BUENOS AIRES - ICG Working Session 1
Thursday, 18 June 2015 - 09:00 to 17:00
ICANN - Buenos Aires, Argentina

ALISSA COOPER: Hello, everyone. We're going to try to get started, so please take your seats.

Hi, folks. We're going to try to get started. Over there in the corner, Mr. Boyle, you're out of order.

Okay. Hi, everyone. This is Alissa, for those who are joining us remotely, and for the transcript.

Good morning. Thanks to everyone for showing up. This is the fifth face-to-face meeting of the ICG, and we're looking at our agenda up on the screen right now.

So we have two days of meetings. I know that some people are going to be in and out tomorrow, so we've tried to really bulk up day one, although we will certainly have lots to talk about on day two as well.

Starting with the pre-assessment of the CWG names proposal, Patrik will be leading that session. We've had a little bit of discussion of the names proposal, but now it's off to the SOs and ACs. We wanted to see if there's anything else that we can get

EN

done in terms of our own assessment while we await its actual transmission to us.

Then we'll talk a little bit kind of logistical planning for the combined proposal assessment, who's going to do that and what the timetable looks like.

We'll have a break.

We're going to talk about multi-step implementation. We've had a little bit of mailing list traffic on that just this morning, so some folks might not be up-to-date. You might want to look at our mailing list to catch up on that.

Then we'll have lunch, which will be served somewhere. Do you know where. In here? Okay. Lunch will be in here.

Then we have a -- oh, this is -- is this the right -- okay. Yeah. Sorry.

We'll talk about the public comment period. We have a bunch of planning things we need to do for that. And there's mail out to the list in the last couple of days from me with some updated text for the Web site we might use for that, and also for the executive summary for the combined proposal.

Then we'll have a break.

We're going to get an update on the CCWG accountability work, which Mohamed will lead.

And then we'll talk a little bit about our response to NTIA and the time frames. We've gotten some more information back from the numbers community and from the ICANN board.

And then we'll wrap up.

So that's the plan for today.

Any comments on the agenda or general overall comments before we dive in?

And I should say we'll follow the same kind of procedure that we usually do in terms of the queue, so if you want to be in the queue, please, you know, put your name card up like this. If you're remote and you want to be in the queue, please raise your hand in Adobe Connect and that's how we'll proceed.

So comments on the agenda or anything else?

No. Everyone is asleep. Okay.

[Laughter]

Good. Then we can begin with the CWG names proposal pre-assessment and Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you.

So as we all know, the CWG names have produced a version of their proposal which they believe is stable enough so it has been passed to the chartering organizations of CWG names for approvals and comment.

The chartering organizations have until June 25, which is next Thursday, to respond to this question.

We have talked about, here in the ICG, that we should start with a pre-assessment of the CWG names proposal on this early version, to try to save some time. This is something that we should discuss. It is a proposal from us chairs that we should continue with the pre-assessment on this prerelease version.

After the -- our proposal is further that the assessment should be done in a similar way as was done with the numbers and the protocol parameters proposals. That we try to find individuals which have the interest of looking at specific issues in these documents.

When we later, in the next step, do have all three proposals -- and that includes the final version of the CWG names which is not what we have on the table now, but when we have all three proposals from the operational communities, at that point in time we need to do an assessment of the three proposals together, and we will talk a little bit about that assessment process in the next slot in the agenda.

So to start with, I would like to talk about just CWG names proposal as it is on the table.

On the phone call that we had the other week, myself and Russ from SSAC explained and offered the ICG to show you where we are in SSAC on our evaluation of the CWG names to trigger some discussion and also show you what SSAC, as one of the chartering organizations, have been looking at and how we are doing our work.

We are not done with our evaluation, so what I will share with you is what process and methods we are using for our evaluation, but I cannot show you the evaluation results themselves because that is something that we ultimately will discuss this coming Tuesday, which will lead to our response that then should be ready on Thursday.

So I hope this is helpful.

The slides themselves includes quite a lot of text, but the idea is not that I should read it or that you should read it on the screen, but that it can be hopefully either material that is useful for you or material that you can just ignore. Up to you.

First -- next slide, please.

So the background from an SSAC perspective is that we in SSAC, after analyzing the public comment, we produced Document Number 69 in which we consider issues that may affect -- from SSAC perspective may affect the security and stability of the DNS, both during and after the transition of the stewardship role.

So we have a number of recommendations in this document of ours, and those are the -- that is what we are basing our assessment on.

Next, please.

So Recommendation 1 says that the operational communities should determine a couple of things. For example, what control functions are going away, is there

any additional external controls that are necessary, by whom they should be administrated, et cetera.

Next.

We have identified that this is discussed in the discussion about the PTI in Section 3, and it talks about a certain obligations for the IANA function operators and also how the auditing of that process is to be done through the CSC, and a couple of other functions as well.

Next slide, please.

Recommendation 2a, we are recommending that the communities determine whether or not existing mechanisms outside the IANA functions contract are robust enough to hold the operator accountable.

Next slide.

And in 2b, if it is the case that the policy development processes are clear enough, or whether that has to be -- be evolved -- that has to evolve in one way or another.

Next slide, please.

We see that this is handled in Section III.A.i. The numbering of the document is kind of interesting, but there is some text here that talks about the community expectations for the stewardship and how the performance is measured, and so we find that this is -- this is covered.

And there are also a number of elements listed explicitly that are -- that are suggested to be included in that kind of evaluation.

Next slide, please.

In -- no. Please go back. Thank you.

In Recommendation 3, we point out the situation with sanctions that exists, regardless of what -- within what jurisdiction the operational -- these kind of services are done.

In the U.S., we talk about the OFAC2 licenses. In other countries, they have other names. And we find it very important that this is investigated.

Next slide, please.

The -- we see that this is discussed in Section III.A.iv.c.

Next.

Recommendation 4, we talk about the importance of transparency and freedom from improper influence on the performance of the IANA functions and that they might require additional mechanisms or safeguards.

Next.

We see this be discussed in Section III.A.iii where it's discussed reports from the IANA functions operator and how that information is published in the -- how that is published quickly and without any further ado.

Next.

Recommendation 5, that stability and efficiency of existing structure and processes must still work at least as reliable, resilient, and efficient as the current process.

Next.

And we see that in Paragraph 148, it is recommended that the root zone management process administrator role is discussed, how that is discontinued and how the actual agreements are changed.

Next, please.

Recommendation 6, that the root zone management process post-transition, including inter-organization coordination for the root zone management, that that needs to be discussed and described in detail, specifically in the cases where the process involves more than one root zone management partner.

Next, please.

And Recommendation 7 is -- has to do with the process and legal framework associated with the root zone maintainer of the transition.

Next slide, please.

And we see that both the text regarding -- related to both Recommendations 6 and 7 can be found in Section III.A.iii, where there is recommended the replacement of the approval function and another mechanism is in use to make sure that the quality is high and minimize -- minimal risk for errors.

And those were all the slides, I think. There's nothing else?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yeah. Okay. So this is where we are at the moment in our evaluation, and what we are currently doing is that we are in SSAC now evaluating whether the text that is -- that is referenced, whether that fulfills, from our perspective, enough sort of -- sort of are the proposals stable and robust enough to live up to the reasoning behind the recommendations that we had.

So this is what we have done, and I would like to open the microphone for others to talk about what they are doing or what they think should be done, and after that, we can talk about and try to find volunteers that have an interest of doing a pre-assessment of the CWG names.

So I want to open up the floor, please.

Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Good morning to everybody. Very glad to see distinguished CWG members face-to-face. Thank you very much. Congratulations to your community providing this response document to the request of the CWG from the chartering organizations.

I hope that other chartering organizations have done similar things or will do similar things before 25th of June to send it to the CWG, if I'm correct, or sending elsewhere, I don't know.

My question to yourself would be: Apart from any other comments that colleagues may make to your draft, which unfortunately I have not studied and I think you have done a good job. I don't want to go into detail.

The situation is your intentions, next step, you will send it at what time to which destiny? Which -- address it to CWG or to elsewhere? That may be good for the others, because I raise the same question last night for ALAC and asked them whether they are doing the same thing. I am still waiting for some informal reply from one of my ALAC colleagues.

So this is my first comment.

And I have a general comment relating to the CWG activity, but I leave it for later stage because it is a general comment. It does not relate to this document which is very highly appreciated. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much.

The work that we are doing in SSAC, to make it clear where we're going to send it, this document is an internal document for SSAC that will lead to the production of the response that SSAC has got from the CWG names chairs, because we as a chartering organization have got the question whether we support the result of the work of the CWG names, and that we will send to the CWG names chairs so they can say, in turn, "We have now produced a document that have support according to the processes we are using inside ICANN for cross-community working groups."

On top of that, of course we in SSAC, as part of the transparency that we are running in -- the way we are dealing with transparency in SSAC, we will also make that note public, of course, and -- but the actual text itself is directed to the CWG names chairs.

Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. Thank you, Patrik. And good morning, everybody. Wolf-Ulrich Knoben speaking.

I have first a question to the process you outlined, and then also a comment from the -- at least from the part of the GNSO side, how we deal with that approach.

The question is: I understand the CWG is now expecting comments from the chartering organizations. However, parts of these chartering organizations themselves have already commented during the public comment period, so -- as the GNSO did.

The question is: Is it part of the SSAC or already comment with regard to those questions in advance? That's my question.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much for the question.

The question for the chartering organizations is not to come up with input to the document because, as you say, we have already given input.

We have to make an assessment whether we do believe that this document is not what was intended to be sent.

So it's more or less black and white: Do you support this or not. It is not an open consultation.

On the other hand, we are -- just like all of us in ICG, we are finding that this has not really happened before in ICANN that you have had a cross-constituency working group where the result is really, really important, so one of the things we are doing at the moment in SSAC is to find out exactly what the question is. Do we have to support it? Is the question whether we object to it or not? Can we say no support and still move forward?

But let me be clear. It is not a public comment period. If it was the case that the SOs and ACs, the charter organizations had interest of giving feedback, that should have been given long, long before. That time is over. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you very much. I just would like to follow up with my second part of the comment because it leads directly to that was -- what the GNSO is now doing as a chartering organizations. And I can only talk for the Commercial Stakeholder Group on the GNSO. Maybe someone else can comment and join me. I understand the GNSO has on its agenda of the public meeting of next Wednesday the issue of discussing how they should respond as a chartering organization. So what they need is the input from the different stakeholder groups within the GNSO.

And this is on our agenda as well from the Commercial Stakeholder Group over this weekend and throughout the ICANN meeting to exactly also try to find out is that paper a paper which we could support or what are the real issues and how shall the responses end. This is the way we shall have as commercial stakeholder groups have various meetings on Sunday, the first one, and on Tuesday. There are other meetings as well. And we will then come to a response that our people on the GNSO Council will be in a position to take their positions on that. So this is how we are doing that from this part of the GNSO and maybe others can then join in and comment on that. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Milton?

MILTON MUELLER: Yes. I'm going to basically be reacting to your report and maybe asking you to elaborate on certain things, knowing that you can't speak for the SSAC at this stage, but maybe just getting your opinion as a person or some kind of indication of what the thinking might be.

So the first point, kind of a minor detail, when you are talking about the accountability functions for PTI, you talked about the

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires
21-25 JUNE 2015

contract, the customer standing committee, and the review process. And I think you left something out, which is that the majority of the board of the PTI will be appointed by ICANN and you will have two independent directors. And this -- this was a big part of the accountability debate within the development of the proposal. So I just wanted to call your attention to that, that many people said, well, we have to keep ICANN in control of PTI from a corporate standpoint because that's part of the accountability arrangements. We want to be able to hold ICANN accountable for the performance of PTI more or less directly.

What I would really like to hear more from you about was the change in the authorization process. And, of course, we don't know much about what will happen to the VeriSign relationship. So maybe we can leave that out of the discussion. But I'm just still a little bit fuzzy about the technical procedures and what you think of the proposal -- the CWG proposal regarding root change zone authorizations.

And then the third point, there is this incompatibility with the numbers proposal regarding the intellectual property, where it goes. And I suppose we will be discussing that later. I don't think we have to discuss it now. But I do want to discuss that. But I'd really like to hear more from you about the authorization process.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. First of all, regarding the accountability issues, there is, of course, a question what feedback should be given to the CCWG accountability and what should be given as feedback to the CWG names which are in reality accountability questions.

And one of the things that we are looking at in SSAC is, for example, whether there is a potential conflict, just to give one example, between the proposal in the CWG names to create a standing committee that discusses and approves changes to the root zone management procedure; that is, to give advice or make a decision that then more or less if I use laymen language that the ICANN board is rubber stamping, how is that working together with a proposal of the CCWG accountability that talks about a requirement to implement the ATRT2 recommendation that the board must act on formal advice from the advisory committees. Is there a conflict between these two if there is conflicting formal advice from one of the ACs regarding a proposal that has come in from the standing committee that is proposed by CWG names?

So there might not be. It might be the case that it is crystal clear of who's doing what there. But it just needs to be sort of sorted out. So these are the kind of -- so, unfortunately, I cannot really answer your question regarding accountability. But these are

the kind of things that we in SSAC are looking at because we are -- just like I hear between the lines what you are saying, it is really, really important that we make sure that the root zone maintenance including the WHOIS server is stable, is functioning, and is of high quality at least as today which means that all the checks and balances that exist today, either we need to make a conscious decision that, no, we don't need that anymore or we need to replace it with something else. And maybe that "something else" is sort of -- extends to already existing mechanisms that we already have or we need something new. But we are currently discussing it inside SSAC.

Regarding your first point regarding -- regarding the PTI, thank you very much for that. That's the kind of feedback that also I wanted to have. It also helps us in SSAC, of course. How we have been looking at that and regarding the accountability, I cannot really go into that because -- either it's a risk that I say the wrong things. But we can talk more later about that.

Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I think in the CWG activities, there are five areas which requires to be addressed. And, in fact, it was primarily addressed by CCWG relating to the accountability which should

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires
21-25 JUNE 2015

be in place before transition happened. And that is ICANN budget, community empowerment mechanism, review and redress mechanism, and appeal mechanism.

This has been addressed by CCWG. But now there is big discussions on the CCWG after the receipt of comments on the first public comments putting in questions all of these five areas on which CWG asked for some sort of accountability. And, in fact, some of them is basic principles which still there is disagreement in the entire community of the type of membership that would be in the transition, whether it should be voluntary membership, whether it should be designated membership, or whether it should be member-model membership. And these are not quite clear.

And for some community, it might be very difficult to be a member with some commitments. And there has been some 300 or 350 pages of legal assessment by the two legal advisers. But it is still a situation in CWG in working party 1 and working party 2 under the discussions to be resolved.

The issue of the empowerment of the community also in relation with the independent review panel is also under discussions and disagreement by some colleagues, whether it should be binding or whether it should be non-binding, whether it should be

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires
21-25 JUNE 2015

allowed to also associate with a court action or not with a court action.

So there are a lot of questions yet to be addressed by the CCWG in order that the linkage between CWG, naming stewardship, and the accountability be addressed. I don't know whether you have addressed in your assessment to this or not.

The second question is Section III.A.iii and onward. There are a lot of questions raised by CWG relating to the proposed changes to root zone, environment and relation with the root zone maintainer, changes to the root zone management architecture and so on and so forth. I don't know. As I told, I have not studied the document whether you have addressed because there are a lot of questions raised by CWG. And some of the questions is in the hands of NTIA, what we will do between transition -- after the transition or before transition with respect to the contract, separate contract that they have with the maintainer or not.

So these questions were raised, and I don't know whether you have answered or not. But that is something to be discussed.

There are some other questions in the document. But my last question is that the reply to the charter organization, including yours, would be full support without comment, support with

comments, no support, and disagreement and so on and so forth.

All of them is not clear. If organizations chartering would not support it at all, what will happen? What's the next step? If it supports with some comments, those comments will be implemented or replied or not? And if there is objections by one or more than one supporting -- chartering organization -- there are four chartering organizations. If two of them totally object to that, what are the next steps? Sorry to raise these questions. These are general questions. They may not totally for the supposition you have made, but it is general for ICG to also discuss maybe at the next agenda item when we are dealing with the thorough analysis of the CWG. So the situation is not quite clear. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much for those -- those questions. As I said earlier, the process issue is something that even though we have had cross-community working groups inside ICANN, we have not had any need so far to discuss exactly the process around the issues that you just brought up in your last question regarding what kind of response is coming back.

I think those kind of questions are issues that specifically we in ICG need to think about because when we get the response from the operational communities, what do we do with a response from one of the operational communities which have support but with comments? Is that something that we should bring into our evaluation of the three proposals together and then maybe ask the operational communities to try to resolve those comments. Is that part of our evaluation? I think that is something that maybe we in ICG have to talk about on how we're going to do our evaluation when we also might get public comments.

As I said on the response to your question, Wolf-Ulrich, I think it is really important -- and I didn't make it really clear before I opened up this session -- is that the proposal that is discussed within CWG names have gone through their process of multistakeholder like bringing a proposal together. So we have already passed the period when comments or rewriting their proposal is done. That is not where we are in the process. We are really looking into the questions that we heard Kavouss talk about. Like, do the chartering organizations support this, support with comments, or disapprove it? That's where we are, which means that the evaluation is actually to some degree very black and white.

