered. But I think that's really important. Like, I understand what they're saying they're going to do. But, if we don't think it's enough, then we should say what we think they should do. Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Alissa. Sorry for dragging this out. I know we need to move on, as we said. I support Elise's comment and Milton's comment in that, if we simply leave it to review for transparency purposes for the current phase, the longer term concern, if there are any changes down the road, whether it's a renewal or a change in provider, that that be subject to public comment. Like a formal public comment community-based approach.

So I think maybe that's the path forward is that, if we don't lead people to believe something about the current phase in terms of the public comments or anything like that or input at this phase. But it's absolutely a requirement moving forward. Does that work?

ALISSA COOPER: Milton. Oh, your hand is up. I -- was that from before?

MILTON MUELLER: Oh, good. I'll just -- yeah, I meant that. Yeah.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Permanently in the queue.

MILTON MUELLER: Right. Again, agree with Keith. To me, this long-term/short-term distinction is important. Based on what Alissa said, if you want to leave "and input" or "feedback" in there, that's true. That should have happened. Although what really should have happened is for the CWG to deal with it, which is why I'm ambiguous on that question. But it really is essential. And I'll volunteer now to write a sentence that we can tack on to the end of that, that we can put it to the list and we can move on?

ALISSA COOPER: That's a welcome suggestion. I was actually thinking it's possible to do it all in one sentence. So maybe think about that. But, anyway, we have Kavouss. And then I think we will move on.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I think we try to solve something, we get another thing. If you want to make it, I would say, made publicly available, and then why it is required to be prior to the execution. Publically available. That is all. Why you need to link it to the prior to the execution? You put prior to the execution in order to get something back. If you don't need that made publicly available, finished. Delete prior to executions. So we're trying to totally destroy the whole thing one after the other.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So here's what I would propose, actually, building off of Milton's suggestion: I think we have enough agenda here for the rest of the day that we're clearly going to blow on probably right until 5:00. So that means we're going to need another break. And what I would ask is that on the break, Keith and Milton and Jean-Jacques and anybody else who wants to hover around get together and propose some text for this. And we will come back to it after the break. We will shoot for a 3:00 break probably. So is that okay? Yep. Okay.

All right. So back we are again to the question of if there's anything else that people believe in this proposal requires substantive face-to-face discussion that we haven't touched on already. Okay. So now we're going to look at the -- You have something? Go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: At the top I propose some changes. You said you come back. Status of the --

ALISSA COOPER: That's where we're going right now, the disclaimer.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: I was just trying to update it. Just give us one second to get that updated.

Okay. Sorry about that. Word problems. We had to move into a different document because of formatting issues. But this would go on the title page. I think Alan has made a good suggestion that we put the name of our group on the title page. That's, I think, accepted without objection.

But this is the disclaimer that would go at the bottom of the title page. This is what it looks like right now.

Go ahead, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL: So do we need "indeed"? I think this is -- I mean, if -- we can either remove and delete "indeed" or even delete the whole sentence. But, yeah.

And another quick remark, I think we had it somewhere that the ICG will seek confirmation from the CWG that its accountability requirements have been met. So if we add "accountability," thank you, the very last sentence.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. I see.

Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Did you consider what I sent you? I send you on the chat. Until the time you find that, I don't believe that we need in paragraph 2 the text starting "implementations (indiscernible)." I oppose to that. Not only I don't agree, I strongly oppose that.

ALISSA COOPER: I'm looking at you, names and numbers people, if we delete that. This is just the title page of the document, remember.

Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN BARRETT: Yes. This is Alan Barrett. I think it would be appropriate to delete the text which is highlighted in blue right now, "implementation," et cetera, is proceeding. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Go ahead, Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Can we say "The ICG will obtain confirmation" rather than "seek."

ALISSA COOPER: We have been saying "seek" the entire time.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (off microphone).

MILTON MUELLER: Seeking doesn't mean you find, okay?

[Laughter]

We have to get confirmation.

ALISSA COOPER: "Seek and obtain." You know that's where we're going to end up. We are going to end up at "seek and obtain."

Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Alissa, I hope people allow me to say this. I have done this work 40 years in United Nations. You seek the information, expecting to obtain that. If we don't obtain that, you don't pay any attention to whatever they do and you go ahead with what you

want. So you seek information. It's not obtain information. Seeking information with expectation to obtain that.

"Seek" means that you need to go ahead and obtain that and ask them, remind them, remind them, remind them. Give me that even. If you fail to do that -- so if Milton kindly agree his English is much, much, much better than me but "seek" is a proper legal word.

ALISSA COOPER: Who is going to blink first here?

Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK: Keith Drazek. Would you like another word suggested?

ALISSA COOPER: Of course.

[Laughter]

KEITH DRAZEK: I suggested earlier in the week actually in this section instead of "seek" to use the word "to secure." That actually replaces "secure and obtain." We will secure confirmation.

ALISSA COOPER: Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL: I'm flexible. But just to highlight that any new word we might have to go and change it again throughout --

ALISSA COOPER: We definitely will. This text appears several times. So, yes, that's a good clarification. I assume that whatever -- whatever we change here, we will change in every other location. Yeah. "Secure"?

I see a lot of support for "secure."

Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Disagreement, if you don't need to go through the whole text and change whenever you have "seek" change it to "secure." "Secure" is also a legal alternative for "seek." Secure agreement, seek agreement. I have done it for years. But if you have to do the whole text, I leave it to those who have time to do that.

ALISSA COOPER: Just in this specific sentence, it appears several times. So we would just change it in this specific sentence. It's not hard to do.

Milton, we're okay with "secure"? Okay.

Jari?

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko. Agreed with taking away of the one sentence. I suggested two more words to replace that in the remaining middle paragraph, just to highlight, as I like to do, that some things are really for implementation. And I'm sorry that I keep laboring this kind of a point in many cases in our discussion, but I care about it.

ALISSA COOPER: Sorry, I didn't catch what the words were?

JARI ARKKO: Okay. So they were in the chatroom. In the paragraph that says blah, blah, blah "proposal are complete, ready for implementation, and have no dependencies" and so forth.

ALISSA COOPER: I would also then propagate this change into the document in the same place where the sentence appears if it's agreed.

So how are people feeling about this? Any further issues? Go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: No option to disagree, Jari.

[Laughter]

ALISSA COOPER: Great. Okay. Going once? Going twice? Lynn. Sorry, go ahead, Lynn.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Sorry. Lynn St. Amour.

I'm just wondering by "any other remaining process" if that might be interpreted by those that are approving this that we are not waiting on them or dependent on them at all. And do we want to be that aggressive or that direct even if that might be what is meant?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes!

ALISSA COOPER: I don't know. I wrote that. That was my intent.

[Laughter]

LYNN ST. AMOUR: I'm pretty clear is a stick a finger in their eye. I'm just saying do we want to stick a finger in their eye rather than do what we can to support approval.

ALISSA COOPER: I'm all for the finger sticking.
Go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: For those who are behind that, would it be harmful if we delete that or any other remaining process? It's too broad. I think for concerns of the two famous communities we've covered, in my view, even if we delete "all any other remaining process." So I suggest consideration of deletion of that. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Jari?

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko. So, I mean, we should do the correct thing. It really is the case that there is nothing further required before this could be implemented. In fact, we tried to go forward already as

we do, basically, every year. So I don't see any reason to not say the truth in this document. Some people may still believe that they need to provide an approval. That's fine. It's not that -- I don't think we're sticking finger towards anybody. It's that we -- we just want to get this done. And this is -- this is the actual situation with the dependencies. So I don't see any problem with that.

ALISSA COOPER: Lynn.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Lynn St. Amour. Just one quick suggestion. This is on the very first page of the document. What if we just stop after "dependencies"? Numbers and protocol parameters portions of the proposal are complete, ready for implementation, and have no dependencies, "no further dependencies" or something like that.

ALISSA COOPER: I would object to that. I think it's important to call out, but that's my personal opinion.

Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL: Actually, I see Lynn's point. But because explicitly the phrase "or any other remaining process," I think even excludes the numbers and the protocol parameters community from further coordination and dependencies in the implementation phase even, right? I mean, there was some commitment to coordination and things that might occur in the future even.

