LOS ANGELES – IANA Coordination Group Meeting Los Angeles
Friday, October 17, 2014 – 09:00 to 17:30 PDT
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

ALISSA COOPER: Please take your seats. We are going to start in a few seconds. Run to your seat.

Okay. Welcome, everyone.

We will start the public portion of the ICG face-to-face meeting. And welcome to our silent observers in the back and everyone in Adobe Connect. Thanks for joining us.

My name is Alissa Cooper. You guys know me. I'm the chair of the ICG. And I have been kindly reminded by Alice to ask everyone before you speak, please state your name so that people who are following along at home know who is speaking. You can see the agenda for this morning. We have a quick couple administrivial items before we move into the rest of the day. Before we get to the agenda, I wanted to welcome our newest member, Thomas Schneider, who is joining us from the GAC and the newly elected GAC chair, as I understand it.

So, Thomas, could you introduce yourself and let us know a little bit about who you are and where you come from.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much. And good morning to everybody. My name is Thomas Schneider. I come from a small country called Switzerland, as you might know. I've been in the GAC since 2008, and I've now been

elected as the new GAC Chair. And since Heather has departed by yesterday and was not going to be here, the GAC then decided that it should be the next chair who should fill up the space here. This is why I'm here. I'm looking forward -- I know some of you. I know -- look forward to get to know you better, also the other ones, and I also look forward to good cooperation. Thank you very much.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. And I think Heather is not with us today, but obviously we have huge appreciation for the work that she contributed thus far. So anyone who sees her, let her know we are very thankful.

So I think also just for everyone's information, Samantha is here and taking minutes for us. Yes? Yes. Thank you, Samantha. And feel free to be as sparse as you want with those minutes, Samantha.

[Laughter]

No, we are extremely appreciative of all your work as well. So thank you. Thank you for being here with us.

So the agenda review, is it possible to see the whole agenda, Alice? Maybe we can work on that. Yes, thank you. Or a little bit more of it.

So I got one request from Wolf-Ulrich to add an item which has been added to the parking lot at the end of the day about outreach to the IANA staff. Anyone else want to bash the agenda?

Yes, Michael and then Martin.

MICHAEL NIEBEL:	I just want to know when we have the opportunity to discuss the interaction that has taken place over the week with the communities.

ALISSA COOPER:	So I think we can fit that into the session at 1530, which is about community transition proposal process. I think we can include, you know, week in review.

MICHAEL NIEBEL:	The only note of caution I would have on that it might influence our discussion on the finalization process.

ALISSA COOPER:	Do you think we need to have a specific separate week-in-review discussion, or can we raise those topics while we talk about the finalization process? Go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:	Yes, Kavouss Aresteh speaking. I support the proposal. We should have a separate item dealing with the relations of ICG with respect to the two groups that has been established. One is called CWG, naming and so on, so forth. The other one CCWG. It should be a separate item. We need to discuss it because there are some issues that need to be cleared in our work. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. So we have an agenda item, if we go back up, at 11:45 which was meant to be about the relationship with the accountability working group. I think we can also talk about the names cross-community working group at that time.

Martin?

MARTIN BOYLE: Martin Boyle. Thanks so much.

The board resolution yesterday, both in its relationship to the ICANN accountability and also in relation to this group, provides a safeguard mechanism that allows the ICANN board to reject our paper. And I think we probably need to have a discussion here about how do we ensure that we have got good engagement with ICANN so that their concerns and the concerns -- so ideas raised in this group have been considered in ICANN and brought back to this group so that if there is a difficulty, we can address it.

I think that's probably an important discussion for us to have because it might actually alter our relationship with liaisons in this group. So -- now whether that fits in on one of the existing agenda items or not, I don't know. But it seems to me to be quite a fundamental question.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Martin. That's a good point.

So I think maybe for this 11:45 session, we can just treat it as a discussion of all of these kind of relationship issues, how do we relate to

these groups, how do we relate to the board and the staff and we can kind of roll it that way.

So I have Jean-Jacques, Manal, Keith, Kuo-Wei.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. I'm going to speak in one other language of the U.N. working languages.

I would like to say or to raise two points. First of all, I would like to support Martin Boyle's suggestion. I think it's a very good idea, indeed to hold a conversation or to hold important discussions on how the content of our transition plan will be addressed by the ICANN board.

I said engage in a conversation with them because we need clarity, especially regarding the communities we represent in that it is not that the board is going to modify our final plan. Instead, for the sake of transparency, we do need to have this contact, this engagement so that the board has the opportunity to raise their concerns.

Secondly, I would like to thank Alissa for adding these items so that we can discuss it today.

ALISSA COOPER: -- update in terms of the board and the transmission process. I talked to Bruce Tonkin yesterday. So we'll certainly talk about that.

Manal. And I'll add Milton to the queue.

MANAL ISMAIL:	Thank you, Alissa.
	I'm just wondering whether the frequently asked question is the best thing to start with at the first of the agenda because, again, I think the whole discussion would reflect into finalizing the frequently asked questions, particularly our relation in coordinating with the accountability.
	I think this is something we have on the agenda and also was not 100% finalized in the FAQ. And, similarly, how are we going to coordinate with the board? So I see a lot of the things that's going to be discussed later would -- should be reflected in the FAQs. So thank you.
ALISSA COOPER:	Thank you. I think that's a very good suggestion. So what I would propose is that we start with the relationship item, and we'll bump the FAQ down somewhere further. I'll figure it out while we're having the discussion. Does that make sense? Yeah, okay. Great.
	Keith.
KEITH DRAZEK:	Thank you, Alissa. Keith Drazek. I just wanted to, I guess, react to Martin's comment just a few minutes ago about the board making a decision about how it would handle rejecting a community recommendation. And I was under the impression that was specific to the ICANN accountability track not related to the work of the ICG. And I just want to make sure that we're not confusing things.

And I may be wrong, but I just want to make sure that we sort of flesh that out a little bit, that the board resolution passed yesterday related to the ICANN accountability track and the community output, from that track, not the work of the ICG. That's my understanding. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Yes. We should talk about that. Right now we are talking about the agenda. So let's try to close on the agenda and we will have that discussion next. Thanks. Kuo-Wei.

KUO-WEI WU: Sorry. I need to respond before Martin talks again. I think basically the board didn't discuss this issue yet. And the board actually promised we are not going to hand out to the NTIA without ICG group agreement.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Milton, I hope you have a comment about the agenda.

MILTON MUELLER: I do.

ALISSA COOPER: Great.

MILTON MUELLER: It is that I agree with Manal that the FAQ might not be the right thing to start with. And if I -- I think we should discuss this board resolution. If, indeed, this is as bad as it sounds or if there's as serious confusion about

it, meaning it seems to exist, we should be talking about that first because the rest of it could all be irrelevant.

[Laughter]

ALISSA COOPER: Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. I have heard from a few people in the room, including myself, that there are some of us that booked flights before the ICG meeting was planned, that we were not allowed to rebook. So around 5:00 p.m. I do know that people will start to leave the room, and I encourage everyone including myself to leave the room without disturbing the discussions that are ongoing. Just so everyone is aware that it seems to be the case that around 5:00 p.m., people will start to leave. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Patrik.

Anyone else on the agenda? Okay.

So here's what I propose that we should do, let's do the minutes approval next, get that out of the way. Then we will talk about the transmission to NTIA item, including board resolutions, and then move into the rest of the relationship topic including relations with the board, relations to the accountability process, and relations to the names

cross-community working group. And then I'll move the FAQ someplace else. Sound good? Okay.

So minutes approval. So the first set of minutes we have up for approval are the minutes from our last face-to-face meeting on September 6th. Somehow we managed to not approve these yet even though we should have. So -- and I know that people weren't aware until the middle of this week that we were going to approve these. So I want to know if anyone has objections to approving these now or if anyone feels that they need more time to review them.

No, no objections. Okay. So with that, the September 6 minutes are approved, and we'll get them up on the Web site.

And then we had one more set of minutes which are from October 1st, the October 1st conference call. So same questions. Any objections to approving these? We've had some discussion of these on the list already. Any objections or anyone need more time? No. Okay. Great. Then these are approved as well. Thank you very much, Samantha and Alice, for getting these up for us.

Okay. So I will start the discussion about the transition to NTIA. So, indeed, my understanding of what the board passed yesterday was a resolution that is specific to the output of the accountability cross-community working group. Theresa and myself and Bruce Tonkin, the vice chair of the board, spoke briefly yesterday about the possibility of obtaining similar language from the board specific to the transition proposal.

I haven't -- he said he would send that to me. He will send it, and I will share it with everyone immediately. But my proposal is that we take what we get from them, which will be highly similar to what they wrote about the accountability process, and we work on that as a group to determine if it's -- if we think it's satisfactory. And then we can go back and forth with them to make sure that it says what we want it to say.

And for those who weren't -- who haven't seen it or weren't there at the session yesterday, if I can give my summary of it -- and Kuo-Wei should feel free to speak to this as well -- it essentially says that the board, when it receives the document from us, the transition plan, will -- if it determines that anything in the document is not in the global public interest, it will send the document back to us with an explanation for why that is and initiate a dialogue with us. So the proposal would never go to the NTIA with modifications or anything like that.

If the board finds a problem with it, then they would send it to us, but they wouldn't send it on to NTIA changed or feeling that there's a problem with it. So that's kind of the general thrust of what they wrote for the accountability output and the same general thrust for this document.

So I see Milton, Russ, Kavouss, and Jean-Jacques. Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah, the proposal -- or the proposed resolution that you say is coming is completely unacceptable. The board is not supposed to be on this committee making the transition plan for itself. This was initially rejected by the community. It was part of the original process that they

proposed. It was rejected. It was taken out. And now the idea that a board resolution can authorize them to control a process that they're not supposed to be part of -- or at least, you know, not supposed to be in control of is just unacceptable.

I mean, we just have to tell them that that's not acceptable because it puts them in a position to essentially veto the work that we're doing.

I just don't understand how things even got to this point. We have been told that the proposal that we make would be transmitted to the NTIA. We had been told that the communities would make their own proposal and that that proposal would then be assembled and that we had the responsibility for finding, you know, interoperability problems or accountability problems. But the NTIA-ICANN relationship is something that ICANN is a very interested party in, and we thought this task had been delegated to the community, so I'm really -- I would think that this group should send a very clear signal that that's not an acceptable resolution.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Milton. There's one more piece of information that I should share as well and then I'll get back to the queue, which is that there is a -- the requirement from NTIA is that the proposal has to be transmitted by ICANN, and that is, as far as I'm concerned, not negotiable.

So -- because ICANN is their contracted party, and they asked ICANN for this specifically.

So just so people have that bit of information as well, that's kind of an invariant.

So in the queue, I have Russ, Kavouss, Jean-Jacques, Joe, and Martin.

Sure.

JON NEVETT: Jon Nevett. Real quickly, do we have the resolution? A copy of it? You know, we're discussing it and people are commenting on it but I haven't seen it yet, so I don't know if you can put it up there, maybe.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. Just to be clear, it's not a resolution about the transition plan but we can definitely put it up there.

JON NEVETT: Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah. Thanks. I think we can, if Alice can find it.

[Laughter]

Russ Mundy.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Alissa.

I am in general agreement with what Milton said, though I might not put the language quite as strongly as "completely and totally unacceptable," but I do believe that that is wrong. I believe that concept was rejected earlier by the community, and I believe we have a considerably different

set of responsibility relationships, if you will, between what we're doing in the ICG and what the names community is doing in their coordinating group, because the names community does indeed -- generally it's viewed as -- fall within the remit of ICANN, in general, to establish and lay out the policies.

What we're doing stretches across the entire IANA functions, and as Milton said earlier, it was -- that was what was rejected, that the board would be sort of in the approval path.

And so I -- I would hope that we would be able to make this clear to the board members as we discuss it so we don't have to get in a fight with the board early on, and so I would hope that we could do this.

But I'd also like to point out that there is nothing that prevents us, especially with our transparency, to continue to follow the plan that I think we at least informally agreed to as to what would happen with our proposal when we finished it.

I.e., it would be given to ICANN and NTIA.

Now, if NTIA says that the official contractual piece has to be handed to them by ICANN, well, that's fine, but it will be obvious that something has occurred between when the ICG finished its work and when they get the official contract piece, if we give it to them, at the same time.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. Kavouss Arasteh speaking.

First of all, I fully support Milton and Russ.

Second -- for the following reasons.

We have to follow the charter. In the charter is not mentioned that we send something to ICANN and ICANN make any amendment or any editing or any comment on that and send it to NTIA. We have to follow the charter. Charter has been approved by the community and it is our final document and we have to exactly follow that.

However, the board or ICANN has a liaison with us. If at any time during these discussions or preparation there are some comments, they are welcome. We will take them into account. If it's appropriate, we implement that. If not appropriate, we mention why we cannot take it into account.

Now, coming about the words, playing with the words, "transmission," "submission," no problem. The final document could be submitted at the post office by ICANN, but it is nothing wrong that the chairman of the ICG also send that to the NTIA, but we have no difficulty for the matter of courtesy that the chairman of ICG send the document to ICANN, "Please forward this document as finalized to NTIA." And we should send a message that without any modification whatsoever.

So let's just be quite clear, we are not going at the -- the veto or at the comments or the editing or auditing by ICANN. This is not inconsistent with the charter and we reject that. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. So I have Jean-Jacques, Joe, Martin, Wolf-Ulrich, Kuo-Wei, myself, Paul, Adiel, Jari. That might be -- that might need to be the end of the discussion.

KUO-WEI WU: Alissa, you can put me at the last.

ALISSA COOPER: Put you at the last. Okay.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you.

First of all, I would like to say that I support Milton's and Kavouss' position, and I would like to add some elements.

Milton is right when he says that there shouldn't be a negotiation in order to get to a veto, but at the same time this should not be perceived as a negotiation.

Concretely, I see three possibilities.

One, that these -- the board of ICANN transmit this to the NTIA without any comments, as a messenger, or the board may reject our transition plan, or the board may choose to transmit this document with a letter to the NTIA indicating its observations, its objections to improve the document.

Of course the third possibility of transmitting this with comments by the board does not preclude any consultations during the working period with one member or several members of the board.

I believe that it would be extremely useful because we need to take into account also the legal responsibilities of the board members. They have a legal responsibility to fulfill, according to the California laws and the U.S. laws, and we need to take this into account.

But if they transmit a document with a letter containing comments, it would give us the advantage of introducing more clarity regarding the responsibilities of each party: The ICG that is doing this work independently; and on the other hand, the board, the ICANN board, that may also remind everyone about its responsibilities in that letter.

I think that we need to take into account this opportunity and the represented communities here would appreciate that, and in that way, we would avoid at a later stage any risks of being accused of taking co-opting positions. Thank you.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Joseph Alhadeff.

I mean, I would support the previous interventions as well. I find it tremendously interesting that the most self-interested party in this entire proceeding will determine, rather than the communities, what is in the public interest.

It seems that the conflicts process should actually take care of that, because from a conflicts perspective they should be recused from that opinion.

So I don't think it's an acceptable process. I do think that if the board is interested, we can do a consultation for them as part of the process, the same way we've reached out to other communities.

So if at some point the board says, "We'd like to have a conversation with you, there are things we'd like to get better explanations of," there's no reason why we can't set up a conference call if it's on the margins of a meeting, have an in-person meeting with the board. That level of accommodation, I think, is completely reasonable because the board has a fiduciary responsibility to make sure that they're carrying out their functions as well.

So I think there are ways to accommodate that, but the concept of, you know, "We're going to send this back to you because we have a special position that no other stakeholder community has" I think is unacceptable.

And so I think -- more than happy to try to figure out how to work with the board to accommodate their concerns and make sure their fiduciary responsibilities are met, but not a -- I mean this is not a one-way street where we tell you the problem and then you have to go and deal with our problem.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Martin.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks very much.

Yes, I agree with what people have said before, and specifically, I would support Joe's comments.

Sorry. Did I say Martin Boyle when I took the microphone? I don't think I did. Right.

It's Martin Boyle at the microphone, and I'll carry on from there.

I think one of the things that certainly occurred to me when I heard the resolution yesterday was that if the board is coming in at the presentation of the results phase and saying, "This fails our fiduciary duty test" or "It's not in the public interest," then why has it waited so long?

And so my general feeling is that if there is any concern that's coming up, the documents are open. I would have expected the board to have come, either via the liaison or through the ICANN staff observing this process, to explain to us what the difficulty was, and then if we shared those views of concern, it allows us to go through that process of trying to address them.

The public interest thing, you know, I think it could come from any quarter, but I don't like this idea that at the hard-stop date, the board places a veto on what we have put forward. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. Wolf-Ulrich speaking from the GNSO.

Exactly, Martin. Fully -- fully in agreement.

So we had over the week, the ICANN week, several times raised this question towards the board, how the board intends to deal with the results of the ICG or the proposals in them, and it was -- there was -- two things were said.

So one was said every time the board is not going to modify and alterate the proposal at the end. They will take it and then it shall be sent to the NTIA.

On the other hand, it was told the board is, as a part of the community, to be seen -- or ICANN as part of the community, which was also pointed out by Larry Strickling, should be involved in these -- in this activity as well.

So this has to be -- this has to be taken into consideration.

So the question is right now how -- in which way the board is going to be involved in this one.

And I am fully in agreement we have a timing problem, a serious timing problem in this regard.

So I would urge, really, the board as soon as possible to end this process and to join us.

We have a liaison here. I -- I'm not sure whether that is enough. Well, it is up to the board to decide how to deal with that. For us, I see the liaison as the point who should take the opinions here towards the

EN

board as soon as possible and then discuss it so that it fits to our plan. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. I am next in the queue. This is Alissa.

So from my perspective, this conversation is almost entirely about theater, because as Russ Mundy noted, everything that we do is very transparent and it is going to be utterly obvious if -- in the final stages what the community comes to consensus around and is finalized by us and by the community and which we can, you know, easily send to NTIA just as any -- anyone with an email address can send them whatever they want.

If the ICANN board attempts to differ from that or make a different argument about the proposal, you know, there's nothing that we can do to prevent them from doing that in private, no matter what they say or what they resolve to, but whatever they do in public, it will be completely obvious if they attempt to undermine the community consensus.

So from my perspective, you know, we should set out the process that we want to set out and we should attempt to have a resolution with them in terms of what they are capable of agreeing to, but in the end it's -- it's mostly words on a page about process and the results will speak for itself.

With that said, I think in terms of this question about outreach and timing and the resolution itself that the board might take, I think the case of them disagreeing with it or sending it back to us has to be an

utterly exceptional case. It's hard for me to imagine that actually happening.

And it's also, I think -- in terms of the groups that we need to be doing outreach to, if the ICANN board is not aware of this process and how they are supposed to be participating in these processes, we have like way bigger problems than what we're going to write down about who sends it to NTIA.

So -- I'm sorry.

Well, not that harsh, but...

So as we said, do we do have a liaison, but even beyond that, I mean, the board is very well aware, I hope, of what's going on and the fact that, you know, they should be participating and raising concerns and discussing outcomes.

If we need to have more separate meetings, that's fine, but honestly, it will puzzle me a little bit if that's really necessary.

So anyway, I just -- I just hope that we're -- we can be realistic about this. I don't have a strong view about what we write down on the page about the process, but to me this is -- if this isn't already worked out, in some sense, then -- then we have major problems going on that we shouldn't have. So...

Kuo, Adiel -- you still want to be very end, no matter what?

KUO-WEI WU: Yes.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Paul, Adiel, Jari, Jandyr, Milton, Xiaodong, Lynn, and then Kavouss and Russ Mundy, and then I think we should go to Kuo-Wei and that will probably be the end of this portion of the discussion.

So Paul.

PAUL WILSON: Thanks, Alissa. Good morning, everyone. Paul Wilson from the NRO.

I think everything that I wanted to say has been said but I will ask a question for clarification.

Whether there's some doubt as to whether the ICANN board can participate in all of the processes which are set up in terms of contribution to the ICG response to documents and so on or whether in some way they're prevented from doing that.

I didn't think they were at all, but it may be worth clarifying this question generally in the FAQ of what is the relationship or the standing of the ICANN board in this process, because there may be different perceptions.

I don't think they've got any -- there's any hold on the -- on what the ICANN board can do in the process, but that may somehow be behind some perceptions about this. But I agree with everything else that's been said. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Do you want to speak to that, Kuo-Wei? Do you feel that there's any restrictions in participation?

EN

KUO-WEI WU: Yeah, I can -- I can try to explain a little bit.

I think, first of all, I would like to be very clear to all of you. The ICANN board, we don't discuss this issue yet. They only receive the summary what meeting is going on.

But one thing I can guarantee you, just with what I'm seeing, we are sending the proposal to the NTIA without ICG agreement, okay?

So please don't make a prejudgment and say ICANN will veto or do what kind of action.

I think as you know, if we do something stupid, that would be really challenging and also damage the ICANN accountability, too.

So please don't get emotional expecting that ICANN would do stupid things. And we are not discussing yet, but we have a very under- -- fully understand, no matter what kind of proposal we send to NTIA have to get the agreement from ICG group.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Adiel.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Okay. Thank you, Alissa. Adiel from the NRO, representing the NRO.

I much agree with everything that has been said. I just want to add that we need to separate the discussion, not to -- not to make it confusing for people out there.

I think one thing is clear in what Alissa said.

This has been initiated by the NTIA. They task ICANN to put in place a mechanism to come up with a solution that is multistakeholder. The ICG has been put in place. Our role is to gather this proposal and pass it to ICANN for NTIA.

I think that's -- that is clear.

So I don't think we need to have -- to create a (indiscernible) error on that.

Now, according to this resolution and what ICANN will do around that, I think we proactively -- and this is a proposal -- probably have to communicate formally to ICANN and say, "This is what we -- the perception we have. This is how we think the process is going to be, and this is the mechanism that we are putting in place in our own processes to allow you to interact with us."

Let's say toward the end of the proposal we organize regular conference call or whatever with ICANN board to make sure that what we are doing is in line.

So if we proactively do that, I think that will remove all misunderstanding and (indiscernible) on this. That's just a suggestion. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Jari.

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko. Good morning, everyone.

So I guess I'm again agreeing with what previous speakers have said. Martin, at least, for instance.

But I think the discussion has been mostly in the mode of, you know, that there's this event when something gets submitted. I think in reality it's more nuanced than that. There's lots of discussion beforehand and even, you know -- not just in the board but also with NTIA, they need to have their, you know, eyes and ears open and we need to communicate with them throughout the process, and that happens in multiple ways.

I think a productive way of thinking about this might perhaps be that the expectation from the ICG is that any involvement of the board in handling the proposal and whether they have substantive disagreements with that should happen before it's handed from us to them so they are part of the process just like everyone else. And I think it might be a useful thing -- for them to in some form or sense approve the -- from their part what has been suggested. And we have the situation where a broad section of the community needs to be okay with whatever is the transition proposal. And I don't want to give anyone a veto power. But board is part of the community as others, and I just recommend that we separate the final post office action of sending things forward from the actual substantive discussion.

ALISSA COOPER: Jandyr.

JANDYR SANTOS: Thank you, Alissa. This is Jandyr Santos from the GAC. And I would also like to thank Kuo-Wei for his comments. My view is that you said the

concept of a stupid thing is a very subjective one. Sometimes a stupid thing, it is stupid for some but it is not stupid for others. So I think there is merit in sometimes stating the obvious. And I believe there's a clear distinction to be made between the board acting and ICANN acting as a sole messenger to the proposal to the NTIA and, on the other hand, being able to assess and review or maybe even if this is the case, we turn it back to the ICG.

I think this is -- somehow was stated as a possible veto power or something in those lines.

But what I will just -- I will concur with my colleagues, I think there is a clear -- there is evolving consensus in this group that the ICANN should act as a sole messenger and our work has to be done independently. This is in a very transparent way, the way it's been handled with the necessary consultations done during this process via the liaison. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, please.