I think unfortunately for us in the ICG, it might be the case that the questions you raised is something that will be something that we have to deal with in a similar way as if we have difficult -- if I use the word sort of in a -- difficult for us in ICG, comments during the public comment period. That is something that we need to understand how we're going to work in a constructive way to bring those comments into our process.

Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Patrik.

Kavouss reminded me of a couple things that I thought were worth mentioning. The first is that the consideration of the CWG proposal the way that it is set forth, it's explicitly conditioned on the output of the CCWG work stream 1.   And so my understanding is that that is the consideration that the SOs and the ACs are giving it right now. The assumption is that all of the pieces that are required in the CWG names proposal for the CCWG work will be implemented, and that's how it should be considered. And that's how we should consider it as well when we receive it.

And if those items do not end up getting implemented, then, of course, the CWG names proposal would have to modified or we would need some other recourse.

But I think everyone is operating under the assumption that the pieces that are needed from the CCWG for the names proposal will arrive. So that's -- that's our current orientation, right? And if that changes in the future, then we'll have to deal with that.

Just the other comment to follow on to what Patrik said, just as we did for the other two proposals, if we as the ICG have questions or we believe that something needs to be clarified or changed in the CWG names proposal, we have a little bit of time built into our process to go back to the CWG and have that conversation with them. And so it's possible that some of the comments that come out of the SOs and ACs, if they do have any comments, can be dealt with in that same time frame again with this whole parallellization of the time lines. So I think we can sort of roughly hope to operate in that manner and also roughly hope that we don't end up in the situation that Kavouss indicated where we have one SO or AC who just objects to the entire thing. I would rather not spend time planning for that because if that happens, we will have to deal with it somehow. But hopefully we won't have that happen. Thanks.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much.

Jari.

JARI ARKKO: Yes, good morning. I wanted to go into a substantial issue or coordination issue in the proposal that was already mentioned by Milton earlier. It's the IPR thing. So just for everybody's understanding, the CWG proposal has a section that says the trademark for -- the IANA trademark -- the license -- an exclusive license will be given to the PTI organization. And that is actually problematic as has been discussed in the CWG mailing list after the proposal was done.

And the reason why this is problematic is all the three communities actually have a need to use this trademark. So the IETF, for example, the first time the term "IANA" appears in our RFCs is from 1990. And since then it has appeared in 3,350 RFCs. So we would kind of like to be able to use the trademark also in the future. So this is a situation where all the three organizations have sort of an equal interest in this and, you know, no one stands above the others.

The current text is problematic. I think it could be fixed by mere removal of the word "exclusive" and the text is under a heading that says something about initial draft or starting point. It is not

that we have to change the proposal as such but that further steps need to take this into account.

But I would like to point out that this is a place where we might actually do a little bit more coordination and get an even nicer result. We've had some discussion previously with the two other communities where we found a reasonable solution going forward. And we need to do that with the three communities, I think, going forward.

The other thing is that the CWG proposal talks about the trademark. It doesn't talk about the domain name. I think the other two communities are also interested in the domain name, so for completeness, that should also be included.

And the third thing is that there's a dependency to contracting between the different parties, so in the IETF response regarding time lines, we said, you know, if we can continue to contract with ICANN, then everything's fine, we can do this basically today. If we have to move the -- or, you know, do something more complicated with something inside ICANN or a part of ICANN to PTI, then that will take more effort and might delay things.

So some of the proposals around dealing with the trademark involve other communities having to contract with PTI, which I think would be something that we desire to avoid.

So I'm just highlighting this issue here. I don't have a particular proposal on the table, but it is something that we together have to solve, whether it's in the ICG properly or we -- us in the different communities working together, but this needs to be solved. Otherwise, at least the current text is going to cause a problem. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I -- honestly, I don't really know which one of you flagged first. Alan, please.

ALAN BARRETT: Thank you. Alan Barrett.

I'd like to echo what Jari said about the IPR part of the names proposal being problematic. I think it's inconsistent with what the other communities have said. I think perhaps the ICG could ask the names community to consider revising their proposal to make it consistent, and I think that a few simple little changes could help.

So for example, removing the need for the license to be exclusive, and also perhaps allowing the license to be from some party other than ICANN, which might hold the IPR.

So, you know, for example, if the IPR is transferred to the IETF Trust, then it would be the IETF Trust, rather than ICANN, licensing things to PTI.

So I would hope that the names community would be able to consider making such changes to their proposal. Thanks.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much.

I think we should remind ourselves that we in ICG, when discussing the IPR issues for the other proposals, we didn't go into design phase from ICG. Instead, we are requesting the operational communities to please talk to each other and resolve the issues. That's the important thing for ICG, not really what the outcome is.

So we -- yeah.

That said, I think of course all of us as individuals participate of course in the other processes as well and we need to give examples to explain why we think there is an overlap and also

that we do believe, as individuals, that there is a good path out of it.

So, yes.

But I do hear that a potential outcome of a pre-assessment from ICG is that the IPR issues need to be resolved, so there might be a question going back.

Milton?

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah.   The thing to remember about the names community proposal is that this incompatibility regarding the domain and the trademark is not really part of the CWG proposal.   It's actually kind of a bracketed detail that was -- the incompatibility was discovered just as the proposal was being sent out to the SOs and ACs, or a few days before, and there was no consensus within the names community on this aspect of the proposal, so you can't really say that it's part of that proposal.   You can say that it is the default text that's sitting there, but there is -- there is not consensus on that, I would say.

So I think it's -- what happens -- what needs to happen is for the numbers community to say, "We don't like what's proposed," and for the protocols community to say the same, if that's the

way they feel, and then we can say to the names community, "This is incompatible as stated. We know that you don't seem to have consensus on that in your proposal. The other communities don't like it. Please propose something else to fix it."

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER: I'm just -- I'm wondering if we need to wait for any reason to get that going, if -- if people like that's something that we could -- we could get going now in terms of –

I mean, I think we have a good sense that the other two communities are unhappy with that, whatever it is, the bracketed language. If we need to get a consensus opinion that they're unhappy.

I'm not really sure that we need a consensus opinion that they're unhappy because if the -- I think as the ICG, if we have ICG representation who says these things that we've just heard, we could probably get the question together to the communities before we even received the proposal, I would say.

But I'd be interested in people's thoughts about that.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: And as an additional question to what Alissa just said, also a question to you ICG members: Would you be comfortable issuing these kind of questions to CWG names in an incremental fashion, like one at a -- one, and then maybe another question in two weeks, or would you like to -- for us in ICG to collect all the comments we have and then go back. That's another -- like another question to you.

I see Kavouss and then Mohamed and then I would like to ask you ICG members who are interested in working specifically with the pre-assessment, because we need, just like with the other groups, a couple of named people, individuals, that will work on issues like the one that we just started to work on in the large group.

So please think about whether you have the time and interest in doing that.

Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Thank you, Patrik.

I think the main question that I have -- in fact, not question, a comment -- that we should use this opportunity of the face-to-face and prepare ourselves for any question or clarification

which requires from the CWG, even if we have not formally received the proposal. This is a good opportunity face-to-face, and we have to effectively and efficiently use that.

We have the draft proposals and we have the proposals sent to the chartering organizations. There is no problem to take that, and if between now and the -- tomorrow afternoon we have some general questions or clarification, at least we should table that. When and how to send it, this is something that we discuss. That is one question.

Second, the issue of trademark or DNS, I think that is an issue to be addressed in ICG. I don't think that CWG address that issue and I don't think that any chartering organization will specifically address that, having any effective output. That is an issue of the CWG -- of the ICG to address that. It was raised several times, I think, at previous meeting and we have to come with some sort of finding or say about that.

The proposal of CWG, there are many areas. It says that it is not clear to them what is the situation. I read you one which is important, Paragraph 105. It is mentioned that all IANA function will be transferred to PTI. However, it is not clear at the time of writing of this report whether the other operational communities -- numbers and protocol parameters -- will undertake to contract directly with PTI or they have separate

contract with ICANN. Similar question like these are included in the CWG. Therefore, perhaps we should look at these proposals carefully by having some volunteers to look at those, including those who have followed very closely the activity of CWG, to identify some of these questions that we need to answer.

Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. Mohamed?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah. Thank you very much, Patrik.

I think some of our colleagues in the chatroom has already said what I was planning to say. I think at the end of our next meeting, maybe we have a list of issues that we need to maybe raise to CWG as soon as possible so at least they have time to digest it and review it and maybe also plan how to update the proposal or how even to work with other communities to resolve issues.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Keith? I'm sorry. There are two Keiths here, so to my left, please.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Patrik. Keith Drazek, for the transcript.

Just wanted to note that I fully support the co-chairs of the ICG raising this issue, flagging this issue with the operational communities, advising the co-chairs of the CWG naming transition that this is a concern that's been identified and a potential conflict among the three proposals that's been identified, and to help facilitate the engagement or the discussions among the operational communities.

I think that's the role of the ICG. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: And then I -- it's also the case, of course, that we don't only have two Keiths. We have two Keith Ds, so let's take Keith from the southern hemisphere.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Keith, Sr., will do.

[Laughter]

KEITH DAVIDSON: Only by age.

Actually, and oddly enough, I'm in complete agreement with Keith Drazek, and just suggesting that particularly where there may be issues that require external legal advice and so on, it would be useful to have those issues flagged sooner rather than later, so that the CWG can make progress on those issues, you know, immediately. Time is not on our side on this thing, so I think the idea of the co-chairs raising the issues as they arise is very sound and sensible.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER: So maybe what we can do is since we have a bunch of open time in the agenda tomorrow that we reserved to pick up from things that we didn't finish today, we can try to draft a question that would go out to the -- all of the communities, you know, tonight and have a little discussion of that tomorrow, to see if we can come to consensus around what the question is to the communities about the trademark and the IPR.

Does that seem reasonable? Use our face-to-face time? Yeah.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yeah. So, yes, let's -- I don't see anyone objecting, and Kavouss, I think you -- just like Alissa, I do think you came with a good proposal.

Of course the negative thing is that we -- I do know that we have people that will not be with us tomorrow, but using the time for discussing these issues tomorrow in one of our -- one of the slots we have would be a good thing, so we use as much time as we can together.

So let me ask now the question on whether I can get some volunteers that can help with pre-assessment of the CWG names proposal.

So I see Russ, Alan, Martin.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: What's the time frame for that?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Ah.

ALISSA COOPER: Can you project that?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yeah. You will see the time line shortly. The -- when we were discussing and looking at the time line -- that was very small.

[Laughter]

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So the schedule that -- there is a reason why we chairs proposed the telephone conferences like we did, where we have both on July 8 and July 15, and we think it's really important to get as much feedback as possible from the pre-assessment on July 7th so we can discuss it on July 8.

So the time frame we talk about is between now and July 7, with incremental deliveries, so we can have a substantial discussion to start with on July 8. That's the time frame.

Keith Davidson.

Oh, another volunteer. Yeah. Thank you.

Russ Housley -- sorry. Russ Mundy. So both Russes. That makes it easy. So we have both Keith as well. No. Sorry.

ALISSA COOPER: -- (off microphone) -- volunteers that I saw, or that Patrik read was Russ Housley, Alan, Martin, Keith Davidson, and Russ Mundy.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

ALISSA COOPER: And Mary. Okay.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yeah.   That's a good number and that's approximately the number of people we had for the other proposals as well so thank you very much for that.

Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Patrik, could you clarify, what was your comment saying that I didn't come up with a good proposal?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yeah. Sorry. No, my intention was to say that I supported you in your statement.

Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you for you that. Another question.

Do we have any question to raise with the legal counsel at this meeting?

If that is the case, perhaps it would be a good opportunity either to ask them to come to our meeting or -- because they are here, or they raise them. Just questions.

Because in CCWG, we raised a lot of questions, and through the chair or directly they were answered subject to a memorandum of assessment or reply.

This is a suggestion on me because one of our colleagues referred to the legal advice from them, and do we have any legal issue to raise at this stage with the legal advisor? Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: First of all, I -- as the co-chair of ICG, I have not heard any such request.

And secondly, just because the CWG names do have this week, until next Thursday, to go through the process of interacting with the chartering organizations, I think we in ICG should be a little bit careful of engaging in that process.

So I think we should try to stay away as much as possible.

And I also think that as part of our charter in ICG is that we should ensure that the process is done in a multistakeholder, bottom-up process, and if we are doing anything that can be viewed as micromanagement of any of the processes that submit information to us, I think that might be very close to a violation of that requirement.

So I think we should be very careful of engaging ourselves in the processes that are currently ongoing, specifically when each one of the OCs do have -- are sort of in their endgame.

So I think to answer your question, of course if it is the case that we see real need to engage, we should take the opportunity, just like you suggested, Kavouss. Absolutely. But I do -- one, I do not see the need. I haven't heard it. And two, the requirement to engage

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires
21-25 JUNE 2015

should be really high. I think the barrier of entry for that discussion should be high.

So with that, 10:03, I'm sorry. Three minutes over. I tried to manage the time here.

Alissa, over to you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Well done. Good job.

[Laughter]

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So we wanted to then talk a little bit about the combined proposal assessment.

We have six volunteers for the individual proposal assessment for names, which is excellent. And Yannis, I think we're going to take a look at the process that these people actually have just volunteered to follow. Nope, not that one.

[Laughter]

Sorry, I know I just sent this to you like 10 seconds ago.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

ALISSA COOPER: The one in the Skype chat, yeah. Great. Yes. Thank you. Thanks.

So everyone remembers this, but just to put a fine point on it, so the folks who are going to do the names pre-assessment are doing this individual proposal assessment. If we scroll down a little bit, we can remember what the questions are that are relevant for the individual assessment.

First of all, an evaluation of the process that happened. Make sure that, you know, the process concerns that were highlighted were addressed by the community. Determine that the community actually obtained consensus, and so forth.

And then if we go further down, there were just three items that people should be looking for. Completeness, clarity, and NTIA criteria.

So the group of six people who just volunteered to pre-assess the names proposal, in addition to thinking about the substantive issues, should be looking to answer that set of questions about the individual proposal.

Perhaps in parallel with that assessment, we need to get going on the combined proposal assessment where we look at all three of the pieces together and make a determination about whether we think this is ready to go or whether we have any questions that need to go back to any of the communities.

And so if we go down a little bit further, looking at our three items that we had for -- perfect, thank you -- for the combined proposal assessment, we have questions about compatibility and interoperability. We have questions about accountability. And we have questions about workability. And so this is what we said that we would -- when we had all these components of the proposal together, that we would assess against this set of questions. And so asked for the volunteers to do the names assessment to have their feedback ready on July 7. I think what we're asking for now is volunteers to do this combined proposal assessment. Would be excellent if we had some of that done by July 7. But really no later than our July 15 call, I think, is what we're looking at.

So do we have volunteers who are able and willing to do the assessment of the combined proposal assuming we receive the names proposal end of this month essentially?

Lynn St. Amour, thank you. I'm asking for volunteers for the combined proposal assessment. Milton. Manal, thank you. Other willing victims? Keith Drazek, thank you.

Do we have anyone in Adobe Connect? No.

Okay. Great. Oh, Russ Housley. You're going to be a busy person. Joe as well.

Great. So we have, just to recap, Lynn, Milton, Manal, Keith Drazek, Russ Housley, and Joe and Paul Wilson.

NARELLE CLARK: Alissa, I'm tempted to help. I just need to check a few things with my currently overloaded schedule.

ALISSA COOPER: Great, thank you.

Xiaodong, did you want to speak or volunteer? Volunteer, okay.

Excellent. I got Paul Wilson. Going back to the full list, Lynn, Milton, Manal, Keith Drazek, Russ Housley, Joe, Paul, Narelle and Xiaodong. Excellent. Thank you all for volunteering your time between now and July 15 or so to do that. It is a long document, but it would be worthwhile for sure. Great.

I think that's actually all we had for that section. It was just a logistical discussion. Yep, that was all we had.

So we could take our break or we could spend our hour on multistep implementation and then take the break.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Sorry. I was not volunteering to that group because I have many other things to do. But is that group open that if we have some occasional participations to assist and to contribute, we would be able to do that? Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, of course. Absolutely. We just wanted to make sure we had some names down so we have people to chase who are on the hook. But anyone else who wants to do the combined proposal assessment is welcomed to do so.

I guess the other question is in the first round of this, in some cases people did these assessments on their own and in other cases they worked as a group. I would leave that up to the people who just volunteered to decide whether they'd like to work as a group or individually, unless anyone has strong opinions about it right now. I see no strong opinions. Okay. If

you like working by yourself, you can do individual work. And if you like working in a team, you can work in a team.

[Laughter]

Okay. So we can either take a break or we can spend an hour talking about multistep implementation.

MILTON MUELLER: Take a break from what? We haven't done anything yet.

ALISSA COOPER: I would say we trudge on, and so we will move on to multistep implementation, which Patrik is going to lead.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. So this might be the first question interesting discussion we will have today and then we might need a break. So can we get the slides?

Thank you. So to start this discussion, we have all seen the discussion that have been going on on the mailing list. We have the statement from Paul at our previous teleconference and also the mail that he sent yesterday.