I'm not talking about the current status. I mean, we can state facts that they are complete. They are ready for implementation but not to exclude anything that might come up in the future. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I'm sorry, I cannot agree with you. When you say, that means dependencies on what? They are dependent on many things apart from all these transitions. So I suggest we delete the word "any," "or other remaining process," "on other remaining process." Delete "any." That will satisfy Jari, I think.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: I will certainly go with the majority of the room here. My last comment is I note that we are, in fact, sending this document into a process.

ALISSA COOPER: Well, this is just for now. This won't be there when we send it obviously. That's the whole point, I hope.

Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL: No, it's okay. I was going to suggest that we stop after CCWG, like Mr. Arasteh mentioned. Again, I see this phrase excluding both communities from any future coordination that might be needed. Again --

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko. Just a quick response to that. Obviously when we -- it's ready for implementation and obviously implementation in itself isn't excluded from the implementation effort. So we may need to do some coordination or some work in the community or some thing as part of the implementation, right? Like what we did with the IPR. We defined that what we had here is the plan, and then there's a bunch of implementation, some of

which may include, like, a community review of some arrangements.

But I think that's part of the implementation. So, I mean, I don't think that itself is so much what's meant here.

ALISSA COOPER: Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: We are toward the end of the day, so I suggest we retain the sentence as amended. However, at the end of the process, please do not add E-S. Process and processes, correspondence and correspondences, you don't say "correspondences." Therefore you don't say "processes." Correspondence, process. Process means could be singular, could be plural depending on the situation. So delete E-S and retain as it is. It is not perfect but at least covering point of everybody.

MILTON MUELLER: I object.

[Laughter]

You can't do that. If you take out "any," which you suggested, you have to say "processes." You can say "any other remaining process" or you can say "or other remaining processes" because

"other" is indefinite. So it can refer to any processes, any of a number of processes. That's just English.

So why are we talking about this?

ALISSA COOPER: What do you think?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Agreed. Go ahead.

ALISSA COOPER: So people agree with this? Some definition of like. Don't hate. We are good to go on the document status.

Okay. So here's my suggestion, I think we should take our break now, have the people get together on the RZM sentence so that we can close. And when we come back, we will talk about we might talk about the status update, if I can edit it during the break properly, and the process going forward. And then we'll move on to ICG work during implementation.

Michael?

MICHAEL NIEBEL: My apologies. But I had based my departure on the most recent -- flight and the most recent planning. So I'd rather go forward.

But if you think that you have to do this and not do a break -- if you rather wanted to finish some wording on the break, I decline.

ALISSA COOPER:

Yeah, I think the issue is that people need to do a little bit of editing in order to get to the next topics. And I think the topic about ICG work during implementation is quite longer than we want to extend. I mean, it will be very late for the break if we take that now. But I'm open to agenda innovations from the floor.

Did we lose Keith anyway? Keith go to the GNSO?

So that's a problem if Keith is in the GNSO because he is supposed to help with the RZM sentence.

I'm sorry, Russ? He's going back and forth to the GNSO.

Let's look at the agenda.

Okay. So we're going to charge forward, since people's flights might be leaving. So what we're going to do is we're going to switch to work of the ICG during the implementation phase. And, when people get really tired or start leaving for the airport, then we'll take our break. And then we'll come back to wrap on

the RZM sentence and possibly on the status announcement that we will put out when we put this document out. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Purely editorial. Are we talking of document or we're talking of proposal? Status of proposal, status of document. What document? It goes at the beginning of everything. Is this a document or status of proposal. And I wish to put it in that way, status of proposal. But is a document, what document are we talking? Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Got it. Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: I'd like to speak to the next agenda item. So I don't know if you're starting on that. You tell me, okay.

Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Patrik is going to start that.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yes. We have Alissa and a few others will work on the text of the things that we'll bring up. But, in parallel, and I will try to -- to

discuss the role of the ICGs. We can start that discussion. Jean-Jacques, please.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Patrik. This is Jean-Jacques Subrenat. So, right from the agenda item, I think that it's slightly misleading, at least seen from the user community. Because it seems to suggest that there are really two lives.

There's the drafting of the transition proposal; and then there's a sort of after-life, which some have called hibernation, for instance. And I think that this is not appropriate.

In the mind of the community I represent, this distinction between drafting and implementation is artificial and, to a certain point, arbitrary.

This differentiation is not substantiated, for instance, in our charter nor in the fact that the NTIA asked ICANN as a facilitator to convene the membership or to gather the membership of the ICG.

Because of what I've just said, actually, the ICG is the only unit or entity which has legitimacy and which has standing.

So, whereas, we fully understand that the operational communities will, as a matter of course, have a great role in the

next steps in the implementation, that is beyond question. However, many of the consequences or implications of transition and the implementation of our proposal will affect or will have some bearing with the rest of the communities represented in the ICG.

So, because of this, I think that, instead of using approximate expressions like hibernate, et cetera, which don't really have legal value, I think we should use the term "we remain constituted."

As our chair has suggested already, this would be in any case until the end of September 2016. And she even specified in what way we would do this. We would keep open our mailing list. We would reassert our availability to our various communities for questions or commentaries. And, of course, that would be a good thing. But I think remaining -- as I said, remaining constituted implies more than that.

In the case the NTIA on its own initiative and on its full criteria or later on transmitting some objection or questions from the U.S. Congress were to put questions, it is our belief that it is the whole of the ICG which should be appraised, which should be given that question or that comment. And not only this or that part of the ICG.

If I were a member of the current board of directors of ICANN -- and let's say -- imagine that I were on the finance committee of the Board, I would, of course -- because the ICANN is, in fact, paying for this, I would have some concerns about the cost of continuing of pursuing all the services provided through ICANN to the ICG.

I'm fully aware of that. And I propose that the ICG co-chairs ask the members of the then now defunct special working group to convene the secretariat to resume its work and perhaps to find a solution with the secretariat so that we find a light sort of arrangement with our secretariat so that, if they desire, they may remain, but not on the same level of involvement, at our service until the end of September 2016.

But this is a detail I would not like to develop here that remains to be discussed among us.

What I am saying is that I'm aware of the logistics and the cost of maintaining some sort of even minimal activity for the ICG until the end of September. But what I'm saying also is that these considerations should come after the maintenance or the affirmation of some principles rather than the other way around.

So, yes, there may be problems logistical and financial. But then we should settle them.

So, in resume, I would suggest that, going forward, we should considering the ICG as a unit, as an entity, and not accept any breakdown or specialized roles of any parts of the ICG. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. Mohamed.

MOHAMED EL-BASHIR: Thank you very much, Patrik. I'm talking as my community hat, not a co-chair representing the at-large community.

I'd like to emphasize as well that ICG is the only group currently to have the wider representation of all the stakeholders, not the operational communities only.

And it's important that this group not to be disbanded and this group to continue. We need to discuss about the exact role. There is discussion or at least talk about hibernation or being there ready to be -- wake up if there's a need for us.

But the at-large community does not support that we disband this group. It's important to keep this group. And we can discuss any logistics required for us to continue, if needed. But I think this is the composition of the stakeholders here

represented here in this group is important for the whole transition.

Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you. Kavouss.

KAVOUSSARASTEH: Yes. For the reason read by Jean-Jacques or said by Jean-Jacques and in addition to important element raised by Mohamed that ICG is the only group is widely represented that any other community that up until now have been discussed in CCWG, we're talking of seven communities, ICGs composed of 13 communities, has well representations. And not only -- just to complement what Jean-Jacques said. Not only questions raised by Congress, but before going to Congress, NTIA may have some questions. And they come back to ask those questions.

And I would think that the operational community would not have any difficulty, that we'd all be consulted in replying those questions.

And after that ICG -- the NTIA given that to the Congress, there might be new questions raised and that NTIA would not be in a position without consultations of the community to reply to

that. For that reason, I fully support the proposal of the two previous speakers. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. I thank everyone for using Adobe Connect and raising their hands there. But I'd also like people to take down their hands. Michael.

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Thank you. Michael. I first take down my hand.