KUO-WEI WU: Thank you very much. I think, first of all, as you mention about in your concern, I promise you I will bring this concern to the ICANN board. And we have something going to -- or you would like to -- some kind of suggestion to have direct communication between the ICANN board and the ICG. I think I can inform the ICANN board, and I think that would be a very good way and to build the trust between the ICANN board and the ICG group.

ALISSA COOPER: Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Yes. This is Milton Mueller, Syracuse University. This is not about theater. This is a big test of the integrity of this process. We cannot give the board special status over the final proposal. They are another stakeholder in the group.   They have the same opportunities to comment as everybody else. There should be no conference calls with them specifically. There should be no separate meetings or, otherwise, perhaps we should have special conference call with the registries or maybe the Electronic Frontier Foundation or perhaps the Brazilian CGI.

I don't think we can be put in a position where we're giving a particular organization a special opportunity to make the proposal acceptable to them. ICANN can file public comments on the final proposal. And if they raise serious issues -- and I'm sure to talk about being stupid or not being stupid, I'm sure that they would not raise a major issue unless it had some backing. But we would also see how much support it had from the rest of the community when they raised this issue.

But this idea of bilateral negotiations, I think, is completely unacceptable. It implies that they don't need -- that we're negotiating with them, that we're responding especially to them. Whereas, this is a proposal about the entire community and about their relationship to the IANA functions which, of course, is a contracted function, that they have no special permanent claim to before now other than what the NTIA chose to give them.

So I think this is very important, and we have to be very clear about this.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Xiaodong.

Wolf-Ulrich, I think we need to close on this, so sorry.

XIAODONG LEE: Okay. I think Chinese is a U.N.-based language, so I will try to speak Chinese. It is better for you to use the...

I also want to motivate the interpreter not only from English and Chinese, they need Chinese to English.

[Laughter]

I think with regard to this issue, this is the mechanism of ICG in our relationship with the board. I have five suggestions. First, over the past few years, ICANN and ICANN counsel and ICANN board have been working in a very well way so there is no stupidity in this regard. But this don't mean in the future, in the important work of ICG we can find a better -- an appropriate, more appropriate mechanism.

ICANN board is part of the multistakeholder. But it is also part of the ICANN multistakeholder model. They are not the representative of the ICG.

Second, ICG is a coordination group and the representative of the entire NTIA transition, and we're the only representative of that transition.

Third, ICANN is a coordination group -- is a coordination body. In terms of IANA transition, if you look at the announcement of the NTIA in March, it says that NTIA asks ICANN to convene the global stakeholder

to conduct a process. So ICANN has a role as a convener. It does not have the role as an approver.

Fourth, if ICANN board has some suggestions in the end or tell us whether this is appropriate or not, my question would be: Does that mean ICANN board is the final gateway, or is it a gateway for the U.S. government?

Fifth, this echoes Milton Mueller's position. ICANN is also a stakeholder of the entire NTIA transition, so ICANN can raise suggestions and advice. We have the liaison from the board. So if ICANN board says that they have a clear position, they can also give us a proposal and they can also get involved into our process.

So we have an open door. We have the open door for them to offer suggestions. Personally, I think ICANN board should not be a body above the ICG. It should be one of the multistakeholders. These are my suggestions. This is Xiaodong Lee. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Lynn.

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

I can keep my remarks quite short because I think a lot of what I wanted to say has been said. But particularly echoing what Joe, Martin, Milton, and Xiaodong just said, this really is about principle. It is not about a transmission process of a document, which I think a lot of the conversation reverts back to.

I'd also like to just point out that we're here because the community wanted to manage this process in a certain way. And I frankly can't see the full ICANN community being comfortable with the ICANN board actually having the ability to stop the process. Whether we ever think that would happen or not, when you set up processes, you are not ascribing motivations to the other party; you are just trying to run to best practices.

So I think we need to work toward what the community was expecting and involve the ICANN board in the discussions, not have them as a separate approver at the end.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Kavouss Aresteh speaking from GAC.

First of all, after listening to all the comments, I think we need to be very careful not to create an environment of dispute and contentious -- of contention between ICG and ICANN board taking into account it might be a misunderstanding or a misinterpretation of the subject. Our charter is quite clear and we have to implement that, point one.

Point two, final definitive proposals from ICG going to NTIA is not negotiable by any entity. It's final and that is it that.

Thirdly, ICANN explained -- I have not seen the resolution. I have heard colleagues, that they might consider the proposal of ICG not to be taking care of the public interest. That means ICANN believed that they

are guardian of public interest, and we, ICG, 30 members representing 13 communities including three operational communities and ten others, we are indifferent for the public interest. That is not a good way of interpretation. I cannot agree with that sort of understanding if that is that.

We have been selected or elected by our communities, by our 13 to represent all those which represent the entire community. So I think if this is such a misunderstanding, that should be corrected by ICANN board. They should not implicitly say that we are indifferent with respect to the public interest. We are maybe more interested in the public interest than the board of the ICANN or ICANN itself because we are representing all that.

Having said that, ICANN explained as I heard in the resolutions that they would not send anything to NTIA without agreement of ICG. But at what time they come in? At the last minute? If they have any comments, they have a liaison. They have all the opportunities through the liaison or through the virtual meeting or through any other occasions, maybe at our next meeting or anything to come in and explain.

We will consider. We have been elected by the people. We seem to be wise people. We will look into the suggestions. If really there is something that we have missed, no doubt we take it into account.

If we believe we have not missed anything, then we don't take that into account. But we consider something. But they should come timely. They should not come at the last moment.

They have a liaison. The liaison should bring. If it is not necessary -- if it is not sufficient, they could board member or whatever, whoever wants to our meeting, virtual meeting, conference call, physical meeting but timely and duly. This is a matter of importance.

If they come at the last moment, if they come at March or April and say "What you have done is nothing, so I don't agree with that," this is my -- what we can do? That is a matter to be considered.

So, once again, Alissa, kindly consider final proposal of ICG not negotiable, should be transmitted as it is to the NTIA with the letter from the ICANN, "Please find attached the final proposal of ICG with respect to" and so forth, so forth. That's all.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Can we wrap this up, please?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Let me finish. Nothing prevents ICANN to send any comment to NTIA separately. That they can do. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. So I have Russ Mundy, and then Kuo-Wei, and then I will wrap this up and we'll move on to ICANN accountability.

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you. This is Russ Mundy. I wanted to point out that, in fact, the resolution that was passed yesterday really is related specifically to an

important role that ICANN plays in the operational community of names. So it's very reasonable, very appropriate for that community.

My belief is that they really hadn't given much thought to whether or not the same approach and type of thing made sense for the ICG. As our board liaison said earlier, they really hadn't talked about it at all at this point, so I think we may be getting a little overly exercised --

Oh, that's the problem. Thank you.

-- a little overly exercised about a problem that's really not an intent or problem, more like it is just a misunderstanding of how the process works.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Russ.

Kuo-Wei.

KUO-WEI WU: Thank you very much. I hear you loud and clear.

[Laughter]

I promise you I will pass the message to the ICANN board. And I think ICANN board is the same as you. We are really concerned about this transition successfully. So, you know -- so I would do whatever I can and let the board and we work it out. And we are not asking any privilege. Don't confuse. We never asking any privilege. We just try to fully support the ICG, the process successfully. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you.

So I think one thing that would be helpful in addition to that liaising, what I would propose is that I will respond to Bruce and Theresa and ask them to hold off with sending their -- whatever they were going to send, which I haven't received yet anyway.

In the meantime, I'd like to ask Jandyr, Xiaodong, and Lynn if you would be willing to as a small group come up with what our requirements are for this particular aspect. If you can do it over lunch, we can talk about it later.

However, I don't actually feel like there is a lot of time pressure on this because we are talking about something that is going to take place next year other than the kind of outreach engagement bit, which I think we have covered fairly well.

So are you guys willing to do that? Okay. Thank you. We'll talk about the timing if you think you can have something for us today or not.

And then we'll have that back to the group, and we can review and refine as appropriate. Good?

Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Kavouss Aresteh speaking. No problem that the little group prepare something, but we should approve that today and should appear in the output of the meeting.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thank you. We will try for that. Again, I don't really see a lot of time pressure on this and there are other things that are time sensitive so -- including our relationship to the ICANN accountability process. So I will turn it over to Mohamed and he's going to lead that discussion. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you very much, Alissa. So I think before we can just start our discussion about the relationship between ICANN accountability, I would like to give Theresa three to five minutes maximum to update us on the recent accountability process that has been announced recently. Then we can start our discussion.

THERESA SWINEHART: I'll keep this short because I think most people have seen the revised process that was posted. The next steps on this in the revised process on the accountability process are the creation of a cross-community working group, which will establish its charter and to address a range of areas that had come up in the community comments throughout the entire dialogue.

The cross-community working group in its charter would incorporate a few basic principles including participation and open to all. So anybody can participate whether they're part of an SO or AC. How that's incorporated into the charter and handled will, of course, be up to the community and their formation of that.

The scope of the accountability process and the establishment of two work streams, one that is focused on the accountability in the context of

the changing historical relationship with the U.S. administration in light of the IANA transition and their stewardship role, and the second on accountability issues that the community has raised throughout the dialogue that are not directly related to the changing historical relationship.

And just to be clear in the names cross-community working group which is providing input into this process specifically their charter outlines the scope of accountability of the operating parties in their relationship with the IANA function specifically. So there's a narrow scope that the cross-community group on the naming area is looking at in relation to their proposal coming into here.

The track one of the accountability process is looking specifically at ICANN accountability in relation to the changing historical relationship.

So I just want to be clear on those distinctions between the different areas of work.

And we will be preparing a diagram, a visual, to help provide greater clarity to the community on those.

There are some other areas that are incorporated into the revised process.

Specifically relating to this group is also establishing a mechanism to liaise with the work of the IANA stewardship transition coordination group -- namely, the ICG -- and that be established with the Work Stream 1 that is looking specifically at ICANN's accountability in the context of the changing relationship.

How this is established is really up to the community how they want to do that, but again, to ensure that as the work of this group is moving forward, as you've heard from NTIA and others, they expect that alongside the proposal coming from here will be a proposal on how we're going to be addressing ICANN's accountability in the context of the changing relationship.

So it was felt that it's important that there's some sort of liaising mechanism between the two groups so there's no surprises so they can help inform each other, see where they are in the workflow process, et cetera.

And also on the scopes of accountability that they're looking at.

So in that context, I'm happy to answer any questions. I think most people throughout the week have heard the informational updates around this, but I'll give that overview of where we are and I'm happy to answer any questions in relation to this.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: So we can open it for the floor?

I have Kavouss, Adiel, and Wolf.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Theresa. Kavouss Arasteh speaking.

We understand that we are now discussing the cross-community working group dealing with the ICANN accountability which has two tracks, the first track relating to the historical relation of U.S.

Government or NTIA with respect to the issue of transition, and the second, overall or long-term accountability of ICANN.

Having confirmed that by nodding, ICG is currently looking to the activities of the first track, that meaning the track dealing with the transition, but not the overall accountability of ICANN at this stage.

What we want to know, that when that group will be established and at what time the result of that accountability relating to the transition activities will be communicated to ICG or how we will be involved in that activity.

And after that, after hearing that, then we request the chair to identify how we inject that result into the overall process of the ICG activities.

It seems that the one on the question raised was not very clear for you. Please kindly clear that the first track is the track that directly related to the activity of ICG. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: So to be clear, the ICG is putting together the proposal to meet the criteria set out by NTIA on the stewardship transition.

The RFP that has gone out to the respective communities asked the respective communities to be looking at how they are also looking at accountability in the context of their operational relationship with the IANA functions, okay?

Those proposals come in to the ICG. It puts things together. That is the remit here.

The Track 1, moving to the accountability process -- okay? -- so moving away from the ICG process and moving over to the accountability process is looking at the topic of discussion that came up when the announcement arose on how is ICANN as an organization accountable in light of the changing historical relationship with the U.S. administration. Not the protocol parameter space and IETF relationship with the IANA functions or the regional Internet registries and IP addressing or the naming space, but how is ICANN as an organization accountable in light of the changing relationship.

So that is the Track 1 discussion.

The Track 2 discussion are a range of other issues that have come up around accountability that some of them are already being addressed and had been raised in the ATRT2 report and various other issues that are broader.

In that context, as you've heard NTIA also state this week and in Istanbul, there's an expectation that as the ICG prepares its proposal, alongside, the Track 1 discussion concludes what its report and recommendation is to ICANN in the context of the changing relationship with the USG.

Hence, the suggestion of a liaising mechanism.

So as the work here is being prepared, the work that should accompany it alongside, achieved by consensus by the community, is also addressed in the context of ICANN's changing relationship.

So I hope that provides clarity around the scope.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: -- take the other questions and when Alissa explains, maybe it has to make more clear.

Adiel?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yes. Thank you. Adiel, representing the NRO.

Yeah, my question is again to very well understand that first track of accountability --

Okay. So yeah, I just wanted clarification on that first track, because that is the impact of the ending of the historical relationship of ICANN with NTIA.

Now, does that scope go beyond the IANA function?   Because that relationship between ICANN and NTIA is mainly for the IANA function.

Now, the ICG role is to build a solution or something that represents the NTIA oversight, right?

What will be the scope of that working group? We -- it seems like there will be a -- you know, an overlap between the two, because maybe what the ICG is doing is part of that group because that group will look at a more broader aspect of the relationship between IANA and ICANN and the U.S. Government while we are looking very specifically at the IANA function accountability side.

So can you -- can you explain that because...

EN

THERESA SWINEHART: I think that's another reason why the liaising mechanism is going to be very important, is in order to ensure that the Track 1 is very much looking at the changing relationship.

In many cases -- and this was also provided in the documentation -- there is a perception that the U.S. would -- perception or reality, however one chooses to do it, of the U.S. being a backstop in the context of, you know, whether there's a renewal of the IANA contract or whatever it might be, or just a go-to place if there's concerns that then would be addressed.

And so dealing with that aspect of things, as opposed to the direct relationship that the operational groups have with the IANA function.

So the liaising relationship is going to be very important in order to not have duplication of work, have complementary work, and ensure that what is being prepared in Track 1 is really addressing this broader issue of no longer having a contract, no longer having the perceived role or existing role that the U.S. has in relation to ICANN, in light of the contract relationship.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: So, yeah, thank you. That helped. Wolf, you have maybe the last questions to phrase in our update so we can open up the discussion for ICG members. Yeah.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yes. Thank you, Theresa. Wolf-Ulrich Knoben speaking.

I tried over the work -- the week during ICANN meeting, well, also to lift the fog a little bit, yeah? Which is -- which is around, yeah?

And it is -- several times it was confusing. I have two comments, one to the wording and one to the content.

So the wording on the one hand is -- so we are talking about this cross-community work.

If you look at the -- at the schedule from ICANN and the related issues, the related items regarding that, you will see that this group has been called ICANN accountability and governance cross-community group, not working group. That's one thing.

So to understand, that's what confuses people, talking about working groups on the other -- on the one hand. On the other hand, you know, it's called in this way. So please, in future, be consistent.

The other thing is with regards to the streams, the working streams.

I think it's -- and I tried, well, to find out. It may be easier then to understand if we could fill up those streams with some more specific items, examples, you know, for example, to understand what is behind them. We are very general on the -- at the time being.

So what I have understood is that the first stream, we could maybe split up in two sub-streams, yeah? The one is more related -- this is the IANA theme -- more related to the technical part, the so-called SLAs, you know, that the IANA function is going to run in the future in an operational way as it is at the time being and that has to be covered as

well and is covered in SLAs and it has to be made sure that it is going to be run as well.

It's on the also kind of accountability question. That's one thing.

And the other one is that the essential ICANN accountability functions which are covered at the time being with the NTIA, the U.S. Government stewardship, that they have to continue to be satisfied in the future, after the transition as well.

That's Part 1.

And the other one is in the more general one with regards to the other accountability issues which are to be covered.

So the first part directly is to be fit in this cross-community working group with its three streams, the operational streams: Naming, numbering, and protocols, as well.

So that's my understanding. Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: So I'll just be very brief on this.

The first part that you identified in relation to the SLAs and the specific agreements of the operational groups with the IANA function, that is actually in this group. That's here. And that's, my understanding, an expectation of what the proposal should include in the context of what is submitted here.

So the two work streams in the accountability process go to your second point, the first point -- the first work stream goes to your second identified area here, and then the work stream goes to broader issues.

But areas around SLAs and all of that, on the direct relationship with the operational parties, is what is within this group and the context of the proposals that come in.

So I hope that clarifies things well enough.

And I take your point on nomenclature and the use of names.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Thank you very much. I think we can just -- just alternate now for the discussion for the whole group after finishing the question.

I have Kavouss, Manal, and Milton, and Alissa.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. Kavouss Arasteh speaking.

Mohamed, believe me, I am not clear.

In the activities of ICG relating to the transition of IANA function, there is a degree of accountability. Who and how and from where we discuss that?

Do we discuss that in ICG, initiated from our own, or we expect to receive something from the first track and then take that into account and proceed further, or we can take both, something we initiated, as Theresa mentioned, moreover we expect to receive something from the

first track relating to the accountability in respect to the transition, and with both of them we will further pursue our matter and we send the final results to the NTIA.

There would be no -- there would be no point that we send something without taking into account accountability. That should be quite clear. Where this accountability will be initiated, will be discussed, whether we do it here, whether we take it from the track -- first track, or whether we do it -- we take it both of them.

Could you kindly clarify the matter? Because that is not clear.

In Istanbul, we just very briefly discussed that, and in fact, it is not in our time frame properly but we have to know that. We need to send something which involves the accountability from the transition activities of ICG. Where this accountability comes from. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah. Milton, please.

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah. I think I can actually help to answer Arasteh's question.

And it was my -- so there's -- there's a cross-community working group on the IANA transition within the names community, and that is actually supposed to come up with a proposal that we see.

However, it has to coordinate with the Track 1 of the accountability process because the basic concept is that Track 1 is what has to happen before the IANA transition takes place. It's the final point of leverage.

And so my understanding is that the Track 1 of the accountability process will wait for the IANA transition community -- cross-community working group to come up with a proposal and they'll say, maybe, "You have to add this and this has to happen before we'll accept that," and ICANN will then kick off a process to make that happen before the transition and then we will get the proposal from the names community and then put it together with the other processes.

Now, if I'm starting to wave my hands a bit, it's because there is some uncertainty about how that coordination takes place, and maybe Keith can fill us in further, but that's my understanding.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Manal, please. Okay. Keith -- okay. Next, I have -- sorry. I've just gone through the queue, Keith, but we have Russ, Alissa, and Keith. Unless, Milton, you want an answer from Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: So this is Keith Drazek. I'd be happy to, I think, maybe expand a little bit on my understanding, based on Milton's comments and in response to Kavouss' question.

So to be clear, there are two separate cross-community working groups that have been formed in the naming community, okay?

There's one cross-community working group focused on the IANA stewardship transition. That's the group that will be feeding its bottom-up consensus community recommendation to us. And then there's a separate cross-community working group that is currently being

formed. The charter drafting team just met for the first time yesterday, so it is new. It is still in the formation stages.

And that group will be looking at both Track 1 and Track 2 of the accountability discussion.

So there is going to be some interrelationship between, I think, those two CCWGs, those two separate cross-community working groups, on Track 1, but it remains to be seen how that interaction takes place and what structure and sort of process we put in place.

But I think importantly, those are both community-led processes and groups and organizations and we have to find a way to work together and to make sure that we're in sync on the questions of what is related and what is necessary prior to the transition.

And I will be -- speaking personally, I will be involved in making sure that those -- both groups are in sync, to the extent that I can. I know others will be as well.

So I hope that answers some of the question, but at the end of the day I think this group, the ICG, is going to be engaging with the naming community's cross-community working group on IANA stewardship transition, not necessarily directly with that other accountability group.

And if anybody else would like to jump in, that's fine.

[Laughter]

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL: So actually I think my question has been answered because I was a bit confused as to when the ICG would coordinate -- I mean, whether the ICG is going to coordinate on the accountability thing with Track 1 of the accountability cross-community working group or through -- because I thought this was what's going to happen because we're saying how we are going to coordinate with the accountability process.

But now I understand that this is going to happen through the cross-community working group on names? Is this the right understanding? So I wait to hear more answers and maybe...

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: If we can go to Russ and Kavouss and Alissa.

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy here. I think in terms of fulfilling our charter and staying properly limited by our charter, it seems to me that where we need to have the flow of, if you will, of the accountability things be is by way of the proposals we receive. And the primary ones, of course, are the operational community ones. And the one in particular we're talking about is the names one, but it is potentially possible that the other two operational communities in some manner might have some interaction with them. But I think that we -- it really seems that our charter limits us to taking any explicit actions with respect to accountability and limiting them again to looking for conflicts and looking for gaps and not introducing anything additional or over -- kind of overarching or anything of that nature.

ALISSA COOPER:	This is Alissa. Thank you, Russ.

And we do have agenda time a little later to talk about how we actually assess accountability and so forth. But I completely agree. And I don't really think this is actually a point of debate. I think we have already said this in multiple ways and with the RFP, which is that in terms of us asking for transition proposals, the entity that exists to answer us for names is the names cross-community working group, and that is the entity that we should hear from.

If we -- you know, that group can decide how it wants to relate to any other process within ICANN, including the ICANN accountability process just the same way that that can happen in the other operational communities. However, I think it's important that we remain informed about everything that's going on.

So what I would like to see is a show of hands of who is already or planning to be an active participant or member in the names cross-community working group.

Which one?

On the transition, the names, the names. I tried to call them something else, and I got shot down, that I shouldn't call them anything else besides they are being called except they are not being called anything consistent.

[Laughter]

What do you want me to call it?

KEITH DAVIDSON:	There are two groups for names. One is CWG IANA and the other one is CCWG accountability.
ALISSA COOPER:	Okay. Is that what we are calling them? CWG IANA and CCWG accountability. Yes? Okay. Got i.

Who is participating in -- who plans to participate in a meaningful way in the CWG IANA, please raise your hand. So I have Wolf-Ulrich, Milton, Keith Davidson, Xiaodong, Demi, I'm participating -- I'm Alissa -- Jari, yes. Whew, that's news to me. Kavouss. Manal. Jandyr. Michael. Martin. And Keith Drazek. Did I miss anyone? Oh, Mary. And Thomas.

That's a lot of people. So what I was going to ask is: Do we need to designate someone who has the responsibility of talking to us when we think we need to know something about what's going on, the rest of us who aren't, the other half of us who are not going to be participating in the group, I won't call it a personal liaison necessarily but should we designate someone who is the stuckee to run back and forth between these groups. We could do a show of hands, a yes or no. Are you volunteering?

No.

I was just going to circle your name on the page.

[Laughter]

MARTIN BOYLE: Can I make just a little comment on this? This particular group is going to be meeting -- was it weekly -- with two-hour conference calls rotated. And, therefore, I actually think we are going to need to have more than one liaison to ensure that we are properly covered and can report back to this group, so just picking on one poor sap to do it I don't think is a solution. And if it is the solution, it ain't me.

[Laughter]

ALISSA COOPER: Maybe we should ask these questions sort of in stages, which is, first of all, do we think we should identify personnel who -- and, again, I would not say that this needs to be, like, every time you have a call you have to tell us what happened, not at all. But when you feel there's something of import, you should bring it back to us. And when we feel there's something of import, we can send it through you. That's the kind of thing I'm thinking about, and I'm seeing general agreement for that in the room. Yes? Are you agreeing? Yes.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Madam Chair, Kavouss Aresteh speaking. We need at least three because of the time difference, the time --

ALISSA COOPER: We will talk about the number of them, yes, yes. I think I see general agreement that you want this, or are you going to disagree that we should have personnel or are you going to volunteer? You are not on the list. Oh, you want to get in the queue. That's Mohamed's problem.