I would like to frame the discussion a little bit, and I'll do it -- I decided to do it this way.

First of all, I see that -- or just sort of recognize that for the ICG, we are still waiting for responses from all three operational communities, that we are starting to do a pre-assessment is not to be mixed with us receiving or with us having received the responses from all three communities. So that's the first thing that is really important to remember.

When we have all three, we must do -- and these are sort of in laymen terms. I wrote this down just this morning. And my apologies if I use the wrong words. But we have to do an assessment evaluation that we just discussed. It might be the case that we have to send questions to the OCs and get responses to that. We have to create some kind of proposal and some kind of combined document. We have to -- we have decided we're going to run through a public comment period on that to see what the public thinks. And we are discussing that later today and tomorrow, how to do that.

Then we are handing this over to NTIA. And NTIA must do whatever they have to do before the actual transition has to happen. And part of that, of course, has to do with, as we all know, implementation. And we also asked the operational

communities how much time and effort is needed for the implementation.

So these are the various steps that we in ICG just must go through, and we should just remember that and remember that there are -- and each one of these steps takes time.

Next slide, please.

So one of the issues I see personally, not speaking as the chair or consensus of the group, but me personally, is that I feel when I read what people say and also -- and when I read what people write and when I hear what people say, I see maybe some confusion about what is needed by implementation. And this might be a little bit confusing also because there are various things that can happen in parallel.

But specifically I feel that we seem to mix up a few things. For example, the ICG activities that leads to the submission to NTIA, the post-delivery activities before the transition, the transition itself. And, of course, what each one of the operational communities can do or should do before, during, and after the transition. We see in the CW names proposal, for example, just to take an example, that they do describe what should be done during and after the transition and what the situation looks like

both during and after the transition because the transition itself is not something that happens just in an instant.

So -- so I really hope that we can have a constructive discussion. And as a lot of people -- a lot of ICG members have pointed out, we have been talking about this before in various ways. And we really would like to settle the discussion so that we agree on how we are going to operate in ICG because as you just saw on the time line that Alissa pointed out, we have a very aggressive time line. We have a lot of things to do in ICG, both in specifically July and in September. And that means that we need to spend as much time as possible on substantive matters and not our own internal processes.

So with this as a background, I would like to start with give the floor to Paul, Paul Wilson, so that he can, with this as a context, explain his position. And then I open the floor for others.

Paul, are you there?

PAUL WILSON: I am. Can you hear me?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yes, we can hear you. Please, Paul.

PAUL WILSON: Okay. Actually, I'm getting a very loud echo coming back ---

So if I make a suggestion of this approach, a couple of meetings in the past. I think it wasn't well -- it wasn't well-noticed, I think. I got a few responses. I made a mention of it at the last meeting. And I think there has been some confusion over what I talked about. The point of the email I sent a few hours ago was ---

Go through the points I raised in that email. Would it be useful for me to go that? ---

If that's okay with you, Patrik, that's the way I'll go.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Paul, to answer your question, I think all ICG members have read your bullets. So I think you can move to the next phase in your explanation and talk about specifically -- if you see at the last bullets that you talk about the phased implementation, or staged transition, what you actually mean by that in the context of the work of the ICG because if I look at the time line and the various things that ICG needs to do, I would like you to explain a little bit what you mean by having various things done before September 30.

PAUL WILSON: Okay. I'm not -- I'm not entirely sure if I'm clear. I will turn my speaker off because I'm getting unbearable echo back.

The point I think is put simply, we've got -- out of three proposals which I believe have --- I said clearly already. Larry Strickling --- actually implement the plan and have the plan implemented. IANA contract will be renewed. It could -- this is a hypothetical assumption on my part. It could be renewed in such a way that it only continued to apply to the remaining set of IANA functions --- names.

So what happens between now and the 30th September, I think, is the --- preparation such and then --- IANA argument --- is that clear enough or stop there?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER: So we're having a lot of difficulty with Paul's audio which is not clear whether it's on our side or on his side. If it is on his side, then we will have to proceed, I think, because even if we wait until some other time, it's not going to get fixed. If it is on our side, we could try to fix it right now and continue or we could take the break, right? Okay. I see that apparently it's the bridge

is the problem. I was just curious if we could hear any of the other remote people better.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: I don't think you can hear me. This is Daniel. I have the same problem. And I tried --- the Adobe Connect to remove the echo. ---

The problem is definitely not on our side.

ALISSA COOPER: I could barely hear what Daniel just said. Maybe we should take a break and try to fix the audio. Is that workable? Okay. Okay. Break until 11:00. Enjoy.

[BREAK]

ALISSA COOPER: Hi, everyone. We're going to try to get started again here, so please take your seats. The audio bridge is back, so we can actually have a conversation where we can understand each other.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Okay. Patrik Faltstrom here opening the meeting again. Can people please take their seats?

We got information that the audio should be better, so I would like to try to restart the discussion and give the floor to Paul.

PAUL WILSON: Hi. Can you hear me, Patrik?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Oh, it's night and day.

Welcome back, Paul.

PAUL WILSON: Okay. Good. No echo here either. That's great. Thanks. So do I take it that what I said before was unintelligible?

ALISSA COOPER: You should repeat your last set of comments, yes. Nobody could understand what you said before.

PAUL WILSON: Okay. Sorry about that.

Okay. So the 10 points that I raised related to that email or --- we will reach 30th of September with -- in a position where the numbers and protocols proposals can be implemented. I'm not quite sure --- entirely implemented, but I'm -- by that, I mean, but we can implement them either before that date or we can consider them implemented on that date, such that the IANA contract could be reviewed with --- only to the remaining names-related IANA functions. And that by doing that, we achieve the -- what I guess could be described as two out of the three community proposals are implemented, the third one is one that will at that time be fully specified in the IANA plan but will, I gather, still have -- or may have certain implementation steps still to go.

So the point is that by implementing two out of three, we are able to achieve something for the community, something that demonstrates progress, something that could also serve as a sort of a test or a last final verification that this process is on the right track before the final step is taken.

So having said that, having not explained that much, I'm not sure what else I can say but I'm happy to answer any questions. Thanks.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Paul.   We could understand you much better now, although we're still trying to improve the audio a little bit, if possible.

So Paul, something I didn't understand about your mail and the discussion that we had about this previously is that I think we are -- in this group, we have consensus to send a single proposal to NTIA that contains all three of the parts.

I don't see you questioning that, but if you are, then definitely let us know.

If that's the case, I also don't understand how the September 30 deadline is then relevant, because as Patrik indicated at the beginning of the session, we in the ICG have a bunch of steps that we need to go through before we can send the proposal to NTIA, including our own assessment, the public comment period, the analysis of the public comments, and all of those

steps together require, you know, at a minimum, enough time such that there's no way that NTIA could approve the -- anything after receipt of the proposal from us. That is, you know, even on our very aggressive timetable that we have for all the steps that we have agreed to do, it's not clear that we could get the proposal to NTIA before September 30th, let alone that they could approve any of it before September 30.

So I don't really understand how that deadline is relevant to this discussion.

Now, if we want to talk about adding text to our executive summary of the proposal that indicates our openness to doing staged implementation of the proposal after it's been approved or something along those lines, that's not really something we've discussed too much before and I'm happy to have that discussion, but assuming that we agree to send a single proposal and that we are still in agreement about all the steps that we need to take, I don't understand how it would be feasible to send the proposal in time for anything to happen by September 30.

So if you could clarify maybe, Paul, that question, that would be helpful from my perspective. But I'll leave it up to Patrik as to how he wants to run the queue.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So I would like to actually go through -- I have a list of people here that would like to speak, and then I'll let you, Paul, go through the --

So the people I have on the queue in this order -- I might have picked people in the wrong order, but this is the order which we will do things: Manal, Martin, Joe, Daniel, Jari, Kavouss, Russ Mundy. Okay?

And Wolf-Ulrich.

Manal, please.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Patrik. And thank you, Paul, for the clarification, because actually I'm also confused, and Alissa mentioned many of my questions, because when I read your email, again the first nine points are hinting towards phased implementation, but then Bullet Point Number 10, I think it's a bit contradicting with the first nine.

Again, I'm not sure at which point exactly are you suggesting that we split the implementation.

I mean, if we are committed to submitting one proposal and the NTIA evaluating one proposal, then at which point in time would you like to split the implementation?

Again, if we have an overall view of the whole plan and it is agreed as one submitted proposal, then the implementation would be easy and we would have known all the steps that we need to go through, but while we're integrating the whole thing and evaluating and seeing whether there are overlaps or gaps or conflicts or whatever, again, I don't really see where the phased implementation would fit, and again, why, specifically, the 30th of September. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Martin?

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks, Patrik. Martin Boyle here.

Yes, certainly I had the same difficulties in understanding that Alissa phrased so nicely at the beginning, that it seems to me that the 30th of September, nobody will be ready to move because we haven't got a proposal, a common unified proposal that NTIA could look at.

But it seems to me that the concept of phased implementation is not an unreasonable one for us to look at, so long as we maintain a coherence between the three different proposal implementation lines, and I guess that one of the things that we

would need to do for that is to go back to all of the operating communities and ask them to look at, from their proposals, what they can actually do, what negotiations they can have, what preparations they can do, before an NTIA final agreement, and then based on what they have done, what would be the proposal for implementation going forwards, so that NTIA, if we're asking them to do phased proposals, or phased introductions, that NTIA can see that and agree to that and that we can feel confident that as those different phased proposals move forwards, that we are maintaining coherence between the three different threads.

So, yes, I think, Paul, you have put your finger on quite an important point, but I think the idea that we would end up having certain ones gone ahead without us thinking through the consequences is certainly, for me, a very difficult concept. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Joe?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you.   Joe Alhadeff.   Yeah, I -- this topic has come up a couple of different times and it's come up with slightly different, you know, formulations, and I think Alissa is right. I think all of

us are scratching our heads still a little bit about what this formulation means.

I think the concept of we submit a joint proposal, NTIA decides to say yay or nay to the joint proposal, is the triggering event for which everything still needs to be together.

If, after the joint proposal, there are ways for some groups to move -- that has been accepted there are ways for some groups to move faster than other groups without creating a disconnect in the coherence of the Internet because, you know, the answer is what they do is not necessarily dependent on the changes in the other group, then that's fine. I don't think everyone has to wait together as long as we're not destabilizing anything.

But I -- you know, I keep on seeing between the lines something that looks like we're severing, again, the pieces of the proposal, and I -- in order to accommodate a fictional date that doesn't have any mean anymore.

So I guess Alissa's clarification still is the crux of the matter for everybody.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you. Daniel?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Most of what I wanted to say has already been said, but I think the important thing is -- continuing on what Martin said, is once we have a -- we've finished our work, we've submitted the one document that we need to produce to the NTIA via the ICANN board, there should be flexibility in a staged -- in finding a staged way of doing things.

I think the concern that I hear in the numbers community is about the complication of the CWG proposal and the time that it will need to set up all these structures and what many in the numbers community actually see as something they don't need and they might not even need to participate in. And therefore, it would be -- let's use the common word "frustrating" -- to their particular community if implementation would, again, take the better parts of years to set up all these structures and finally implement all these structures.

So I think that's something we should keep an open mind to.

And it's -- certainly there's two different messages I see here also from the numbers community, since Paul brought it up. One is we should look into a staged -- we should keep our mind open to a staged implementation, like I just said and like Martin said, and others as well. I fully support that.

And the second thing is the answer to NTIA about when we're ready, and that's a different agenda topic. But there, I think, the numbers community made quite a point and said, "As far as we are concerned, you know, one could go ahead as the originally envisaged state," but that's a totally different subject to the one that we're discussing right now. I'm done.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much.

Jari?

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko. Incremental is again. Parallel processing is good. I do actually agree with Paul, even though I do agree also with the comments that have been made, particularly those from Alissa, about, you know, what exactly are we addressing here.

I think we might actually find some consensus around, you know, sending a single -- I mean, we are on a track to send a single proposal forward, a plan forward.

But, you know, it's still possible to have the implementation part of that be done in various different ways, and I believe that most real-world big projects cannot be done as atomic transactions. This is one of those.

So in reality, it will be, you know, X, Y, and Z who have to be done, you know, in sequence, and then A, B, and C who can be done in parallel.

And if the ICG were to point that out, you know, with some meat to that statement, you know, explaining the actual things that can happen independently, and what the dependencies are, then I think that would be an overall good thing. That, you know, this is -- this is where we are, this is the plan, these parts of the plan can be implemented in parallel without regards to the others, and here are the other parts that need to be sequenced for these and these reasons.

I think that would be very beneficial. And I also share some of the same concerns as Daniel had. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much.

Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Patrik.

First of all, I look into our charter and -- which is in Word format, and I pushed the key for implementation. I did not find implementation in the charter. I maybe have not properly processed.

So our charter talks about plan for transition of the stewardship. However, the issue of implementation was raised at least formally by NTIA in the letter to the chairs of the ICG and CCWG asking to provide the time by which the plans are implemented.

If we remember, I raised the question that the issue or the term "implementation" is something we should think quite deeply, because it might have some different meanings.

Perhaps we should be consistent with our charter and we still continue to have a consolidated, single plan for transition of stewardship and that would be labeled ICG proposal for the transition of the stewardship to the NTIA and copied to ICANN. In that submission, we would open a chapter or a heading under implementation. In the implementation, we would have two subsections. One subsection would be global or total or complete implementations of the transition plan for the stewardship.

Under that, still I am of the view that we will not be in a position to provide any clear and specific time because some of the issue is beyond our control.

In CCWG, they are discussing many, many issues and the preliminary ideas of the counsel -- legal counsel is that in order to implement what is CCWG written, and perhaps would be subject to some change and may be more complicated. It requires a time up to July 2016. So that is something we should mention.

However, under the Subsection 2 of that implementation, we should put something "phased implementation" or "incremental implementation," or "stepwise implementation."

And for the time being for discussions, not for putting in that proposal that we could say that we have received from communities suggestions for the implementations in a phased manner subject to what one of our distinguished colleagues mentioned without any adverse effect or impact in the other part of the transition of the stewardship.

In order to study the pros and cons of that, I don't think that with the very little time that we have here we would be able to have some say on that. But we in any way should not totally reject the idea, but we could discuss that.

In discussing that, we need to have a little group by someone heading that group. But for now and next time that we will discuss, 15th of July or any other time, we will have a clear picture of the pros and cons of those phased implementation. However, the final proposal to the NTIA would have two options: One, complete implementations with that provision that we have no complete knowledge of all implementation aspects. And the second one is the phased implementations.

The final decisions will be made by NTIA and also final -- comment will be made by ICANN because ICANN is authorized to make a comment to our document to NTIA to see whether that this phased implementation will be helpful or not.

This is something between the two totally yes or no.

However, my question to Paul and group of RIR is that what -- apart from the words that some colleagues use, "discouraging," "frustrating," I don't think that this is a proper way to say we are discouraging anybody or frustrating.

What RIR community will lose if we don't have that phase implementation? Does it have any address -- any effect on their works? Would they have any difficulty to continue in the way they have worked? I don't think that they need such a formality at all. They could continue. Some of our community, even if

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires
21-25 JUNE 2015

they have started yesterday -- I told several times in our meetings they don't need any -- anything from the practical point of view. But from the legal point of view, yes, three proposals are together.

So, Paul, could you kindly identify what would be the deficiencies apart from the discouragement or whatever way frustrations. Do you lose anything at all? Do you have any deficiency? Would there be any discrepancies, reduction in the output, in efficiencies and so on and so forth? This does not mean that I am not in favor to study. I just want to hear from you what we will lose if we don't take that at all. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. And I want to remind people that we're still going through sort of the initial round of comments and then I would like to give the floor to Paul again.

So I have Russ Mundy, Wolf, and Jean-Jacques, and then the floor back to Paul and then I start over again.

Russ Mundy.

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you, Patrik. I'd like to just raise the comment here that when I believe this set of discussions started was around the

issue of NTIA asking about the time frame relative to the contract renewal.

And at least my interpretation of the discussion has been that Paul's suggestion is that one or two of the communities be effectively exempted or written out of the contract. I don't know if that's a correct interpretation. But at least that's basically how I interpreted Paul's suggestions here.

And I'd like to interject that having read the entire contract multiple times, looking at how it's structured, the fact that the IANA response to the open call for the RFP actually is part of the contract. And you have a very large, very complex document involved.

And having dealt with government contracts in the U.S. for a number of years, they are extremely complex to change, especially something of this nature that involves the good of the broader set of things. Large public comment time is required.

And I think that it's totally impractical to even consider making any kind of formal contract change to the existing contract.

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires
21-25 JUNE 2015

Now, on the other hand, if I've misinterpreted Paul's suggestion here and it's something else such as let's try to move forward with some of the ideas, some -- drafting some of the proposals that would be needed for some of the new organizational entities where the current IETF and the RIRs are having agreements in place with ICANN and now the names community has proposed the PTI. So if this is a suggestion that Paul is making that we should move forward with looking at drafts or relationship things with those communities or having three communities get together to figure out how they're going to put all those detailed pieces together, I would strongly support that. I think that's a very good suggestion.