So I agree with three previous speakers. And I think we have, on the basis of our discussions preceding the Monday engagement meeting already announced, that the constitution of the group as a body until the 13th of September. I think that was your proposal, Patrik. I think the point -- contact point for the NTIA is very important. And that was kind of confirmed also in discussions with -- you -- I also think it's important that the feedback loop is -- remains installed with using the word "feedback" with those who are participating in the CCWG as our contacts. There has to be a process. It just didn't float and then single stars in the sky.

And then there -- I think there's -- we should have some humbleness in saying that we do not know all the issues or all the questions that might arise also from people that are not

presently in the discussion. So we have to be prepared also to have reflection on that.

So this is, basically, supporting what has been said without adding too many more arguments. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Okay. So, in general terms, I hear that people would like to -- I don't think we need to use too many words to say that we support the previous speakers. So I would like to move the discussion forward. So, if people have more details to say, otherwise, I think we can take down the flags. Because it might be the case that we have more details about our role.

Thank you. Thank you for that.

So what I see is that, Jean-Jacques, if I summarize what you said, the proposal is that ICG remains constituted until September 2016, available for questions. And you also note the potential extra cost in operations. But that's an implementation issue that I'm not worried about that can be discussed. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. But Michael said something more important. Because of the continuation of activities in CCWG, the liaison of ICG, CCWG should remain in place. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yeah, he used the term I wrote down specifically that Michael used. The term terminology that the feedback loop is still in place. That's what I wrote down for Michael. And my apologies for not mentioning that explicitly.

Okay. To me, that implies that we have consensus of -- or continuing to have ICG constituted and then the re-evaluated. So that was easy.

Martin. Oh, sorry. Martin Boyle, please.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thank you. Martin Boyle here. I actually, find it very difficult to accept the points of view that has been made by the previous speakers. And I think a lot of my problem is that we're being very, very vague about what we see would be the role of this committee going forward.

When we first set up, we saw our role as being very, very clearly the coordination of a combined proposal that would then go via ICANN and into the NTIA.

Now, I'm quite happy for us to maintain a watching brief going forwards. I'm quite happy for us to be ticking off and making sure that things that we've asked for to be done. But I'm also

highly conscious that the actual proposals have come from different multistakeholder processes that were specifically aimed at ensuring a practical implementation.

And what I don't want to do -- and the reason I am very concerned is that this group then starts getting drawn into an interpretation exercise or a reinterpretation exercise that, essentially, starts having us trying to substitute ourselves for some of the other communities.

So I'm not saying no, we shouldn't. And I'm quite happy for us to maintain a watching brief. But I would like us to be very, very clear as to what we see our role and, in particular, where we safeguard our role so that we are not substituting ourselves for what I would see as being the appropriate implementation bodies, which are the operational communities themselves, reporting back to the wider community through whatever process they would normally use for so doing. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Thank you very much, Martin. You point out something that it is good to discuss that. But I must say that I think that we have agreement since early discussions that the responsibility of implementation of the proposals from the operational communities lays within the operational communities. That is something that we discussed earlier.

And the discussion that we had earlier this week was given that that is the consensus here in ICG, what, in that case, would our role be? But it's good that you point that out again. Keith. Keith Davidson.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Okay. So I'll read here. Let's see here. "I'm unable to use the microphone. Agree with Martin's comments. I feel confident that our role concludes with the delivery of the proposal and very concerned that the group of 30 overseeing implementation would impede implementation." That was the statement by Keith Davidson.

And then we have a follow-up by Jean-Jacques. "The community I represent here does not consider itself as impeding implementation."

And now I would like to go back to the queue. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. Exactly what Jean-Jacques said. I don't know how Keith Davidson see us as impeding. We never impeded anything at all. We facilitating. I don't think it's a correct word. I disagree with that. Yes, we remain constituted, but with maybe new charter or amended charter, but not impeding. I don't think that -- who said we're impeding. If someone doesn't want, don't

participate. Go to your community and say that you don't -- but doesn't mean that we're impeding. Has there been any evidence that we're impeding anything? In fact, we're facilitating time. Giving our time. Considerable amount of time. Hours and hours and hours. In what way we impeded that? So people need to correct and maybe even apologize for that.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Paul Wilson?

PAUL WILSON: And I made some personal remarks and I was personally comfortable with a lightweight role involving I mentioned primarily the operational communities to provide communications and certainly not oversight, but monitoring, I suppose a watching brief, if you like, over the implementation process. I thought that we had a clear -- that proposal was based on an assumption, a belief that we had a very clear charter. And, in fact, if we stick to that charter, then we would be taking no further role after producing the proposal.

So, personally, I'm -- I don't see harm and potentially there's benefit in continuing. But I should say that the RIRs have got a established position now that we prefer to see the ICG stick to its charter and conclude when the proposal is accepted by the

NTIA. So I think we've all agreed it's not a matter of just simply of submitting to the NTIA but waiting to make sure that the proposal is accepted by the NTIA.

Alan, do you want to add to that at all? But I think that's our agreed position. Thanks.

ALAN BARRETT:

This is Alan Barrett. No. I think Paul stated the position we discussed in the RIRs, quite accurately. We think that the ICG's role should end when the proposal is accepted. And that might be after it's submitted.

PATRIK FALTSROM:

Lynn.

LYNN ST. AMOUR:

Lynn St. Amour. I think we have all agreed that we stay constituted. I think we've all agreed that the work actually happens in various communities, not only the three operating communities, of course, but also ICANN and IANA and other communities and, I guess, the subcommittees in the ICANN community.

I'm actually wondering, we've used the liaison roles, I think, with great success through this process. And while there is certainly

collaboration going on across all the communities, there are going to be an awful lot of moving parts in a relatively short period of time.

So I'm wondering if maybe some sort of halfway role between one or two people that I hear may be asking us to take on a much more active role might be to appoint a couple of liaisons to work closely with the implementation effort that ICANN staff are driving. I mean, they clearly have an effort that's just getting off the ground and it seems to be moving forward with great pace.

But I think that would help to ensure that all the communities were appropriately considered through the process. I mean, even this week alone, we've seen several instances where it was pretty obvious that maybe one piece of work that was happening in the community hadn't either given due credit or due thought to implicated work or impacted work in the other communities.

So just to try and summarize, I'm wondering if there is maybe a lightweight role of two liaisons to interface to the ICANN implementation effort which would ensure some level of linkage and maybe some additional comfort within the community.

PATRIK FALTSROM: Thank you very much.

Mary, and then I would like to make another summary of where I think we are in the discussion. Did you want to say something? Okay. After Manal.

Mary?

MARY UDUMA: Thank you. First of all, I agree that we remain constituted. And, again, we still have some work to do. The work might not be implementation work but coordination work with the two. And if we are to answer queries from NTIA or even in the middle of the Congress, evaluating -- if there are queries through the NTIA coming, I think they first land on this group and then the group goes to the other OCs to get responses.

And the fact that there's still work to be done by both the CCWG and CWG, because there are some aspect of CWG work that has not been completed, it might require us getting some flags and.

So I'm expecting there will still be some phone calls, some online meeting. I mean, the online emailing list will be active until we are done with CCWG and confirmed with the CWG. And until it is accepted and it starts, I think our services will be needed. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSROM: Thank you very much. There are two things I would like to bring up that I want us to adjust. I know you have flagged.

But there are two things I specifically want people to try to talk about. The first one is I heard people using different terms for how long we are constituted. I have heard end of September 2016 when -- when our proposal is approved, I think the current word that is used in the chatroom.

And I can also envision, another end could be when the current contract between NTIA and ICANN terminates. And there might be other kind of -- and that is where I don't see an agreement yet. I would like people to address that.

The second thing I would like you to think about is that currently, as we heard this week, tracking of the implementation of the ICG proposal is something that ICANN is going to do. And I would like us to explicitly, you should think about if that is something we feel comfortable with and matches the proposals from the operational communities.

So with that, let's continue with Manal and then Jean-Jacques, et cetera.

Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Patrik. Exactly. I was going to say that I thought we have already agreed to remain constituted and to have the mailing list on and to keep the channels open. And this was already on the slides. We have already communicated on our engagement session. So actually I thought this has been agreed.