[Laughter]

So I'm hearing support for three people in different time zones. Yes? Three people in different time zones. And should we try to do this as a group or we can try to figure it out on the side? Maybe we should try to figure it out on the side. Yeah.

And I just want to ask one other question which is if we think we need something similar for the CCWG accountability? Yes, I'm seeing head nods.

MILTON MUELLER: My understanding is that the accountability cross-community working group does not need to coordinate with us per se. Here's how they intersect. Let's suppose the IANA group from the names community comes up with a proposal for dealing with IANA and the rest of the DNS community says, "That's okay but we don't think we've extracted enough accountability out of ICANN before we go ahead with this plan and we want something else which is not pertaining to IANA. It might be a new appeals process or something like that," that's where the two intersect.

So yes, we are committed by our charter to coordinate with that group, so obviously we should have a liaison. But in some ways, that group's input on what happens during the transition depends on what the names community proposes.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Further points of clarification or can we ask the question about do we need -- Okay. Okay.

KEITH DRAZEK: Sorry to jump in. Keith Drazek. Just two points. One is that in the conceptualization of this cross-community working group on ICANN accountability, there is a liaison role that's been built into that process for this group.

ALISSA COOPER: It is a mechanism, right?

KEITH DRAZEK: A mechanism, thank you. I did not an individual, a role -- but, yes, "mechanism" is the right word. Thank you, Alissa.

So, yes, there is an opportunity for -- an opportunity and an expectation that the ICG will have some sort of a liaising mechanism with the CCWG accountability. There was something else.

Oh, the other thing I wanted to say, there are a lot of moving parts to this obviously. Lots -- two different tracks, two subtracks, sort of dotted lines between the various groups of interaction.

So I asked Theresa and Fadi just a couple of days ago or suggested that an updated infographic would be exceedingly helpful, and they have agreed to do that. So I think that should help clarify things as we look ahead. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So focusing on this question of do we need dedicated personnel who are responsible for sending information back and forth to the CCWG accountability, is that what -- James, is that what you intend to speak to? Let's have James and then Kavouss and then Manal, and I will try to wrap and give the floor back to Mohamed which I hijacked.

JAMES BLADEL: As part of that question, trying to understand the hands that went up there, that's for participation in the naming community proposal. Are we expecting delegations of that size to the other communities as well? Because we may have to budget our liaisons a little bit.

ALISSA COOPER: I was going to ask, maybe -- should we do the show of hands again? I wasn't sure if we were ready.

JAMES BLADEL: I don't want us to spread everybody into one basket when we may need people in other communities as well.

ALISSA COOPER: If it's something we think we'll need, we'll do the show of hands. But let's hear from Kavouss and Manal.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, Alissa. Kavouss is speaking. I suggest that CWG IANA you add comma "name" with capital. If you say CWG IANA, still we don't know what is it. You have to go a little bit further that we are dealing with

that specific group concerning the names. So we have to add, "comma names." That is quite clear.

Having an infogram, it helps a lot. We should know really what is the name of this group, what is the link of this group with others and if you can add some timing.

I cannot agree with Keith that mentioning the CCWG accountability has no relation with ICG. It would have relations if, yes, at what time this relation should be established and how the ICG will take into account as a result of effort. That is the reason we need to have somebody from this group in CCWG accountability, first track at least. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you.

                           Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL: I was just going to ask when we receive the three proposals from the three operational communities, each one with its own aspect of accountability, and then we try to package this in one proposal, we said we might find gaps or overlaps. But I'm concerned now about the gaps in something like accountability. Would this go back to the Track 1 accountability?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, this is a conversation that we will be having after we take a break. Right now we're doing -- we are trying to do the process piece, so we will definitely come back to that.

Keith and then we'll try to wrap.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you. Keith Drazek again. Just to respond to Kavouss, and I think maybe to clarify my remarks earlier, there is definitely a relationship between the ICG and the IANA -- sorry, the cross-community working group accountability names. It's built into the process that there will be a liaison mechanism and so there will certainly be a relationship and interaction. But we, the ICG, are not expecting that group to deliver us any recommendation. That's a separate process.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Okay. So back to the question. Do we think we need dedicated personnel to send information back and forth to the CCWG accountability?

Yes.

People nodding yes. Do we think we need three different people in time zones or less? Yes, we need people in different time zones. Okay. Show of hands of who will be participating in that group, CCWG accountability.

Jon, Jean-Jacques, Keith Drazek, Kavouss, much smaller group. Keith Davidson, go ahead. I know you are not volunteering. Go ahead. James. Why are you sitting at a table?

KEITH DAVIDSON:	Can I just make a point of clarification, that the charter for the names CCWG on accountability has only just started the process. There has been no call for membership of that committee yet and we don't know what the joint community might decide in terms of how that would be populated.
	But to give you an idea, with the names CWG IANA, there was a call for volunteers to fill positions from -- and there was five from each of the two communities and then the four of us, the four ccNSO reps -- or ccTLD reps on this group were automatically appointed as observers, so that same process might happen from our community. But I feel a bit powerless for us to commit to saying this is the way it's going to be for accountability in its formation stage.
ALISSA COOPER:	Okay. Does that mean that we -- the people who raise their hand can feel more confident that they will be participating for whatever reason, that we could ask some of them to be our people initially. And if we want to change it up later, we can do that as more people participate.
	Yeah. Okay.
	Kavouss and then Jean-Jacques and then we'll end.
KAVOUSS ARASTEH:	Yes, Kavouss Aresteh speaking. Yes, Keith Davidson, it is right they have not started. But we wish to be from the very beginning involved in that. We don't want to have something ready made and then go there and say, Sorry, the train is gone. You were not here. That is all. We have to

be involved from the very beginning. That's why we indicated our volunteer to participate in that group with different time zones. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Jean-Jacques, did you --

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Alissa. If you already have more than three volunteers, I would withdraw my name there.

ALISSA COOPER: I wasn't asking for volunteers. I was asking who was going to be there.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: I mean it is also a matter of time zones. So I'm with a question mark if you wish. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Just very quickly, while I won't be participating, there will be members from ICC/BASIS participating. So if at some point they can be of help and support, we can coordinate with them to be useful in the process as well.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So I think I have enough information. I will turn it back over to Mohamed. I didn't really mean to hijack it but I did.

And then I would ask that -- well, we'll try to come up with something on the break and maybe we can talk about that right when we start again.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: So I think we are done. Anyone have any other issues? Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Will ICANN or someone prepare that infogram, that diagram or whatever showing the correct name as we have at least proposed here and the relation of that quite clearly. It helps a lot because there is still some confusion. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Ergys says they are working on the infographic. Okay. Let us break. We will be back at 11:45. 15-minute break.

[Break]

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

Okay. Let's get started. Thanks, everyone, for coming back.

So just to wrap up from the last session, I think we have volunteers to liaise back and forth with our two friendly groups.

For the CWG IANA names -- names and names, we have Milton is happy to volunteer, Xiaodong, and Martin. So thank you. You all live in different time zones and you have other qualifications as well.

And in the CCWG accountability, we have Keith Drazek and Kavouss who have happily volunteered to liaise with those groups.

And obviously these roles can change over time. If people come and go, just let us know that you need someone else to take over and we can fix it, but for now, keep us in the loop. Anything you think is important, let us know. Anything that we think is important, we'll let you know.

So the next topic is the -- upon the suggestion of Michael Niebel, I think we're going to shuffle the agenda again and have our discussion -- our kind of week-in-review, what did we hear from the communities. You know, any kind of process updates that people think are -- raise issues or concerns. We don't need to give an overview of everything happening in the communities, but if there are things that people heard this week that they feel they want to discuss, now is the time to have the discussion about the community transition plan development processes.

So go ahead, Michael.

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Yeah. I just wanted to share my impressions and also the realization that there is a wide range of views of what the transition is.

I mean, people are asking what is really transitioned? And I think the answer is too short, as Bertrand said, "They shouldn't be in the room, then."

So what does the transition mean?

The issue that -- ranging from Michele Neylon saying the IANA stuff is really very boring and Finn Petersen saying that's the most important decision in his working life.

I took from some of the questions a concern that the design of separate pillars leaves out what Bertrand called the glue that the NTIA provides or what ALAC, in its questions in the session we had with ALAC, the umbrella. And I think the intervention of Roberto Gaetano was in the same sense, culminating in this -- in the question from Roelof from .NL to Alissa when she said there's no oversight by NTIA, "Then what are you doing on the panel?"

So what I'm talking about is this really -- apart from the fact that we have three functionalities that pretty much work well and which -- where certain communities are pretty well-prepared to take it on board, the -- the dimension that the IANA fulfills -- that NTIA fulfilled, what's described as stewardship, is this stewardship dimension which is also a trustee dimension, completely falling away or is it something that, as Theresa said in the Accountability Track Number 1, this is where we're going to deal with it? Are we -- the question -- the clear question in ALAC was, "Are you, ICG, dealing with the umbrella dimension?"

And Alissa's answer, as I recall, was "If somebody from the community comes up with an umbrella proposal, yes."

So I just wanted to throw this out, because there are different perceptions, and there are -- there is also a perception -- and we had this in further -- in earlier discussions, and I think Jean-Jacques and Jandyr brought this up -- it is also a political challenge, it's been triggered by a political dimension that NTIA gives out, but it's not only something that's historical and saying that the communities are now ripe to grow on their own.

I just wanted to throw this out, where this is going to be dealt with, whether it's Theresa -- what Theresa said, the accountability first track, or whether we have any space to discuss this.

ALISSA COOPER: So I can respond to just the one point about the question that was -- that was raised about the umbrella.

Actually, what I meant to say, if I wasn't clear, was that it's -- it's within our purview insofar as we can coordinate that amongst the communities. So if a proposal from one community comes out that has elements in it which would affect the other communities, then we as the coordinating body should alert those other communities about this and try to initiate dialogue between those people. Not that we as the ICG should figure out whether an umbrella proposal is appropriate or not. So just to be clear on that point.

Joe?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thanks. I think we heard many of the same kinds of comments and I think there was also -- sorry. There was also a concern related to how the three proposals would be meshed, and I think a lot of that concern was generated from the fact that the people raising those issues had never read the RFP, had never kind of understood what was being asked, and that there were common elements that were going to be asked and, you know, that we've asked for detailed accountability from the actual communities on how they do their own accountability.

So I don't know if it's worth us trying to do some kind of a short document to help clarify some of the misunderstanding related to that. It's -- it would be additive to what's there already. Yeah. But, you know, so -- so that was the only question.

When it comes to the accountability, rather than perhaps the concept of stewardship or even trusteeship, I kind of think of it as there were three children who have figured out how to share toys and play well, but while they were doing that there was an adult in the room, and now the adult may be leaving the room and what's the impact of the adult no longer being in the room.

In one case, one of the children already doesn't recognize the adult, so, you know --

But the question is, I think -- I think the place for me that was an issue was whether any of the accountability processes within a community may be linked in some fashion to this larger umbrella accountability, and if it is and the umbrella accountability will either positively or negatively impact the community accountability process, then we do have to take that into account if the umbrella changes.

So for me, that's the place where that intersection occurs, because they could have an effect.

To the extent that a community is not linked into that process to begin with, then chances are there will be very little change if the umbrella changes.

But for me, that was an issue that we've kind of bounced back and forth on the discussion list and I think it still has some relevance to make sure that we keep an eye out for that as we're looking at the proposals and understanding

And we -- in the RFP, we've asked specifically for their linkages to those broader processes so it would help us see if that would be something that was impacted.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. Jari?

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko. So, yes, we have been hearing these kinds of things, and not just this week but also before, and I guess it relates to how -- what kind of thoughts people have in their minds about stewardship. And, you know, I -- I tend to think of the U.S. Government stewardship as one where they let the community grow and now, you know, we have grown up quite a bit and we can deal with some of those things that, you know, some -- they might perhaps have had to deal with in the past.

And I think that's the key point to take away.

I think we need to deal with the reality and not try to come up with, you know, solutions that match people's imaginary ideas about what kind of stewardship they might want to have.

I think the practical outcome of some of these discussions is that it would be useful for the ICG to clarify its coordination role. What does it mean for us to evaluate that the different proposals actually work together.

Now, I don't believe we need a fully -- full alignment of every little detail. I think it would be silly, I mean, in general, because like the IANA functions are different. Getting a TLD is slightly different from getting a port number, as an example, although, I mean, maybe the IETF financial problems would be solved if we did the same thing as the TLD community does for allocations.

So I think the solutions can be different but it's that, you know, when they interact, those interactions need to be described and those parts need to be compatible.

So I think that -- that is something that we should keep emphasizing in the future.

ALISSA COOPER: Mohamed?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I want to just emphasize as well, on the point that Joe raised, it seems there's confusion about the RFP and what exactly the RFP covers, and sitting in the CWG meeting, I think you can -- we can see that there is no

clarity about how they can submit a proposal which is complying with the RFP components, which is a requirement from our side, and which is -- also will make it easier for us in the future to evaluate those components, including accountability, and how we -- we see accountability in terms of the RFP requirement.

So maybe if we can have a smaller document or just explain exactly what is required, because I'm afraid that at the end of the road, we get a submission that will be very difficult to digest and might not even be able to be aligned with the requirement.

ALISSA COOPER: Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy here.

I would suggest that if we do happen to receive something that asserts to be an overall accountability proposal for the entire community, the only role that we have, again from our charter, is that we would send it at least to the three operational communities and they would have to be the ones that would decide and determine if this was an appropriate approach and a way to approach it or not, rather than the ICG itself.

ALISSA COOPER: Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Kavouss Arasteh speaking.

Yeah, Joe may be right that some of us may have forgotten what is in the RFP. That might be the case. 18th of August till now. Some time. But if we want to provide additional information -- additional explanation, should not paraphrase nor interpret that. It should be for information only.

Additional explanations for any paragraph for information only. We don't want to depart from what we have agreed after a lengthy discussion. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Milton?

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah. Again, I think it needs to be emphasized that the names community is slightly different than the numbers and protocols communities. It's -- both the numbers and protocol communities are in a position, in effect, to move the IANA functions that they receive or the services that they receive from IANA to another source, so a certain level of accountability is there.

And that's not the case with the names community.

So what I have proposed before, and I will repeat, is that when we get the three proposals in, that we do an analysis of the accountability aspects of the proposals that we have.

Some of you are nervous about that, but I think basically what it involves is sort of us describing the proposal's accountability features and saying, "Here's what they are, here's how they interrelate to other."

Then we hand it off to the names community Accountability Track 1 people and we say, you know, "What are you going to tell the names community about what to do regarding this? Would these current arrangements be sufficient for you to go ahead with the transition or not?" Because that's the question they're going to be asking themselves and answering.

So rather -- rather than having a bunch of names community people rise up in -- against the entire proposal, I'm saying we do this in preliminary interaction in which we get this cleared up whether people consider it sufficient or not and whether there are certain things that need to be done at ICANN. Which we have nothing to do about, of course, but -- but at least we would know what we're waiting for. We would be saying, "Okay, the names community thinks there needs to be something else done, there needs to be a revision of the membership structure or there needs to be an appeals process or there needs to be X, Y, or Z before this transition can go forward." Or it may be that the news is, "This is sufficient. Nothing needs to happen before this can go forward," and then we would continue with our processing of the proposals.

So I'm curious as to whether people think that's a good plan or not.

ALISSA COOPER: Kuo-Wei?

KUO-WEI WU: Regarding for the proposal, I'd like to mention a very fundamental thing, if that is possible.

At least have to have one section in the proposal have to explain how they can promise to maintain the Internet stability, security, and resilience.

I think that is, for general, the global public interest. I think this section have to include. If the proposal is without this section, I think the proposal will be quite dangerous.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. We do have in the RFP the section that asks the communities to describe how they meet the NTIA criteria and that's one of the NTIA criteria, so hopefully they will all tell us about that.

Lynn?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Lynn St. Amour.

I mean, as a committee here, we may be coming to sort of a common understanding of what we're trying to solve for, but I think Michael's question is still a really relevant question for the broader community and beyond the ICANN community or the names community, and that's a lot of people read the NTIA announcement and say, "Where's that oversight role going?"

And we're not answering it clearly enough, I think. Some of our work presupposes we know what that answer is. It's not going to a new organization, it's not going anywhere, the three children are growing up at different stages and they're all moving away to independence and we'll all be happy at the end of the day and things will act in a normal

sense for a large part of the community. But it's not responding to a lot of the questions that I think Michael was referring to and that I hear all the time, which is, "Well, who do we -- who do we appeal to or how do we get our concerns taken seriously?"

And I think we have answers for that in this room.

I don't think that question is well understood outside of the room and I don't think the answers are there and I'm actually quite afraid that that will give us some roadblocks in the future.

And while I think we might be as a community okay thinking that the names community will address this and that will be okay and I think there's more confidence that the IETF and the protocol parameters and numbers communities will. I don't know if we need to do another piece of work which is maybe just some additional facts, but I'm not sure that's enough either.

It almost feels like we need some sort of campaign or outreach or something that continues to address, from a very high level, what we're doing with the work. Not how we're doing it and not the process and not the outcomes, but that tries to address the questions from the people we're getting them from.

I don't know if that was particularly helpful because I still haven't quite formed in my mind what would be -- what is the appropriate set of questions that some people are asking that I feel like we're not answering yet and. Then, obviously, then I don't have a proposed solution.

ALISSA COOPER: I have Manal, Elise and Martin and Keith.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Alissa. I have great sympathy toward what Mike had
                              mentioned and Lynn also. So I see the need for this and might even be
                              further than just a list of further FAQs.

                              I also like the suggestion by Milton. And I think we need to have further
                              discussion on this and maybe write it down in a page or two that
                              describes the process or feed into -- we already have -- I forgot the
                              name of the document, but the document that describes how we are
                              going to evaluate the three different proposals. But maybe we can
                              further elaborate on how are we going to consolidate and how we are
                              going to coordinate with the accountability thing. So it might be worth
                              putting this in writing. It is good to have this conveyed outside this
                              room because we cannot depend only that we're open and everything is
                              posted. But I think we also should proactively post this beyond our
                              discussions and also for us to have it documented for later. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Elise.

ELISE GERICH: So since you've asked what kind of input or feedback we heard this
                              week from the IANA department's perspective, the questions we
                              received most of the week had more to do with what exactly does the
                              IANA department do. And you all as representatives from the various
                              communities, perhaps you could point them to the presentation the

IANA department gave on Monday which talked not about what is the contractual relationship but what the actual department does and what we do for each of the functions.

And that seemed to be a misunderstanding broadly within some of the community. It sort of surprised me, and we did have a good reception at the session on Monday morning. I know -- I saw Mary there and Jari and Russ and some others. But I know that's not what the ICG's role is; you're to coordinate. But since you represent the communities, you might take that opportunity to point them to the presentation and the audio that's online.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Elise.

Could you send the links to the mailing list, please. That would be very helpful.

Martin.

MARTIN BOYLE: Martin Boyle. Thanks, Chair. I actually rather like Milton's solution -- or Milton's approach that we do take these things when they arrive and look at them very quickly and then go out and do a rather proactive interaction early on.

And I think that actually would be a constructive way forward. But for Lynn, I wasn't quite sure how easy it would be to produce the sort of document she was talking about without it then starting to look like we were setting new conditions and it turning into being a conditions thing.

And I was, therefore, actually quite pleased with Manal's line which was, yes, perhaps we could take Lynn's thinking and build this into the assembly and finalization process as these are things we are looking for and things we will want to discuss early. And then it makes it look very much more like you've got to think about it rather than us getting into the danger zone of suggesting solutions for which nobody will thank us at all. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Keith Davidson and then I put myself in the queue, Wolf-Ulrich, and then Jari.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Hi, this is Keith Davidson. Just an aside that arose during the ccTLD discussion on the transition and the idea of maintaining sufficient safeguards in the transition, one of the identified concepts was that the oversight which may not have been used very often by the U.S. government is a safeguard and do we want to relinquish any of those safeguards that are in place.

And for the ccTLD community, we have probably a different view to Michele Neylon's boring analysis of what the IANA is. For him as a registrar, he has no skin in the game. We do. We have an entry in a database and a process by which that entry can be challenged by anybody at any time. So to us, safeguards might be much more appropriate than to him. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. And that's actually -- I mean, that is I think the venire maybe that was missing about my comments about the IETF, which is that same type of safeguard, it just doesn't seem useful at all in the protocol parameters case which is why I think, you know, we can sort of easily say that there's no oversight provided currently. You know what I mean. Or that, also, that within the IETF community, the notion that that is the body that you would go to if you were concerned about something is a little bit of an anathema.

Go ahead.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Could I just follow up? It is Keith Davidson again. That is really, really critical, that, yes, we understand there are parts of the IANA users who do not share the same views. But in order to make the transition, we all need to be satisfied that we all have the appropriate safeguards for us.

So I think while it may not affect your community, if does affect your work in this committee, collectively speaking.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, yeah, completely agree.

What I put myself in the queue to say is that I think the notion of the early review is very good but that it should start as early as now. So, you know -- and there's already -- there is a thread on the CWG IANA list about the overlaps within the communities. And I know that within the IETF community, I have been actively twisting people's arms to participate because of the amount of discussion that I imagine there will

be about the overlaps. And we had already been doing that with the numbering proposals and sending them around to everyone who is interested within the IETF previously.

And so I think that's -- to me that's the most important bit of coordination, is that we have people participating in all of the groups who are aware of what's going on in the other groups. And that's a coordinating function that we should all be thinking about how we can facilitate. To me, that's the best safeguard.

I'm still not sure I understand your proposal, Milton. But we'll have more time to talk about it after lunch.

Wolf-Ulrich and then Jari.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. Just with your last words, you covered that. I agree to Milton's proposal, but there is a modification that before the proposals are coming in, there is a lot of communication and coordination necessary as well between the three lines regarding -- let me say here, how they might be impacted, for example, with regards to the accountability issues.

And existing there, the communications necessary. I see that is moving forward since we have this correlation and interrelation between those groups and several members covering several groups. So that should be followed up. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Jari.

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko. So the first thing I wanted to say, I want to thank Elise and the team for the Monday thing. It was really good, appreciated by everyone in the room, myself included but particularly the others over there to learn. I think we need to continue doing things like that.

And sort of in the same way, I want to continue the thread that Lynn started. I think there is room for us to, you know, provide information, not to force a solution on anyone. But we need to be clear and we need to communicate at a high level, not about the details or the process or something like that but, you know, make it very clear to the communities and, you know, even beyond like the ICANN world that we are expecting to find the situation where, you know, the stewardship that historically has been at the U.S. government can now be transformed to the community because this is what -- this is what the initial -- or what the opening situation of this whole change was.

And we can -- we can point communities to how that can be done. Either you find a way for your own community to be in charge of that oversight, make sure that you can provide that oversight or find some way for you to do that. But it is, indeed, the expectation that this is moving to the community rather than inventing another U.S. government-like entity that would do it.

ALISSA COOPER: Go ahead, Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: I'm a little bit -- I mean, I sympathize with the intention of Jari's point, but I think we have no business telling people what solutions we don't

or do want to get. We have the parameters set for us by the NTIA, which is that we can't propose an intergovernmental solution and we can't turn it over to a particular government. But outside of that, we should just not say anything. Let the communities decide what they want.

ALISSA COOPER: Go ahead, Lynn.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Just to be clear, I fully support Martin's comments earlier, that this is a slippery slope. And I think that's what Jari is trying to reflect as well.

I don't know if we just start to show -- or ask the communities at an appropriate stage to start to show the trajectories they're thinking about. Keith was just suggesting maybe a matrix where you look at the work that's done and you start to identify which pieces you have indestiny (phonetic) for or something and which ones are still underworking so people kind of understand the questions we are wrestling with and start to see where this is leading before the proposals come out and now they are frankly, probably, lost in terms of what they thought we were solving for versus what we're actually working towards.