But from a making a contract change perspective for the existing contract, I think that's just something that's physically impossible. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you. Wolf-Ulrich?

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

I'd like to join what you were showing us before the break on your chart, that we have to split up and we have to be very clear in the phases what we are doing before the suggestion is submitted to the NTIA and after that.

And I'm very clear that before we submit the initial proposal, it has to be one single proposal. It must be very clear. And there was a question of Alissa to get that clarified.

I don't think that we have any chance -- or there will be any chance to come up with a proposal which says -- with separate proposals because there may be doubts that the CWG may not be ready for their proposal in time. That's the first thing.

With regard to the implementation, I'm also open, as Kavouss mentioned, after that to discuss the proposals that are submitted who comes first or under which conditions. There may be a stepwise implementation depending on the needs of the separate communities.

It is the same, if you have an example, if you build up a big bridge. So there may be different requirements for that. There are lawyers to be transported. There are pedestrians. There are bikers. You can open this bridge

stepwise for the bikers and tourists and for the lawyers. In the end, it is one bridge you have to provide for that. This is what we can discuss afterwards after we have this proposal provided as a single proposal. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you.

Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Patrik. This is Jean-Jacques speaking. Sorry I arrived late this morning.

Two points. The first is on principle. I agree with Alissa, Kavouss, and others who have pointed out that we are expected to deliver a single unified or consolidated proposal for transition. I think that's a very important point.

And to use Wolf-Ulrich's image which he just used now, I'm very much in favor of the single bridge analogy. There can be different paths, different things. But it has to be one unified proposal.

My second point is actually on what Kavouss proposed earlier. He said in the implementation stage, if we get that far, if we all

agree on that analysis, then we would actually have to propose an alternative. Choice one would be -- as was provided for. And second path would be -- I think he said time slippage. I don't remember the word. There was time something, differentiated. And his suggestion was if that is the feeling of the ICG, then perhaps we should submit that idea to a study by a small group of us. I'm willing to take part in that effort, if we come to that.

So I think those were the two points I wanted to point out. One, we should abide by the principle, which is overarching for us of one unified proposal. And the second thing is we should not out of hand reject Paul's proposal. I think it has the merit of pointing out a certain number of things which are at least questions, valid questions, on his part and on the part of others.

So if we go down that path, then we should form a little group within the ICG to study it more thoroughly. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much.

Paul, please.

PAUL WILSON: Okay. Thanks, everyone. Can you hear me?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yes, we hear you loud and clear.

PAUL WILSON: I understand there was some choppiness earlier. So I will try not to speak quite so quickly. I am sorry that the written -- the email that I sent didn't fully clarify things because that was my intention, of course.

The idea I thought was clear enough. Absolutely not. Just the proposal, I understand fully the concern if that was the interpretation; but that's not what I intended. The point is, we are charged with producing a single plan but that plan can be staged and to stage the plan in two or three steps would have its benefits. I have tried to explain and I think people recognize.

What I didn't explain what my own assumption about the time line. And I suppose, to be honest, I didn't recognize that we had finally and irretrievably abandoned any achievement by 30th of September. I just didn't recognize that. I mean, we have a time line that has moved many times and it is only in the latest versions that we seem to have introduced actually a much longer time line and much longer time for the steps of -- let me see -- Rows 14 and 15, the public comment period and the ICG analysis they seem to have extended out. And, of course, if we

keep that length of time, then we don't -- we cannot make anything by 30th of September.

So I expected that we had an opportunity to adjust still. But if that's impossible -- and I'm actually not in a position to argue it -- argue against it, then please let's consider the proposal as standing but without the explicit date of 30th of September with specific timing for a multistage process. A number of steps have to be determined later on. So I accept that, and I'm happy if the proposal achieves that much.

In response to Kavouss, my concern about delay and, in fact, the concern about having abandoned the 30th of September is that I'm sure it could be seen or as characterized as some kind of failure. I mean, after all, a result was supposed to have happened at that time and we have no promise if we don't make that deadline of when the results would be produced.

So this comes to the next point about what I mentioned as disappointment or frustration. The work has been done, but the expected result hasn't been produced at the expected time. And instead we've got an extension which seems to be indeterminate. That's the concern there.

You may disagree, Kavouss, or others, that that's a valid concern. But I'm putting it forward because I believe it is valid.

As for Russ' comments, I had understand that at the 30th of September when the contract was renewed, there would be an opportunity to adjust the contract without adding a great deal of burden. Russ seems to disagree with that. And I'm sure he -- I'm sure he knows better than I am. So if it is complex -- exceedingly complex, impossible to adjust the contract at all at that renewal time, then I was unaware of that.

I had understood that there was discussion about renewal of the contract not for a two-year period but for shorter periods that may actually be sort of a cycle of a number of -- a number of short-term renewals. For instance, three months or so. So that seemed to me to provide an opportunity to progressively release -- even if after the 30th of September, the opportunity to progressively release components of the contract -- from the contract and its renewal.

Again, if that's impossible, then I suppose a staged approach doesn't need to correspond with the contract or contract renewals or adjustments at all. I think it still has to have a date on it regardless.

So apologies if I have had incomplete knowledge of every aspect -- or every issue of the proposal. But that is, I guess, what it is all about. So I think that's all. Thanks again, everyone.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So that was the first round of comments. And now I have Daniel, Russ Housley, Mohamed, Elise, Kavouss, Alissa, Xiaodong. Let's start with that.

So, Daniel, please.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Can you hear me?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yes.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Thank you. A couple of points. First one I wanted to make in the first round, and that is that people keep bringing up statements by the NTIA as show stoppers for any initiative from our side.

And I think while we, of course, in our charter have accepted the conditions of NTIA for a solution and reflected that in our call for proposals, I don't think we are ultimately bound to take as given whatever NTIA says.

Of course, we want to make a proposal that they accept in the end. But I think we should assume some room for negotiations there. This is a point of principle.

The second is I'd like to emphasize the point that Paul made about our tardiness or not making the original deadline being perceived or spun as a failure by those who are antagonistic to the whole process. You will remember that in our first face-to-face meeting, I made, I think, two interventions or three even when we discussed the time line mentioning that point, where I said the time line is too aggressive, we're not going to make it. And then we as the ICG decided that we would use the aggressive time line anyway.

So now we face the risk that I was mentioning back then of being regarded as a failed process.

Even now that Paul is not aware, as a member of the ICG, and did a bit overlook the extension of the time lines, I'm quite sure that communities, plus the general public, have not been informed well enough by ourselves about the change of time line and I think we should make a very careful statement about this, and I think it's later on the agenda.

But let me just reiterate the point that there's a risk of this -- of the -- missing the original expiration of the contract as being seen as a failure, so we have to be very careful with that.

And thirdly, I think that there is a lot of room to make progress on the technical part of the agreements, the service level agreement if you wish, and the statement of work, even before the other structures are really clear.

I think that's a risk and I'm concerned about it that we have at some point all the governance structures set up and then start to negotiate the technical part of the work, the service level and the specific service.

I think there's a tremendous opportunity to discuss that now already, since the proposals seem to converge in a way that the current -- the people who are currently doing the job are going to continue doing the job and they are part of ICANN or a wholly owned subsidiary of ICANN.

So I think we should explore whether that's a possibility to negotiate some of the statements of work already now or in parallel. And that's it.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you. Russ Housley?

RUSS HOUSLEY:	Thank you. This is Russ Housley. I think that what we ought to do, as part of the front matter in delivering the three proposals, is provide an analysis –

ALISSA COOPER:	Russ, could you move closer to the microphone, please? Sorry, I can't hear you.

RUSS HOUSLEY:	Boy, I thought I was close.
	So starting again, Russ Housley. I think we should provide, in the front matter, an analysis of the dependencies between the big events that the proposals provide. That way, the operational communities and NTIA are aware of what the -- what their choices are. And then we should step away, having given them that information, and let them do the implementation as it makes sense to those parties. I don't think it's our job to impose anything other than that information.
	Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:	Thank you. Mohamed?

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires
21-25 JUNE 2015

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Patrik.

I think Paul's suggestion and idea is sensible and good.

The only concerns I had was the date, September, which it seems we cannot catch it now, and the other concern was the separation or the fragmentation of the proposals, which is -- he confirmed that's not the case.

Just also to understand things, referring back to Steve Crocker's response to ICG regarding the time frame, he acknowledged that ICANN understands that the different communities' implementation varies, so -- and he clearly, in one of the sentences, which I'll try to quote exactly, he's saying, "With respect to time lines, we expect the implementation time frame applicable for each of the operational communities to vary. For example, we expect IETF and RIR's parts of the proposals currently prepared to be fairly straightforward."

So I think it's my understanding after the U.S. Government sign-off and approvals, ICANN implementation of the proposals could be a phased approach, could be the same proposal as Paul and the numbers community are suggesting currently.

That's my understanding of it.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much, and I see Manal as well.

I will now close -- close the line.

So I have Elise, Kavouss, Xiaodong, Manal, and then Alissa will summarize.

Elise?

ELISE GERICH: Thank you.   This is Elise, and I wanted to talk about the implementation phase and the time lines and ask the ICG: As the three proposals are put together and each proposal independently comes in with their proposals for time lines and implementation, does the ICG -- am I not talking loud enough, Milton?

Martin? Sorry. The other "M." I'll talk louder. Okay.

If the -- if the three proposals come in with their proposed time- -- implementation time lines, does the ICG see them as going in independently, so that all those things could start on time "T" and finish at whenever? Because it's the same organization that's going to be implementing all of these proposals, and as Jari mentioned, most things are phased and some of these may have to be interleaved or sequential. It's not clear to

EN

me that everything could be done in parallel with the resources we have at hand.

So I'm curious, when the ICG puts the three proposals together, only for the implementation phase -- I understand the three proposals are going together -- will that be taken into consideration or will the proposed time lines just stand alone and will the communities have an expectation that those time lines can happen in parallel versus potentially being interwoven or sequential? Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you. Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. To just what Elise says, that would be part of the discussions with the little group that I suggested, if the ICG agreed to do that. That would be another version of that. The time line for each community would be in the general time line in the Alternative 2 and so on.

But the purpose I asked for was not this. It was that the proposal of Paul or RIR community are before the CCWG. That has been well-documented. We have discussed that at working

parties of the CCWG. It is before CCWG. Tomorrow if I find some time just to be absent here, I will raise the point there.

And then I would raise the point that I request the CCWG to seek the advice of the legal counsel for the legal aspects of these three different time lines and so on and so forth, whether this has some legal consequences or not. That I will ask if ICG does not want to do that.

But I would like that in this study, we also take into account the views of the legal counsel with respect to the legal aspects of these phased proposals, and that would be part that we receive something -- assessment from that. But that -- that is a way.

So once again, we would not totally reject the proposal. We study the proposals, we see pros and cons, and we come back in our meetings. I don't know which -- what type of meeting. Maybe one of the conference calls to see to what extent we could proceed with -- further proceed with that proposal. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you. Xiaodong?

XIAODONG LEE: Firstly, I think Paul Wilson provided a very good point, so my concern is I think it doesn't mean that -- if it is implemented step by step, it doesn't mean that we need to end the contract with NTIA separately or just in the same step.

I think actually there is -- anything cannot be finished totally parallelly, so we have limited resource. Just as mentioned by others, you know, technically we need to do that step by step. But we cannot give the community the image that we want to separate that but cannot finish that totally.

I think we need to follow -- follow up our charter.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you. Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Patrik. I'm sorry to ask for the floor again, but I'm still unclear. I mean, regardless of the -- I'm still unclear when exactly is this phased implementation proposed to take place within the milestones we have in our time plan? Because if it is prior to finalizing the overall proposal, then it raises the list of issues as highlighted by other colleagues also.

If it is after the finalizing the overall proposal, then it only makes sense that implementation would go phased, a few things in parallel and a few things in sequence.

So I mean the exact timing of when exactly do you want to put this into action, I think this is the question. But otherwise, I'm fine. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you. Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. So I've written up a few points that I think we can use to summarize the agreement in the room and remotely in the Adobe Connect room as well, so we can try to see if we're on the same page here.

So the first point of agreement that I heard is that the ICG will submit a single unified proposal, and I think everyone is in agreement about that.

The second point is that not all implementation steps need to be taken at the same time, and that phased implementation may be useful. Lots of support for that, I think, from folks who have done implementations of things in the past. It's useful to try to do things not all at once.

And then the third point is that the communities and ICANN can take preparatory steps towards implementation while the proposal is still being finalized, which is like now, and also while it's being evaluated by the U.S. Government after it gets submitted to NTIA, and that -- that sort of parallellization can be good.

And that's already happening, as several people pointed out. The RIRs are working on their SLA. The IETF is working on their SLA. People are thinking about how to implement the PTI. There's lots of things that are -- have already started and that can continue to move forward, even while the proposal -- while we await the approval of the proposal by NTIA.

So those are the items that I heard that we have agreement about in the room.

I think then we need to think about whose role it is to carry forward the various different steps.

As Kavouss pointed out, the remit of the ICG is limited. Our charter is to deliver a transition proposal.

And so I think we can make points 2 and 3 there in the introductory text of the transition proposal that we are drafting. If we have agreement on them and we think they are important

to communicate to the community and to NTIA, we can certainly do that.

I think beyond that, the details of when and how the proposal gets implemented are really up to the communities and ICANN and NTIA to work out.

I don't really see a role for the ICG in that process because those are -- by their -- the implementation is -- you know, by its nature is specific to the various communities.

I think if -- as Russ indicated, if we point out to everyone what the dependencies are, then everyone will have enough information to take that into account while they're engaging in the implementation, but I don't really see a role for the ICG at that point. In fact, I don't see a role for the ICG after we've transmitted the proposal to NTIA. That's our stopping point.

So our discussion here, I think, is really about what do we say in the introductory text of the proposal about implementation, if we want to, but that's about as far as we can go.

Unless -- unless people want to go farther or set up a small group to consider reopening the charter and so forth.

But I'm not sure that that's -- we would have to discuss that more, if we decide that's what we want to do.

So maybe I'll stop there and give the floor back to the chair.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you. Comments on this?

Let's start with Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Yes. So I'm in agreement with what Alissa has just said, and I agree with, you know, Paul's basic motivation, which is to, you know, get those parts of the proposal that can be implemented faster done as quickly as possible and not have them tied to the much more complex process of the complete reform of the domain names policymaking apparatus, as well as the domain names IANA functions.

However, three of the four points that he makes have to do with meeting the -- three of the 10 points he makes have to do with meeting the September 30th deadline and I think, you know, you made the point at the outset, Alissa, that this simply isn't possible, that we cannot have a complete proposal to the NTIA by September 30th, much less have them approve it, because of the complications associated with the CWG and especially its interdependency with the CCWG.

So the -- this sort of takes a lot of the bite out of what Paul is proposing in the sense that if we're not making the September 30th deadline, what are we doing exactly? Well, we are maybe implementing -- or we are seeing a phased implementation post-approval by the NTIA, and that's -- as you just pointed out, Alissa -- something that we really have no control over, after we've -- we've gotten our final proposal accepted.

So I'm not sure why we're spending so much time talking about this.

I think if we can't make the September 30th deadline, we can't really alter what the NTIA does, and if the NTIA approves what we do, our final proposal, then of course the communities should be able to implement as quickly as possible.

So I'm asking, essentially -- I guess the bottom line here is that I'm reasking the question that Alissa just asked, which is: Are we going to somehow put in implementation guidelines into our final proposals? Are we going to recommend that the naming -- the numbering and protocols proposals be implemented on a different timetable? Can we really do that without knowing how the final proposal shakes out?

I really am not sure what we're trying to do here.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Well, I think first of all, what we are trying to do is that we chairs wanted to give the ability for people to speak about these issues before we move into a phase where we need to do what we really are supposed to do, and I think that just like I thought when we started this session, I felt that quite a lot of the what looked like disagreements in reality were more that we were using different wordings or we were really talking about very similar things.

I also think that -- so the most important thing was to have -- give the ability for people to talk about these issues.

We are -- I see that a number of people have their flags up. I just want to point out that we will have lunch in the room, time is actually up for this session and the food is here, which means that if we talk more, the more we talk, the colder the food will get, but I -- at the same time, I don't want to cut off people because this is important just to talk about.

So we have three people -- Kavouss, Jari, and Martin -- and we'll take you in that order and then we'll have lunch. Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Thank you for cold lunch.

My suggestion goes with the summary that Alissa made. She referred to introductory parts, one or two or three sentences. But that will be a very delicate sentence. ICG will say absolutely nothing, saying that this is our transitional plan, completed, consolidated, and that's all. Or if you want to say something about implementation, we have to agree on that. And I don't think that without having a group and so on and so forth, it would be easy to have that. And I have experience to write a small letter to ICANN board. It took eight versions of that, considering all the time. I'm open. If you don't want, you don't want. That's all. So no introductory parts.

I leave it to the NTIA to take care about implementation. I think they are hearing what we are doing here. They read the transcription. Or we have some introductory part and we have to have some agreement of that introductory part, whether in the group or without the group. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I also missed that Joe had his flag up. So we have Jari, Martin, and Joe. And then we have lunch. Jari, please.

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko. Quickly, I also support the summary that was laid out before.