So I believe maybe the question is till when, as you rightly mentioned, and how active. And I believe that this is -- definitely will be in coordination with the operational communities and the wider community. I mean, even -- I mean, I didn't hear what they're thinking of the other phases and our role in upcoming phases.

But, again, I think we are brainstorming here on what we think our role is. And then this is going to be coordinated with the wider community. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSROM:

Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Patrik. This is Jean-Jacques.

Two or three points. The first is a question of symbol. I suppose you agree that convening the ICG with members of various

communities and not only the operational communities meant that the conveners, NTIA and ICANN, were not simply looking for a moral caution or moral stamp to be able to say later on, "Oh, but the transition plan was done community-wide." Of course not. So we must accept the consequences of that and consider that the ICG is really representative of the global interest in this matter of transition.

Now, in answer to some of the remarks I have heard over the past ten minutes, I would say that we -- and I speak as a representative of the ALAC along with Mohamed, of course. We consider that in practical terms it means that any question, remark, request for further work, et cetera, arriving at ICG would not be channeled to any particular individual or part of the ICG. It is sent to the whole ICG. First point.

My second point is about impeding the work and other expressions I've heard bandied about this afternoon. I don't think it is up to any one of us to state who should be out of this. It is up to our communities to decide if they think that, for instance, this or that part of our future work is unimportant, then they can opt out either permanently or temporarily. But it is not up to us to decide ex officio who should be in and who should be out. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSROM: Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. With respect to your comment, I put in the chat my suggestions. There are two phase. Phase one, remain constituted until the proposal is accepted by NTIA. After that, during the implementations, we will decide whether or not we should remain and with what charter. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSROM: Thank you very much.

Alan?

ALAN BARRETT: I wanted to address the question of who is going to track implementation. I don't think it is only ICANN. I think operational communities should do their own tracking and in the RIR community we have a Web page with a checklist which we are trying to keep updated with the status.

PATRIK FALTSROM: Michael Niebel.

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Thanks. Michael. I just wanted to support what Manal has said. We had this discussion already. We have decided and supported a text -- slides, text, that was presented publically which is on record which has been presented by the chair in the engagement session, which says keep ICG constituted as a body until 30 September, 2016; maintain ICG mailing list; ensure communities know how to get in touch with us; schedule calls, meetings only as needed.

I do not think we should have a rediscussion of that. That's in the public domain. I don't think we should reopen yet again this discussion. This has been publicized, and I think we can talk about other things, but I think that's in the public domain.

PATRIK FALTSROM: Thank you very much. We chairs felt we would like to bring up the question. Let me then call it reaffirm given this week's events.

Okay. I think we are -- oh, Lynn.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Thank you, Patrik.

Lynn St. Amour. One concrete suggestion, could the ICG -- or would the ICG be interested in perhaps monthly publishing a

status that was a compilation of status reports from the operating communities, ICANN, whatever other bodies we thought might be appropriate? Is that an appropriate role? Looking for something concrete. And if not -- if no is the answer, then that's absolutely fine, too.

PATRIK FALTSROM: I think you have two questions there. The first one is whether the operational communities feel that they are able to, want to, whatever report to the ICG. And the second one, for ICG to compile that as some kind of status. Of course, we can discuss whether it's monthly or whatever.

Jean-Jacques and then Kavouss.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. This is Jean-Jacques. I very much appreciate Lynn's suggestion. I think it's a good idea. It's a sort of minimal service that the ICG could continue rendering.

But I would add that it should not, of course, be to the exclusion of the things that we have asked for which is to keep the whole membership of the ICG in the loop on all the subjects. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSROM: Kavouss and then Russ Housley.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Thank you, Patrik. You mentioned about feedback, but I would like to put it in proper order, with existing ICG liaison which is important. Because we have done at least -- maybe Keith Drazek confirm -- a considerable amount of contributinal activities, reflecting views of the ICG, the CCWG, trying to defend the things and so on and so forth. We need to have that because the work of the CCWG starts tomorrow. They have working parties continuous at least up to January and maybe after that continued. So we need to carry out that process. So feedback is not a proper word. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSROM: Russ Housley.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I would like to change the topic if there is no one else in the queue.

PATRIK FALTSROM: Please.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So the mission statement in the ICANN bylaws is currently incorrect. And the IAB has asked that it be corrected twice, once during the CCWG comment periods. So far no change has resulted. The CCWG plans to make the mission statement a fundamental bylaw. And after they do that, it will be quite difficult to get this corrected.

The current mission statement text comes from a time when there was a protocol support organization and that organization has not existed for over a decade.

The mission statement needs to reflect ICANN's current structure, not a historical one. And I ask that the ICG send a message to the CCWG asking them to correct the scope of the ICANN in its mission statement.

PATRIK FALTSROM: Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I think it is discussed deliberately in the CCWG. It's not completed but is not ignored that it exists. Thank you.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I took a look at the document on how comments are being handled, and it says essentially rejected.

PATRIK FALTSROM: Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Patrik. Keith Drazek.

So if I'm not mistaken, during the public forum yesterday the IAB chair actually posed this question directly to the board and to Steve Crocker, I think. Correct me if I'm wrong.

And the question was posed: Is ICANN willing to consider this? Or is ICANN open to fixing this problem? And the response from Steve Crocker was yes, sort of definitively yes.

So my sense is that while the CCWG is extremely busy right now and its work ongoing, the bylaw drafting exercise has really not begun because it couldn't start until the framework and the model and all of the -- sort of the structural questions about the proposal were resolved. I think now that we have made some significant progress this week here in Dublin, that is all the more clear now.

And I expect that the bylaw drafting effort will begin in earnest in the coming week or weeks. In putting together Steve Crocker's response to the question, the fact that the bylaws' effort has not yet begun, and that moving something that is factually incorrect

into a fundamental bylaw makes no sense, now's the time to get this taken care of.

So I guess the question back to you Russ, would be, what can the ICG do to help make this happen?

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, I mean, we proposed an alternate framing for that in the IAB comments. Whatever is necessary. We're pleased to engage. We just don't want to have this become a fundamental bylaw that's nearly impossible to change and be wrong.

PATRIK FALTSROM: Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay, thanks, Russ. Keith Drazek.

Just a follow-up then. I guess, would this be appropriate for a communication from the ICG co-chairs to the co-chairs of the CCWG with a copy to ICANN board or staff or somebody referencing the communication that took place in the public forum yesterday?

RUSS HOUSLEY: That would be perfect.

PATRIK FALTSROM: Milton?

MILTON MUELLER: 100% in support of whatever can be done to modify the mission statement in a way that makes it consistent with the post-transition world. The elements of the mission statement that Russ and others are objecting to were probably written in 1998 and reflected the view that ICANN and the IANA were conjoint and inseparable and always integrated. And that is fundamentally at odds with the premise of the post-transition models that we have.

And it's also intruding ICANN into areas of protocols and numbers that doesn't -- well, maybe numbers is arguable, but certainly protocols it doesn't have any role in.

The question is: How does this -- I think we can do more than reference the public forum exchange. I think we can say, as ICG without strain from our remit, that there is an incompatibility here, that the premise of these three operational communities proposals is that the IANA functions operator is separable and moveable, and that the mission statement seems to say something different. And we would like for this to be clarified as a -- in some ways, it's not an incompatibility of our proposal but

it's a potential incompatibility between the workability issue with respect to our proposal and the overall ICANN environment.

So I think we should not have to rely entirely on that public forum exchange but also on our own initiative, say, that this is really a problem.

PATRIK FALTSROM: Lynn?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Thank you. Lynn St. Amour.

And I would like to agree very strongly with the comments both - I think Jari's in the chatroom, Milton just now, and Keith's and Russ' earlier.

I actually put my hand up to respond to I think a point of confusion between JJ and I in the earlier comments. I was not suggesting that the ICG be reconstituted differently or some ICG members step away.