ALISSA COOPER: So can I just ask, is that -- the problem that that's solving, is that just reading the intermediate drafts of the proposals is too difficult? I feel like if you kind of look at the existing ones in numbering and protocol

parameters, the work that has been done already, we want kind of an overlay over that. Is that the suggestion? I'm just trying to figure out what are we talking about producing here.

KEITH DAVIDSON: This is Keith Davidson. And I think -- you know, to me there's content inside the contract that is just there in the IANA contract. And then there are the greater issues. I think if you matrix them in terms of clumping together this is all technical specifications, this is all public policy relating to delegations and redelegations, this is all accountability bits so that you're breaking the contract and the issues into their respective homes, and then you had across the matrix, the homes of protocols and parameters, RIRs, TLDs broken into Gs and Cs, you could then you have a check-box approach to say these are the things we care about or these are the things we don't care about. And then furthermore, you can green tick them or red tick them as to whether you have attended to them fully as your community or not. It might give us an overview in a matrix form of saying "This is the progress of the community," sort of as well a traffic-light approach to the thing.

Now, that's a non-frivolous task. Don't get me wrong. I'm not volunteering to do it. But it may be something that our community might look to resource through some contract or something and start building that because I think to me, it will be very difficult for the names community to come up with a joint proposal unless we take that kind of approach. So whether that's more applicable across the entire community or not, I don't know. But it's an idea that's just been in my mind of trying to break this into slightly more binary pieces. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. Joe and then Narelle. Were you first?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Joseph Alhadeff. I wanted to pick up on the point that Lynn started with, which is we may not be answering some of the questions that are out there. And I think if people are informed about this process because they've read some newspaper articles on stuff that's gone on, then the impression they would get is somehow there was a problem with the U.S. role in this and the U.S. has decided to give up that role. But they might have every reason to believe that that was a day-to-day, very hands-on management role that they took in their oversight as opposed to much more of an exceedingly light touch role. Where in some cases, the fact that they had a role at all was a vestigial error in a contract. And so I think those pieces of context are important to inform the expectations of what it means to have oversight and what was the oversight that NTIA was providing.

You cannot ever gauge correctly what is the emanation of an entity being there even if it didn't act because its presence may be a deterrence in and of itself.

I agree with Milton. It is not up to us to define all of these things. But perhaps in the community processes, they could focus on explaining exactly their interaction in the past of oversight so that it better informs people who are looking at the proposals so you understand, well, I'm replacing this with something that is equivalent to this, not, "Well, gee, that seems pretty light and the answer is it is still stronger than what was there before."

ALISSA COOPER: Narelle.

NARELLE CLARK: Just to pick up a little bit on that -- sorry, Narelle Clark for the transcript.

Just to pick up a little bit on that, Joe, if -- so you're suggesting we put back to the community a request that they add an analysis of the previous interactions, direct interactions with the NTIA in the oversight role? Yep, I think that's a great idea. That would be really helpful. I don't know how we would do that. Do we now do -- issue an appendix to the RFP? I'm concerned that actually if we do start spinning a process where we modify the RFP, we add more confusion into it.

ALISSA COOPER: Well, that's what I was going to say. It is in the RFP already. Like, that's the weird thing about this. I feel like if people read the RFP, that would solve many of these problems.

NARELLE CLARK: If I might finish. Narelle Clark again.

I think Keith Davidson's point of us doing some sort of analysis or at least requesting from somewhere -- and I'm working on doing that within ISOC at the moment -- an analysis of the contract itself, just the contract because there's about four documents we could do an analysis of, but the contract is sort of categorized out and say, This part of the contract refers to the NTIA's role with IANA and all of these other bits are some other stuff.

Certainly when I read that contract -- and I have said this before -- I see a whole lot of establishment stuff with ICANN. And if it was my job inside ICANN to go and renegotiate that contract, then I would get rid of a whole bunch of that stuff because it is all establishment stuff and it is to do with corporate establishment, establishing a corporation to do a bunch of stuff and not necessarily running an IANA.

So I suspect it would be even more complex to do that job that Keith's asking. So I apologize for that.

What I think we need to get back to is an analysis of how are we going to assess these proposals and do that detail. I think that's far, far more important. And that would give more clarity back to the communities.

Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. That's our next topic for after lunch and I will -- I'm sorry, Manal. I'm going to put Russ in front of you in the queue because I think he has a response.

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah. Just in terms of what is the contract, what's in the contract, what does the IANA do, what does the NTIA do, I would urge our folks on this committee and the community to read the SSAC 068 report. That was precisely what we were trying to accomplish there.

Now, maybe we didn't do as well as we could have, but that is, in fact, what we were trying to do. If it's insufficient, then maybe something

else can be done, but what you were just describing, I believe, is what the SSAC was trying to do.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes. Thank you for doing all of that work, SSAC.

Manal, and then I think we should close this discussion and have lunch.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Alissa, and I think I was going to echo what Jari said earlier, but also I see the concern Milton said that we should not be imposing solutions.

So I believe the essence is that we can try to play a more proactive coordination role among the different operational communities and this might help us see the problems or the gaps early enough and would facilitate our later role of assembling all this together.

So again, it's a balance.

So -- and while I have the microphone, I will promote my session later during the day, I think.

The documents we're referring to, we can -- we can link them to the FAQ as well, the SSAC document and what Elise mentioned, the presentation on IANA.

So if we can have this, we can link them to the FAQ --

ALISSA COOPER: Sure.

MANAL ISMAIL: -- and later on we can see how we will update the FAQ. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah. Yeah. Okay. Kavouss and then Mary and then he we're going to wrap this up and go to lunch.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Kavouss Arasteh speaking.

I support Manal. She is, in turn, supporting Milton. We don't need to write anything, we don't need to put any direction or any guidance to anybody, but reference to the documents for people to have a look at, very good.

But trying to start to write up something, we don't have time and it is difficult. We get some sort of interpretation and difficulty to agree on something to be start to be rewritten. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Mary?

MARY UDUMA: Thank you, Alissa.

I think one of the concerns that I got from the communities -- okay, okay. All right.

Mary Uduma, for the record, please.

One of the concerns that was evident was the question of how the -- all the proposals will fit in, in that the protocol and the number communities will bring a different proposal from the naming communities.

Most of the things I've seen there, or people saw, was that the protocol and the number communities no change, or IETF no change, IAB no change, but when it comes to names, a lot of people are looking for change.

So what I think we should be considering now is the marking scheme. What should be the evaluation scheme. Develop the marking scheme for the RFP that we have published and encourage the communities to also redo RFP, because some of the things they are raising, they are already there, maybe because they have not read it and they've not done a thorough analysis.

And some of -- especially the naming community, I think they are just starting. They didn't do a lot of work. So for us in the ICG, I think it's for us to develop the marking scheme.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes. Thank you. And I think that could be the same thing as the assessment which we're going to talk about after lunch.

So I think what I heard in this session is that we definitely need proactive coordination, starting from now, between the communities to make sure that these cross-cutting issues are -- everyone is aware of the cross-cutting issues that may be emerging in the proposals.

It's -- I don't think we really have consensus about producing further high-level documentation. Didn't -- didn't sound like everyone was on board with that. But that maybe having some sort of intermediate point where, in November/December, we try to do a matrix that shows what the -- you know, what the draft proposals look like and compare, on -- maybe on each part of the RFP is what I was thinking when Keith was talking. Actually, you know, we have a bullet point for everything that we want to see, and so if we looked at them across the three and said, "Here's what's being proposed in names and here's what's being proposed in numbers and protocol parameters," then that might give people a sense of -- before January of where the possible conflicts are.

Does that sound sort of like what you were suggesting?

So we can -- we can continue to discuss who's going to do that or if we want to do that. I think we have a little more time. I think -- I mean, it doesn't make sense to do this until there's something that looks like a names proposal or a couple of names proposals or --

You know, give names a little bit of time, is what I would suggest on that front, but people can disagree with that.

Go ahead.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: And I think those are all good ideas, and maybe one of the things we can do, one of the other suggestions was to look at putting a few more questions into the FAQs that we're working on.

Even if nothing else, some of the questions you had at the end of the presentation yesterday in the public session aren't in the current facts. We should add that in. But maybe also addressing, you know, does this imply that the U.S. Government's role is replaced by an entity. And we can put in a politically correct "Not necessarily. Some committees might," blah, blah, blah, blah, but I think that's a critical question to get out on the table because it's one I heard far too many times this week to have me believe that, you know, with 2,000 people here and, I don't know, maybe the 300 people that were in our session yesterday, that somehow this is really going to be a global enough effort in terms of setting appropriate kind of expectations, and I'd just like to do that in the earlier stages rather than later.

ALISSA COOPER: Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah. Just, again, I think we're kind of -- we're really jumping the gun
here.

The communities have set in motion survey processes that are asking some of these questions directly to their own members, and I'm just -- I sense this sort of -- what is it? I don't want to call it panic. That's too strong. But this -- this real lack of confidence in the method that we have agreed on in our charter that we're not trusting the bottom-up process to work, we don't think it's --

We can wait for them to get proposals to us and then we can figure out if there are conflicts and send it back to them. I thought that's what we had agreed to do.

So I mean I don't understand the calls for greater intervention. We've already found out that like a dozen people here are involved directly in the different processes so there's linkages between them.

I just -- we just need to wait until we have proposals.

ALISSA COOPER: Is that -- sorry. Is that an objection to this notion of like a summary matrix that -- of the proposals that come out?

Which to me was more of like a coordinating like --

MILTON MUELLER: Well, I --

ALISSA COOPER: -- this is an easy way for everyone to know what's going on in the other communities and wasn't meant to be an intervention of any sort.

MILTON MUELLER: But if it comes after we actually have the proposals, I have no objection to it. If we're jumping the gun and saying "This is a proposal" when there actually isn't an agreed proposal and people are still debating issues, what do we put into this matrix?

ALISSA COOPER: Well, I guess -- I guess I thought what I was hearing -- because --

From my perspective, it's like it's not that hard to go figure out what the current draft is in the IETF, what the current proposals are in the RIRs and the names, but it sounds like it might -- maybe is difficult for a lot of people to do that.

So it would be sort of a way to have a single point where interested parties could go and find out the current status at some point -- you know, some intermediate point in November or something.

But I'm not committed to it. It was just -- if it seems like it's adding too much, then we don't have to it, so...

Joe -- Keith, do you want to respond to that, and then Joe?

KEITH DAVIDSON: I think so. Keith Davidson, for the record.

And I don't think I was proposing necessarily that the -- the fully developed matrix be the property of a group or an undertaking for this group, but more that that might be the bottom-up approach that the various groups will apply along the way.

But if we can find a methodology by which we can all stick to and we see the top level of that matrix which gives us the traffic light, "These are the bits that are well advanced, these are the bits that need more work," and so that we can make sure things are not falling between the gaps and that efforts are not being duplicated or triplicated across the various groups, that to me would be a very useful device for us.

So if -- if it was something that the entire transition community was entertaining, I think it would be quite useful.

And I think, you know, this IANA transition is a big task. It is like eating the elephant. And we can only do that one bite at a time. So this is maybe drawing lines on the elephant of the bite-size chunks.

ALISSA COOPER: Wow. Okay. Nobody wants to eat lunch over here.

[Laughter]

So I have Russ, Jean-Jacques, Joe, Mary, and then Jari and then we're going to --

Did you put your -- did you just want to respond directly or what is the --

I will allow you to jump the queue, due to exasperated body language.

[Laughter]

Go ahead, Mary.

Well, we have Mary, Russ, Jean-Jacques, Joe, Jari, and then we're going to eat lunch.

MARY UDUMA: Okay. Mary Uduma here.

I think if you set examples for people who have sent an RFP, I think it is important that we develop what Keith has said and develop the marking scheme.

The ones we receive, we can just, you know, start keying in the responses and having a sense of what is coming until we get the rest.

So it is not a question of panic; it's a question of planning. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy.

I would suggest that trying to develop anything that would supplement the RFP in any way would really be a mistake, because not only are the communities out trying to do things but it would take us a lot of energy because we took a lot of energy just to get the original RFP agreed to.

And I think we all have jobs of the two-way liaison back and forth with our communities, and the best thing I believe that the ICG should consider with respect to this issue would be expanding our FAQ, because that's something we've said is live, it's something that if we can agree to whatever the questions are that we think need to be dealt with, we -- we deal with it and that's a mechanism that won't disrupt the community and should provide a way to get additional info out if needed.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Chair.

A simple observation. I think that so long as we provide facilitation, meaning helping elements of the community to understand what is going on and what the choices are, that's fine, but we should not be seen as intervening in the process by which they will be sending their contributions. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. Joseph Alhadeff.

The point I wanted to make and I think the point that I was making in relation to Lynn's point was not that any of these elements are missing in the RFP. The RFP is complete.

Not that the proposal -- not that the communities aren't considering these things in the proposals.

But these are people who are steeped in these matters and who describe things in ways that are not necessarily accessible to those who aren't steeped in these matters.

And the extent to which the ICG can help translate some of that concept so people can feel that they are understanding what is going on, that is a benefit.

I do not think -- I completely agree. I don't think we should edit the RFP. I don't think we should dictate anything to the proposals. But -- and we

have put in the proposal the concept that they should consider plain English ways of describing things.

But communities have a habit of not recognizing when the jargon is being used, and --

Yeah. So I'm saying, I think, you know, we need to figure out how to address some of those concerns and I think the feedback we get from people when we see them not understanding is part of when we know we have to address a concern.

ALISSA COOPER: Jari.

JARI ARKKO: I agree with, Joe and Russ. I think we are in a situation where we're communicating with the world and not just with the people who are developing these proposals in the communities but the broader world, and it is important that we try to be as clear as possible to them and, as Lynn pointed out, they have some questions and that's natural. I think adding things to the FAQ will be a useful thing, and that can be a very fact-based operation.

We could say for instance that -- you know, if they have a question of, "Does it mean that the stewardship role transitions to a new entity," we could say, "Not necessarily. You know, the particular solutions depend on what the communities choose to do but the stewardship can transition, for instance, to the community in charge."

ALISSA COOPER: Paul?

PAUL WILSON: Thanks, Alissa.

ALISSA COOPER: Paul is last.

PAUL WILSON: Paul Wilson here.

I thought it was a good idea -- it seemed like a good idea at the time, but I'm not sure I like the idea of doing the kind of analytical and transcription work involved with creating our own matrix.

I think -- I think for the ICG to get involved with trying to represent what's being said in a -- in a sort of authoritative way could be seen as it could be inaccurate, it could be seen as interfering, could be seen as providing favor to one side or the other in ongoing discussions.

So I would suggest not to do that or to -- you know, to allow it to be a community exercise.

And then also, I strongly support continually updating the FAQ as we -- as we go to answer the questions that we've become aware of, and I think that's one objective way that we can put data out in a -- and information out in one predictable known location without overdoing it. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Paul.

So I think we have broad support for using the FAQs as our vehicle for informing people about some of these things and we have a session later in this afternoon to talk about the FAQs.

I will certainly have the questions from the -- from the community discussion yesterday ready and maybe we can collectively type up some answers to those as well, but people should be thinking about what additional questions we should -- specific questions, like how you would write them down, that we should be adding to the FAQ and we'll talk about that in the afternoon session.

So that seems like the main takeaway, and getting links into the FAQ as well.

So let's break for lunch, which is in the Olympic room. We're having a private lunch just amongst ourselves in the Olympic room and we'll be back here and starting again at 1:45.

Dear ICANN, can we leave our stuff?

Okay. Yeah. The tech people will be here so if you feel comfortable leaving your stuff, there will be people around.

[BREAK]

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

All right. We are going to get started talking about the proposal finalization process. Woo-woo! People are feeling punchy after lunch. That's what I like.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: To some degree, this might actually be my job here to be a little bit of a cleaner (indiscernible) you guys.

ALISSA COOPER: Cheerleader Faltstrom.

I can't wait to start. Our next topic is the proposal finalization process. So this is a document that I put together a few weeks ago to try to kick start this discussion that we've already been having a little bit today, which is what is it that we're going to do when we actually start receiving proposals, including how are we going to assess them and what are the steps we are going to go through back and forth with the communities and in the assembly of the unified proposal.

So just to briefly review, if people haven't looked at this in a little while, there's three phases listed in this document. The first one is the individual proposal assessment. And so this is for when we start to receive proposals from the operational communities and we want to make some assessment of them before we move onto the next step. If we scroll down a little bit, we can see there's a bunch of checks that we've put in here. And this version incorporates kind of the first round of edits that we had and suggestions from the mailing list.

So the list right now, as you can see: Completeness, clarity, does the proposal fulfill the NTIA criteria, were community comments, you know, addressed somehow, what was the level of consensus to the proposal to achieve consensus, and was the process inclusive and open.

And then the idea is if we amongst ourselves have consensus, that the proposal meets all of -- passes all of these tests, then we would move on to the second step. The second step is the unified proposal assessment, if we can keep scrolling.

So in this step, we have three proposals. We've already gone through the first step with all of them. We put them together. And we ask ourselves, okay, are these compatible with each other? Do they interoperate? Are all of the overlaps properly addressed? Does it make sense when we put them all together? And then this question about accountability and whether the unified proposal includes sufficient, independent accountability mechanisms which is the language from our charter. So that's the second step, is the unified proposal assessment. If we agree in this group that we have passed all those tests, then we would move onto the third step, which if we keep scrolling, the third step is public comment and proposal finalization. That's where we put the unified proposal out to the community, out to the world, and seek any additional public comment that hadn't already been received, review the comments, figure out if we need to reengage with the communities to make modifications. And if not or once those are done, go on to the NTIA submission process. So that's just an overview of the three steps.

If we go back up to the first step, I know there had been a couple of comments already on the mailing list since I sent this version, one from Joe about, I think, the order of the elements and one from James about NTIA criteria. We could start with those, if you guys want to revisit your comments or the floor is open for anyone who has comments on Step 1.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I was just suggesting that perhaps if we think some of these things, a couple of these things go to the process and some of those concepts are things we can already start looking at in some ways before the proposal comes in. So I was just thinking if we maybe put them in the order of the process and the deliverable, that might be a better way to consider them and then the other comment I had made was that we also should make sure it's incompleteness, but it might be worth just saying they are sufficiently documented because there could be an assertion that's the correct assertion but we might want to see some more documentation related to the assertion. So those would be the only comments.

ALISSA COOPER: So what is your suggested ordering? I mean, yeah.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I guess it would be looking at some of the inclusiveness and openness and level of consensus upfront because those are more of the process issues and then getting to the substantive issues because I actually think we now know what a number of the processes are in the communities already. If we see an issue with the process, we should probably alert

the community that there may be a process concern but without waiting for them to fill it and then it's more of a check-the-box exercise to say, yes, we completed our process effectively and this is how.

The other question I would have here is there may be some stakeholders -- and this goes to the community comments. Is there an opportunity for members that aren't part of the community who participated in the process but somehow didn't feel their comments were taken into account to let us know that? Because that seems like this would be the appropriate time for them to make us aware as opposed to waiting until we get to the final proposal.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah. I think on that last point, we do have the input mechanism. And anyone can provide input at any time. So that's probably what I would say is the thing to use for that.

Okay. Adiel, are you not in the queue anymore or are you in the queue? You're out of the queue. You're in the queue. Okay.

[Laughter]

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: I was just suggesting to flip C and B, move C up, check the NTIA criteria first before looking at clarity within the proposal itself.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. I guess maybe while we're just talking about the ordering thing, I was sort of assuming -- and Manal and I had a little bit of a discussion of

this on the list, that we get the proposals and anyone in the ICG who wants to go through and do this assessment can do it, the full assessment, all six items.

So people who are talking about the ordering must be envisioning some different process because if you're going to sit down and read a proposal and decide for yourself if you think they pass these tests, the ordering of them doesn't really matter. So do you see what I'm saying? I'm happy to rearrange the order, but I just wanted to give my mental model of how I think this is going to happen.

So... do you want to speak to that issue? Okay.

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko. The way I partially understood this, and it would perhaps make more sense understood in that fashion, is that there are some aspects of this that can actually happen even before we actually get the document in front of us, that we are tracking level of consensus and inclusiveness and openness as we go along. But I do agree that once we get it, it's like an individual task for us to do these evaluations and look at any or all of these criteria and make our assessments based on that.

ALISSA COOPER: James.

JAMES BLADEL: Hi, thank you. James speaking.

So I had a question or wanted to maybe provoke a conversation a little bit about Step 1E, a level of consensus. And I'm hoping that perhaps at this level, this group would simply be taking whatever declaration or assessment of level of consensus that the submitting community had for its process and we would not necessarily dive down deeper into examining how they arrived at that consensus or perhaps even entertain challenges from other communities or other members of that group who want to challenge whether or not the consensus threshold was met and are appealing to the ICG to revisit this issue.

So I guess my question is: Is this simply just a check the box "yes," that group declared they have achieved consensus for their proposal and we have confidence in their assessment, or do we want to do something a little deeper than that?

ALISSA COOPER: Kavouss.

I will let people think about that.

Go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Kavouss Aresteh. I think there must be some order, clear order, how to proceed. Even if a condition of some of the items is not met, we would not need to go to the second.

For instance, completeness. If it is not complete, what is the point to go to the other area to see whether criteria are met or not met? The

proposal is not complete. Then you have to see what is the action to be taken, where you go.

Then there is a problem between D and F. To some extent, they're overlapping. When you talk about inclusiveness and openness, you're talking about community comments as well in an indirect manner. So do we need to explain them or point them in a different way or we could combine them?

Then the level of consensus, how it could be the only thing that the proposal has mentioned consensus to the extent they have (indiscernible). And if there are different views tabled that they are put in the RFP, that different views should be also mentioned. So some of this is difficult to see, for instance, when you say that whether all stakeholders interested in the parties have been included. How can you have all the stakeholders? Who could claim that my proposal has the support of all stakeholders? Are you talking of community? You are talking of 7 billion people? You are talking of 200 billion Internet users? How could you check that all people have participated? So we be a little bit more clear for this criteria.

And then my last comment on that, how you want to proceed with that. Do we proceed that the entire group or you try to -- at least some of those we could treat together should be first, have a first round among us in one or two or three groups, in parallel in order to facilitate the discussions? Otherwise, all of us would be included in comment on one and then I don't know how long discussion will take.

Alissa, we are having a little bit short time before us. So it would be difficult if we started that and continue to having the experience of the

first round of this extensive exchange of emails and so on, so forth. So we might have a way how to proceed.

But the first thing was again we need to have a proper order, and then we need to have -- if the proposal is not complete, what is the point you go to the remaining parts? Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. I think you raise a lot of good points. So just one clarification. And then I want us to focus on this, like how are we going to get this done, because I think it will solve maybe some of the other questions.

On the issues between D and F, so I think F inclusiveness and openness is about whether the process was open to anyone who wanted to participate, not whether everyone did, but whether the process allowed for it. So I think point taken that we kind of already know whether that's the case or not. We should continue to monitor that throughout, but that is what F is about.

Whereas, D is about whether comments -- in particular comments that maybe came through us and that we directed to the community because they weren't initially directed to the appropriate community, whether those were taken account of, whether the people who are tracking the proposal paid attention, not whether they were incorporated or not but just whether something was done with them. So that's kind of to me that's the difference between D and F.

So I think we should talk a little bit about this procedurally because I had suggested, I think, in the original mail that we could delegate the

assessment of each individual proposal to some subgroup of people who are interested in that one and should probably include, you know, people who weren't involved in the proposal development itself.

So I love delegation. I think we could do that usefully if we had three or four people who would be willing to do this assessment together and bring it to the rest of us and then we could have a discussion about each proposal in turn. I think that would work well. I know there were some concerns about that.

So that's my suggestion on the process and would be interested in hearing people's thoughts about that.

So I have in the queue Russ, Joe, Milton, Jari, Jean-Jacques and Manal. Did I miss anyone? Adiel and Martin. Okay.

Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Alissa. Russ Mundy here. I have two points that I would like to get in the record. The first one being not closely related to the process but I think important to the process in terms of defining what is the process. And that is each of these criteria, when we are interacting in various ways with the communities, I think that we're obligated to point out if we are speaking from the perspective of what we expect the ICG to do, that we point to the criteria that we have. And when we're speaking in the groups about what we think the groups should be doing as the groups that we put together, that we try hard to differentiate the role.

And somewhat what brought this to mind is a discussion at lunchtime when we were around the table talking about the challenge of an IETF working group chair. When you said something within the context of that working group, you really do need to declare which way in which you're saying it.

And more to the criterion itself and James' question, are we just going to kind of look and say, okay, are these things there and go on or are we going to try to assess them because honestly, in just about every one of these criteria with the possible exception of completeness, there's a lot of subjectivity. And I think we do need to try to reach an agreement of some sort on how deeply we intend to delve into whether or not the criteria there actually are met since they are -- they have as much objectivity as they do.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. Joseph Alhadeff.

I just wanted to, I guess, highlight two things. One, I think the delegation concept makes sense because still are all discussing then what people have come up with as their initial impressions. So I think the group is doing a little bit of the initial work, and then the consultation makes perfect sense because everyone still has the obligation to go through it. But we've had a little bit of a precis coming in.

I think to an earlier comment -- and this is a process issue. I agree that there are -- a failure to complete properly the RFP means that it can't be considered. But I think we actually have to answer all of the conditions when we send it back because we don't have time for six cycles.

So the answer is: We need to tell them all the information they need to know on the failures of the proposal as soon as we can so that they can actually work on remedying the failures in a timely fashion. Otherwise, we're going to have three iterations of the same proposal and we don't have the cycles for that. So it's a little bit more work on us, but I think it's necessary to be time efficient in the process overall.

ALISSA COOPER: Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Yes, going back to James' comments about assessing consensus, I think we pretty much -- when we get a proposal, we are presuming that the community that submitted it pretty much has agreement. But if we receive complaints or signals that this is contested, then I think we do have to go into the -- do some investigation into what the merit of those complaints are.

On delegation, I'm not sure I know what you mean here. We have a lot of people and only three proposals. So are you proposing, you know, a small group read it and tell us what's in it or that, you know, we divide the work amongst three different parts of us? I'm not sure what you mean there.

ALISSA COOPER: I just meant that we get a subgroup of people to do -- to run through this checklist for one group for each proposal and present their findings to the full group. And, of course, anyone who wants to do a whole assessment themselves is welcome to be part of that subgroup.

MILTON MUELLER: Okay.

ALISSA COOPER: It could end up being a large group. It could be small, yeah.

MILTON MUELLER: I would support that concept as long as it is open for anybody to look at the whole thing and to fully maintain -- participate in a discussion about it.

And, finally, on the completeness point, I was going to make the same point that Joe made, which is we can -- you know, even if it is incomplete, we can say, oh, this part that you did fill out is unclear or we can say, you know, this doesn't meet the NTIA criteria or it does seem to meet the NTIA criteria. Obviously, we'd have to maybe reapply that thing if the thing was seriously incomplete and we got a completely new proposal.

But I agree, we don't need -- we don't have time to just stop and send it back and keep going back and forth.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Merci, Alissa.

Thank you, Alissa. I have a few points to make. First of all, I agree with the proposal regarding the methodology. My second point refers to item F, inclusiveness and openness.

What are we talking about? We are talking about checking whether the process has been conducted in a valid manner. Is this just a matter of wording? I think that here we are trying to say that we are talking about the validity of processes. And then we can explain inclusiveness and openness. But this is a minor issue. Actually, I'm interested in Item E, level of consensus. This is not applicable to all the communities that we represent. But in the case of At-Large and ALAC, I think that it is quite clear that we have two cases. On the one hand, a proposal is received at ALAC and it is integrated so when ALAC put forward that proposal, it already contains all these observations and all these other proposals. Or on, on the other hand, you may have individuals that will address directly the ICG.   And in that case, we forward these suggestions or these proposals to ALAC.

So that I think our role is to verify whether there is consensus or not, but actually that is not our role. That is the role of each community, when it is an organized community. That is the case of ALAC.

ALISSA COOPER: Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Alissa.

And being the one who added it in, I feel obliged to talk to why I thought it would be good to include those.

It's very hard to assess both the level of consensus and the inclusiveness and openness, as mentioned by a few, but I think this is not only for ICG members to know the criteria we are to follow in evaluating, but also to give a signal to the operational communities how their proposals are going to be evaluated so that they can provide some documentation or support to this, if possible.

They may have some documentation about the process itself to show that it was inclusive. I mean, it's going to be hard from our end, of course, to have some accurate evaluation for this, but it's good to know how the process was open, inclusive, whether there were any objections to the proposals that are being submitted, and just to know the level of consensus.

So I just feel that it has both sides. It's criteria for ICG members to look at as well as criteria to be fulfilled, to the extent possible, in the proposals submitted by the operational communities.

So I'll stop here. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. So I have Adiel, Martin, Joe, Wolf-Ulrich, and Kavouss, and then I will try to summarize and then we should move on to Step 2, which is where we talk about accountability, which will be fun.

Adiel.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yes. I think this first part of the document is important and I will say that it would be good for us to have a kind of matrix based on this for all the proposals. It should be something that we will say, "Okay, all the proposals we have received at least passed those fundamental and first elements," and that will add transparency to the process that we are doing.

I support the idea of having a group of people that will look at them and, you know, tick and check that they meet the criteria, but everyone else can do the same and comment and do that so that we can --

I also have some kind of reservation on (e), in fact, on the level of consensus, and somebody asked that question yesterday during the public session on what are the criteria. And if you are going to put it there, we need to have a clear criteria what are the elements that we're looking to in the proposal to say that it's reached consensus.

For instance, inclusiveness and openness, we can easily say that. Was the mailing list open, was everyone able to send their inclusion, how diverse was the participation, et cetera. But the level of consensus will vary from one group to another, and we may find ourself in a very subjective situation there.

So unless we come up with very clear elements to support the consensus and let the community know about that now, that this is what we're going to look at may be good. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Martin.

MARTIN BOYLE: Martin Boyle. Thanks very much.

I've got three areas I'd like to just tick off.

Firstly, on the evaluation if the proposal isn't complete, I would certainly well agree with Joe's comment there. We haven't got time just to send it back and ask them to fill in the bits they've missed. We've just got to get on and do it and try and give as much feedback as we can on what was missing.

The second is the point about sharing the work of reading the proposals, which I'm fine with. Where I have a little bit of concern is when you suggested that perhaps people who have been involved in those processes shouldn't be involved in doing that assessment.

I think it becomes very difficult because the people who have been following the processes, whether they're liaisons or participants, for example, in the cross-community working group on names, that will probably take out the whole of the naming members on this committee, and secondly, those are the very people who will notice whether the process has properly been open, inclusive, and whether there was a good level of consensus that came out of the process.

My third point was on the criteria for the level of consensus that Adiel raised, and again, I think that that is actually a very important point, something that we do need to reflect.

I'd sort of liken this to that rather long discussion that we had on our own decision-making processes where you need to make sure that a significant community is not excluded because the process ended with a vote and they were the minority.

So, you know, it's just making sure that it isn't just a straight, you know, there is nobody completely dissatisfied with what came out. You know, there might be dissatisfaction on both sides. But one community that is completely disadvantaged probably means that you haven't really got a consensus and will run into troubles later.

Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: So if I can just take the opportunity to respond on a couple of those.

I was thinking about what I said after I said it as well, and I think what we want to probably hit on, in terms of who is doing evaluations, is that at least someone who wasn't involved in the development of the proposal should be an assessor, or whatever, but certainly people who were involved as well should be welcome to do it. I think that's kind of -- we want to have a mix.

Just for people's reference, the sort of standards that we're looking for in terms of consensus in the NTIA request is for a proposal that has broad community support -- so we can think about what that means -- and then in the RFP what we asked for was -- from the communities is an assessment of the level of consensus behind your community's proposal, including a description of the areas of contention or disagreement.

So that's what we asked for is really just a description, and I think if we receive proposals that say, "We got consensus and there wasn't any disagreement," this is going to be moot.

The problem is going to arise if we get proposals that say, "We didn't get consensus," and then I don't know what we're going to do.

[Laughter]

But again, we have to think about that in right of the overall standard, I think, that we're trying to meet from NTIA, which is broad community support and how do we demonstrate that and so forth.

If you want to do a quick follow-up, then I'll go back down the queue.

MARTIN BOYLE: Yeah. Thanks. Martin Boyle.

Yeah, I'm fully with you on that except, for example, with the names cross-community working group, there is a voting structure. So in other words, the members are allowed to vote. And of course as soon as you end up with voting, you can then end up with winners and losers from that particular area.

And my point was there that you shouldn't end up with a whole community being outvoted by everybody else on the committee, because if you do that, almost certainly you've got something that that community will go and knock on NTIA's door and say, "Well, actually, we were excluded," and NTIA will be fully justified sending it back to us.

ALISSA COOPER: Good point.

Joe?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. Joseph Alhadeff.

I think we need to understand where (e) is coming, because it's consensus among those who participated in the operational community process.

That is a broader group than the community. That is the people who participated in the process. And while it is essential that the community itself finds consensus on it, it actually has to include those people who may be outside the community who have joined the process. Otherwise, we are not going to create those broad linkages we were hoping to create.

So when I look at (e), I look at as kind of the validation of (d) and (f); that essentially what happened is it resulted from an inclusive and open process in which community comments were taken on board, as appropriate, and yes, we did get a consensus, and it's up to the community to make the statement that there's a consensus and to provide a description, and I don't think we're looking to second-guess that, but those elements are things that have to be demonstrated to show that the consensus occurred.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. I had closed the queue but I will be nice and let Keith and Adiel back in and then, Adiel, you will be last.

[Laughter]

Because we have a substantial discussion to have about accountability as well. Wolf-Ulrich.

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

I agree to these bullet points. Well, obviously they have to be filled up with more detailed items.

With regard to the level of the consensus finding, I suggest that we all look to the charters of the related operating groups here.

At least I can tell this for the cross-community working group. In the charter there's outlined how they are going to base their proposal on -- to find consensus.

And I remember that we had an extensive discussion here in our group, in the ICG, on how we are going to find consensus.

There is like a difference in that -- in the perception, you know, because there are procedures imposed which those groups are using for years at the time being.

So I don't think we should -- we should -- we should just check whether they -- these groups, in their proposals, have been following their own consensus finding procedure which they have imposed in their proposals and not going the other way, that we are just discussing again with them how they should find consensus. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Alissa. Kavouss Arasteh speaking.

I think the situation is mentioned is here. First of all, some of the elements is not needed, number one.

Number two, I think we are forgetting what we have decided. We have decided that at least for the time being the proposal will come from the three operational communities.

So we should tell them that, "Look, when you send in your proposal, take care that it should be clear, it should meet the criteria of NTIA, it should provide the level of the consensus," and so on and so forth.

So we address them from now in the output of this meeting that this is something that you have to take into account.

However, with respect to the consensus, I don't think that apart from the way that they currently come up with their decisions, we could change that.

For instance, we take IETF, they have a propose- -- a -- the criteria for consensus. They call them rough consensus. That is that.

So whenever they give a proposal, they indicate that this meets the criteria of this community proposal. So we cannot impose them another degree of consensus.

Similar for the naming or similar for the numbering.

So I don't think that we could change that for the time being. That is that. Otherwise, we try to change the whole thing.

So what I suggest is that we delete (b), clarity, because it is totally subjective. It is clear or not clear. In view of some of the checkers,

people who check, it may be clear or may not be clear, so I don't think that.

If we send a message that "Be careful that your proposal must be clear, your proposal must meet the NTIA criteria, your proposal must contain the inclusiveness" and so on and so forth, that is sufficient.

The only element that we have to check after receiving a proposal is, one, completeness, and two, meeting the criteria of NTIA. The remaining should be in a step before that.

And now I come to the proposal or comments made by Martin. It is quite a valid point. When we check the input received or proposal received, the community which is involved in the preparation of that should not be involved in the evaluation. Could be included in the evaluation group, whoever it should be, to provide clarity, but should not be involved to evaluate its own proposals. Its proposal or the proposal of that community should be evaluated by others but not by the same community. That community has already evaluated since.

So we have to exclude that from the evaluation group first level. However, at the second level, as Milton mentioned, everybody is free to comment at any point, but at the first degree, we should not ask the same group to evaluate but we should ask them to provide clarification on that.

So in summary, I would like to propose that make this criteria for the first instance something addressed to the three communities and then you establish a second group of criteria for ICG and that includes

completeness and compliance with the NTIA and nothing else. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Adiel?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: I just want to support something that Joe just said and suggest that we either remove (e) because (d) and (f) meet -- allow us to say that, or we put (e) and we explain clearly at the end that we will evaluate (e) based on (d) and (f).

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thank you.

So I think we've -- we have some agreement on a few things.

First of all, in terms of the process, that people are happy with when we get a proposal in, we'll do a call for volunteers, have a subgroup evaluate the role of people who are involved in that proposal development itself. Maybe they just get to provide comments or they can do an evaluation. We can keep talking about that.

It's not obvious to me what we should do with (e), in particular. We seem to have a few different ideas of what we could do. Although I do think we have pretty good agreement that we need to -- what we're evaluating is whether the community met its own consensus requirement, whatever that is, and we're not here to tell the community that they didn't get enough consensus or whatever.

I had a suggestion on the side that we call this "nature of consensus" instead of "level" so that it's not quantitative, which might be a helpful modification.

And that (f) -- (d) and (f) are either subcomponents of (e) or they could get deleted, something along those lines. So we can do -- we'll take a few more comments on that and then we'll move on.

Manal and then Paul.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Alissa, and I was just going to suggest that maybe people could help with the language. Maybe "level of consensus" is too quantitative and difficult to evaluate, but again, I see the word -- the word "consensus," that we are going to look into the consensus, is worth keeping in the document.

I also believe that we're going to go through this path anyway when we are cross-checking with NTIA criteria, because again, it mentions the broader community consensus.

So -- and I think what Wolf suggested earlier, that it has to go -- I mean, we're not proposing one size fits all and we're cross-checking through the three communities. I mean, if each community went through its own consensus process, then this would be good enough for us. I mean, we're just seeking the information and not really evaluating. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Paul?

PAUL WILSON: Paul Wilson. Yeah, I'm a little -- a little uncomfortable as well with some aspects of this and I think we should take the time necessary to thrash it out. Not here and now, but over the -- over the coming -- the coming weeks.

I just noticed in the charter of the -- the ICG charter, we actually do have a section on assessment, so we gave ourselves some guidance there and I'm not sure that it corresponds very well with this document. Actually it might be worth, for the sake of consistency, going back to that assessment paragraph, which is (ii), to double-check this. And we used the term "assessment" rather than "evaluation." I'm also not terribly comfortable with "evaluation" because it implies value -- judging the value of, making value judgments, whereas, in fact, we're not involved with giving marks to these proposals. We're -- we should be providing a sort of binary check that they satisfy the criteria, I think.

So I think it would be useful to go -- to just double-check again, to cross-check against the assessment section.

I mean, I say that about a sort of binary yes or no. I think during this process somehow, we've got to avoid the prospect of putting together a final proposal which we know -- which we strongly suspect might actually be not as good as it should be or could be. So I'm not saying there shouldn't be some loopback. But I think what we're doing is some kind of review and comment rather than sort of an authoritative evaluation, if you'd like. But I do prefer the word "assessment" than "evaluation." Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. Patrik, last word.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you. One thing that we have to remember when we are going through these sort of evaluation criteria is that, I think, it's important that we have the text of the RFP in front of us. Having listened to this discussion -- and I have the point Number 6 in front of me from the RFP that talk about the community process because in the RFP, when we have the specific three items that is part of the community process, that is what they actually would respond, okay, if they are really following the RFP. And so that is the text we have. And given the text and the question is, okay, do we know exactly which one of those criteria we are going to apply to which one of these things. You can think about this from a more practical standpoint to be able to develop this matrix that Adiel was talking about.

Okay. So, the last of these three points has that the group itself should make -- should include an assessment of the level of consensus behind your community's proposal including a description of areas of contention or disagreement. Okay? So that is what they actually will describe themselves. Given that text, then we have to apply, I presume, both D and F to that point, right?

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. So I'll try to spin a revision of this and incorporate some of the discussion maybe with some open questions, and then we should continue to kick it around on the mailing list.

Let's scroll down to Step 2. So this is the unified proposal assessment. We can scroll a little bit more probably. Thank you.

This is the place where we have all three components or we have more than one component at least and we're trying to assess how they fit together. And you see the two -- the two assessment tests up there. And obviously we've had some discussion already today and on the mailing list about -- in particular about the accountability piece, which I think is the one that needs a little more fleshing out.

But the floor is open for discussion of how are we going to do the assessment of the unified proposal.

Jari.

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko. I just want to make a comment on the first part. So I do suggest in the arrangements that are not compatible with each other, I think it would be useful to clarify that a little bit based on discussions this week. And I think the clarification should be that, you know, if there are areas of incompatibility on things that actually have to be compatible -- now not everything within the IANA process in the different communities has to be exactly the same. Again, they are fundamentally different starting from, you know, even the sort of business models and so forth. So clarification that that doesn't apply to everything in the process would be useful.

ALISSA COOPER: Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Alissa. Kavouss Aresteh speaking.

I don't clearly understand the relevance of compatibility here. Are we talking of overlapping or are we talking about -- what does it mean, "compatible" with that? What does it mean that the proposal from names should be compatible proposal of the numbers? What are the criteria of compatibility? There is no criteria. These are three different things, and I don't think -- they should not overlap. They should have no contradictions with the scope and the terms and activity. But compatibility and interoperability I don't think is relevant issues here. That's point one.

Point two, if you -- or if we found or we find that two are contradicting or overlapping, what we do after? To whom we send? A has overlapping with B? A is responsible? Or B is responsible? What we do? Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: So just -- I'll take the second part, and I think Jari is going to answer the first part. I think if we do discover problems in this phase, we send -- we send back to both, and we ask them to work together. Imagine that. That would be -- that would be my ideal. Not sure if anybody really does that, but I think that they should.

Jari.

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko. So I think, Kavouss, you are basically agreeing with me. I think there was a difference, though, in terms of -- I actually saw a need

to have something like this there. We both were questioning what does it exactly mean.

I think if we said something along the lines of arrangements that are not compatible with each other in areas where they have to interact, there are some things where we do actually have to -- when we have a connection between the two communities, for instance, we have to work together.

And now if my community and your community are doing completely different things on that interaction point, that's a problem. Now, if we do completely different things in some other area, that's fine.

ALISSA COOPER: And just to follow up on that, this -- the language -- the compatibility and interoperability language comes from the charter, which is why it's there. That's where I found it. I don't know if it helps to give a concrete example. If one community suggests that there needs to be a single oversight body for all three of the functions and the other two communities suggest each having their own different oversight bodies for the functions, those are not compatible. And so we need to figure out how to resolve that conflict. Just an example of how an incompatibility might arise.

Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy here. I guess I'm also a little bit concerned about why and how a community -- whether it was oversight or something else, other

than the places where interfaces are going to be required, how one community could make as part of their formal proposal an assertion that would heavily impact another community. And not that there is an answer for it, but it is something I think thinking about it at this point and being aware of in the future, I find it hard to envision honestly.

ALISSA COOPER: I mean, there are proposals in the names community that talk about taking all three of the IANA functions out into a new separate entity. Clearly if that proposal came out of names, it has an impact on the others. And so -- that's the kind of thing that I hope gets worked out way before we see any proposals. But it might not, and that's all this is about.

Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. Joseph Alhadeff. I think what you're hearing is concerns about the fact that it sounds like we're trying to demonstrate compatibility when really what we're looking for is finding places where there isn't compatibility, where there is an actual conflict between the proposals.

So maybe if we wrote the language in the negative as opposed to the positive, that would help focus it on what we're looking for is where the pieces don't fit together. We don't care about where the pieces don't touch.

ALISSA COOPER: Makes sense. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Kavouss Aresteh. Follow-up questions. Thanks, Joe. I also mentioned in my intervention that contradictions are overlapping and so on, so forth. Put a negative, it doesn't matter. We should not be always have starting with positive.

But suppose with the overlapping or contradictions, you found that there are contradictions. You send them to both. Do we ask them to get together and resolve the contradictions? And you give them one round or what else? How -- the practicality of that, I'm talking the modality, how we do that? A, send something to you and B something? We found they are contradicting. We send to A and B. These proposals are contradicting. What do you expect from A and B? To get together to resolve the matter and come back to you? And how many rounds you give them time? One round? Two rounds? Do you have some time?

Or like the first step, I suggest that this should be outcome from this meeting to the community that be careful or take necessary course of action that the proposal that they make are not contradicting, are not conflicting, and in the area that should interact with each other. At least we make the first attempt before coming to us that they get involved in each other's discussions in order to solve anything before sending that. Otherwise, I don't know how much time you have and how you organize that A and B getting together, resolving the matter, something sent to us. Comment on these things now. Thank you.

We have now resolved the degree of contradiction and degree of overlapping, how it works in practice. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks. I mean, each of the steps is approximately the same length of time. So -- and I think, you know, on the basis of the discussion this morning, we are already asking everyone to coordinate with each other to try and avoid this, right? This is, I think, sort of an exceptional circumstance that we really hope that we don't end up in, but we do need to check and make sure.

So having the check in there I don't think implies that it shouldn't be down now. It should be resolved now while the proposals are in development. If for some reason it doesn't get resolved, we can't just pass it on to NTIA with a proposal that doesn't make sense but amongst the three functions. So we can use the time that we have in the timeline at the phase, if we need to, but hopefully we won't need to. That would be my preference.

Okay. I will take all this in the account and try to rephrase in the negative and send it back out for comment. But I do really want us to talk about this accountability bit because right now it says we will, you know, ask ourselves whether the proposals include sufficient accountability mechanisms and that's all it says. So what does that mean? What are we going to do? And how does it interface with the other processes?

Go ahead, Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Well, to some extent, I think we simply have to wait until we see what we have and recognize that there is a broad selection of people from different stakeholder groups on this committee who are in a position to assess the overall picture which the individual proposals may not be. And we're in a position to say, okay, here's how the overall accountability picture fits together. And since many of us have been dealing with the accountability issue for some years, make our own assessment.

Obviously giving a lot of presumptive value to what the communities have proposed. But if there is -- we would look for a gap in accountability the same way we would look for a contradiction in the interfaces between the two proposals. So maybe we go back to this overused notion of a stress test.

We think about what happens if. What if this community wants this and this community does that. And given this proposed institutional structure, what happens? Can it handle this problem? Could things go haywire in unexpected ways? I think we just have to do that kind of analysis because what we're trying to do here is not necessarily change proposals. What we're trying to do is anticipate objections that might come in at the public comment phase and stall the proposal. So if we can say at this stage, have you thought of this? What if this happens? And the community goes, "Oh, you know, we didn't think of that, maybe we can tweak our proposal," then we give them back the proposal and say, "There may be an issue here that you need to solve." I mean, that's my assessment. It sounds very vague but, again, I think we just have to trust the expertise and the diversity of this community to do that process in a way that is constructive. And it would be very hard to come

up with -- Martin's shaking his head (laughter) -- to provide some insight into how the system -- the proposed change would work holistically.

ALISSA COOPER: Joe and then Russ and then me.

OSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. Joseph Alhadeff. Kind of builds a little on Milton's point, I think we have the concept of we are not second-guessing what the community has suggested is their method of accountability. But when you put the pieces together, the pieces may not fit correctly under the accountability rubric. And I think the question becomes, you know, as the proposal is unified, are there questions of accountability that have been created because of the way they may operate in conjunction which goes back to some of the compatibility questions because in many ways, that's a compatibility issue. And I think there's probably also a concept there where we will have to understand what the questions might come, going back to Lynn's concept earlier on today, of what people may be thinking or misunderstanding and how to address those issues that come up.