Just to respond to Milton's question about what are we doing here and why do we need to do this, I think it is actually a fairly good statement for the ICG to make because I don't think it has been cleared through all parties in this discussion around the world that we can have something else done in an atomic transaction for the transition. And it has not necessarily been clear who is in charge, like the communities can actually work on their own to do the preparation steps and that they are in charge of figuring out what the right sequencing is.

I think making those statements is actually important. Even though, you know, it's kind of obvious. But stating that is important because for some reason it hasn't been obvious to everybody.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you. Martin?

MARTIN BOYLE: Thank you, Patrik. I think I can be fairly brief. Certainly I would support Alissa's --

ALISSA COOPER: Martin, could you speak closer to the microphone, please.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: And regarding the microphones, they are very directional as well. So you need to unfortunately speak into the microphone. It is a little bit picky, but that's the way they work.

MARTIN BOYLE: Okay. Thanks for that warning. Martin Boyle.

I think I'll be fairly brief in that certainly I can subscribe to Alissa's summary.

But the reason I put my flag up was really about what our particular role can be most usefully going forward.

And I think we mustn't keep forgetting that we are a coordination group and that we should be trying to make sure that we are ensuring that there is coordination between those three proposals and that we understand the implications of what one operating community might do on the other operational communities.

So essentially Alissa's point earlier about making sure that we are looking at something that is a reasonable and coherent plan that will fit in with the fact that we will have a critical path on

limited number of people sitting within the IANA functions, I think all three operating communities are going to want to discuss service level agreement with the IANA team, for example. And I think that is actually really, really important, that we start talking to the operational communities so that we understand what they see as being reasonable and sensible ways forward. Thanks -- without us actually substituting for them. We're not saying we will do the implementation. We just need to understand how they see them doing the implementation and whether it all fits together. Thanks.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: And, Joe, my apologies for missing your hand in the Adobe Connect room. I give you the floor to be the last speaker, and then we have lunch.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thanks. I'll be brief. I, too, agree with Alissa's summary. But just wanted to build on Martin -- one of Martin's points a little bit more.

I think the coordination function that we have is important when we think about the phased implementation because I think it is useful and reassuring to the broader communities if all three

communities agree that the phased proposals from each of the communities causes no havoc in the other community.

And to the extent that we can put those forward, we are not determinative of the outcomes because it's going to be NTIA and the IANA process that may determine what happens to the contract and when.

But I think we can provide a useful potential roadmap of how they may see things happening with a vetting across the communities that each community has seen the other communities' proposed phased implementation and doesn't see it interfering with their phased implementation because I think that's -- the disconnects there would create problems of potential stability or workability of some of the solutions. And I think if all the communities are aligned that, yeah, if they go forward with those elements, it doesn't impact us, I think that will be a useful element for NTIA to consider this more favorably.

But our role is limited to assembling that set of proposals that are then consistent with each other.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. With that, I would like to close this session and hope that also you remote manage to get some lunch or breakfast or some evening food, whatever -- whatever

suits you in the time zone you're in. And let's reconvene in the room -- reconvene the meeting at 1:00 p.m. local time.

Thank you.

[LUNCH BREAK]

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So we have five minutes more of the lunch. Five more minutes until we start.

ALISSA COOPER: It looks like we have a bunch of people who are not at their seats, so if people could return to their seats, we are going to get started.

Hello! It's after lunch.

Okay. This is Alissa. We're going to get started again here. And looking at the agenda, we have now an hour and 45 minutes to discuss various items related to our public comment period, which we will be conducting after we are done with the assessment of the combined proposal.

And again, we're talking about this now not because we are ready to go forward with the public comment period but because we wanted to get as much planning done in advance as we could while we await the names proposal.

So there's two documents that I sent around only a few days ago to the mailing list that we're just going to go over quickly so that everyone starts from the same starting point here.

The first one is the -- this is draft of the executive summary that could be included in the combined transition proposal. And

actually, if we could just -- could we look at the table of contents, the big one? I mean, the one at the very beginning of the document quickly?

Sorry. I keep changing the directions with no notice to the secretariat, so it's my fault.

It's like the page before this page or something. Aha! Thank you.

Okay. So just to review what we're talking about here, we have the two proposals from the two communities. When we get the names proposal, we will -- we will add it, so we will have all three components together in one Word document.

And then what I think we want to do is have some words at the beginning of this document to explain to the public and to NTIA and anybody reading it what the document is, and a few other things. And we've had -- we've started our discussion of what should belong in that section already and that section is currently called the executive summary.

So if we then go look at the executive summary, it has a number of elements in it that we discussed on the last call, and these are just very initial thoughts of what could go in here.

There's a summary of the process that has -- that will have taken place by the time the proposal is out for public comment.

There's then space, if we scroll down, for the -- a summary of the proposal itself, and I think we have strong agreement to not go into a lot of detail here. Right now there's just placeholders. There's not actually any words, there's just placeholders for very brief summaries of each of the components of the proposal.

And then if we go down further, there's then a place there for a summary of our assessment that we're going to do that we just had, you know, seven people volunteer to do in July, so this is where we will be able to report to the public about our assessment of the proposal and how it achieves the various objectives that we think it should achieve.

And then lastly, there's a summary of our assessment of how the proposal fares against the NTIA criteria.

Now, none of these things have been written yet because we haven't actually done it yet, but the idea is that we just agree on the structure and get as much of this written as we can, while we await the names proposal.

So that's all the content at least that I am proposing that we would have in the transition proposal itself.

We could add some words about implementation. Based on our discussion this morning, it sounds like people might want to add some words, and Kavouss has started drafting a few words that he can share with the mailing list, so that could go in here.

But roughly speaking, we're, at least in the first cut of this, trying to follow some of the guidance from Daniel on the mailing list this week, which is to keep this limited, to reuse a lot of words that we already have from other places, from our own charter, from the NTIA announcement, and so forth, from our finalization process, and keep this -- keep this fairly short and succinct but give the public and the community everything they need to know so that they understand the proposal as a baseline.

So then if we look at the -- can we look at the Web page materials?

Thanks.

So then we had -- part of the conversation that we had about this was that there's some other information that some people who haven't been following along every step of the way might want to have about the proposal so that they can -- they can adequately understand it when it goes out for public comment.

And so this document has several sections of material that are proposed to be included on our Web site when we put the document out for public comment.

So certainly we will have links to the transition proposal. It will be translated. We will have links in multiple languages.

Then there's a background section where we can include -- we can have kind of a lengthier discussion of the background, where this proposal came from, what it's about and so forth, if we think that's necessary for the public's understanding.

Then if we scroll down.

So then, you know, standard things for a public comment period. The date -- the deadline that we're asking for comments, instructions for how to submit comments, then the summary of the proposal which we can hopefully have -- just use the same words as we have in the executive summary.

And then most importantly here, at the bottom, if we continue to scroll, we have the questions that we will be putting out to the community that we're -- that we're asking the public to comment about. And we can go through these in detail, but as a first cut, I included questions directly from our assessment, so we want -- we want to hear from the public about whether they feel that the proposal parts are compatible and interoperable,

that there are sufficient accountability mechanisms, that the whole thing is workable, some of the things we were talking about this morning.

And I think it's important to keep in mind that at this point, the component pieces of the proposal will have all been out for public comment previously, some of them multiple times, in the operational communities, and so the focus here really is on items that the public perhaps didn't have a chance to comment on previously because they relate to the intersection of the different components, and overall an overall assessment of the proposal, as opposed to being focused on, you know, details of individual proposals, which hopefully will all have been worked out in the communities already.

So that's the first section of questions.

There's a second section of questions, if we scroll down further, which all relate to the NTIA criteria.

I think it's really important for us to hear from the public as to whether people feel that the criteria have been met, so there's one question for each of the criteria and the surrounding statements from NTIA's announcement, and then just a general question if there's -- if people want general feedback.

So this is all content that is proposed to be on our Web site when we go to public comment, and not in the proposal itself.

So this -- this, I think, kind of gets to that -- that issue we were discussing before about having multiple audiences for the proposal. We can put whatever we want on the Web site to make sure the public understands, and we can keep the material in the proposal itself somewhat more minimal.

So I just wanted to go over all of that before we discuss any of this in too much detail so that people have the whole picture in their minds. Maybe we can go back to the executive summary and start with a discussion there, but happy to entertain comments and questions about the plan -- you know, the overall idea of how we go forward to public comments and then detailed questions about the executive summary first and the Web page material afterwards.

So thoughts?

Jari, your tag is up. I'm not sure if that's from before. Joe.

Okay. Joe, go ahead.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thanks. Alissa, just one comment. I think both documents are pretty good. You know, we'll refine them over time.

But the -- the one thing I do want to make sure is that the transition proposal is complete. So the only thing I think that's missing from it is the when we need comments and where to send them, because I think that should also be in the proposal so it stands completely alone as a document. It can be replicated on the Web site and in the more explanatory material, but I think that would be useful to have in the document itself.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thank you, Joe.

Other comments on any of this? The executive summary or the overall plan?

Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Well, I think the overall plan is a very good one. This is Milton Mueller, by the way.

On the executive summary, I have a very minor point, and that is, process summaries have always kind of disturbed me, particularly when they're appended to a 150-page proposal, so I'm wondering -- I proposed some language which I just sent to the list.

Basically there is a part of our Web site -- and I've sent a link to our list -- where we kind of summarize the process. We show each of the communities a proposal process and we link to our RFP, and I wonder if just a sentence saying, "For a detailed breakdown of the process used to develop this proposal, see this link" would be sufficient, or do you think for sort of pro forma reasons we need to actually summarize the process?

And if you do believe the latter, then the summary that we have may be too short, but I understand the -- the need to truncate it as much as possible but I just wondered if we could get rid of it even more.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah. Fair point.

I think the issue, in kind of thinking about this and putting the words into paragraphs, is that there needs to be some explanation of why there are these three pieces, which inevitably leads you down this path of describing the process, because there are three pieces because we asked -- because we put out an RFP that asked three communities to respond.

So it's a little difficult to explain why there are three pieces unless you say something about the process. I'm happy to have

that be, you know, shortened and made into a link to our site but that's just why this ended up this way.

MILTON MUELLER: You saw the way I handled that in the Web site language, and I think for the Web site you do need an explanation of why there are three pieces, but I'm not sure the proposal itself needs that explanation.

But it's -- it's not a, you know, big issue for me. It's just like, again, this is the proposal rather than an explanation of the process, and unless, you know, NTIA needs documentation of the process and that's part of the legitimacy of the proposal, I don't think it needs to go into the proposal.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Good point.

Russ Mundy?

RUSS MUNDY: Hi. This is Russ Mundy.

It seems to me that if we need to say very much about the process itself, it might be better for us to actually -- and if it needs more than a Web site, if some kind of document or

documentation is needed, that we do a separate document that would assemble the things that have already been said/done.

I'm in favor of using a Web site but I know that there are various concerns that various folks express from time to time about how well -- how stable and how well-archived Web sites can be, so it might be something that the ICG might want to think about is perhaps ask the secretariat to assemble some of the pieces that currently exist and create a document that will be a document that says, "This is the description of the process that was used," not put any more in the actual proposal itself.

ALISSA COOPER: So that -- I'm sorry. Just to clarify, that's -- you think the process summary would go in or what do you -- what exactly do you think would go in this separate document?

RUSS MUNDY: The majority of things that talk about the process itself. That the only thing that should -- we should need to put into the executive summary, I think, are things that relate to answering the questions that NTIA has asked.

So if we feel that it's important to say words about the process so we provide a bit of material as to why it was an open and

multistakeholder process, fine. But that, in my mind, would be the only reason to put process things into the proposal itself.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Got it. Thank you.

Daniel?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Hi. This is Daniel. I'm -- oh, I can hear -- okay. Better.

I'm a bit confused because I actually think the draft as a starting point is very, very good.

I also think that in the proposal itself, we should be talking about the process that was used and the processes that were used, actually, to devise the final product.   I think that's important information for NTIA to know, and to know from us, you know, how we see that we did it and that the communities did it, because we evaluate that as well, so that the result of those evaluations should be in the final plan. It's really part of it, as far as I'm concerned. So that's why I'm confused by people saying it should be -- it should not be.

The second thing I'm confused about is what Joe said, that he wants to have in the proposal -- so in the document itself -- the

information on where to direct comments to. I don't understand that. Certainly once we have done the public comment period, we'll turn the document into NTIA, so it doesn't need to contain that information, so that should actually, as far as I'm concerned, be in the literal material or in a separate thing that we do where we say, "This is a call for public comment." So I'm totally confused now.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Daniel. Maybe Joe can get back in the queue to respond to your second question.

So I have now Jean-Jacques, Martin, Xiaodong, and Kavouss. So Jean-Jacques.

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

First, I'd like to support very strongly what Daniel said. It should be part of our report an explanation of the process insofar as we think it's really part of our duty to explain how it fits in with the requirements of the NTIA initial request.

The second thing is about using more liberally annexes or -- what do you call it -- (non-English word or phrase) in French. That's, yes, annexes.

So in this part, in the process summary part, make obvious, according to what Daniel has just suggested, the various processes which we thought were really important, and each time there is a reference, we can put in the link. Plus in that text we could put a reference number to the annex, and that allows us to put in the annex the full text or texts.

This is a suggestion I made during our last or last-but-one call.

Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Martin?

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

I think for me the concept that we're looking here at an executive summary is quite important. An executive summary tries to pick out those issues that are specifically important and what the headline response to those is.

I certainly agree with Milton, we shouldn't be trying to paraphrase that which has already been said in some quite detailed proposals because of all the risks that such simplification runs into.

But it does seem to me that perhaps what we need to do is identify quite clearly -- for example on process, which personally I don't find desperately interesting and I suspect the people who read the proposal won't find desperately interesting, but the key issue for the proposal is that -- for process is that it was the operational communities that defined their own processes and reached out to their own community, and then we can point to the relevant proposals, so that people can get the more detail if process is something that really excites them.

I think the thing that sort of missed for me a bit, though, was that -- and I'm conscious that this work still needs to be done so we haven't got any boilerplate text or any particular idea. But we do need to look very much at the assessment of the proposals and in particular the identification of the different approaches and how they fit together.

I'm actually conscious there that certainly -- and I tried to look for it just a moment ago but failed in the other two. But certainly in the names proposal, Section IIIa gives the elements of this proposal which is quite a nice short section and that could be cut and pasted in and if we can find relevant similarities in other documents, cut and paste that in and then identify how the three things can work together.

And then the other thing I just sort of would like to touch on quickly is the discussion we had before lunch on implementation or the process towards implementation.

And it seems to me that an executive summary really does need to identify and highlight what are the next steps, what are the things that need to go into place. And whether that is just a chart showing the different bits going on in parallel and then coming together or whether it's a narrative, I really don't know. But it seems to me that we ought to be -- bearing in mind this document is going to the NTIA eventually, we need to be able to point to them that here are the steps that will need to be followed. And when they start to try and push that through political processes in Washington, these are the things they need to highlight that we might not have the full detail here but it will be put in place by the time it is finished going through. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. Just one note on that last point, as with the summaries of the individual proposal components themselves -- which I agree it would be good if we can just copy and paste an individual section from each and that summarizes the whole thing, that would be excellent. The same thing goes for implementation because we had a question in the RFP about it.

And so there's one section in each component that talks about implementation. So we might be able to reuse that text as well.

Xiaodong.

XIAODONG LEE: Just to confirm if we have comment only for the process summary or for the whole document?

ALISSA COOPER: The discussion is open for the whole thing if you want to talk about some other part of it.

XIAODONG LEE: I have one comment for the proposal summary, the second paragraph. The proposal summary mentioned that there is three summaries for each paragraph. So my concern is if we need to ask the different communities to give a summary or the ICG to give a summary for the three parts.

ALISSA COOPER: So what I was thinking was that we could identify one volunteer for each community within our group and have that person try to write a paragraph or find the right text from the individual proposal and use that as the summary so that it would be, you

know, an ICG member, one each from each of the three communities, who would provide some text for that. Does that make sense?

XIAODONG LEE: I thought for the proposal for each community, they have the abstract for their document.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, that could work assuming the abstracts adequately summarize the proposals themselves. I haven't looked back at all of them recently to see if that's the case.

XIAODONG LEE: Okay.

ALISSA COOPER: Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Alissa. I think this document have two purposes. One is used for the public comments. The other is after that. Relevant part of that would be used for the structure of our

proposal to NTIA. Let us at this moment concentrate on the public comments.

I'm very sorry, Alissa, the executive summary is not executive summary at all. Executive summary of any document should summarize in an executive manner the whole document. I don't know why we are limited to one paragraph.

If I look on the CCWG, there are four pages and 25 sections or paragraphs. And after that, they go to the introduction and background. So either we totally delete executive summary and start with introduction, no problem. But the executive summary, it does not describe in an executive manner the summary of the document. It just talked the first part. NTIA made this announcement and ICANN asked the community to start to work. And that is not an executive summary.

So I think perhaps we should decide or we should decide that maybe totally delete the executive summary and start with introduction. Nothing wrong with that, introduction and background.