I was actually suggesting that just as we've used liaison roles in our current constitution and in our current charter to follow work in other groups, that we might think of appointing two people from the current ICG, currently constituted through September with all the other things we've already agreed

several times now, in fact; that we simply appoint two liaisons to help follow the work. Specifically I was thinking within the ICANN implementation role.

And then my second suggestion a little bit later, of course, was whether or not there was support. And obviously, Patrik, you split it into two questions. But obviously anything we might do here would be with the support of the operating community and the broader community, whether or not it would be a useful community service to actually pull together in one place a monthly status of all of the implementation activities.

And again, this is not something I'm pushing. I'm just trying to -- really trying to understand what would be helpful overall for the transition and try and see if there's one or two concrete things we might want to do because I heard earlier some comments about this is sort a lot of talk repeating our role but possibly not being concrete enough about what we would actually do.

And if we are just going to be here in case somebody has questions, that's fine, too.

Hope that helped clear up a couple of points.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, I think the point raised by Russ Housley was that that was initially rejected. But, because it was a comment from one community. Now it is supported by ICG. If they put in the communique or note from the co-chair or chair and two co-chairs of the ICG to the co-chair of CCWG, we will follow up the matter. And I don't think that there is a restriction. Perhaps we should find one way or the other to do that. If they don't want to within the fundamental bylaw we want perhaps to create and separate and put it into the standard bylaw.

But first we need to have a clear text and need we have support of the ICG in the note from the ICG chair to the co-chair of CCWG. And it is up to any other people, including both of us, I and Keith Drazek, to further pursue the matter and try to find a solution for that. And we'll do our best. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So, before I move on to Milton and Manal, I would like to flag that I will ask for volunteers to write, for example, the letter to CCWG. Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL: Just very quickly following on Lynn's proposal, which I do like and I believe, if the operational communities would find this

helpful, this would also fit within the public record that we are supposed to keep for the whole process. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: You said who? And punishment goes to Russ Housley. He can prepare that, I think, is not difficult. One or two paragraphs. Send it in. And then we try to pursue that and further develop that and the CCWG. And you can believe that we never leave it like that to be not considered. We push for that to be considered seriously. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. So, Russ, we can rely on you sending that to us chairs. And we can circulate that note to the CCWG. So we have USA, the person writing that. Good. Thank you very much.

The other issue that I would like to -- given that we -- that I don't hear an opposition to the suggestion from Lynn, I would like to -- may I suggest that the current liaisons to the operational communities plus CCWG liaisons are -- could be the volunteers to keep the -- continue to be the connection between ICG and the operational communities and CWG during the extended

period under which ICG is constituted. And that also implies that these individuals will be the liaisons which bring not only the messages but also status from these operational communities and CCWG to the ICG in the case ICG is going to keep the status of the implementation. Anyone have a different proposal than that we continue with the liaisons that we currently have? Okay. Thank you very much.

Alissa will be back in a few minutes. Anyone that have anything else we should bring up? Okay. I suggest that we take a short break until Alissa comes back. So we allow everyone to stretch a little bit. But, when Alissa comes back, let's try to get seated as soon as possible. Reconvene at 3:40 Alissa just told us. So I think we better follow the Chair's instruction.

[Break]

ALISSA COOPER:

One-minute warning. We're going to start again.

Okay. We have a few technical issues as always. That's totally fine.

Good. Okay. So, before we get back to the RZM because I know everyone is dying to talk about it again. Patrik is going to have to go to the airport in a minute or two. So before he leaves, we wanted to say a few words. First of all, to the Secretariat, who all of you, including the rest of the team who is not here, but, in particular, the three of you have put in a just inhumane effort into this process, have lost many nights' sleep, have responded to our every beck and call and done so with grace and aplomb and never complained one single time, even when we made completely ridiculous and inappropriate requests of you every week.

And so, for that, from all of us in the ICG, we wanted to express a truly sincere thanks. And we got you a little gift to show our appreciation. So, if we can have a big round of applause for the secretariat.

[Applause]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

This is going on to my wall

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The wall in what room.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Behind the dartboard.

ALISSA COOPER: And you, my friend, you don't get out of here without a big round of applause as well. We're remaining constituted as a body, but we wouldn't have gotten here without you. And I would have lost my sanity without you. So really. Can't thank you enough. Thanks, Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you, everyone. Thank you thank you.

Okay. Thank you, everyone. Now, while I'm running to the airport, just be done with it, please!

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Patrik. Safe travels. All right. So now we have no choice.

RZM team, take us home. What do we have here?

This is your sentence or your set of sentences, I believe. So --

KEITH DRAZEK: We got it. Keith did it. I like it. Russ likes it. No one dares disagree with us.

ALISSA COOPER: Floor is open, if anyone wants to object to this. Otherwise we'll incorporate it as-is.

Go ahead. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Not objecting. I want to understand. The review should be based on the community consensus based. In order to be reviewed, the community should have the decision on the consensus to be reviewed. Otherwise they don't review that. This is the meaning of this sentence. Consensus-based review.

What does it mean? Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Whichever one of you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you. Keith Drazek. I'll answer the question. And then maybe it makes sense for me to read it. And then we'll go from there.

I think the intention, Kavouss, is that, if there are going to be substantial changes to the agreement after the transition, including any change to the roles of the parties, that that should be subject to community review, input, and approval and through the consensus-based process.

So any changes to what takes place after the transition. So a year from now, two years from now, three years from now, that at least the community will have the ability to be part of the process of approving those changes.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Approving to the changes by community consensus is something consensus review changes also. Also, could you reread -- reformulate that the agreement should be based on the community basis decisions, but not the review. The consensus base -- the review is subject to the consensus based, which I don't believe that. Anybody could review that.

KEITH DRAZEK:

So this is Keith Drazek. Let me try again with the explanation. So there will be an agreement, a written agreement coming out of this next phase. As part of the transition, ICANN is intending for that to be staff level implementation.

What we're talking about is any changes to that agreement once it's executed afterwards, to Milton's point, as part of the requirements in the CWG recommendation, is that the community needs to be part of the process of reviewing, providing input in the traditional way, public comment period and part of the approval decision to any subsequent changes, to any changes that take place after the fact.

So let me read it. And maybe we can -- if there's a language adjustment necessary, we can look at it. But I think this covers it.

So it says, "The ICG reiterates that a written agreement between the IFO and RZM establishing each party's role needs to be in place by the time of the expiry of the NTIA contract. For transparency reasons, that agreement should be made available for public review prior to execution. In order to be consistent with the CWG proposal, any post-transition structural changes to that agreement, including any structural change to the roles of the parties, should be subject to consensus-based community review, input and approval."

And so, if you have any suggested adjustment, I'm happy to consider it. But I think that's fairly straightforward. Alissa.

ALISSA COOPER:

So I think I'm tripping over the same thing that Kavouss is tripping over, which is what does it mean to have a consensus-based review? It seems to me -- if you're driving towards that the -- we need to agree to the changes -- that you need to have consensus on the changes in the end, then I would suggest moving consensus-based to be the modifier for approval. Yeah. Okay.

Anything else? Done, okay.

So, with that, we have agreed all the changes that we will make to the proposal. A bunch of editorial things as well that we didn't talk about but that will be incorporated.

So what I propose is to circulate into your inboxes by Monday morning a version that incorporates all the changes, both a red line and a clean, and give people 48 hours to -- not to open up anything that we've agreed, but just to give it one more look and, you know, get a few eyes on it and make sure there's nothing that's a glaring grammatical error or something that you absolutely cannot live with it going forward.

And, hopefully, you know, assuming we get no one objecting or just commas here and there, things like that within the 48-hour period, then we can declare ourselves to be complete, as much as we can be with the one dependency. And then we'll talk about kind of the publication or the status update that we talked

about publishing. But that's what I propose as far as process. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I agree with you, provided that you introduce purely editorial amendment. Any opening would cause problems. Opening a new sentence or new subject or changing the word or restructuring, we have difficulty. Purely editorial.

ALISSA COOPER: Yep. Agreed.

Okay. Good.

So then let's look at the statement to go out when -- sorry. I meant to make it smaller so I could find it. Today or you mean earlier emails? Oh. Okay. I haven't seen that. Sorry.

I'll take a look. But just to preface this.