But I -- the word that makes me a little concerned is the word "sufficient independent" because that makes it sound to me like we're evaluating the community's definition of what their accountability process is. And so I'm just a little concerned by that use of the phrasing because I think if it is a consensus process, and they've done all the right things and they've come up with it and it is their decision of this is what we think accountability is, then it is a question of did it meet NTIA criteria and

when you put the three proposals together, have we created a problem. And if the answer is we haven't created a problem by putting the three proposals together, then I don't think it is up to us to second-guess what accountability is at that point.

ALISSA COOPER: Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Alissa. Russ Mundy. I was going to say very much I think what Joe just made the point of, and that is the accountability and the accountability mechanisms I believe strongly have to come from the individual operational communities. And just looking for -- as we've said in the past gaps and conflicts between them, not sufficiency of them.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. Yeah, I agree. I don't really know -- so, first of all, sufficient independent accountability mechanisms are words from our charter. That's where they came from. Although we didn't say it's not specific we were going to do this assessment, it is just like an overall this is what we're chartered to do. I think that's where it is in the charter.

But, yeah, I think if we go down the path of saying, you know, oh, well, this part of the proposal isn't sufficient in the event of nuclear war or something, it's -- I think it's perfectly reasonable that the community said to us, well, we're not concerned about nuclear war. So that's why we didn't defend against it in our proposal. And it is not really our place to make that judgment. So I agree that I think this is -- this can be

rephrased to be more about gaps and conflicts as opposed to sufficiency.

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah, again, if the language is in the charter, I don't think it needs to be changed. I think what we have to work with is the understanding that we're achieving here as to what we're looking for and what the -- what the standard of sufficiency is. You know, if sufficient means to you that we are second-guessing the operational community's proposals and imposing our own standard, again, I don't think that's a big danger because there's so many representatives of different views on this panel. But if that's what it means, then I think we've agreed that's not what we're going to do.

ALISSA COOPER: That's fine.

MILTON MUELLER: But as a guide to the operational communities, I think this is valuable. It tells them, "When you're doing your proposal, make sure it has sufficient independent accountability mechanisms." I think that's part of what we want to do.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. I think that's reasonable, which means we can leave this or we could leave this sentence and add a little more detail about what we think it means, maybe. So I'll take a crack at that.

Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Kavouss Arasteh.

I think I agree, I tend to agree with the previous speaker. The issue, even though it is in our charter, it's not quite clear, because when we say "sufficient," you don't have any means to see what is sufficient, what is not sufficient. This is number one.

But the more difficulty here is keep the proposals together. You receive a proposal for community -- operating community 1, 2, and 3 and then you want that all together in a cumulative manner, they have sufficient degree of accountability how? We don't have that information.

Each of these communities may mention that there is or they have used a mechanism of accountability in their proposal but how we could say that they all together, they meet a criteria of accountability and we say that this is sufficient and not sufficient?   It is not implementable, number one.

Number two, for the time being we have not received anything and we don't know to what extent we receive something from the CWG IANA name accountability that we could tap.   I don't know what the accountability there. I have it is something -- we have to put something differently. Perhaps we could say that what accountability mechanism has been -- you know, whether the accountability mechanism has been used in each of these proposals and then to see whether we in ICG will be able to create a cumulative accountability for the whole proposal to work together. That is very difficult. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. Okay. So the other open question on this bit was -- and we don't really have to work this out right now, but if we have two components that come in and are ready before the third, if we should start doing this analysis pairwise.

I'm all in favor of that because we are short on time in general, but in case anyone was avidly against that, I wanted to raise it.

And people are okay with starting with the first two and doing this analysis and then adding the third?

Go ahead. Go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I'm not against that we could do something, but at the end, you have to look together to see all three, whether they are -- I used the word "compatibility" that you used, but yes, we can use -- we can take advantage of the time but it doesn't mean that it is complete because they have interactive -- they have influence or actions one over the other, but doesn't -- nothing prevents us to start for -- if we receive something from the first two communities, waiting for the third one, which I think will be in delay. It is very improbable that they could do it on time but the two others we may receive it earlier, why not. We can start. So there is no opposition with the proviso that we come back once all three, to look at the issue again. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Good. Do you have a thought on that? Yeah.

MILTON MUELLER: That up -- move that document down so that we can see what's above (a) and (b). The other way.

Yeah.

That's unified proposal assessment, so to my mind, (a) and (b) happen when we have all three, by definition.

If you're worried about, you know, one of them being really late, then I suppose at some point we could -- you could make a motion that we should go ahead and we could decide based on what we have, but -- and I wouldn't oppose it on principle, but in -- you know, if it's just talking about waiting another two weeks to do a proper unified assessment that we wouldn't have to repeat part of, I -- I'd say just wait two weeks.

ALISSA COOPER: Got it. Kavouss and then Russ and then Russ. Oh, okay.

Kavouss, Russ Housley, Russ Mundy, and then Lynn.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. I think to at least resolve that issue, delete "unified" at the beginning of the text for the time being and mention unified at the end. That at the end of the process, we need to look at the whole thing together. But at least in order not to prevent us to do something when we receive two proposals, delete "unified" from the title. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Russ Housley.

RUSS HOUSLEY: This is Russ Housley. Thank you.

My gut tells me that we're not to get these all at the same time and that we're going to have to deal with them when we have them, and anything we can do to process them efficiently is going to be good, but we have enough people participating in each of these communities. We'll know if we're at the place where we're close to getting the next one or we're far away from it.

And so I think this is something we can decide late, but we should be prepared to deal with the analysis of one, then two, then three.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. Russ Mundy.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks. Russ Mundy here.

Yes, I'm in -- strongly in favor of Russ Housley's suggested approach there.

One -- once we do, I think, a comparison of any two, whatever two they might be, a subsequent comparison of a third one should be relatively straightforward. Yeah, there might be some yet recollection overlap but this may also be getting to the problem that folks may have different models in their heads as far as what we will actually be doing in producing the consolidated proposal.

So let me just say one short bit about the model that's in my head for that.

Our consolidated proposal, I think, should consist of the three operational community proposals, unchanged, untouched by us, and some set of words that the ICG puts together on top of those three proposals.

So we're not going to be hopefully having to create huge volumes of words.

We'll have to do our assessment, and if we're fortunate, not have to write too many words. But the major work of the community -- operational community proposals is going to be done in the operational communities.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Lynn?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Yeah. I mean, I would support -- Lynn St. Amour -- would support going forward with reviewing two, if we have two come in ahead of time. I mean, I think this is a process in any case. It's clear that at the end, we need to do a unified and consolidated review, but -- so I'm not quite sure, actually, what Milton was sort of objecting to, because I thought prior to that, it looked like there were a lot of heads nodding around the room with respect to if we had two come in, we would get started and we would, you know, engage the third when we had received that.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. Go ahead.

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah. I don't have any objection to doing two if, you know, we think there's going to be a long gap between the third one. I really don't.

It's just I don't see any reason to get ourselves in a situation where we have to do the comparison again if we don't need to. That's all I was saying.

ALISSA COOPER: I think we're -- I think everyone is in agreement about that.

Jari, did you want to add something?

JARI ARKKO: Yeah. I just wanted to say that I think the general principle here is that we should provide as much information as possible back to the communities as soon as we can provide that information. You know, if we see an incompatibility between two pieces that we have gotten, we should tell that immediately back and not wait, no matter what the situation is, but of course we're not repeating work. We add more analysis as we get more information.

ALISSA COOPER: Sounds right to me. Okay. I think that's probably good enough on this proposal for --

Oh, sorry. Last word. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yeah. Last word.

I suggest that neither we use the word "unified" nor we use "consolidated," and the title "assessment of proposal" and summary text "overall assessment." It's not unified nor consolidated. Overall assessment. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. I think we have enough to chew on with this. I will spin a revision and we can continue this discussion on the mailing list and then conference calls.

The only thing I was going to ask is if there's anyone -- if there's one person who wants to help me out with this, so that I don't have to hold the pen and be the bottleneck because I'm busy. Joe. Great. Thank you, Joe.

Okay. So we're going to move on to the FAQ discussion, and Manal is going to lead us in that.

Do you want to project yourself -- your own computer or do you want Alice to project?

MANAL ISMAIL: I'm flexible. I can send the file to Alice because I've been doing some other --

ALISSA COOPER: Oh, you've been editing? Okay.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes. Or projecting.

ALISSA COOPER: Your preference.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. If I can --

Yes, please. Okay. So thank you. I'm sorry to keep you waiting.

So thank you all, first, for your collaboration and flexibility in getting this out before the L.A. meeting, and I don't think we need to open the discussion on every single question on the FAQ, but I'm aware that there are a couple of questions that were not a hundred percent agreed on the language and maybe we want to confirm the language again also in light of the discussions that were held earlier this week in L.A.

Of course in addition to adding more questions.

So I'll try to go quickly through the different sections and maybe we can pause on the questions that need to be revisited.

So the first part is about ICG. I don't think we need to change anything about "What is the ICG?"

I'll be going through the questions and please stop me if we need to pause.

"What is ICG?"

"Who are members of ICG?"

And "Is the ICG part of ICANN?"

"What do the ICG do?"

I think all this have been agreed.

About the IANA functions, we have "What are the IANA functions?"

I have just added a link to the presentation that was held here this week, the link that Elise sent to the mailing list, and I hope we can also link to the SSAC document that was mentioned earlier, as soon as we get the link, too.

So if there is no comments on the sentence added, I can just move on to the next question.

"Which aspects of IANA are to be covered in the stewardship transition?" I think also this has been sufficiently discussed and hopefully agreed.

Then about the process and how to participate, we have "How will proposals be delivered?" Again, it's the RFP thing.

"Who are the operational communities?" I mean, by now, we should have known this.

"How can I participate in these processes?" I think also nothing to add here.

"Where can I find more information on the operational communities?" It's the portal we have.

Then about the decision-making process, "What are the criteria that need to be addressed in submitting" -- in the submitted proposals, I think.   In submitted proposals.   And this is the document we were discussing earlier now, so I think any modifications or changes in the document would ultimately be reflected here, so do we need to address this question now or we can wait till the document itself is finalized?

This is, "What are the criteria that need to be addressed in the submitted proposals?" This is what we have been discussing a while ago.

Move on?

Further up or --

ALISSA COOPER: I think we should wait to -- wait until the other document settles a little bit and then just have this reflect that.

MANAL ISMAIL: I'm sorry?

ALISSA COOPER: I think we should wait. I don't think it makes sense for you to edit this every time the other document gets edited. We're going to go through a couple rounds of discussion on the other document and then when it feels settled, then you can have the FAQ reflect the document.

MANAL ISMAIL: I'm of the same view, so anyone --

                          Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I think you may need to add just a small little something, editor's note, that this portion needs to be reviewed or revisited in the light of discussions that has been held at this meeting.

                          So just put something, not forget.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. Thank you. I won't forget. I'll make sure to take note.

                          So Narelle, please, and then Mary.

NARELLE CLARK: Narelle Clark. Perhaps just a short line there to say that this section is still under further discussion and refinement by the ICG.

                          Personally, I really like what's here and I'd hate to see us go too many steps backward.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. Happy to do that.

                          Okay. We have Mary, then Demi.

DEMI GETSCHKO: Just a short suggestion, maybe.

Maybe we can publish this in separate steps. What is defined can be as soon as possible at the Web site and then we can announce that the rest of the document will be available soon, as soon as we conclude the things, just not to make a delay -- too much delay.

MANAL ISMAIL: So I have Mary. Then Kavouss.

MARY UDUMA: Okay.

MANAL ISMAIL: Mary, please.

MARY UDUMA: Yeah. Mary Uduma here.

Inasmuch as I agree with what others have said on this part --

You can't hear me? Okay.

I agree with the suggestions made, and the truth is that we have a buffer where we say this is a living document, so it wouldn't send confusion to the -- or uncertainty to the community.

But I want to raise this issue of NTIA criteria. Can we spread that to name the criteria, you know, some of the things that NTIA will be looking out for, not just say "the NTIA criteria."

MANAL ISMAIL: So everybody be happy with listing the criteria? Okay. Keith, please.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Keith Davidson. Maybe just a hyperlink to the NTIA criteria page would be sufficient.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. Go ahead, please. Keith.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Keith Davidson. I think Mary's point was under the bullet point "NTIA criteria" to list the criteria. I think just merely having NTIA criteria linked to the page where it all is would probably be sufficient. Would it, Mary?

MANAL ISMAIL: Mary, go ahead.

MARY UDUMA: I'm happy with that, sending them out. If you list it there, it catches the eye immediately. Thank you. Either way is okay.

MANAL ISMAIL: My only concern is that we are referring to the NTIA criteria several times. So if we are going to list them every time, it's going to be too much for a FAQ. Okay. Thank you.

Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Kavouss Aresteh. If you have referred to that once, you could say here whenever you have NTIA "see above." However, for this section, I suggest for the time being perhaps in the larger discussions, you just retain the title and put underneath "under development" because we cannot put something which would give the impression of something that people might be confused because of what is there. So keep the title and put "under development." Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. I think this also goes with what Narelle mentioned earlier, that we just alert the community that this is under discussion so they should expect some changes.

So I think we shouldn't be wasting more time on this question, especially that we're discussing the document already. So if there are no more comments, I'll proceed. Narelle, please. I'm sorry.

NARELLE CLARK: Narelle Clark. Just a short comment on style that I wanted to make, and that's just simply for information. For the purposes of -- you may have noticed that a couple of times when I was doing an edit, that I had changed a link -- hyperlink where people had selected something -- had a piece of text like the word "here" and there was a hyperlink to somewhere. And if you could read the text, that made sense. So I've changed that in each case so that it is a more explicit hyperlink from text that makes sense, and I've done that purely and simply for Web accessibility, for people who read this and have a vision impairment and are using a text-to-speech reader. So I hope that makes sense to those

around us here, that I did an edit there where I replaced hyperlinks from -- actually, if you look at the screen here, you can see it says, "Further details on IANA stewardship transition proposal assembly are available here." Originally what was hyperlinked was just the word "here." And that means if you have a vision impairment, all you see is the word "here" and it makes no sense to you whatsoever. So I changed that to be a hyperlink of that whole piece of text.

Sorry if it is cumbersome. Sorry about the editorial piece here, but I think it needs to be said.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Narelle. And, yes, it was very helpful, and hopefully we will continue on the same steps.

So the following question is: Can I submit my own proposal for how the IANA transition should take place? I don't think we need to modify anything here. I see no requests for the floor. So the following question is: How does the ICG make its decisions? I think we've already been through this discussion. I see no requests.

I tried to put some text here just to get us started so please no panics. It's just a very initial...

But let's start by the first question: How does the ICG see the role of ICANN board in preparing the proposal? Again, I'm not sure this is the right question or the right way to -- so, Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Manal. I think maybe it is a little bit imprudent to talk about this. This is some discussion between ICG and ICANN, it continues, and raise it in the formal document which is for the public. It may show that we have some sort of implicit difficulties with ICANN and so on and so forth. Let us not include that item. It is in the output of our ICG in the way that will be developed. We are waiting for that.

I don't think this is to say we should do something here in the questions and answers. It may appear in a different way, but it is not part of the questions and answers because there is no question and there is no answer to that at this stage.

MANAL ISMAIL: So my recollection was that we didn't want to draft a new document, and we thought everything we would like to convey we can put through the FAQ. But I'll take another round and we can see. I'm flexible if everyone sees that we can delete this.

So I think we have Milton, Alissa, Lynn, and then Narelle. Milton?

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah. I think you probably do want to address these questions. I would make them one question. I would say: What is the role of the ICANN board in the ICG -- or the ICG's proposal preparation?

And the answer you have now to Question 15 would send alarm bells off in most people's minds because it is so elusive or evasive, basically. I don't know if it was intended to be evasive, but it really reads like you don't want to answer that question.

It is sort of like -- it is a kind of thing that people -- politicians say when they're asked a question that they don't want to answer directly. So you don't want to say that.

What you want to say is basically, the ICG is independent of the ICANN board. We will develop our proposal. We have to transmit it through the board but the board does not have a role in modifying or developing a proposal.

Or approving.

Or approving a proposal. So you could kill all three of those birds with one stone with something like that. And I could submit some text to you if you want or do you want to do that yourself?

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, it will be very helpful. Yes, please. Actually I was trying to draft -- I didn't know I'm going to go live.

[Laughter]

And I was in the middle of Question 15, so it's not even finished yet. And I think I got this from the presentation from the frequently asked questions that were included in the last slide of Alissa's presentation. But, again, I'm fine with this.

So I have Alissa next.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. This is Alissa.

I was going to suggest that since we have the small group who has agreed to put together what our requirements are for this very question, that what we could do in the FAQ for now is just make a note, like, "insert Q and A here about ICANN board role" and defer the actual Q and A until after we get some -- get that back from the subgroup and have a chance to discuss it. Otherwise, we're just going to be rehashing the whole conversation here.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Alissa.

Lynn, please.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Lynn St. Amour. I support Alissa's suggestion and also thank Milton for giving us a good start on your excellent start to the questions. So I think it is a good direction.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. Narelle, yes, please.

NARELLE CLARK: Narelle Clark at the risk of being repetitive I agree with Lynn who also supported both Alissa's suggestion and commended Milton for his suggestion on the process. And I thank also Manal for having taken the risk and the courage to write something down to begin with.

I would be very sad to see this piece go all together. We have already had the discussion on this topic this morning. It is in the transcript. It

will be in the minutes. It was in public. We cannot deny the fact that we've had this discussion, contentious discussion, about the role of the ICANN board.

We have to put something in the FAQ. And the sooner we do that, the better.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Narelle.

Wolf, please?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich speaking.   Not to confuse everybody more, but I wonder whether in this context why shouldn't we in the headline use only "what is the role of ICANN" instead of the "ICANN board" because I have in mind also that Larry Strickling was referring that ICANN is part of this community in that.

So I know that it culminates in the decisions taken by the ICANN board, but it's just a question here in this context.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you.

Next I have Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. No problem to put an agreed text here. The first part is what Milton said. Fully agree with that. But we need also to add what we

discussed, that ICANN board has a liaison in the ICG and at the proper time, duly could comment or could be engaged in the discussion and so on, so forth. So we mentioned we would not totally exclude that. So that should be added. But we wait to have a text.

But the first part is the exact text that Milton wrote. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. I have Russ next. Sorry, it's Joe. Okay. Joe. I'm sorry.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. Joseph Alhadeff. No disagreement on what people are suggesting for the text. My only question is a logistics question of when is it likely to have -- that we may have the discussion with the ICANN board based on whether they're going to come out with a lovely piece of text that looks like the one for the accountability process in our behalf?

Because if that's going to happen in the fairly near term, then the question is maybe we post that as a result of the discussion. It doesn't change, I think, our content in the least. But the question of the timing may be appropriate if that discussion is happening in the near term. If that discussion is not going to happen in the near term, then I think we should post a comment in the near term. It is just a question of timing and order of those processes and what makes sense to do when.

MANAL ISMAIL: So, Alissa, is this direct response to the timing thing or we can proceed with the Q?

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah. I was going to respond to --

MANAL ISMAIL: Can I just give Alissa the floor and then -- Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: The answer to your question is I don't know. But I will say that I jumped the gun in terms of the conversation that we had this morning, which I learned about afterward obviously. So, you know, the text from the resolution yesterday and all of that was not really ready for discussion amongst us. Obviously we don't even have the text.

So -- but I do think that the next step is really on our side anyway to establish what our requirements are.

So I'm happy for there to be a placeholder in the meantime. I mean, even what I said yesterday was, like, we're trying to figure this out. That was basically the answer to the question. So I think that's fine. But I don't think we can really know -- I don't think we really know what the timing is, is what I'm saying.

MANAL ISMAIL: Kuo, please.

KUO-WEI WU: Basically I'm not going to say anything about what ICG puts on the Q&A. But I would like to explain a little bit about the ICANN function in this IANA transition. As all of you have seen, actually ICANN is part of the communities. And I think, Alissa, you can put a fair wording instead of

negative wording. So I think -- I have nothing to say about whatever you want to put in the Q&A. Just to be fair, that's (indiscernible) enough for us.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay, fair enough. We have Milton, then Martin, then Patrik. Milton, please.

MILTON MUELLER: I have proposed wording if you want to hear it. Or is that -- should I just send an email to the list?

UNDESCERNIBLE: Email.

                         Email.

MILTON MUELLER: Email it?

MANAL ISMAIL: I think if you send it, yeah. Thank you. And, meanwhile, Martin, go ahead.

MARTIN BOYLE: Martin Boyle. Thanks very much. Firstly, I'm quite happy with the editing process that was outlined earlier. I think that would be useful

that we do some serious thinking about what the wording is and then incorporate it here.

But, in fact, the reason I put my flag up was to respond to Wolf-Ulrich's point about the board and ICANN. And I think in this particular case, we're looking at whether the ICANN board has the right to change the proposal, bearing in mind that, for example, the names proposal will have come from a cross-community process that engages beyond but certainly engages with the relevant ICANN communities.

So in this particular case, I think the board is right. And I'd also refer back to the slide of questions heard this week and the last question was, in fact, that very one of does the ICANN board have to approve the final transition plan. Will they be able to modify the plan before it gets sent to NTIA. That was very seriously a question that we heard during the week. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: So thank you, Martin.

Patrik?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Regarding the timing issue, I think -- I think we should have a placeholder, and I think it's good that Milton is working on some wording that we can agree on today.

The reason for that is that I think the discussion that -- the serious discussion we had this morning and including, of course, the feedback from Kuo-Wei, that he will bring back strongly the information on our

reaction on the board resolution, I'm pretty sure that that communication will be clear enough so that the group that we just created that will do some kind of communication back, they will deliver before the board is acting because I will trust the people we asked to come back with suggestions will work faster than the board. I think we are safe so we can use a placeholder and then update the text. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Patrik. I have Jandyr, then Kavouss.

JANDYR SANTOS: Thank you. This is Jandyr Santos. As a member of this small group appointed by Alissa, I'll be happy to give it a try and draft a first proposal, and that will be based on what Milton just circulated in our email as well as on the discussions we had this morning and I intend to do it as soon as possible, please. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Jandyr.

Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. Kavouss Arasteh.

Thank you, Manal.

After the resolution that we have noted, the resolution does not talk about ICG. The resolution talks about CCWG, so on and so forth, but this injected the idea that we express our views of our work, so we should not defer to that resolution because inappropriate. It has nothing to do with ICG. Talking about something else.

But based on what we have discussed, we could clearly mention that what we talking is the text of Milton. If it is going to be amended, I don't know to what extent. I hope that the essence of the text remains. I have no problem. But we should be very, very clear that our proposal is final and should be submitted as a tool to the post office by ICANN to NTIA without any editing and so on and so forth, and in the meantime they have liaison and they could contribute and -- duly contribute, we should put the word "duly contribute," not at the moment, and that's all. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. I think, yes, Milton has already circulated the first draft. I'm going to incorporate this as soon as I'm off line and you are most welcome to submit any further proposals.

So Martin, yes, please.

MARTIN BOYLE: Martin Boyle. Thanks very much.

I must admit I really do quite like Milton's text. You know, I think it's a good -- good basis for us to start with.

The only one thing that I thought we'd sort of skirted around this morning and have been trying out this morning is understanding the concerns of the board as we go along, which is partly the role of the liaison, to make sure that we get that information that there is a legal or fiduciary difficulty, and secondly, the role that the board can have in submitting comments to us in the same way as any other -- any other community process. And I think with those two additions, I would feel very happy with that as being our first-line stab at the text. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thanks, Milton.

                       Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. Having read Milton's text, I think we need to modify it slightly, that I don't think it is appropriate to say that the board is not authorized. ICG should not be so strong and so deterministic, the word "authorized." We put it in a passive way, "the proposal of ICG should be sent to the NTIA" without any edit and without any modification rather than "is not authorized." It is too strong and too harsh. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Kavouss.