While other proposals, they have executive summary and introduction of background. But it is not necessarily that. So I think that we decide that we delete executive summary or we should put it in a way that summarizes the whole document in

an executive manner, one or two pages, but not being so critical putting one single paragraph. It does not describe in an executive manner the executive documents.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Kavouss. Just one point of clarification, the process summary and the proposal summary and all of the other sections are meant to be subsections of this overall text, which is called executive summary. So the whole thing is meant to be the executive summary. I realize that's not necessarily clear because of the heading format.

But I agree that originally this was called the preface. People didn't like it being called the "preface." Some suggested it be called the executive summary. I agree it doesn't summarize in and executive manner. So I would be happy for it to be called the introduction. I think that would be appropriate.

I have Joe next. Go ahead, Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thanks. I don't disagree with Daniel's concern about the concept. My concern was it seemed like we were bundling a lot of the introductory material together in the other document and for those people who don't need all of the introductory material,

I don't want us to lose the actual logistics of how to deal with the piece of paper buried somewhere in this material.

So maybe we could on the Web site make very clear how to respond to the paper as just one section and then the introductory material as another section. So if all a person wants to do is take a look at the proposal and respond to us, they don't necessarily have to do the entire introductory section if they have actually been following the process with us.

I was just trying to make sure that for those who are kind of playing the game along with us that they have a -- a clear way to get to the answer that they need to do to the document and not have to go through all the historical antecedents of how we got there.

So if we can do that by clarifying it on the Web site and maybe not blending everything into this thing that's called, you know, the other document or the other material, then that addresses my concern.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Joe.

Jon?

JON NEVETT:	That's, Alissa. I think Larry's blog this week was pretty instructive of what we should be doing and how we should be going about it. I'll just read one sentence. "ICG's role is crucial because it must build a public record for us on how the three customer group submissions tie together in manner that ensures NTIA's criteria are met and institutionalized over the long-term."

So what's the best way for us to help the NTIA do that essentially? Build a public record. I don't really know or care whether it is an intro, executive summary, or preface. I don't think it really matters. But I'm not steeped in that type of role from the U.S. government. And there are people who are.

So, you know, the U.S. government provides notice of inquiries or notice of intents, NOIs, all the time. And there are people who do that for a living on a regular basis. And perhaps we as a group should look to getting some expert advice on that process and help us help the NTIA do this efficiently and in a manner that they are accustomed to. So when they are looking at it from a U.S. government perspective on how we tied together this kind of public record, we could do that in a way with some help perhaps in structuring the right questions to ask in our NOI or in our request for public comment and elicit the responses we are looking for, make sure it is complete and tied together.

And then to the extent we do employ some person to help us with that, they could help us with the hundreds of hours that will be required to review all the responses that come in. So I'm not sure how procedurally we would do this, if folks like the idea of maybe getting a professional staff person assigned for, you know, a few months while we are going through this process. But I think someone steeped in that kind of background would be incredibly helpful for us and most assuredly for the NTIA when we transmit that proposal. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Would certainly be interested in thoughts from others on that proposal. Just on the second point -- well, I will have two responses.

First, if you look at the questions, the sort of proposed questions for public comment, before putting that together, I went back and looked at a few of the NOIs that NTIA has done previously in regards to the IANA functions contract just to get a sense of what they've asked about before. Those are all publicly available. And people can go and look at them and think about that on their own.

And the second question -- or the second issue of managing the comments as they come in and doing the analysis, the chairs

have already had some conversations with the secretariat about preparing for that process and we expect to -- we have been expecting to rely on the secretariat to help us with the synthesis of the comments in a similar manner to what has gone on in the CWG and the CCWG. But happy to entertain anyone's ideas about how to do that. So thank you.

So I have Martin next. Martin -- no, you put it down. Okay. Okay. Then Kavouss -- are you back in the queue? Yes? Go ahead. Go ahead, yeah.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Alissa. I think when you go to the questions, for me, having considered the proposals from CCWG and CWG and the replies or comments received, the most important element of this document is questions. What questions we raised? Raised it in a very clear manner that the community and individuals would understand that.

If you kindly go to the question you raised, you have five elements. You took one of the elements of the NTIA and say that: Do you think that the entire community support that this is not quite proper? Perhaps you should say do support this proposal. And from the reply you receive, then we conclude that, yes, there is broad support.

For instance, CCWG with the proposal sent, there 45 comments received, 29 in favor, 20 have some concerns, 7 have divergence. So I think that the first question will be slightly modified.

However, having said that, I don't know whether we should raise questions in two categories. First, what is your views with respect to each of these individual proposals for three individual operating communities? And then what is your comment with respect to the overall of the three? Because that might help to have that one because that is quite important, that somebody might have no problem with the proposal of two communities, have some comment with respect to one community. And if you make it general, it is difficult to understand how the community should analyze and respond to that.

So I suggest that perhaps you consider to making questions in two categories. One with respect to each community's proposal and, second, as an overall.

But, once again, the important issue is the questions that we raised. And then later on, once the proposal is received, then we have to see how to deal with that, take into account experience gained by the two other community proposals that have been made. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Kavouss.

From my perspective, I completely agree about the first question. In thinking about it, it is more appropriate for us to determine if the proposal has support than to ask people if they think it does.

To your second point, as I said at the beginning, I think it is important to try to focus the public's attention on the items that we -- that haven't had the chance to have public comment thus far necessarily. And I think the details of the individual proposals have been out for public comment a few times. So I would be a little hesitant to separate out and ask specific questions on the specific components because we're really looking for the public's general assessment of the proposal as a whole. But, again, would like to hear people's thoughts about that, that framing.

Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you, Alissa. Joe Alhadeff.

I think to the point that you and Kavouss were just discussing, perhaps what the questions on the individual proposals should raise is not the substance of the individual proposal but the

process. So, in other words, you know, were people able to use the process? Do they believe their comments were reflected in the process or something like that? Because, you know, part of what we're supposed to suggest is that the process has functioned correctly. And to this date, we have no reason to believe that they didn't. But that might be one of the things where we take a look at the individualized processes from that perspective because one of the things that we're supposed to glean from this is the community orientation. And as Kavouss and you discussed, it is not appropriate to ask people whether they feel the document is reflective. But what their experience was with the process may be something that's legitimate for them to provide opinion on.

The other thing I think is when we get the final list of questions, I'm afraid that the way that we have the document drafted at the moment, it lends people to provide us a narrative answer. And a narrative answer is going to mean that we're going to be hunting all over the narrative to try to figure out where they address question 4, to figure out that maybe they didn't address question 4 at all.

And so perhaps there's a way to use a form basis so that you are answering the piece of the question next to the question and not just providing a completely free-form answer. And that's not

going to pre-include some people from sending us something that's free-form. But at least from an organizational perspective, we will be able to match answers together and synthesize answers across submissions in a much easier way than if someone is just organizing their thoughts in whatever way they please.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Joe. That's a good point which I should have mentioned earlier and I think Wolf-Ulrich had brought up on a previous call, this notion of having a form or a public comment sheet of some sort where commenters can input their comments as specific answers to specific questions, and I think we -- we can certainly do that.

I think that's a good idea. I think we should have a Web-based form that allows people to do that, if they so choose, and it will make our task easier as well, in addition to allowing people to provide free-form comments if they want to.

So I have Patrik and then Russ Mundy and Milton.

Patrik?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much.

Regarding the questions we ask and how we phrase them, I think one way of thinking about how we do that is by looking at our own charter, because we cannot ask for feedback on things that we cannot do anything about.

So what we need help with and what we need input on are things that we actually do work with, and that is at least the scope that I've been thinking of.

Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks.

Russ Mundy.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Alissa. Russ Mundy here.

One thing I wanted to emphasize, I guess, is the point Kavouss brought up earlier, the importance of the phrasing of the questions.

I think that is something that is really very crucial and we need to give that as much attention as we can, to get the questions

well stated so that we get the information back from the public that we want to hear.

> The other aspect that -- I believe it was Kavouss brought up -- is whether or not we should try to structure these questions to address just the overall issue or the individual proposals that we have in our combined proposal, and I -- my view on that is I think it would be a mistake to encourage that.

We can't prohibit it. If somebody wants to give us comments on individual -- one of the three proposals, that's fine, they can do that, but I don't think that we should try to structure the questions that we put together so that we would be specifically asking for such a thing, because if it's an individual proposal comment, it seems like it would have to go back to the operational community involved anyway.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah. I just wanted to speak against the idea of trying to overly format or formalize the public comment input, and in particular the idea that we're inviting narrative responses is a bad thing. It

almost sounds to me very close to saying, "My God, we might actually have to read the comments." Okay?

And, yeah, we really do have to read the comments. And we have to make sense of them. And the idea --

I've seen in some of the CWG processes an attempt to, I think, overly formalize the input process, and I think that's a bad thing. I think it really prevents us from trying to grok or understand what people are saying. I think we just need to read the comments. There will be differences of interpretation.

It is a good thing that Alissa has provided us with structured questions relating to those three areas, and I think many -- not all, but many will respond specifically to those questions, but I suspect we're also going to get more broad narrative responses that we should pay attention to.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. I'm -- I would be really interested in people's views on this question. Not that we have to decide it today, but I -- it does impact us in terms of our approach to the public comments and how we seek to analyze them, and in our -- the chairs' preliminary discussions with the secretariat about how to prepare for this, we did talk a little bit about the level of detail that is really necessary in terms of our analysis of the comments

and how much we want to structure that analysis versus being able to understand comments in kind of whatever categories we want as –

You know, if we get a lot of comments about something that we didn't ask a question about, we should be able to synthesize that, and if we make it too rigid, then that can become difficult.

On the other hand, having some -- you know, giving people a way to provide structured comments might make it easier for us to do our analysis.

So there are -- there are pros and cons, and if we make both mechanisms available, then we'll inevitably get some of both.

I think the CWG -- in the CWG's most recent public comment period, about half of the commenters used the template and half of them did not. Roughly, I think.

So we might expect something similar and then we'll have -- we'll have input of both kinds, but we definitely want to hear people's thoughts about that.

Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. First, I agree with Patrik that the question we raised -- we will raise should be at least consistent with the charter. Not exactly the same language, but consistent. We should not raise a question outside the charter. That is quite clear. We understood and fully agree with it.

Now, let me share with you the experience that I have with the CCWG. After receiving the comments, because of the way the question was phrased or because the way that the answer was given, the CCWG has spent a considerable amount of time -- five or six sessions of calls of for hours each -- and a document coming out talking about categorizations of public comments, because it was not clear. They could not discuss that.

First, they have to categorize them. They spent a lot of time to categorize them.

So if you try to be quite clear from the very beginning, our job will be more simpler.

Let me give another example for the proposal I made. Suppose you raise a question and the answer is overall that, "No, we do not agree with that," but we could not say whether the agreement is for Community A or B or C.

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires
21-25 JUNE 2015

So how you try to identify the situation? You raise another question or you try to interpret that?

The maximum effort of the CCWG was not to interpret any comments received. Try to understand the comment. Otherwise, the interpretations would be very, very dangerous. Because a number of the people identifying and setting that will be very limited. I can assure you it will be limited in ICG.

So you will be hostage of two or three people interpreting any comments and it would be dangerous.

So perhaps we should be quite clear, if you don't want to raise it in two different categories, at least you mention that, do you agree, so forth. And then add "and if possible, provide whether your disagreement relates to overall aspects or whether it relates to a specific community," and so on and so forth. At least make it possible that the answer comes quite clear.

So what I'm suggesting is experience that we get from the two other areas, because for us, it's the first time, and there are people that have done it two times in CWG and one time in CCWG, so we should get the experience of

those people and not repeat the same deficiency. I'm not saying mistake. The same deficiencies. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy.

It seems to me that if we can structure our requests for input from the -- on the public comments such that it would be most -- what we think would be most useful to get most of the inputs that we could in the formatted, structured type of responses, it should make the analysis job easier but not prohibit the textual type of responses.

Again, as Patrik mentioned earlier, and Kavouss brought up, we really need to keep our focus on the charter and what we're chartered to do, and so I think that we can structure things so that we don't -- we do not encourage people to give long, massive, rambling textual answers that we can't figure out what they're saying to begin with.

ALISSA COOPER: That's a good point. I mean, you will note in the questions concerning the NTIA criteria they all asked "why or why not." You know, like, "Do you think the proposal meets criteria X? Why or why not?" Which may generate some interesting, long, rambling answers. But at the same time, I feel that we really just can't ask a yes-or-no question. So there might be a way to do that, and I would love for people to propose better ways to phrase the questions.

Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Alissa. And I think Russ made most of what I was going to say because I don't think both options are mutually exclusive. I'm in favor of having a structured way of questions with consistent language which would allow and encourage a structured, also, way of answering that would help our analysis.

Again, without limiting people who would -- violently would like to reply in a more flexible way.

And again, and as you mentioned already, even with the very structured forms before, some people chose not to go by the structure, but at least we can help those who are willing to reply in a structured way and help our analysis, too. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Where are we? Milton.

No. Okay. Daniel.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Thank you, Alissa.

I'd like to also propose that we -- for any question of public comment, we provide some structuring as to categorizing that answer or that comment. I think what Kavouss has brought up is very valid. We should not be in a position where we have to spend considerable time in finding which particular category a comment goes into, and the dimensions that I see for these categories would be -- and have been mentioned also would be an overall comment, a comment relating to one or more of the specific community proposals.   There's also, I think, some categories we could think about, some categories of asking whether in the opinion of the commenter the comment -- the gravity of the comment, in the sense of does the commenter feel that the whole process cannot go ahead because of the issue that is raised, or does the commenter feel it can be remedied, you know, after the implementation has begun, something like that.

And that would also help us to categorize. And we should think of more categories.

And of course filling in these categories should be optional. You know, if someone just wants to make a rant, they should make a rant. But we should provide an opportunity for the commenter to give us some way to categorize what they're saying.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. That's a good point, and that is a process that has been used in the other groups as well, to sort of mark the gravity of the comment in the analysis.

You don't like it, Milton.

Kavouss, are you still in the -- are you back in the queue? Yes.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Just a simple example. Even if, Alissa, we design the questions to receive a binary reply -- "yes" or "no" -- I'm afraid we don't receive that. We receive explanation.

For the CCWG, RIR provided 23 lines of answers. We found 7, which is almost 32 lines in Number 11 and 12, for one question. So you receive explanations of that. So perhaps we should not make an attempt to give the impression that we are looking for a binary answer. It would not help us. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. Milton?

MILTON MUELLER: Well, that's partly what I was going to say. Let's suppose that we create a little box that says, "Do you want to issue a rant? Put your rant here." Half of the people that want to rant will not recognize themselves as ranting and will put it somewhere else.

You know, and besides, I think that we're -- we're going about this with the wrong attitude, which is that we want to make public comments conform to whatever makes our job easy, and the point of public comments is to get the opinion of the public, whatever it is.

Certainly asking specific questions that we need answers to is a good approach, but it seems to me that it's enough, and trying to, you know -- and we will have to categorize the responses through some kind of invented process, assuming that we get enough comments that we can't read them all.

And basically, if you look at the number of comments that the domain name community has gotten, which is a lot more than what the numbers or IETF people got, you know, it's not really that much. It's 60, 50, 40 comments.

Now, maybe we'll get more in the final proposal stage. Probably we will.

But it's not like -- you know, it's not like we're going to get thousands of comments. I really think that would be very surprising if we did.

So let's not over-think this. Let's ask the questions that Alissa has given a great first pass at, and think if we need any other questions that really need to be answered, and let's just do the work and read them.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Milton.

I agree with you. I -- what I heard Daniel saying was not that we would try to get people to conform into separate boxes in terms of the gravity of their comments, but that that's something that we might take into consideration when we do the analysis.

So even if it -- you know, it's narrative comments picking out little nitpicks but generally being supportive, we could be able to characterize someone's narrative comments as being supportive as opposed to blocking or

something like that, so it's just a matter of factoring it into our analysis, as opposed to stuffing people into boxes a priori.

I think our queue is clear.

Okay. So going forward with this material, we have a drafting team of volunteers who will work on what I think we'll call the introduction instead of the executive summary to the proposal.

There are a couple of pieces that we either today have talked about adding or changing. The bit about implementation is one. The summaries. Tweaking the way that we talk about the process and possibly putting the process information in an appendix. So the team will work on that and come back to the full group with an update.

We should probably think about the timing of that but we don't have to do that in this forum.

And then people should look in more detail at the Web site materials and provide comments on the list, if you have further comments, because they haven't been out -- they've only been out for a few days. But it would be excellent if we have all of that ready to go, you know,

mid-July, because the comment period should be starting in August if we get everything done on time.

Kavouss, are you back in the queue? Yes.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Yes. Thank you very much. It's good suggestions.

What I would like to raise at this stage, because the questions that we have to raise is more or less independent from any action that we take with respect to the remaining part, do you think or do we think that there is a need to have a small group to put their thoughts together and draft the questions for consideration? That is very important. It is -- should be from the various communities and the group of people, more representatives of all, because that is important, the type of questions, so I suggest that you consider that we need to have a little group for formulating the questions which will be sent out at an appropriate time from the early -- even from now -- between now and the next time that we put the document for public comment. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. Jean-Jacques, did you want to respond?