So, previously, I had circulated some proposed text during the week. We put announcements on our Web site when we do things. So this is the proposal for the text that would go on the Web site and would link to the cleaned version of the proposal once we finish this 48-hour period this week. Jari had made some suggestions. Jean-Jacques had made some suggestions.

One of those led to the title of the thing being a whole sentence, very long, which I did not incorporate if only because the Web site doesn't handle those things very well.

But, otherwise, I tried to reflect at least the spirit if not all the words of what Jari had provided and also made it consistent with what we just agreed earlier in the document disclaimer. So the words here in the first and second paragraphs are, essentially, the same as the document disclaimer slightly reorganized because it's a little bit of a different forum.

So I'd like to hear people's feedback on this. And I will look at your mail, Jean-Jacques.

Capitalization, okay. Yes. We can do capitalization in here to match the proposal. No problem.

Go ahead, Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Alissa. This is Jean-Jacques. I hope I'm wrong, but I had the impression that we had agreed in paragraph 2 to say at the end of sentence one, "and have no dependencies."

Either stop there or "no dependencies on the work of the CCWG" and stop there.

I was under the impression, but I may be wrong, that in any case we had agreed to strike out or "other remaining processes," because there was a long discussion on that. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: I thought we had agreed on this exactly. We had this back and forth about process, singular or plural. And then in the end we went with plural, and that was the end. Yes. That was the end.

I had Paul, Paul Wilson.

PAUL WILSON: Yes. Paul.

On the last paragraph, it might be worth clarifying that we're talking about public comments during the latest, the final comment period. Because you're -- you're then sort of enumerating the changes that were made as a result. Does that make sense?

ALISSA COOPER: We only did one public comment period.

PAUL WILSON: Okay.

ALISSA COOPER: Right? Did I forget one?

PAUL WILSON: I reminded myself of that by looking at the timeline. So I thought no, okay.

So this is the entire set of changes that have been made as a result of all comments that have been received?

ALISSA COOPER: Well, no. Because, as it's qualified, these are the main themes that we made changes about.

PAUL WILSON: Okay. I'm getting my multiple comment periods on different proposals mixed up here. Apologies.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Lynn.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Lynn St. Amour. Actually, my recollection was similar to Jean-Jacques's as well in the second paragraph. Because I thought, when we were discussing it, the comment was made that the text that we reviewed earlier was simply the interim document, that it wasn't going to be there in the final submission. And I

may have misunderstood that. But I thought that's sort of where we were and let it go.

And I'm not really hard over on this. I just -- I don't know. If you want to really allow people to really open and, you know, assess this work in the best way, I think to say that we're ready and, you know, there are no dependencies and work has been ongoing for a time, I think all that is good. I think we should make it as kind of as constructive and open as we can. But I don't have any specific suggestions.

One knit, if we keep it there in the final sentence of the paragraph, I don't think we need "has already been underway."

You can just say, "is underway" or "has been underway."

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay. Thanks, Lynn. Can I just on this part -- because I want to make sure that we get this right. I thought the conclusion of the last discussion about the document disclaimer was to leave this in "other remaining processes." But, if everyone else was to take it out, then I'm wrong.

I'm not talking about the sentence. I'm talking about the "other remaining processes."

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: What we dropped out was "any other" --

ALISSA COOPER: "Any" is gone.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That's what I remember.

ALISSA COOPER: See? Everyone remembers it differently.

We're all in the same room. Go ahead, Jari.

JARI ARKKO: First, can we all use microphones so the rest of us can hear. And, secondly, let's do the same thing and not a different thing. We could perhaps have more information here, if you wanted to do a lengthier explanation. But let's not use a different sentence.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah. Whatever change we would make here, we would change there, too. But it seems that I don't -- I'm not recalling it correctly. So -- Milton and I recall it one way, and several people recall it the other way.

PAUL WILSON: I recall that we kept "other remaining processes."

ALISSA COOPER: Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That's Paul, by the way.

ALISSA COOPER: I have a queue. Thank you, Mohamed. Alan.

ALAN BARRETT: Thanks. Alan Barrett. In the very last sentence of the very last paragraph, I suggest to remove the words "have been clarified" right to the end. So the sentence will read, "As a result, matters relating to XYZ, among other matters, have been clarified."

ALISSA COOPER: Like that? Okay.

ALAN BARRETT: Yes, like that.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Someone else was in the queue. Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yeah, just very quickly on the first point, yes, your recollection is right. I suggested to have a full stop and remove the whole thing. But we ended up where we are now. But, anyway...

Regarding the last sentence in the second paragraph, I feel it's a little bit negative but if it's only me, I'm happy to leave it. I propose that we delete "without waiting for the CCWG to complete its work." I mean, we said it's ready. We said it's under implementation. We said it can continue. I mean, we don't have to keep every time remind everyone that we are waiting for the CCWG to finish.

Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thoughts about that. I'm not partial either way.

Paul, are you going to argue against that?

PAUL WILSON: No. I'm just noting that there's some sensitivity to the idea that implementation is actually underway when before the -- before the thing has been approved. And it may be better to say "preparation for implementation has been underway." I know that we were -- the RIRs were questioned about why we were

launching into implementation before the proposal was done. And so our explanation was that we were preparing for implementation rather than actually implementing anything. So I would suggest that second sentence in the second paragraph be "preparation for implementation has been underway and will continue."

I actually feel like the four-months clause is a little bit vague as well and maybe it should be simply "preparation for implementation of the numbers and protocol parameters proposals has been underway and will continue," full stop.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay. I'm hearing you. I will go to Kavouss and then try to do some editing if nobody objects.

Go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Two things. First, the first line I think we should try to make it a little bit more clear. ICG completes its work and awaiting the conclusions of CCWG on ICANN enhanced accountability. We are not waiting for ICANN accountability itself, the ICANN as it is ICANN.

We are waiting for the enhanced ICANN accountability as currently being carried out by the CCWG. So we have to amend that and await conclusion or outcome of CCWG on ICANN enhanced accountability. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Are you okay with that further abbreviated version?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: "Enhanced" before "accountability." "CCWG on enhanced accountability."

ALISSA COOPER: Let me try. It just gets very long. I was wondering if we could use the name of the group.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: CCWG on ICANN enhanced accountability. That is the name of the group.

ALISSA COOPER: I'm sorry. Just say one more time more slowly.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: The title of the group is Cross-community Working Group, CCWG, on ICANN Enhanced Accountability. This is the title of the group.

ALISSA COOPER: Jari.

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko. Just to say one thing about the part Paul was listing, that we take out the end part of the second paragraph. And I think the rationale on that has been that if you take a broader view than we've actually been implementing the oversight in the Internet community for the last ten-plus years. So, I mean, I don't want to upset anybody who reads these things. But it actually has been the case that we've been for real implementing things like oversight.

And we have not been executing a contract of particular sort before this approval. I don't have a particular suggestion how to fix that, but I just wanted to provide the background why I felt that's important.

And, finally, this is again in multiple places in the document. So we want to be clear or consistent.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Or both.

[Laughter]

ALISSA COOPER: Some people want to take it out. You want to leave it in.

JARI ARKKO: I would prefer leaving it in, but I am not religious about it if people are opposed to it.

ALISSA COOPER: Let me make the other change with Paul's suggestion.

MILTON MUELLER: Can I ask a two finger to Jari.

I lost the context, you think it should be four years instead of four months?

JARI ARKKO: I was referring to the change where we go from -- the implementation has been going on versus preparations for implementations had been going on. I actually don't care about the other stuff. I think shorter would be better. Sorry. I was unclear.

ALISSA COOPER: Sorry. I misunderstood that as well. So let me try to rectify that.

So the part that other people had wanted out was this part at the end of the sentence.

MILTON MUELLER: I would oppose removing it.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay.

MILTON MUELLER: Think of who we're talking to here. This is people who are waiting for the IANA transition proposal. This is not people who are thinking about the entire history of Internet governance or the IETF, all right? So the point that it can continue without the CCWG is very important. And to just leave it hanging that it can continue is kind of -- why are we even saying that?