                       Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER: I would just suggest for the sake of time that we not attempt to wordsmith this in this room. We have very helpful text from Milton. We have the subgroup that's going to take this up in the large, not just specific to the FAQ but overall what is it that we want to have happen here, so I think we know that we want to have something. We can beat it around on the mailing list. We are really good at that. And I know there's some more that we have to get through, so I would suggest that we not wordsmith in the room.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Alissa.

Yes. And I think we can further edit over email, so with this, I think we can proceed to the next section, which is about the time line.

"What's the time line of the transition process?" I think, again, this -- nothing changed that would require further editing to this question.

"Are there alternative scenarios if the target date of September 2015 is not met?"

I think this also has been agreed.

"What's required for the community processes to succeed by the target deadline?" I see no requests for the floor.

Then the next section is on the coordination with the IANA accountability process, so this is what we had initially as a response to this question.

I'm not sure if we want to revisit this text. It doesn't necessarily have to be, again, editing during the session, but just to hear views.

Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER: Sorry. I actually had a comment on one of the -- the previous section about the time line.

One of the questions that with we had on the slide yesterday, because people had been asking about it, was whether the first target deadline has been changed from January 15 to January 31.

So I think at least for the next few months, it might be worthwhile to have that question included in the time line section, with an answer, which is "no."

[Laughter]

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. Thank you. I have this question at the very end. I'm going to --

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Sorry.

MANAL ISMAIL: No, but -- yes. It's good that we tackle things in their appropriate sequence. So I have Kavouss and then Michael.

MANAL ISMAIL: And Jean-Jacques.

                         Okay. So Michael first. I'm sorry, Michael. Go ahead.

MICHAEL NIEBEL: I probably have missed something. The line about "an act of the U.S. Congress might be required," where does that come from? Could that be clarified? "May be required."

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: That is after we submit to the NTIA. I think that part is after we have submitted to the NTIA so that is not part of our time line, I guess.

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Yes. Sorry. Yes, but this reads as if the prolongation of the current contract, if there is a delay, would require an act of the U.S. Congress.

MANAL ISMAIL: So if I may, if people -- I mean, if we have direct responses to this, I would like to take this first and then go through the queue, so I have Narelle, Patrik, Joe, and Russ. Okay.

NARELLE CLARK: Narelle Clark. I may, indeed, plead guilty here to this piece because -- but I think it's not quite what I intended in the first place when the editing went through.

                         A comment about this was in -- as a result of conversations that I had had with people, and it is now also the reason behind why I think we

should meet with Larry Strickling and get some more clarity on any other super process-type stuff that might have to happen if the contract deadline isn't met, et cetera, et cetera.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Narelle.

                         Patrik?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much.

                         According to the contract, it can already be extended. The question is about the change of contract, and I don't want to have any speculations in the text so I suggest at this point in time that this sentence is removed.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah. I -- Joe Alhadeff. I would concur because number one, this is actually beyond our remit to answer that question, even if we knew the answer to the question. And I agree with Patrik, the extension doesn't require any Congressional action, but if you were to change what happens after the extension, that may involve Congressional action, but that's not a fact, that's a conjecture.

                         So I think we should -- we should stay away from those things and we should also limit our -- we have enough in the FAQ to deal with what we're dealing with without having to deal with what we're not dealing with, so I would -- I would take those kind of topics out.

And then the only other point since you also had raised 16 at the time, in terms of when we start to interact -- I think it was on accountability -- the concept is we may be starting to liaise through mechanisms as of now. So the statement in there that we will only start to liaise in any way when proposals are submitted may not be correct.

That's when we may actually be effective in our liaising, but the liaising is probably starting earlier in the process than that.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So this is Russ Housley, and I think this came from when we were working on the time line document I asked Larry Strickling how long he would need to process the proposal, and he said he had no idea because he didn't know which parts of Congress would want to have hearings about it.

And I think the best thing to do is to delete this. That, I think, was for our information.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. So do we have any more direct reactions to this point in specific, or should I go back to the queue?

Yes, I -- we should -- okay. Then Jean-Jacques has been patiently waiting. Please.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. This is Jean-Jacques. Actually, it's on two points.

The first one is, I agree with all those who have commented on this point.

I think that as Joe so eloquently said, we have enough on our plate without worrying about the U.S. Congress, and there's a principle in international law, you don't stipulate for someone else.

But I don't know if we've reached big VI, Roman VI, because we've been going up and down. I just want to put in a word.

It's a bit more than just wordsmithing. It's the notion of coordination. We are using the "coordination" in several sentences, and here I think it's not absolutely the most appropriate one.

It's about the articulation with ICANN accountability process, because we are not going to do a sort of super coordination, which would be even more complicated. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Jean-Jacques.

Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I concur with all colleagues. We should remain within our remit. Maximum level is NTIA, not beyond that. So that would be totally deleted.

Coming to that, I agree with Jean-Jacques that we need to replace, but "articulations" I don't really understand. To articulate something has many different meanings and different connotations, so perhaps we

might use another word but not "articulation." Thank you. Sorry, Jean-Jacques. I'm very sorry.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: No, no. No problem. I suggest that we put a footnote "articulation in the French sense."

[Laughter]

That means -- that means the link between the two. A link can be a strong link or a weak link. No problem.

MANAL ISMAIL: I have Paul, Alissa, and then Adiel. Paul?

PAUL WILSON: Paul Wilson here.

Thanks, Manal.

I'm just -- I'm not sure if I'm missing something here but Question 15 doesn't say very clearly what -- simply what will happen if the target date isn't met, which is that the current arrangements will continue, and I think that needs to be very clear somewhere that -- that, you know, existing arrangements will likely continue or are expected to continue with the -- with the renewal of the contract if this process doesn't succeed.

On the -- on the question of success, though, which is maybe moving on to Question 16, I'd just be a bit careful about describing the entire

exercise in terms of success or failure, and in fact, I don't particularly like the "failure" word at all, which I know doesn't appear here but -- so this is -- you could take this as a general comment that, you know, we're all being optimistic here and we're hoping to have a successful outcome.

But there are all sorts of reasons for which we might not have that outcome. It's a nontrivial exercise. The -- the community processes are going to be very unpredictable as multistakeholder open processes, and I think we'd be -- we'd be, you know, risking a negative assessment of the multistakeholder process itself by sort of associating the failure or success of this process with -- or by allowing the so-called failure of this process to sort of suggest that the multistakeholder process is not up to this task.

So I would like to be a bit more -- a bit less about success and failure here and more about the fact that we have an opportunity. The community, we hope, will come together and take the opportunity. If we're unable to do that, then the, you know, current arrangements will continue. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL: So thank you, Paul. I have Alissa, Adiel, and then Kavouss, but first I would like to know how -- how much time do we have left for this discussion?

ALISSA COOPER: 15 minutes.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. Thank you. So Alissa, please.

ALISSA COOPER: I just wanted to respond to the suggestion from Narelle, and I know you had also sent an email.

I'm happy to reach out to NTIA whenever we want and they said they're happy to join a call or something.

This month might not be the best, perhaps, but, you know, sometime -- sometime late fall or winter might be a good time, so --

And I would just say from my personal interactions with them, we should let -- we should, you know, kind of ask -- set what the specific topics are that we want to talk about and have them send whoever the experts are on those topics. It could be Larry, could be people who are very intimately familiar with contracting for the U.S. Government or whatever it may be, so...

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Alissa.

Adiel?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yes. Just a wordsmith proposal for the 15. "Include the capacity." Instead of "capacity," I would suggest maybe "clause" or "mechanism," instead of "capacity" there. And, yeah, on the -- on the "articulation," maybe "interaction" or "interrelation" could be the word here. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. Thank you.

                         Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Kavouss Arasteh.

                         While I agree with Paul that the situation would -- would be that, but I
                         don't think that ICG says that the current situation will continue. It is
                         outside our remit.

                         If we want to quote something from NTIA, please quote that in italic. If
                         you don't have -- you say if we cannot meet the deadline, NTIA will
                         consider the matter and decide accordingly or as appropriate. I do not
                         want to be engaged to think that the current situation will continue. It's
                         beyond our mandate. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Kavouss.

                         So I think we'll be moving to the following section. I'll try my best to
                         reflect all the discussion and circulate another draft and we can take it
                         from here. From there.

                         So the next section is about the interrelation or interaction with the
                         ICANN accountability process.

                         This is what we had initially as a response: "The ICG charter says that
                         accountability is central to our process.   The ICG has asked the
                         operational communities to consider oversight and accountability in
                         their process. After receiving consensus proposals from the operational

communities regarding IANA, the ICG will conduct an analysis and assessment of their implications for ICANN accountability. At that point it will liaise with the ICANN accountability process and advise it on how the results of the process affects the requirements."

So Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Manal. Kavouss Arasteh speaking.

I think you need to slightly modify that in the light of the discussion that we have this morning, that now we have two groups. One is CWG IANA names, and the other is CCWG Accountability Track 1 and 2. So we need to slightly modify that to reflect that situation. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: I personally think it's not a description of the process itself but rather our relation with this process so I'm not sure but I can -- so yes, Joe, please.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I think the specification is useful because our relationship with the process is not with the entire process. It's with a subset of the process.

So we are not talking about certain elements of ICANN accountability that don't impact the transition. We are only dealing with those that impact the transition, and that gives the impression that we are dealing with the overall process which we're not.

So I do think we have to have the limit and I do think we have to recognize that our participatory mechanisms are starting as soon as they're starting, because we've already talked about who's participating.

So we're starting -- whatever we call it -- articulation, coordination, whatever it is that we're doing with these processes, we're starting actually fairly soon. They're being taken into account of at perhaps a certain point in our process but our coordination is not at the time that we've received the proposals because we're already starting to participate.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. Milton?

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah. It's easy to fix Joe's problem and just say, "We will liaise with Track 1 of the ICANN accountability process."

The reason I don't particularly like that, but I'll go with it, is, again, this is an FAQ for people who don't know a lot about what's going on, so do they know what Track 1 of the accountability process means? Probably not.

So -- then do we have to have a question that says, "What is Track 1 and Track 2?" And then go into the morass of endless explanations, so --

Yeah. Please don't. I mean, you can overload it.

An FAQ is for people who need help understanding what's going on, and if you overload them with so many details, you can actually be counterproductive there.

So let's put in Track 1 and just run -- run --

MANAL ISMAIL: So, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. Kavouss Aresteh speaking. I think it is an easy fix for that. Instead of going to Track 1 and Track 2, we say ICG deal with the element of accountability which relates to the IANA transitions functions without referring to Track 1, Track 2, and so on and so forth. Along the line of that but not -- because if you go to Track 1, Track 2, we have to put the whole document of the ICANN. But we have to mention we are dealing with only that portion which relate to our activities.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Kavouss.

So I think this means that the only missing part is that we identify the exact part of the accountability process that we are describing our relationship with. So we can take the drafting offline. Any further reactions to this? Hartmut.

HARTMUT GLASER: To Question 8.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes. 8.

                           Who are the operational community?

HARTMUT GLASER: I only like to see -- you mention GNSO. You mention ccNSO, but you don't mention NRO and ASO. You mentioned RIRs. Only to include the supporting organizations as we are composed. Thanks.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. So Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I think the charter, charter clearly explained what is operational communities. Take the same wording from that. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Actually, I think this is the same wording from the charter because I've been trying to extract text from the already agreed documents. So are we adding NRO and --

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: You could add something in bracket -- in round brackets, explanation somewhere. But we should retain -- maintain the charter's explanation or charter terms. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. Thank you. Then moving back to where we are -- so I think it's about the ICG outreach activities, how the ICG is reaching out to the community. Any comments on this?

Seeing none, how is ICG reaching out beyond ICANN community? Great.

Then the resources and materials and archives. So do we have anything to add here?

Okay.   Then it's about unanswered questions or any submitted questions. Yes, those are -- Jean-Jacques, please.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you.   I was just wondering whether "My question is not answered," so that's under the caption IX "unanswered questions." But probably "can I submit a question" should come under the Roman number just before that, no, "How can I follow process development?" So I suggest that you put IX after 22 actually and before 23.

MANAL ISMAIL: So the proposal is we move 22 in the previous section, right, "Can I submit a question" to the previous section?

Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Manal. Kavouss Aresteh speaking. I don't think that the title "unanswered questions" is correct.   That means some question has been raised and we have not answered it.   Maybe "additional

questions," "further questions," but not "unanswered questions." It means the question has been raised and was not answered.

UNDESCERNIBLE: Open questions?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: "Open questions," maybe "other questions," "additional questions," but not "unanswered." Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. We can do this. It was part of it I read all the questions and I didn't find an answer to my question, but that's okay. We can change the title.

So do we have any further comments on the document? So great, thank you. And I'll hand over to Alissa. Are we on time?

ALISSA COOPER: We are. We have five minutes left. I thought there was going to be another question but apparently --

[Applause]

Premature clapping.

[Laughter]

Lynn, go ahead.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: I had seen at the bottom of Manal's note the reference to the questions from the other day, so I thought we were still in the process of perhaps adding some additional questions.

I do still think it would be helpful and I would like to come back to the suggestion that we add a question along the lines of -- I had better words a moment ago -- but will the U.S. government oversight role be replaced by one body? And I think some of words people were kicking around earlier were "maybe" and some details or "not necessarily." And then you could go on and say, for instance, the protocol parameter process has evolved over the years. It has a longstanding oversight process or something.

But the first question before we wordsmith, do we believe we need a question that actually asks -- that addresses the question I heard of a lot of in the hallway which was an expectation that the U.S. government oversight role would be replaced and most of the assumptions were with a body.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, thank you. Yes, Lynn, thank you for noting this. I had it in my notes, but I didn't compile it to the document. And the exact wording that was discussed earlier this morning is: "Does this imply that the current U.S. government's role will be replaced by an entity"? So do we want to leave this language? Joe?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah. I think the topic needs to be addressed, but I think the answer to the topic is not the answer of what replaces the U.S. role but, rather,

how we've asked the community proposals to address that question, which is where the answer can be found, not us suggesting what the answer actually is.

We've asked in the RFP that the communities address this, that the communities discuss how their relationship with NTIA has been impacted. We should be directing people to those proposals where they can find the answer. We should not be answering that question.

MANAL ISMAIL: I think if everyone agrees, I think this already serves as an answer to this question. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. I concur. You raise the question, but there is no text. It would not mention anything.

MANAL ISMAIL: You're seeking an answer for the question -- we're just discussing this now, and I was proposing that we take what Joe said as an answer to this question. So are you fine with this?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Can you repeat that?

MANAL ISMAIL: It's along the lines that we have already asked the communities to address this. Joe, if you want to...

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah, that the concept is that as part of the RFP, we've asked the communities to address how they will be managing oversight and how they have replaced the role. And we refer the question to the community proposals for the answer.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, please. Xiaodong.

XIAODONG LEE: A question and I may have another question. If the U.S. refuse the proposal of ICG, what's the next step of ICG? That is a question.

ALISSA COOPER: We should make a rule, you can only propose a question if you have an answer.

XIAODONG LEE: My question is -- it is just getting to my mind. If we develop a proposal and ask ICANN to follow to the U.S. government but the U.S. government refuse that, what's the next step of ICG because, you know, no ICG now.

UNDESCERNIBLE: We're done.

[Laughter]

XIAODONG LEE: We're dismissed. Okay.

My question is: Is this a question? And is that the answer?

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. We have Jari, Russ, Adiel and Kavouss.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah, I don't think it is appropriate to respond that we should all just go home and quit this thing. I think we have a responsibility to continue to evolve the ecosystem that our organizations are a part of and this process is part of that evolution.

And, you know, of course, if the U.S. government disagrees, that will put some obstacles in our path. But I think we'll have to continue in some fashion.

This is a hard question to answer on the FAQ. But I don't view this as something that we'd have to quit and not do anything after that. Definitely not.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Jari. I think we already have a question that what happens if we miss the deadline which, again, implies failure to have the proposals submitted on time which is another way of looking to things. So being positive and not predicting anything like we said today with the board, so let's not predict.

So, yes, Adiel?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yes. And in any case, we have been created because the NTIA has asked ICANN to lead the process. So if we send it and they say this is no what we want, they will deal with ICANN. And ICANN wants to say something -- I don't think we have direct engagement with NTIA, and they will do that. And we don't have to put it in the FAQ either.

MANAL ISMAIL: So I have Kavouss, Russ, and Jean-Jacques. And if we all agree not to put it in the FAQ and those responses are on the question, then maybe we can put -- now, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I concur with the others. And I think six minutes ago we said that our issue related to this has been finished, so we have to skip from any other questions -- additional questions and go to the timeline, that we have to have another subject. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. So I have Russ and Jean-Jacques. Russ, please.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Sorry.

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy. I think this is such a huge unknown question -- answer to this question that we should probably stop with the one we have earlier that talks about not meeting the timeline and just keep with that. Otherwise, we would have a hard time and waste a lot of cycles trying

to agree what we should say. And in the end, I don't think any of us actually know. And so I think we should just drop that last addition.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: I agree with most of what has been said, but to answer more specifically to Lee Xiaodong, I would say it is slightly beyond our remit because his question -- your question, Xiaodong, is of a true strategic nature which goes beyond simply transition. It is linked, but I think it is very difficult for this group to bring an answer.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. And thank you all, again. And over to you, Alissa. Sorry for taking more than has been scheduled.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Manal.   Being four minutes over time is being on time obviously in this group.

Okay. So 10-minute break. Please come back 4:15. We're going to talk about our future meeting and conference call scheduling, everyone's favorite.

[BREAK]

ALISSA COOPER: Please come back and take your seats. We're going to get started again.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Can we please take our seats?

Come on, cleaner. Do your job.

ALISSA COOPER: Start talking.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Okay. So we are now going to decide when we have our meetings and I think only people around the table are allowed to actually give input to this process.

So next slide, please.

The first thing we have been talking about has to do with the meeting in February around the ICANN meeting in Marrakech, and this is the current result of the Doodle poll and I have verified that the translations and all the other logistics are okay, so given this result, I think we have consensus that Friday-Saturday, 6th to 7th of February, is the preferred date for the group.

Yes, please. James.

JAMES BLADEL: Thank you. James speaking, for the transcript.

Just to point out that the Saturday and Sunday -- so the 7th and 8th -- prior to the ICANN meeting will be focused with GNSO working sessions, so for those who are in the GNSO, on the GNSO, or have work before the GNSO, will probably be fairly scarce on the 7th.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Unless you want to exclude me from participation, if you put it on 13 and 14, I will not be able to participate at all because I'm vice chairman of another group. Please do it on 6 and 7, or whatever you want, 5 and 6 or 7 and 8, but not on that date because I would be excluded.

If you decide unanimously to exclude me, welcome.

[Laughter]

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Can we please have some order in the room and please use your flags. Keith.

KEITH DAVIDSON: In associating myself -- oh, Keith Davidson for the record. In associating myself with Kavouss' comments and speaking on behalf of Narelle and I, we both have ISOC board meeting on the 13th and 14th, so we're very, very hopeful that it will remain 6th and 7th.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yeah. I don't hear what you're saying because you don't read into the microphone. I think I understand what I heard by reading it -- "sort of works" -- okay. Thank you very much. I got the information.

Kuo-Wei?

KUO-WEI WU: ---

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So also of course we in SSAC we normally meetings even on the Friday and Saturday. On the other hand, I have informed the normal scheduling process that we're using that this -- that we might have this collision and we have to resolve that accordingly, and this is one of the reasons why I find it important that we are scheduling already now.

As I said, I myself now have to rush from this meeting, even though the meeting might not have ended just because I couldn't change my flight because we scheduled this meeting too late, so we need to schedule the February meeting now, and I hope that everyone can do the best possible.

So yes, people will probably be forced to go in and out of the meeting, but it's still so much better on the Friday-Saturday, 6th to 7th, than the alternative.

Regarding the -- yes, Thomas.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Patrik. Just for your information, normally the GAC starts at 2:00 on Saturday afternoon at the beginning of the ICANN meetings.

If you think that -- I mean, if you think that we -- this is no problem for overlap or you think that we might be done by noon or something like that, but otherwise, I just want to flag this to you that the GAC starts. And it's normally like Saturday and Sunday are very important because this is where we have some time to go into the issues, actually.

So that might --

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yeah. The next thing we're going to talk about is what time during these two days we are going to have the meeting.

Alissa.

ALISSA COOPER: I can defer to that. I was just going to say, if it helps the people with conflicts on the 7th, if we were going to do a day and a half, we could do the full day on Friday and the half day on Saturday.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Kavouss, did you have your flag up?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, it's good, but I don't think that we should limit it to just a day and a half. It depends on the workload. If we need to continue the afternoon

of Saturday, we continue afternoon of Saturday, that's all, and I think we leave it to the colleagues of GAC to do what they do and so on.

So I don't think that -- there's a lot of workload for us. I have doubt one and a half day, even if we have a little time for a break and start earlier than normal.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: The suggestion that I would like to put on the table is that we are starting in the morning of the Friday, run Friday, and then also schedule to have meetings during Saturday, but we are noting that the further we move and have meetings on the Saturday, the higher the risk that people have to leave, which means that we should, if nothing else, do the scheduling of the work we are doing such that the full committee is not -- might only meet until lunch.

There might be other things that we have to work on face-to-face like in subgroups or whatever when we are moving into the evaluation that the time during the afternoon can be used for.

So my suggestion is schedule two full days but we decide later on whether the full committee ends the meeting earlier on the Saturday and the rest of the day is used for other matters.

Any comments on that? Thomas?

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Sorry. I'm just trying -- because this is all quite new to me.

I think I've been told that the chair has some meetings on Friday with staff and other people, but I don't think that this is a problem. I think we can organize our -- organize ourselves in a way that if I'm not there partially, that will not be a problem. At least not for me. So -- but just to flag it that I might have to go out, but no problem, I think.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Being one of the SO and AC chairs that actually schedule those meetings on the Fridays, I can clarify to you that this will be taken care of.

Okay. Good.

Next slide, please.

So the next thing I did was to look at the time line we have, and I marked the three ICANN meetings.

We have the one in Marrakech, 8th to 12th of February. There is a meeting in Latin America and the ICANN meeting is June 21 to 25. And then we have the meeting in Dublin on October 18 to 22.

Of course this is the time line we have, and we all know that it might be adjusted, depending on our workload, the workload on the various communities, but I think it's important to at least start to think about whether -- whether we think the interval between February and June is -- is something that makes sense or whether it is the case that we should -- basically after Marrakech, when do we meet the next time. That's my question to the committee.

Meeting in Latin America is, of course, the easiest and cheapest to do it, adjacent with the ICANN meeting.

Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER:
So the graphic -- the time line graphic shows the months, but the time line itself actually has dates. Not that those dates aren't a little bit fungible, but I would note that we say in the time line that we're putting -- I think that we're putting the proposal out for -- the unified proposal out for public comment on June 19th, so if we do meet on the 21st, sometime in there, we might want to think about whether that's supposed to be before or after when we are putting it out for public comment.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:
We can -- I think we can and should defer the decision, but I think it's really important that we think about it now because if it is the case that we are going to request the interest of a face-to-face meeting outside of the ICANN meetings, that's a lot of work regarding logistics, finding a location. It might most certainly be like a budget issue and other kinds of things. So we need to decide that pretty early to make things -- make sure that the meeting planning and scheduling ends up being as smooth as possible.

Next slide, please.

Narelle, sorry. I missed you. Please.

NARELLE CLARK:
Narelle Clark. If you could just jump back to that one.

I was just wondering, is it worth us reconsidering moving the date of that release of the piece for public comment so that it would come immediately after our meeting and then that way we get a chance to say, "Yes, indeed, we all agree, done, out"?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER: Up to you how long you want to wait to make this decision, but obviously like in the next meeting, we're talking about meeting prior to the start, and the 19th is prior -- just prior to the start, so it's probably only a matter of a little -- a few days if we need to change the date -- that date.