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

I think it's a good suggestion, but I'd say that why not the same team formulating the questions and also taking care of the draft which will be submitted to the whole ICG? Because it's very much two sides of the same work.

ALISSA COOPER: That sounds like a good plan to me, so seeing -- seeing no objections, I think we should go forward with that.

So the tasks are for the -- for the small group.

Great. We are ahead of schedule, which is always good.

Oh, go ahead, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Alissa. Just a very quick remark back on the introduction versus the executive summary thing. Again, I'm not a native speaker and I don't have a very strong position. But, again, I'm in favor of an executive summary.

To me it means that this is a summary in a nutshell to the whole thing from the beginning to the end. But an introduction is -- again, could be an introductory paragraph that doesn't necessarily summarize the whole thing. So I think the approach would be different if –

ALISSA COOPER: So are you suggesting we have both an executive summary and an introduction?

MANAL ISMAIL: At least keeping the executive summary thing because I thought you were saying we can name it an introduction instead of an executive summary which I don't feel gives the same meaning because the executive summary is a summary of the whole document. To me an "introduction" could be something else.

ALISSA COOPER: True. Do you have a suggestion, Kavouss? I don't know.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, I agree with Manal.   My understanding was that you suggested or you concluded that instead of executive summary,

you put everything in introduction. That was not the purpose of my proposal.

My proposal was that executive summary should describe -- not describe, should summarize the whole document in an executive manner. However, you could have one or two introductory paragraphs. So I suggest that we make it quite different, executive summary, more or less with different format as you mentioned because formatting was not good. And then have one or two paragraphs, introductory paragraphs, for the whole document, what it's about but not summarizing the whole document. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Go ahead, Narelle.

NARELLE CLARK: Narelle Clark for the record.

When I write documents, I usually write the executive summary after I've written the document. And I normally start by writing a sketch of what the document will have and that might eventually evolve into what I have as an executive summary.

But so far I think we're -- we're trying to skip to the end of this before we've even sketched out what the document's going to have. And we've started to debate the semantics of introductions versus executive summaries.

I don't think we've got far enough really to tease these apart and set these things in concrete yet.

I agree with Alissa in that what she sketched out so far is more -- feels more to me like an introduction into a document rather than an executive summary.

So I would suggest that we leave this a little bit loose at this point in time and not get hung up on this is an introduction or an executive summary or whatever.

When we're close to the end, I think we can then pull it back and carefully phrase up an executive summary. Because I agree, I think this document is definitely going to have to have an executive summary. You're going to have to have a shortcut way of figuring out what the whole thing is about. So it's definitely going to have to have an introduction, and it's also going to require an executive summary. So let's just not get too hung up on it right now.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Narelle. I think that's a good suggestion. I think we can leave it up to the drafting team for now what they want to call the thing or divide it up, whatever. Okay. Great. Thank you.

So that brings us to the end of this section. And I think we're just going to move on to our very next topic rather than take the break. So that is the update on the CCWG accountability work. And Mohamed is going to lead us in that.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you very much, Alissa. So basically this session will -- would like just to open it up for the members to discuss the progress of the CCWG work and the Work Stream 1. Recently, they have published a draft for comments, and the comment period has been closed. And I think they also indicated the time frame of submission to ICANN board.

So if -- I think it will be an open discussion about how the progress, you see it and any comments from your sides.

Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Mohamed. I think in the role of the meeting, the chair of the meeting, I at that time as a liaison to CCWG provided a brief summary. If you want a brief summary, I would be happy

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires
21-25 JUNE 2015

to provide that, what is going on. If you don't want, I don't take anything. This is up to you and the meeting if you want a brief summary at this stage about the CCWG to see whether or not it impacts our work and also to report as a liaison to the CCWG to your meeting. So it is up to you to decide as the chair.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I think it is a good idea to hear from our liaisons definitely. So there's no one in the queue.

Please go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Mohamed. I think the CCWG was established for the enhanced accountability of the ICANN, and they established a charter. And they had created two work streams: Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2.

Work Stream 1 was the area in which the accountability or enhanced accountability should be in place or committed to be in place or activated before the transition take place. And the Work Stream 2 was overall accountability after the transitions.

And based on that, they have established an arrangement taking into account existing accountability they have.

Second, the comments received for the existing accountability.

Three, the accountability coming from the CWG.

And, four, any contingent and any stress tests that would require. And that four group, they provided the inputs. And finally they come to the points that they have subdivisions. The first division was the empowerment of the community on the activities of the ICANN. And the second is remedy and redress.

With respect to the community empowerment, there were six areas. Empowerment of the community with respect to the ICANN board in removal of an individual board member, removal of the entire board members, accountability of the bylaw. And later on they came to the conclusion that they must have two types of bylaws. One is traditional or a standard bylaw. The other is the fundamental bylaw that sometimes some people they call them golden bylaw. And that is covered in the issues related to the mission and core value and some of the commitment or -- Affirmation of Commitments would be in that and a few other things that comes from the CWG.

And the second one was related to the redress and remedy. The first, they had to have the core mission and core value of the ICANN. And then they have to talk about what part of the Affirmation of Commitments needs to be included in the bylaw,

fundamental bylaw, and what part of the accommodation -- Affirmation of Commitments may not be required anymore, should be cancelled or should be not taken anymore into account, that now they come to the conclusion that that portion should remain in some sort of document called procedure and functional documents. That is another issue.

And then they come to the independent review panel. And the independent review panel, how it should be established, what are the members of that group and how they will be selected, the number of the representatives of that, and the decision of that, whether it should be binding or not binding. And these were all discussed.

And then coming into the Work Stream 1, dealing about the six areas of accountability that I mentioned. That was the most important part of that apart from removal of the board member and bylaw. There were two other areas, and that was budget. And the other area was the area relating to the strategic plan. And then based on that, it was mentioned that -- how they could empower the community.

They had two legal counsel. One of the legal counsel was the one who counseled on the CWG. The other one they have employed. And then these two legal counsel studied the legal aspects of the issue. And they provided that in order to

empower the community, that having standing with the way of having the authority to call for or bring suit into the court, they need to have standing. And that standing requires to have a personhood arrangement. And in the current situations, none of the existing arrangement provides that personhood and ability. Therefore, they have to make some changes and they have to have different arrangements from what exactly having today.

And then they discussed the issue of three categories of possible arrangement. One category was designator. And for the designator according to the definition given, designators generally are those SO and AC who have the ability to designate the voting director. Later on it was slightly changed. And that is the designator.

Designator -- if it is established and should be personhood according to the California law, these designators would have the ability for four areas: Removal of the individual board, removal of the entire board, and bylaw changes for the fundamental and for the standard bylaw.

Nevertheless, the designator would not have the ability for the budget nor ability for the strategic plan.

For these two, they need to have another type of membership, and that is the member model. And this member model requires

a lot of legal arrangements. And in order to have some things they need to have another process which is called unincorporated associations, which group the members together in order to make final decisions in respect of, for instance, removal of entire board.

So the whole process was established, and they have the arrangement who can vote for this -- for what area. They put all this in the document, and they submitted. And now they have the proposal -- the comments. And the comments have a lot of -- raise a lot of questions and the issue now under discussions, they categorize the reply and they are discussing to what extent they could reply to the questions.

But the issue of the membership is still an important issue before the community, and they have to reply to that issue and how they could make it possible that one of the three possibilities, voluntary group, designated group, or membership group, could be established. And that is under the discussion.

The issue is quite complex and many, many meetings was held and the people contributed. A lot of work has been done. It is a very efficient group. And a lot of activities put for the group, and still discussion is continuing. And the public comments for the first 30 days, they have extended to 45 days. Now the comments are received. And they are putting together in order to have a

document prepared for the second public comments that may be after this ICANN 53 meeting for another 40 days' comment. And then the proposal for that will be put together.

And after that, they try to submit the proposal to the ICANN, not to the NTIA, to the ICANN. And ICANN is authorized to make any comment, either reject or accept or put comments and send that one as part of the proposal to the NTIA. Was very, very brief summary of the activities. Keith may have something to do that if he wishes. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Kavouss. Thank you, Mohamed. That was an excellent summary of the work and the process and the procedures that are ongoing in the CCWG. So thank you very much, Kavouss.

So just a couple of points maybe to circle back on. The public comment period for the CCWG closed initially on June 3rd but then was extended for a period -- for another week to allow for some of the translated documents to be fully considered by those who were relying on those rather than English.

But the public comment period is now closed. For the last two weeks really, the CCWG has been analyzed and summarizing and categorizing the public comments received. The CCWG has a

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires
21-25 JUNE 2015

full-day working session tomorrow from 8:00 a.m. until 6:00 p.m. The bulk of that session is to continue working on the analysis and the summary of the public comments so that during the week -- during this coming week, during the outreach sessions with the community, there will be a resource to refer to.

The goal, as Kavouss mentioned, is to engage with the community to discuss the public comments, to incorporate the public comments, and then to come out with a second draft proposal following ICANN Buenos Aires.

And as Kavouss mentioned, the target is to have a second public comment period ideally beginning in July and the ultimate goal of having the CCWG accountability proposal reviewed and approved by the chartering organizations in Dublin, which would be the third week of October, as it's unlikely that some of the community groups would be able to accomplish approval prior to that because they would require a face-to-face meeting.

So that is the tentative time line. I think one of the key concerns for this group, for the ICG, will be the dependencies between the CWG naming proposal and the CCWG accountability proposal.

The CWG naming transition group has already identified several areas where they expect certain things to come out of the

accountability track where there are assumptions that certain things will come out of the accountability track.

And if they do not, that raises further questions down the road for the stability of the CWG transition proposal. So I think that's going to be a key area of focus for this group, for the ICG, to make sure that we're fully aware and tracking those dependencies.

And at some point, when we finalize our proposal, it may be -- it may be beneficial or necessary for us, the ICG, to call out specifically those dependencies on the CCWG accountability track.

So I think I'll stop there. Kavouss did a great job of summarizing. Those were just my additional comments. And maybe we can take any questions.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Kavouss and Keith. I think I will hope it now.

Russ, please.

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy. One question that I have -- and thank you for the summary of our liaisons. Truly excellent.

Since our charter and our plan does not really involve any substantial CCWG interaction and timing and so forth -- and your point is excellent, Keith, about the dependency in CWG on CCWG actions. How do you -- do either of you have a suggestion on how we should go about making sure we're aware of first that those things exist?

And, secondly, who is the determinant, so to speak, of whether or not the CCWG output adequately addresses those aspects of what the CWG is looking for?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Go ahead, please, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you, Russ. So great question. And I think ultimately the responsible party for determining whether those criteria have been met or those dependencies have been resolved is the operational community.

So I expect -- and this is still all very much in the works as the chartering organizations consider the CWG transition proposal, but I expect that they will be approving the CWG transition proposal. At least that's the hope and the expectation. They will be approving this week,

conditional upon further review or certification that the accountability track delivers their expectations, or at least meets a minimum threshold.

So I expect that at least some of the operational -- the naming operational community will say, "We approve this, pending the results of the accountability group, and that we reserve the right or the need to be able to review the accountability output to ensure that it meets our expectations."

So maybe I could just take it back up a level and explain why this is so important, and give an example.

The CWG, for example, has recommended the creation of the PTI, which is the ability at some point for the community -- the customers and the community to decide to take IANA and to separate it from ICANN under, obviously, the most dire-case circumstances.

The question coming out of the accountability group is: How does the community enforce the community powers? And that's really one of the open questions in the accountability group right now is this question of enforcement. Do you need legal enforcement? Is some

other level of enforcement adequate? That's still under discussion.

But at some point, I think the CWG transition proposal assumes that there will be some level of enforceability, or some ability to compel the ICANN board to, in a sense, agree to what the CWG has proposed.

If that is not there, then the question I think arises: What happens if the PTI process is initiated and then at some point the ICANN board says, "Thank you, but no, we don't agree"?

And so I think that's one of the -- just as one example, one of the areas where the CWG proposal assumes a certain level of enforceability, and that if that turns out not to be there, then that raises questions about the viability of the proposal itself.

So maybe I'll stop there and see if Kavouss has any other -- any other comments. Excuse me.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah. Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Keith.

No, you very well provide the -- some answers, but I would like to draw the attention of Russ Mundy that, first of all, with respect to the relation between CCWG and ICG, there is no relation. ICG does not require any output from CCWG to its proposal for the NTIA.

However, the link between CWG and CCWG indirectly involves the ICG into the matter.

In order to further provide information, CWG on 15th of April provided five areas for CCWG to address. The Area 1 is ICANN budget. That they could have possibility to comment on the budget, in particular for the PTI. They don't want that the budget of the PTI would be under the mercy of ICANN, because otherwise --- they should have a say on that.

Second area was empowerment of the -- empowerment of the kind of community, in particular with respect to the ability of the community to review the ICANN board decisions.

To review the ICANN board decisions requires an independent review panel. An independent revenue panel now is a complex subject. Currently they propose three members. There are seven people but three members decide on the matter.

In another version, they said one single member decides on the issue and the community is not in agreement with that.

The community said that we could not put the decision on the one person nor on the three persons nor in the way that they are elected, because currently the procedure is that ICANN proposes the candidate. They said that the candidate should come from the community, not from ICANN.

And they said that there should be some member also for international arbitration. Some people they disagree with that. They say that we don't agree with international arbitrations.

So the second question is considerably under discussion and there is no agreement yet.

On the budget, the question is linked with type of membership. If you don't have the member models, under the California law there would be no possibility for the community to reject the budget. That is also a pending issue.

The third issue, the address mechanism, which is again the issue of independent review panel.

And fourth is appeal mechanism.

So the four issues is under discussion in CCWG and has not yet been replied. If there is no satisfactory reply for that, the five

areas of CWG would not be implemented. Therefore, we as ICG would not have a clear idea how to treat the proposal of CWG.

So we have to put every effort into the CCWG this week and later on to push for that, and this is our duty. We do it as a liaison of the ICG to raise the issue and we have raised it at several times and say that we are indirectly involved and we have to have this clearance in order to help.

But the issue is quite complex. Very, very complex. As I mentioned, there are some 400 pages of the legal assessment and still the issue is -- and in some area, still there are the problems and so on and so forth.

Even just for example, there are problems as to whether or not the seat of the ICANN should be United States or not. Whether there should be agreement or not, that is not the issue.

And also whether the seat of the ICANN will be in the United States, whether it should be in the fundamental bylaws that this requires 75% or 80% of the vote, or if the standard bylaw that requires 66%. These are also discussions. So there are many, many issues that are yet to be replied.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah. Thank you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: So we are stuck on that --

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thanks very much, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: -- and we have to push for that to see what we can do, but once again, thanks to the CCWG, they are working very, very efficiently. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Thank you very much, Kavouss and Keith. I have many people in the queue. I wanted to ask them just to be, as well, brief.

I'll get back to you, Keith.

It's Joe, Alissa, Milton, and Keith, please.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. Joe --

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Joe?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah. Thank you. Joe Alhadeff.

It strikes me that we -- when you go down -- you know, Keith laid out a problem, and then Kavouss laid out a set of details related to that problem which it seems like every one of those details could be a derailing function to the CWG proposal.

And since the CCWG may not be able to put itself to bed before October, assuming decisions are reached, I think we -- this starts to blend into our time line discussion because I'm not sure how we proceed. Do we proceed with the presumption that they will be addressed but the right to review comes back? Because I don't think NTIA -- based on the blog that Keith had circulated, I'm not sure NTIA is looking for the, "Yes, but we may have to come back to you on this proposal" concept.

So I think this is a huge issue and I'm not exactly sure how we deal with it, but -- and I think we need to do more than just highlight that there might be possible problems, because from the post also, it sounds like NTIA is driving for all of these issues to be resolved at the same time before it considers for approval and moving forward.

So those who are more intimately involved in the process may have an opinion, but having heard all the details, it has created an exceedingly high level of concern.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Alissa, please.

ALISSA COOPER: So I -- I mean, I think one simple way to plan for this is that knowing that the CCWG is driving towards having the -- their proposal to the SOs and ACs for approval at the end of September, we can plan -- we as the CWG can plan to ask the CCWG around that time if they feel that the proposal from the CCWG as finalized meets all the requirements that they needed from -- from the other group.

And let's hope that the answer is yes.

And if the answer is no, then we have to decide what to do at that point. But I don't think we have to decide now. And I also think that inquiry is limited to the parts of the CCWG proposal that are specifically required from the CWG.

So if the CCWG has issues with some other aspect of their proposal, we are not necessarily blocked on that, but I think it would be good for us to plan to check in with the CWG around the time when the CCWG work is planned to be finalized, to determine if -- if the CWG feels that they have everything they need from the other group.

So that's what I would suggest that we do.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah. Milton, please.

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah. My take on this is a little bit different from Alissa's. I totally agree with what Keith was saying, that this is an interdependent process, and I think the only solution is that the -- the final proposal that we submit to NTIA has to be put out basically for public comment at the same time as the final CCWG Work Stream 1.

Just to clarify some of the things that Keith was alluding to, the review process for the IANA functions presumes that the authority of the community to switch the IANA functions operator is a fundamental bylaw within ICANN's system, and the enforcement of the fundamental bylaws is something that the CCWG has to do, and if that is not done or is not accepted as part of the plan, then the whole CWG plan really doesn't provide the kind of accountability that would meet the criteria, at least in the minds of many of us.