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thanks, Alissa. This is Jean-Jacques. I just want to make sure that Paul is comfortable with the new wording, which is

proposed by Jari, because the counterproposal came from Paul. And, frankly, I prefer Paul's amendment.

PAUL WILSON:

Paul here. Yeah, I do prefer preparation for implementation. We were challenged on why we were implementing. And to be honest, we are not implementing because our proposal is not implemented until contracts are signed and a review committee is in place. We have not signed contracts or put the review committee in place. We have merely prepared for that by drafting and negotiating the documentation. So personally, I prefer "preparation." But maybe in a broader view "implementation process" includes that preparation. I suppose I'm not strongly advocating for the change. It was a constructive suggestion. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER:

So we have a couple of options here. We can -- the sentence is in the proposal. So we can take it out of the status update and just leave it in the proposal. We could say something different for numbers and for protocol parameters if they actually aren't similar situated. Just throwing out some ideas.

I see Kavouss.

KAVOUSSARASTEH: Yes. The end of the sentence on the second paragraph is incomplete. "And continue." Continue to what? Continue as such? Continue to what? Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you.

Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy here. It seems to me that we should go for not only completion but also conciseness here when we can. And since we have a set of words that, I think, we can easily modify to make it a little shorter and provide a little less information in this status since the actual status is in the proposal, I propose that we delete -- I think it's the second half of the second sentence, the one we're having difficulty with and just simply not put it on a Web page. We don't have to say all that detail.

ALISSA COOPER: So you would delete from after "underway"? Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (off microphone).

ALISSA COOPER: Use the mic. Get in the queue. Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't know. I think Jari has been arguing for keeping the point that we're not waiting for that. So the question is how many times we have to highlight it, I guess. That's going to be on the cover. Is that right?

ALISSA COOPER: This is the announcement that goes on our Web site.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This is the posting for the Web site. Yeah.

ALISSA COOPER: And gets tweeted and so forth.

Russ, you're thinking.

Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I think "underway" slightly bother me. Perhaps the sentence should say the "preparation for implementation of the numbers and the protocol parameters proposal are being continued." It has been started. They continue and are being

continued. Better not to say without waiting for this or that. So that's not to be totally proclamation of independence of these two communities. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you.

Lynn?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Lynn St. Amour.

Maybe we're trying to do too much in this one announcement. What if you kept the first and the third paragraph, which is pretty much a factual statement of where we are with respect to our work? And then maybe secondly or separately you can say "In other news, here's a status report from each one of the OCs." Because we are trying to find words that the numbers and the protocol parameters community can live with and, yet, they have different sensitivities.

But you could actually separate the two. Again, have the first and the third paragraph which is just a status of where we are on the work. And then you can say, the numbers community reports X with respect to their current readiness efforts or

something. And let each one of the community get the messages that work for them.

But then we're not trying to -- I don't know -- stick a finger in somebody's eye or get an extra message in just because we have some emotion around it. Keep the first part factual and then the rest I would propose factual as well with respect to implementation but do that within the communities.

It is factual, but it is not necessary to tell the community we are ready and as soon as the CCWG work is ready, we can go. We're trying to give them a second message in that second paragraph that are different messages for each one of the communities that are here, which I think is why we are stumbling over text a little bit.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks, Lynn.

Alan?

ALAN BARRETT:

Thank you. I think we should phrase -- if we are going to keep the second paragraph, then I think in the second sentence "preparation for implementation," et cetera, "has been underway," I think we should phrase that in the present tense.

Not "has been underway" but rather "is underway" or "is already underway."

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Alan. Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Actually two things. I find that Alan's amendment is good. It's interesting.

Another idea or comment is more general from the user perspective. This will be the very first statement, public statement, public announcement about our whole work. So the sentence for people who are not as familiar as we are, the sentence "without waiting," et cetera, "the CCWG," introduces an element of doubt. I'm not sure that's really what we want to do.

And, therefore, to conclude, I agree with Lynn's suggestion that perhaps in addition to the general statement here, we give the possibility for the three operational communities to put a short sentence each for itself.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Jean-Jacques.

Jari?

JARI ARKKO:

Jari Arkko.

So I'm actually in agreement now. I mean, I posted something on the chatroom here. The text on the screen does work for me. And it is kind of a compromise that we agree to go to "preparation" language. We keep the explicit note about the CCWG.

And I would actually like to argue that we do want to say something about the numbers and protocols in this note because in so many instances, we always talk about we're not done because the CCWG. I think it's important to keep highlighting that there are other parts. That's the reason I would do that.

I understand it could be done separately, but I suspect this is the only note people will read. So I'm happy with the way things are right now on screen.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks, Jari.

Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I agree with Lynn, that taking first paragraph, second paragraph with respect -- and third paragraph, sorry, first and third. And with respect to second paragraph, just quote what these two other communities have said. I don't know, "underway "what it means to me as a member of ICG. I just listened to what they said. I cannot confirm nor put in anything against. So put as a third paragraph whatever you receive from these two communities. But currently "preparation is underway" is vague things.

The previous statement was quite more clear. Leave it to their responsibility to what they have said, and we just more or less quote what they have said. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: So I know Milton is in the queue. Just -- I will for one time put on my IETF hat. I could bet you a lot of money that what the protocol parameters community would say is "Implementation of the protocol parameters proposal is underway and can continue without waiting for the CCWG to complete its work." So if people are trying to get that out asking the protocol parameters community to provide one sentence is not going to achieve that.

Milton, go ahead.

MILTON MUELLER: Well, that's kind of what I was going to say except that I don't mind Lynn's suggestion that you make the second paragraph the third paragraph. I mean, that could be -- flow easier. But I think this statement does exactly what we want it to do and what we need it to do with all three of those paragraphs.

What are we doing here? We're looking at -- we're saying that we're finished except we're waiting for the CCWG. That's the essence of the message. And we have to secure confirmation from the CWG. And we're saying we don't need any kind of confirmation from numbers and protocols. They are basically done and waiting for the CCWG. And then we thank people for comments, and we ensure them that their comments made a difference in what we did.

Why are we picking this apart? It doesn't make any sense to me. It does exactly what we need it to do here.

ALISSA COOPER: Lynn.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Lynn St. Amour.

If the number and protocol parameter communities have come to agreement on text and we are not going to discuss preparation for or implementation and the ICG is happy with that paragraph, then we should close and move on.

ALISSA COOPER: Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. First paragraph as it is. Third paragraph goes to second paragraph. Second paragraph, the first line remained as it is. Please do that first. Okay. If you want to change it. And then the first line remains unchanged. The number and protocol parameters -- okay. The problem is I have difficulty read that color. Don't matter. Okay.

The number and protocol parameters portion of the proposal are complete, full stop. These communities have indicated that they are ready for implementation. For completeness, we could say "complete." But for "ready for implementation," it is a their statement. It is not our statement. They have indicated that. They are ready for implementation and put whatever they want to put.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So this is text from the proposal. So we are saying it in the proposal. It's just a question of whether we are also going to say it in this -- on the Web site. So I don't think it really is just they who are saying it because it's in the proposal itself.

But I'm wondering if this is a compromise that people can live with. We rearranged the order of the paragraphs. So it's further down. People who can't bear to read a third paragraph won't ever make it to the controversial bit. We have preparation, which makes some people happy and not other people.

And we have the two references to the non-dependency which makes some people happy and not other people.

So if everybody is a little bit unhappy, that might be the time to stop.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (off microphone).

ALISSA COOPER: So anybody who is going to continue to object to what's on the screen right now...

Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (off microphone).

ALISSA COOPER: Approved by exhaustion. Very good. Okay. So we will carry out that plan.

You'll have the proposal in your inbox on Monday. And we'll do a 48-hour -- what we call in the IETF off 48 which never lasts that long, but it will this time.

And then we'll push this out on Thursday, roughly speaking Thursday.

So now we're onto the part of the agenda which is about the plan going forward. I think we've talked about this already. But just to confirm with people, once we put that out on Thursday -- so we have that plan for the proposal.

For the public comment summary document, Manal, would you like to tell us what the plan is, since it was only an hour and a half ago that you and I talked about it and I can't remember.