All I'm saying is if we met at the front end of the Latin American meeting, we could in theory still have the agreement by June 19, but it might also be beneficial to have the agreement a little bit more in advance of the ICANN meeting.

So we should think about the two things together.

JAMES BLADEL: Sorry. Hi, James speaking. And just to follow up with that comment, any comment period that opens immediately prior or is open during an ICANN meeting is essentially a wasted week, if not more, so holding it off until after immediately the conclusion or, as Alissa suggested, moving it up would probably make a little bit more sense.

I would point out that if we're going move it up, then we probably should, as you were saying, Patrik, look at some sort of intersessional meeting somewhere in between the ICANN calendar.

Maybe April.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you. I can take on the task then to see what kind of alternatives there might be for such an intersessional meeting and come back to the group.

So next slide, please.

What is more -- is more important is to talk about what we are going to do between now and January.

I have -- just in case this -- we are not done with all the different issues at this meeting, I have already prepared and prepared with the secretariat to have a phone conference already this coming Wednesday, to start having telephone conferences at some uneven or even intervals, if we just decide when -- when to have -- when to have them.

For example, every third week or something. We could do a preliminary scheduling and then cancel if it's the case that we have to.

It would make it easier to do that kind of planning a little bit longer in advance for, if nothing else, translation.

So the question is first -- yeah. Jari.

JARI ARKKO:

Jari Arkko.

So I think it might actually be useful to think about what we discuss, more so than exactly when, and I -- you know, just one idea is that as the communities produce some of these proposals, scheduling a -- you know, reviews for those early versions of those proposals might be useful activity for the ICG.

So as an example, perhaps the IETF draft could be reviewed in one of our teleconferences and that would be a -- I mean, we're open to doing that in any particular time, but I think that would be a useful activity for us and others.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Yeah. I suggest that the way moving forward here is that, first of all, that we unfortunately need to try to set a preliminary number of conferences just for planning issues for the translators, and then we to -- then we have to decide whether we have an agenda item and what we're going to talk about at those slots, and if we don't find any, we cancel.

That would be my proposal. Because sometimes we come up with what we're going to talk about so close to the proposed date for a telephone conference, so we cannot schedule people, we miss that people have scheduled other kinds of things and we don't have translation available. So when I say that we should talk about a little bit often we should have these calls, it was not my intention to have that imply that we should have a call if we didn't have anything to talk about. Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER: So by my count, we have 10 weeks before major holidays. Ish.
                        Approximately 10 weeks.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Major holidays?

ALISSA COOPER: Summer holidays? What do you call them? I don't even know what --
                        you call them summer holidays? Okay.

                        Yeah. Seasonal holidays. The holidays that happen in December, and I
                        guess, January.

                        Yeah. I'm just trying to be politically correct and I still completely failed.

                        Okay. And so if we were doing something like a call biweekly, that
                        would be five-ish calls. And I think we actually could easily fill five calls.

                        If I look at my list of topics, we will have a call about the secretariat
                        finalization for sure, I would -- that has to be done on a call, I would
                        think.

                        We will probably need face -- real-time discussion about this board
                        resolution issue, I would gather.

                        If we do any of the review -- early reviews of community proposals,
                        that's one -- one or more calls, I think.

                        And then we have the two documents that we talked about today, the
                        FAQs and the proposal finalization process. We might be able to get

away without call time on the FAQs but probably not on the other document.

So I think we should go ahead and put a call every other week on the calendar, and if we need to -- if we cancel, we cancel, but it's better to have people available than not.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So then what I will do is I will issue a Doodle for the call on Wednesday. We have decided to do rotation. So the Doodle poll will be for Wednesdays around -- like, two, three hours around the circulating hour to see exactly when people are available. I will do the Doodle poll just like I did for this one, investigate what languages are available for direct translation. And on Wednesday everything but Portuguese exists, is available, so that is already resolved.

Keith?

KEITH DAVIDSON: Keith Davidson. Just noting that the cross-community working groups are scheduling their calls already for the upcoming period. And given the disruption to those of us who live in the unkind parts of the world, there might be an opportunity to try and coordinate the timing so that we're doing things in the same weeks, sort of roughly in the same zones rather than having 3:00 a.m. calls and 5:00 a.m. calls. So they're working on their schedule, and they have their dates already. So it might cause disruption to our current next one, but to be coordinated might be more useful than not.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I will take that into account and investigate when the other groups have their calls.

ALISSA COOPER: I was going to put in a suggestion that the first call not be this week but the following week. I know I'm not going to get anything done before Wednesday on this because of my day job. I was the person that originally suggested this week anyway, so sorry about that.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I think I have put in some work to plan this Wednesday but most of the work, of course -- no, most of the work actually Alissa -- or Alice and Ergys actually have done to prepare for this Wednesday. As I said, if we cancel, we cancel. So we will come back with the planning of the reaching to the other groups. That is what I hear.

I also hear that we have calls every second week, but let's suggest that we at least one week before should have an agenda item or we cancel so people get to know well in advance whether to have the call.

Anything else?

Then we don't have to show the next slide because we have canceled the call on Wednesday.

ALISSA COOPER: We thought we were going to have the secretariat done, that's why we originally had that --

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Oh, absolutely. If it was the case that we were closer, it was really, really, really important to do all this work. Otherwise, we would absolutely not have been able to have a call on Wednesday. So, yeah. It was an investment that we unfortunately didn't use.

With that I think -- yes, please.

ALISSA COOPER: Do we like the 60 minutes for the calls? Is that working for people? Yeah. Okay. We always run over, that's why. But I think that's okay. I think it's fine.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Actually go to the last slide. Thank you. So this is an example -- for this Wednesday, the -- it was -- it was according to the rotation, this day should be around 12 UTC. So the way I have been doing this is, in this case, take the four hours around it, ask the secretariat to investigate for translation what time slots are actually in reality possible and then, like, in this case, we had all languages, all time slots. We were close to, for example, not have French at the 11:00 to 12:00 UTC hour. That information will be included to you when we do the polls so you can also take that into consideration.

So, anyway, yeah -- and then we do the rotation as we have agreed to, eight-hour slots. Thank you.

Paul?

PAUL WILSON: It's Paul Wilson. I'm just wondering if we can simplify by ruling out slots where all the interpretation is not available.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yes. The question is -- okay. I have decided that to include slots where only one or two languages are not available for interpretation. And what we have done one time before is that we have requested translation to be done afterwards of the scribed language. Basically prioritize having a call with as many participants as possible, then direct translation in some languages.

I have not included in the various polls I've done time slots where more than two languages have been unavailable, so I will use that sort of kind of general rule.

But anyways, this is why in the future including for this call will include information about available translation so you have the ability to come with feedback because I feel a bit uncomfortable just doing that decision on my own. So you will get that information.

And if there are no more questions, over to you, Alissa.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Patrik, for doing all of that.

So the next agenda item is the parking lot for things we wanted to return to. And we had one item from Wolf-Ulrich suggested on the mailing list yesterday. Do you want to talk about that? IANA staff, yes. Go ahead.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Alissa. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. This is an idea which came to my mind during the week. We saw IANA staff outreaching here to the community with the presentation, which was welcomed. I didn't have a chance to participate I'm afraid. But I had a chance to talk to staff members from IANA as well. And I was interested to know, we are talking about IANA function transition and those things. But if you think about and you know that behind that function there are people working in order to make some function operable and working.

So the question came to me, as I have this experience from my former company as well where I was working, if somebody is talking outside the company about your task and your work and how it should be done in the future and how it should be impacted maybe, you start thinking about how does it impact me. It may impact me personally in the future.

And then it starts rumoring, and then it starts thinking about what to do. Is that place where I'm working on, is it still safe? Is this going to be impacted in several ways? And I'm seriously thinking about is there maybe another way to get to safe places.

So from the point of view that we have to have in mind that the operation of IANA should be of a high level, high level of degree of the operation in the future, we have to take care that this is going to happen and that is in relation to that staff.

My question here -- and the idea is why not to outreach to staff from this group in order to tell them what's going on because there are so many ideas in the ICANN communities about what's going on that these people might be confused about that.

I know that the staff executives, they are talking internally with the IANA-related staff in order to keep them calm with regards to that. But they -- if they look to our discussions here, they will see, okay, so the executives might not have a saying in the future about what's going to happen because we wouldn't like that the ICANN board is going to modify our proposal and so on. So that's why I was thinking whether this group or somebody from this group could once outreach to ICANN staff personally in order to communicate those ideas and what's going on, what we have in mind.

I do not have the right idea how that could be done, who should that do. It should be done in a very casual and simple way, I think. So the best would be to go to their office here and talk to them. So that's just the idea.

I would like to leave it here for maybe discussion or if that is an idea which could be accepted and then think about who and when that could be done. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Elise.

ELISE GERICH: Wolf-Ulrich described this idea to me. I think we talked a couple days ago. And it is one of the roles of the liaison to this committee for me to take your messages back and to let the staff know. And his concern was more that the staff would still be concerned of the security of their jobs, I guess that's one way to put it.

And I think that the staff is well aware of the fact that their role and our role is to continue to do the job that we have to do and that it is the job of this committee and the multistakeholder community to come up with a proposal on how to -- what the future might look like.

And I don't really think the staff is all that worried because the community itself has expressed confidence in this session as well as in other sessions that they listened to remotely that the job they're doing is being done well. So I think they are confident about the fact that people say that the IANA functions are being done well. So...

I'm not sure that having someone go and talk to them more about what the committee is doing here, how that would be received. And I'm just saying that it might cause people to be more nervous versus less nervous. And it is this coordination group that's going to coordinate proposals. It is not this group that's making the proposals.

So, Wolf-Ulrich, I'm not really sure that it would get the benefit that you're hoping for, but then I'm not sure. So it night again. So we should probably get other people's opinions.

ALISSA COOPER: Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thanks. This is Jean-Jacques. I recognize Wolf-Ulrich's concern and its motivation. But I think that I very much understand much more actually what Elise just said. There is a liaison, and I think we should leave it up

entirely to the liaison to see in what terms to answer to possible preoccupations on the part of the concerned staff. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Anyone else on this?

I agree with Jean-Jacques for what it's worth. I think it is at your discretion, Elise. Yes, some nods. A few nods. Okay.

Yeah, yeah go ahead.

ELISE GERICH: I do want to mention if anyone does want to visit the ICANN offices and visit the IANA office space within the ICANN offices, you know, we are always welcome -- we always welcome people to come to the office and visit us, too. Please make sure you give us a little warning to make sure we are there. We might be out to lunch or whatever. But you are always welcome to visit the office at any time.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thank you. Unexpected visitors will be showing up at your door.

Okay. Any other topics that people want to revisit or come back to? We have a few minutes before people are going to start vanishing for the airport.

Go ahead, Lynn.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: It is not actually a topic and credit goes to Keith, I think, for saying -- we found ourselves at a couple of points wanting to express agreement with what seemed to be the consensus that was emerging in the room but not wanting to take the mic just to say +1 or to try and find a different way to say it. So I don't know if we could start a -- you know, a process for -- if there is a seeming consensus emerging doing a lightweight call and just asking people to put a thumbs up or nod or something. I don't know. It just seemed -- a hum or -- I don't know, as I said.

ALISSA COOPER: Go ahead, Keith.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Keith Davidson. Just to follow on from that, I notice Adobe Connect as the wonderful little function of a thumbs up beside your name. And on some of the working group calls that I'm chairing, I find that incredibly useful in terms of judging the consensus emerging within the room. And that might well cause me to -- if there is about half the room indicating thumbs up, I might then call for is there anyone who specifically wants to speak against which can then get to consensus very, very quickly.

So that's sort of strange that an electronic technology is actually more useful than actual face-to-face communications where we sort of go through iterative processes and using lots of words to say "me too."

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Anyone else? Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: No. I was about to say "me too" but that's not the case.

I have a concern.   Whilst recognizing that Keith's proposal is very conducive to a quick result, I am concerned, as I have been since the first meeting in London, that the proportion of members of the ICG actually responding is not always optimal.

So if there were a way to encourage -- sorry -- all members to be more proactive on that, I'd be satisfied, but failing that, then there's always the question of how representative is that humming or that tick, really, for the group.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Patrik, could you clearly explain what we're talking about?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: The issue that was brought up was Lynn, that -- if I understand things correctly, was that Lynn brought up the issue that we had a fair amount of intervention during the day where the intervention itself was more or less only support for the previous speaker without addition of much substantial information, which meant that we spent quite a lot time today just sort of supporting others.

And the question was then, can we show support of a statement in a way that is faster and quicker than asking for an intervention. I think that was the question.

Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, you can create something that you want to support without speaking. Raising that, that is support. But when you support and you don't speak is good. You save the time. Otherwise, I could support, then I could talk about 10 minutes and then support. You want that?

[Laughter]

So create some cards, red, yellow, and whatever. When raising that, I support the previous speakers.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: You have understood the point and the question --

[Laughter]

-- well.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: And I see that Lars-Johan Liman from RSSAC here, he didn't even ask for an intervention. He already implemented your suggestion, Kavouss, by showing a thumbs-up.

So anyways, I think we can -- we can think about -- we take on the task, we who try to run these meetings, on how to do that, the logistics,

because I think all of us are happy with the progress that we have made today and it's very important that we do have time to talk through the various issues. Specifically when people actually do have substantial comments or otherwise. So we will think about how to do that and thank you for the input, Kavouss.

Lynn?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: And one more small point, I think, but do we have a standing order of business that says at the end of every one of these meetings, we will put out some high-level memo that says, "The ICG met today and the main orders of business were X, and Y was decided" or something and just post something on the site?

ALISSA COOPER: So this is, I think, to be the -- the sort of new version of the minutes. Well, so we've done two things in the last couple of calls.

We've had just a summary of the decisions and action items sent to the mailing list before the minutes are ready, so that's, I think, roughly what you're talking about, I hope. No? Okay.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: I was actually talking more about a public communication.

ALISSA COOPER: Oh.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: A lot of people knew that we were meeting today. It's a pretty extensive meeting. It's 30-odd people for a day. To put out a couple of paragraphs that simply says, "We met, the order of business was," and something that we think would be of interest. I mean, you know, "We reviewed the facts, we progressed on X" or -- just something that people could read that was a few paragraphs long without having to look to specific action items and --

If there's not anything worthwhile reporting out on at that level, then I think we revert back to kind of our normal minutes, but...

ALISSA COOPER: People should feel free to join the queue.

Yeah, my perspective on that is that I -- I really would rather not sort of privilege any one meeting over the others. I feel like if we say that we do that for a face-to-face meeting, then we also have to do it for the calls, and I would much rather the demarcation points be when we put something out, like we have many times, you know, those are the big announcements to the community in terms of what we're doing, as opposed to --

And in particular, today's meeting, there's not, I think, that much of interest. It will just be sort of the action items from the minutes with more words around them, which to me just kind of seems like work for someone to do, so that's -- that's kind of my feeling.

I think we get a lot done on the mailing list, we get a lot done on the calls, we get a lot done in the face-to-face, and when we feel it's important to say something, we can at any time.

I got the thumbs-up from Russ Mundy.

And from -- and from Martin Boyle. Okay. Therefore, we can -- we can proceed.

[Laughter]

So Samantha has hopefully gathered for me the decisions and action items from the meeting today, so I will just try to summarize briefly and then we will be done early. Goodness.

So let's see. Decisions from today. I'm just trying to figure out the order to do these. One second.

Aha. My list -- my list starts with the secretariat discussion which Samantha was not in. I think I'll skip those, actually.

[Laughter]

Probably, right? Yeah.

Okay. So in terms of the actions that we took, we approved the minutes of September 6 and October 1. They will be published on the Web site. As part of the discussion about the relationship with the board and the transmission of the proposal to NTIA, we have a subgroup of Jandyr, Xiaodong, and Lynn who will be developing requirements about how we want the final submission to go and how we want it to be handled by the ICANN board.

And specifically for the FAQ text on that item, we will use that output, together with the language suggested by Milton, to help develop an

EN

answer to that question about the board, and Manal will continue updating the FAQ -- the rest of the FAQ.

And I -- and also on that board point, I -- I will coordinate back with Bruce Tonkin from the ICANN board to make sure that we're in sync as far as timing and next steps on that issue.

Joe and I will take the input from the proposal finalization discussion and we will update the document and send it back to the group for further discussion on the mailing list.

And Patrik took an action to issue a Doodle poll for the calls, the remaining calls this year.

And I think we also agreed to dates for Marrakech. Yes. February 6 and 7.

We cancelled the teleconference for this week but we'll Doodle for the following week, and we'll keep the teleconferences at 60 minutes.

I think that's it. Did I miss something?

Yes. Go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: One small thing you missed, that we agreed that an infogram be prepared to indicate various groups dealing with accountability and relating all of those together in order to avoid all of these confusions that has been coming to the mind of the colleagues.

So that should be something that we expect to have, that infogram with necessary explanation, what are the groups and what are the names, so

on and so forth, properly mentioned, working group, community working group, IANA names and cross-community working group, accountability, and two track, and this info diagram was mentioned and need to be prepared. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. So I think that's actually an action on ICANN because they were already -- that's something they're going to do, not something we're going to do.

Yeah.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: We have to mention that, yes, ICANN was requested. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Well, yeah. Well, ICANN has -- ICANN -- it was ICANN's idea, so we'll -- sure. We can put something in the minutes about that, I think.

The other one actually that I did miss is that we identified liaison people for the two groups. For CWG IANA, that was Milton, Xiaodong, and Martin; and for the CCWG accountability, that was Keith Drazek and Kavouss.

Anything else that we missed?

Lynn.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: So at the risk of irritating everybody late at the end of a week, I'd actually like to come back to a point I raised a moment ago because I think publishing the action items is organizational for us. It helps us to understand where we're going and where the responsibility lies to move the work forward. That doesn't feel like a communication out to the rest of the world with respect to the progress that was actually achieved here and we actually did discuss some fairly important subjects, made progress on them, and even if they weren't closed, I think it's still useful for the world to understand that they were under discussion and that we're moving forward with them.

So I mean, I won't continue to push it but I do think there's a fundamental difference between an action item list which helps us versus a communication where we try and tell the rest of the world sort of what we accomplished and just keep them engaged and understanding some of the progress. But I'm not actually hard wedded to it so I will stop.

ALISSA COOPER: Keith and then Mohamed.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Keith Davidson. Just associating myself with Lynn's comments, I think, yes, just given that the alternatives are to read lots of text or listen to hours of recordings, for people who want a brief summary, I -- I'm -- I think it would be of use and it would also dispel any further negatives in terms of our lack of accountability or transparency as a group.

So for me, it's probably not a big task compared to the benefits to the broader community.

ALISSA COOPER: Mohamed?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah. It's Mohamed El Bashir. I do support the proposal and I think it's also useful to be presented in the context of ICG activities in ICANN 51 meeting, for example.

We had the public session, we had as well some meetings, so I think it's -- the announcement could be highlighting what we did during this week, including this meeting.

ALISSA COOPER: Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I have no problem with that. I hope that we are not going to have a communique from ICG. I hope it is not the intention. But if you want to announce what has happened, put it in the name of the chairman of ICG. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Well, okay. So I was just going to ask (a) who's going to do this work and (b) are we going to then, you know, debate it on the mailing list. I guess I have a personal bad experience with this kind of thing where it's

like you get to the end of the day and there's all of a sudden this rush and we all have to agree to some text and people feel that they are pressured into agreeing into a very specific interpretation of what happened in the meeting because we have to get it out because we just had the meeting and it's not timely if we wait and all of this.

So I would like to understand a little bit better who's going to do this work, how long we're going to debate it, are we going to debate it in person, are we going to debate it on the mailing list, does it matter if it comes out two weeks later because we can't agree, so on and so forth. So I would like some input on that. Joe?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. Joseph Alhadeff. Let me clear upfront that this is not volunteering.   I think there's a difference between what Lynn was talking about and what Mohamed was talking about in terms of I think it actually would be useful to discuss what happened in the open forum, kind of give a little precis of ICANN week and our participation in ICANN week and our outreach activities during ICANN week.

To Lynn's point, I understand the utility but I worry about the editorial nature that happens in that where someone is going to say "You left that out because you are trying to not be clear about what you're saying." So in some ways, I think especially if we get to minutes that perhaps are less detailed, the minutes themselves might become that because the question is if we are not then publishing that beyond where the Web site is, then I question whether it is any more effective than anything we put on the Web site anyway. And I would rather see the effort made to have the Web site be more clear, accessible, and useful

as part of our process forward, and then talk about things which are opportunities for interaction with the group and opportunities for outreach rather than, "This is how we decided to summarize what happened."

ALISSA COOPER: Thumbs up from Martin. This is the problem with the thumbs is that the remote people can't necessarily see. We have them also from Milton.

Keith and then Jean-Jacques and then Kavouss.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Keith Davidson. I was just going to add that I don't think time is of the essence that this needs to be -- if we were to proceed, that, you know, arguing text at the end of a long day would be just not appropriate for this group. But a week or so later would be appropriate. But I do like Joe's idea that publishing the brief minutes quickly might be the expedited communication that we would need and maybe we try that.

ALISSA COOPER: Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Alissa. This is Jean-Jacques. Yes, I very much like Joe's proposal. I think it is important to signal where the community can find things rather than going into details. That's my first comment.

My second comment is later on when we're better equipped with a permanent secretary -- sorry, not a permanent, an independent secretary, then that's one of the tasks we could assign in advance to the secretariat by saying, well, look, as soon as you start working on any one of our meetings, think also -- take notes also for what could go into a communique -- not a communique but a notification or whatever you want to call it, signaling the highlights. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. If we are talking of notification, it should be not delayed for long time. It should be within the next two or three days maximum. If you do something in November, it has no value at all. But still the text of that is very important. I don't think it is a resume' of the minutes because we may play with the words. But if you wanted the chairman of ICG to give something what was the result of this meeting or whatever you want, you can do that. But anything that in the name of ICG, we have to see it and we have to comment on that. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah. I mean, to be clear, I have no interest in issuing something on personal title. This is our meeting. So we either all need to agree that we want to say something about it or not.

Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I just wanted to suggest of publishing draft minutes clearly watermarked with "draft minutes." We can do that pretty early on before they are approved. Just a kind of middle ground idea.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Okay. It seems that we have people shaking their heads, some people giving the thumbs up. What do people think about this suggestion that we do sort of minutes on the Web site as the compromise, I guess. That's the compromise you suggested. Joe? Brief minutes on the Web site. Yes, okay. And are we okay with, say, asking Samantha to try and author these and circulate to us? For today, obviously, yeah. That's what I'm thinking about. How do we do this for today. Yeah, are you okay to do that? You can say no.

SAMANTHA DICKINSON: The full set of minutes.

ALISSA COOPER: No, no, no, like the email with a few more sentences. Samantha says yes. Okay. She doesn't have a microphone.

Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: No problem with draft minutes, but we have to have a disclaimer that this draft minute that this draft is subject to modification. Thank you.

EN

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Okay. Great.

Any other business? No. Okay.

So I would just like to say a very big thank you to everyone. I think we had a really productive meeting today and looking forward to getting down to the real work the next time we all see each other. Also huge, huge thanks to all the secretariat, the ICANN staff who arranged the dinner last night which was lovely, the interpreters in the back -- is there someone -- the tech team, yes.

[Applause]

Are there other people who sit in the back who are not named? Okay. I just wanted to make sure. Oh, and the audience. Yes, thank you to the silent observers for being silent. Yeah. No one protesting the outcome. So, yep.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I fully endorse what you said. I would like to sincerely thank you as the chairman of this group, all the effort that you have put before, during, and so on and so forth including those distinguished colleagues they have worked to prepare the elements, like Manal and others. And, also, we would like to mention that we are very happy with the atmosphere and environment of ICG which is very friendly and very promising.

[Applause]

ALISSA COOPER:　　　　　And I would just say the same for Mohamed and Patrik who are incredibly helpful in doing all the work.

[Applause]

Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]