MANAL ISMAIL: So I have already incorporated the comments and feedback that was received this morning. I can circulate it in an hour or we can hand it to the secretariat for formatting. Whatever is more appropriate. I think we can have a final iteration on it and then

look at the formatting. Maybe it would be more practical.
Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Manal. Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. This part on Web site does not have any title. Statement by the chair of the ICG. There is a title, right?

ALISSA COOPER: The title is the first line.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: No, even the first line we should have a statement by the chairman or by the chair and co-chair or whatever of the ICG. And then the start of that.

Because in CCWG we do always -- at the end of each meeting, we have a statement of the co-chairs. So should -- title should be a statement. And that is the content of the statement. So is that going -- should have a title with a more visible form and then that would be good that everybody expects after this ICANN 54 there should be a statement for you and you and the two co-chairs. So the charter should be a statement from the chairman

or the chair of the ICG or chairman of ICG or chair and co-chairs and then the remaining title. Should have a. No title.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, Kavouss. It will be posted on the ICG announcement, so it will be ICG announcement. And that the continues of the title.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So, otherwise, going forward, we do not expect to schedule any calls, as we discussed. I think the chair -- Elise is crying. Yeah. No more calls at 3:00 a.m. for anyone. The chairs have said that we would operate under this set-the-alarm policy. We'll check in and probably check in with our liaisons to the CCWG sometime in December. See how things are going.

Ask for a status update and, you know, schedule calls as necessary.

I assume that we will eventually want to schedule a call to decide to send this document on to NTIA via the ICANN board. That's a little ways away, but we will not be meeting again in person. Just wanted to get that on the record. This is our last in-person meeting for the foreseeable future, if ever, if all goes to plan. So, with that, I was going to -- Keith. Keith, you're in the queue. Go ahead, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Alissa. Were you about to close the meeting?

ALISSA COOPER: We have a few closing remarks and things. I was going to ask if anyone else had closing remarks. So, if you have something, feel free.

KEITH DRAZEK: I'll wait to see what you say.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Kavouss, please go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: If you're organizing a call, please kindly consider that there's a heavy agenda of the CCWG and its working parties. Please kindly, possibly, avoid to have any conflict with that call. It would be very difficult for us. And I would be interested to also participate in your call and similarly, in all the calls, all the working parties. So thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: I have -- secretariat will coordinate with the secretariat of the CCWG to avoid conflict. Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL: Provided that the summary report is going to be circulated tonight, can we also agree on some deadline for the comments, please. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: You're going to circulate it tonight, you said? Okay. People will be in transit. It's the weekend. Should we say Thursday 2359 UTC deadline for feedback on the public comment summary document? Does that give people enough time? Yes, go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL: Just with the caveat it still needs formatting and maybe capitalization. Everything we have agreed here in terms of consistency and formatting might not be done tonight. But, I mean, the substantial part. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Substantive commentary on that. Okay.

So I, coming into this meeting. Was just looking back at our web site. And was getting a little nostalgic. Do you guys remember when we started? We didn't have anything. We didn't have a charter. We did not have a timeline. We didn't have an RFP. We didn't have any proposals. We didn't have an FAQ or a decision-

making process or a communications strategy. We had nothing. We have accomplished a lot in a short amount of time. Even people say it's taken so long. I mean, I don't think it's taken long. Most processes that any of us have ever been engaged in have taken longer than this, I guess is another way of saying it. So I think we should all be pretty proud of what we have done. I know that most of the work happened in the communities. But I think our leadership as a body has been really integral in the process.

So I just -- I want to thank all of you for everything that you have contributed. I think we have really come together as a group to make this as successful as it possibly could be. And that's a tribute to all of your efforts. So thank you.

[Applause]

Also wanted to give a huge thanks to the meeting staff. I don't know if any of them are still here. But they've been really integral to our success as well. So thank you, meeting staff.

Huge thank you to the interpreters and the scribes. Tireless efforts. Thank you, thank you, thank you.

[Applause]

Thank you, secretariat. I know we thanked you earlier, but can't thank you enough. Technical staff. Oh, yeah. Dear lord knows that we put a heavy load on the technical staff at all times.

And then, lastly, I would like to say a personal thank you to Mohamed, our rock on the chair team here, like keeping us under control when Patrik and I are -- you know, freaking out about everything. So huge thanks to Mohamed for all your efforts.

[Applause]

That's it.

PAUL WILSON:

I think you forgot somebody, Alissa. And I think we all do owe you a very big thank you for bullying us through, for setting us impossible deadlines, and actually doing it with such good grace. So thank you very much.

[Applause]

ALISSA COOPER:

You guys, are you really in the queue? Yes. Okay.

Kavouss, you're in the queue. Go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, I am in the queue. Thank you very much. It is and it was a big challenge, the ICG. 17th, 18th of July when we started. And at least the GAC people had some difficulty that at the beginning they were not accepted. More than two were finally accepted. There were five. And perhaps it was good to have this. It was very difficult at the very beginning. Very, very difficult, like anything. We have spent about 1 1/2 months to talk about consensus building document. But we never used that because we've always had good and mutual understanding of that. But we had something in place. Charter, yes. Hard work of all people. Understanding of all people. And coordination with other groups, CWG, CCWG, and so on and so forth.

For me was a great pleasure to work with all of you. Your understanding. I learned a lot from any one of you and all of you. And I'm really very happy that was in your group and continued -- if the group continued to work with that.

Alissa, thank you very much for your leadership and your co-chairs and the amount of the work that has been done by those people who took the responsibility of drafting something or being coordinated. They have done a really tremendous job.

Like other groups, ICG is and was or was and is and will be a lovely group with lovely people. We apologize if for some time we have a sort of discussions, maybe dispute. That was

necessary, I think, always discussions is necessary. Sometimes dispute necessary in order to improve the situation. If all of us agreed with each other from the very beginning, we may not have any improvement. So we should have this sort of the -- I would say constructive and objective, let us say, dispute and discussions. We really believe that our proposal, as it was mentioned in the blogs and in the statements and many other places, a strong proposals.

Our proposal has been announced as a strong proposal from ICG. And really, it is strong. Putting many things. Although we were only coordination group. But it was not easy. Coordination sometimes is more difficult than being totally independent. Because we have to meet the requirement of all the three groups.

Thank you very much, Alissa, in particular, during the sometimes that we have to give birth to a very, very nice and lovely daughter that you have. And I see the photo two days ago, two, three days ago is really very much appreciated that you worked tirelessly indefatigably, and beyond call for duty. And we very much appreciate it. You and your other colleagues. You deserve a very big round of applause from all of us once again, even though we have done it before.

Apart from all those you have appreciated, I would like to add that, at the beginning, ICANN staff has also worked for us. And we have to appreciate their efforts. They have done a lot for us, and they continue behind the scenes to support our proposal. So we have to express our thanks to those people that provided the traveling arrangements, the meeting arrangements, and many other things. So I think that you would have a safe travel to your home country and see you in an appropriate time, if we have a face-to-face meeting. Otherwise, on the chat. Thank you and God bless all of you.

[Applause]

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. The thanks have been distributed. And, of course, I associate myself with everything that has been said.

I would just like to end on a sociological note, if I may, as probably the oldest member of this group.

I think it's really important as a model, as a pattern going forward, not only on transition but perhaps in other areas which are already important for the Internet and for future generations. I see, especially the inclusiveness, the fact that right from the start it is, as much as possible, all the elements, all the constitutive elements of our communities which are

represented. That, in itself, I think is a great message. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks for all of your very kind remarks. We're done.

[Applause]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Wait, wait. I agree with all of these expressions of thanks. But I think they could be reworded.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I also agree with Paul, the expressions and the thanksgiving. And I want to say that working with you the group here, has been a great G30 group let's remember G30 in ICANN. We've done so well. I learned a lot. But to meet people like this. And I say thank you.

I said thank you to Alissa in particular. You've done so well. You're about the youngest here, but you led us so well. No matter we are pushing. And we are timeline and whatever you do and you meet your deadline. You are amazing. So let's keep it up.

We're still the group, and we'll continue to be the G30 of ICANN. Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]