So those two things have to be kind of approved.

Now, it's true that CCWG is doing a lot of things that don't have to mesh with what we do, and -- but those things are supposed to be very clearly divided, and I hope everybody on the ICG understands this, that there's a Work Stream 1 for the CCWG,

which is everything is supposed to happen before the transition takes place, and then there's a Work Stream 2, which is all the other stuff.

And the Work Stream 1 has gotten larger than many of us anticipated because of these basic legal issues regarding membership and fundamental bylaws and enforceability of the reforms, and those changes are very complex.

So this is, indeed, the thing that -- I wouldn't say it's something that can derail our process, but it can certainly delay it because the fundamental nature of the membership changes, in particular, have to be very carefully thought through, and we have to be very careful about whether they actually work as intended and don't have unintended consequences, and that means that before we can actually put our stamp on the CWG proposal for names as the final proposal, we have to know what is in Work Stream 1 and what it's going to do and has it gone through all the stress tests.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Keith, please.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Mohamed, and thank you, Milton. It was excellent clarification to my -- to the points that I alluded to.

I also want to clarify something that I said earlier, and I apologize if I, you know, created confusion.

I didn't mean to suggest that the chartering organizations of the CWG proposal would have to, in a sense, revote or reapprove at a future date.

I think it's more a question of they have to -- they will have to certify to their own confidence that the output of the CCWG accountability is meeting their expectations or meeting the assumptions that were built into the CWG transition proposal.

And they could simply do that by writing a letter or sending a note saying, "Yes, the output of the CWG accountability meets our assumptions. We're good." Or it could provide comments to that effect during the public comment period in the CCWG accountability process.

So I didn't mean to suggest that it would have to necessarily require a whole 'nother review and approval formalized vote process. It's simply a matter of review and making sure that the assumptions are there.

Now, if the assumptions are not met, that raises other concerns, but I just wanted to make sure that my -- my comments were understood. Thanks.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you very much.

Lynn, please?

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

This is a very complex and fast-moving set of changes we're talking about between both the CWG and the CCWG work. Possibly the most complex we've actually looked at in terms of the whole process.

I'm wondering if it's worthwhile for us to set up a small team within here to look at some of the possible consequences or implications across the whole, while at the same time asking each community to go back and run a similar process to look at the requirements that the CWG is putting on the CCWG and do a specific assessment of some of the possible consequences to their proposal of that.

It's a reasonable question for anybody standing outside of the process to look at this process and say, "Did you spend time? What were your efforts, you know, to try and assess consequences?" I mean, I'm pretty sure that there will be unintended consequences from the series of these changes.

But I also think there's some reluctance in the ICG to step into some of that role. And if we're not going to do it, then I think we need to find either the right questions to ask of the communities to ensure the communities go away and do some of that work -- and I guess as I suggested at the beginning, I think it's probably both, not an either/or.

But maybe the question on the table in front of all of us is what actions do we think the ICG can take over the next probably several months as we watch the CCWG and the CWG work roll out to ensure that we're being thoughtful within each of our own communities but also that we're looking at the possible consequences or implications as a whole.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you for that very important point. And it's important that we be able to flag up things at an earlier stage.

Alissa, please.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Mohamed.

I just wanted to respond to Milton because you said that we were not in agreement and I think we actually maybe are.

All I was suggesting -- and maybe this isn't relevant for the nature of the proposal, but all I was suggesting is that when the CCWG proposal is finalized, that we go to the I -- we go to the CWG and ask if it meets all of the -- CWG's requirements. That's all I was saying.

It's possible that that means that they have to be in agreement with the entire CCWG proposal because every component of the CCWG proposal is required for the CWG. It's possible that their assessment will only rely on some part of it and not all of it, but that -- that would be up to them.

So that's all I was saying.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Alissa.

Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I think the process in CCWG is a little bit more complex than that one.

As I mentioned, there were six areas that requires the empowerment of the community. Four areas of them could be easily or more easily implemented, but the two areas, budget and strategic plan, is very difficult, because if you want to reject the budget or reject the plan, you should be in a position to have understanding. Understanding means that to bring the suit to the court. And that is the issue that lies with the membership model which is under discussions. However, there is another track apart from that, or separate. That is, reconsiderations.

For reconsideration, you can ask ICANN to reconsider, but when reconsider, you are at their disposal. They reconsider, they say, "Yes, I agree with you," and they say, "No, we don't agree with you." And if you again comment, you can have a second request for reconsideration but you could not have an unlimited number of reconsiderations.

So these tracks are also under the consideration of CCWG.

But to reply to the Milton question, the question is not bylaw. The question is these two tracks of budget and track of the financial and -- sorry, the strategic plan.

And now, recently, the legal community -- legal counsel has added another area and that is review of the function -- IANA

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires
21-25 JUNE 2015

functions, and that is the seventh area that requires that the community should be empowered to do that.

So the whole issues under discussion -- and I agree with Alissa, that we have to possibly raise the questions and base ourself on some assumption at some time that this will be resolved. If it is not resolved, then we have to reconsider the plan. For the time being, that is that. So we have to be active in the issue but it's very, very complex.   And also the complexity is that the chartering organizations, depending how they reply to the issues. If they don't reply properly or positively and say, "No, we don't agree with that," so we don't know what will happen to the situation.

So these are the unanswered questions but complexity is more than what you expect.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Russ, please.

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you, Mohamed.

Russ Mundy.

I'd like to speak in support of Lynn's suggestion she made a few minutes ago that the ICG should consider asking the other -- well, asking all the operational communities to look at the now-evolving structure that's coming out of the CWG and CCWG and how, if any, that will impact their already submitted proposals or their proposed or thought-about implementation approach.

One thing that certainly comes to my mind in this space is the IETF and the RIRs have agreements in place that are with ICANN.

And if there is a new legal entity that is created at least, they need to think about what that might do to their existing legal arrangements, and if they would need to change, if they would need to modify their proposal or some such thing as that Because I believe at the time the other two proposals were submitted, the whole concept of PTI had really not formulated up. And it could have substantial impact.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Russ.

Milton?

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah, I actually forgot to make a point last time which makes things even more complicated, which is that the new DOTCOM Act requires the CCWG Work Stream 1 to be completely

implemented before NTIA can do anything. So I'm not sure -- this hasn't passed yet, I don't believe. But I don't -- I think that the administration has actually said that they don't oppose this act, so it probably would pass. But that means that the U.S. Congress would require NTIA to impose Work Stream 1 completion upon the transition process.

The bottom line is I think what Alissa was saying is more true than she even knew, which is that we have to look at the CWG and the CCWG as the proposal that we are submitting. We have to look at those as integrated things.

And so the procedure that she suggested actually, I think, could work well in a sense that we say to the CWG after we have a completed CCWG accountability reform, we say to them, You folks okay with that? Does the names community have its act together? And if they say yes, then we say we have a complete proposal.

But we can't, I think, do anything in terms of public comment and submitting to the NTIA until that Work Stream 1 is considered complete. And another little complicating wrinkle here -- although if we adopt the proposal -- the procedure that I just suggested, it may not be a problem -- is that technically we are in charge of the IANA transition proposal. But ICANN is in

charge of the CCWG reform process. ICANN, not us, is in charge of it.

So I think our gatekeeping mechanism for dealing with that is, again, we say to CWG is the names community agreed on what reforms they want across the board? If they're not, if they're still complaining about how ICANN implemented the CCWG, for example, we cannot move forward. If they are unified on that, then we can. That's my opinion.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Thank you, Milton.

We have Jari -- sorry -- and Martin are the last ones in the queue.

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko. I was just following up on what Russ and Milton said. So, first of all, this question of new legal structure and how that might affect the other communities, we've said publicly in our response regarding the time line that we -- if we can continue with the existing arrangements where our contracts are with ICANN and that's our preference, then we're ready to move forward as soon as possible. Today, if needed.

If something else is required from us -- and I'm not sure if that's actually -- if there's any reason why that should be like that. But if some other arrangement is needed, then we would actually have to do some more work which we don't prefer.

And the other comment is about the accountability work and its relation to the whole transition proposal or the whole transition effort.

And I just want to state the fact that the IETF proposal is not in any way dependent on the CCWG results. I mean, it's a good thing that they're working on that. But we're not dependent on that. So I think this is the moment where we can go back to our earlier discussion about complete proposals, complete plans, but then implementations, you know, have to understand the dependencies.

So from our point of view in the implementation stage, you know, we could go forward even before the CCWG thing is completely implemented. I'm not taking any position on what the U.S. government thinks or the Congress thinks. Just looking at this from a factual basis, those two have no relationship.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you.

Martin, please.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks, Mohamed. Martin Boyle here.

I've actually put my flag up because of something Milton said. And I think I heard him say that before we can go out for consultation we need to have the CCWG proposal for Work Stream 1, which then actually doesn't happen until the end of September.

And that seemed to me that it was putting an unnecessary barrier in front of us doing our work and our due diligence.

And I go back to something that Alissa said that we should -- when the CCWG proposal is made, then for us, it should be simple enough to simply go back to the CWG, which essentially by then probably won't exist but imagine it might be, and ask whether the CCWG proposal as is meets their needs.

And one of the good places that we're in -- we're not in many good places but this is one of them -- is that the cross-community working group on the names transition has actually said what it needs, what it expects to have in place to make its proposal complete.

So having put that on the table, really all we need we can go out to our consultation and say, This is what is expected. This is what has been requested. And the CCWG has taken account of that and will be working on that. So I can't see why we would need to wait for that final proposal to come in. But we can go ahead with the proviso that at the end, we can say that CCWG has delivered what CWG needs and ICANN has accepted that and is starting to put those pieces into place. Thanks.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Martin.

I think we're closing up and we have the break. Milton, if you can allow me to just try to summarize what we have concluded.

I think there's almost an agreement that our liaisons to continue the coordination with the CCWG and the work and flag any issues that they see that will impact our assessment.

And we have the proposal from Lynn to form a small group to look at CCWG work and how that will impact our CWG proposal assessment and the final proposal formulation.

So any volunteers would like to join maybe the liaisons in that group? Milton, please. Milton and Lynn. Thank you very much.

Kavouss, please. Last comment.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: In any case, if there is any group to deal with that, I will be in that group automatically.

[Laughter]

I can't get out of that. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah. More people to help you. Yeah, for sure.

I think we can close for the break and we'll resume again at 3:15. Yeah. Thank you.

[BREAK]

ALISSA COOPER: If folks could take their seats, we're going to get started again.

So our next topic is time frame, if we could take a look at our time line.

Could we look at the -- sorry. The graphic.

Thanks. Okay. So this discussion is really about our -- the response to the letter we received from the NTIA, or that the chairs received from NTIA concerning time frames, and if you will recall, we had a discussion about how there are multiple different parts of the time line. There's the piece to finalize the transition proposal. Then there's the -- and send it to NTIA.

Then there's the piece where the U.S. Government reviews the proposal and decides whether to approve it, and we obviously don't have anything to say about that.

And then there's the piece concerning implementation.

And that's the one where we asked the communities and the ICANN board for some input.

So what we're looking at here refers to the first piece, which is the time line to finalize the proposal. This hasn't changed.

There is now a note -- if we scroll to the right, there's a note that we had talked about adding that explains that this is an

optimistic time line and that it may be adjusted in the future, depending on various contingencies.

So the plan is still to update the dates of this time line as soon as we receive the names proposal from the CWG, but this is the rough timing that we're looking for, and so I would say that if we get to the end of -- if we arrive at our Thursday session next week and we don't yet have the CWG names proposal, that we just incorporate this in our response to NTIA and explain that the dates might -- the dates will be, you know, more firm as soon as we receive the names proposal.

So that's the first component of what would be our response to NTIA.

And then if we could look at the summary of the inputs from the communities, that would be good.

So then the other part is about implementation time lines, and we asked the communities and the board, the ICANN board, for some input to help us answer this question. And what you see on the screen is just my very, very terse summary of those responses, the specific parts of those responses that speak to how much time is needed for implementation.

All of the communities and the board provided some other explanatory material about contingencies and so forth, but just

for the purposes of this summary, I tried to boil it down to the minimum that we need, to put together a response.

So -- and people can -- from the communities should correct this characterization if they don't think it's correct.

But essentially what we heard from the IETF is that the IETF is ready to transition now, and one of the components -- or, you know, the -- there were pieces of their transition proposal that it was decided would be effectuated through their annual SLA process, and if that SLA -- if those modifications are affected by further details that might come about related to the PTI, then more time might be required. So that's a basic summary of what we heard from the IETF.

The basic summary of what we heard from the RIRs and CRISP was that they believe they will be ready to transition by September 30 -- I should say September 30, 2015, so a few months from now. That was kind of the one-sentence summary of we heard from them. And they provided a lot of further color about why that's the case.

From the CWG, we heard that they think they would need, you know, something in the range of three to four months for the PTI implementation, once it gets started.

And then the implementation of the bylaws-related items is essentially part of the CCWG time line.

So those were kind of the two pieces that we heard about from them, mostly about the PTI implementation.

And then from the ICANN board, we heard that they believe the implementation of the IETF and RIR plans would take something on the order of several weeks; that the PTI setup would take something on the order of several months; and that it's too soon to determine the time line for the CCWG accountability items because they're still being worked out.

And also, this question that raised some discussion on the list, which we should certainly talk about, which is that the ICANN board expects to use their normal process for bylaws changes, including a public comment period.

So my kind of thinking about our response to NTIA is that, you know, we can talk first about the time line for the proposal finalization up to Dublin. We can summarize this feedback that we received and point NTIA to the specific responses that we received from all of these entities. And that could be it or we could provide some further analysis, if we want to.

I hadn't really gotten that far in my thinking, since we just received a couple of these responses, so would be interested in

people's thoughts about whether we need to make some other statement about what we think about implementation timing or if we can just point NTIA to the responses we received.

So with that, I will open the floor. Keith Drazek.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Alissa.

Just one thing I should have mentioned in the earlier update on the CCWG is, during the full-day working session tomorrow, the CCWG will be discussing the response to NTIA regarding the time line. So I expect coming out of -- if not tomorrow, then coming out of the next several days, the CCWG will have more information to share or more detail to provide regarding its anticipated time line that we could then incorporate, or at least reflect as it impacts our work and the CWG time line. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. That's good to know.

Martin?

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks, Alissa. The slide that's currently on the screen, I think, yes, it's a good start, but I think we do need to factor in some of

the interdependencies we were speaking about in the last session.

In particular, a lot of this is going to require some form of negotiation between the communities affected and ICANN, in trying to work out how best to do some of the implementation. I.e., the detail.

And the other thing is the fact that we will have, almost certainly, quite a major bottleneck just in the staff resources sitting in ICANN, whether they be in the legal department or whether they be in the IANA team, which will -- in addition to its normal job of fulfilling its service expectations, has to try and identify the bits and pieces that it needs to put in place to ensure correct and full implementation of the job.

So, yes, it's useful to have the raw data but let's not forget that we will get the different communities all putting in bids to get quality time with a very small number of people sitting within ICANN or the IANA teams. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. I have Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Thank you, Alissa.

Two -- three issues I have to raise.

First, in the time line, I understood that this time line is based on one single public comment.

At the previous meeting, we have discussed that, and at least there were three or four ICG members that they thought that this one single public comment is not sufficient.

The reason is the experience that we gained in the CWG, that the first document put for public comment 1st of December, 2014, compared with the second one, is considerable changes to the process. Totally. It's quite different.

So there's a big risk if we eliminate another public document -- another public comment period with the expense of that -- something which may not satisfy NTIA.

So I would request that you come back to the need to have two public comment periods, each of which 40 days. Four zero days.

Second, the issue of three months -- three to four months by CCWG -- by CWG, sorry, does not indicate the starting time where this starts, and you said that once the issue is ready for implementation, it takes this time. But what is the starting date of that? We don't know yet.

And that PTI also involves many formalities that may take also the modification to the bylaw, and modification to the bylaw -- you cannot modify bylaw partially. You have to make one thorough modifications, totally.

Traditional bylaw, golden or fundamental bylaw, and many thing -- and as I mentioned, currently there is a lot of problems with respect to the -- how much of the Affirmation of Commitments should go to the fundamental bylaw, whether it should be to the fundamental traditional, and what happened to the remaining part of the Affirmation of Commitment and whether it should be cancelled subject to agreement between ICANN and NTIA and so on and so forth. This is not quite clear.

Therefore, I don't think that PTI would be three to four months and we should just take ourself that it's three to four months from the date that we don't know the start of that.

And coming to the IETF and others, 30th of September, we have discussed that. We don't come back to that.

But in the documentation of CWG with respect to the PTI, it is mentioned that it is not clear at this time what happen to the situation when all of the staff and all of the workload of the current operators will go to the PTI, and what happened to the other two communities than IT -- than the naming community,

whether they have a separate agreement, whether they don't have separate agreement, whether they would have another arrangement with ICANN. That is not clear, so that is –

But I think the point I can make that implementations for the CCWG takes considerable time is very important.

The last point I would like to make is the one I made two times, and this is the third time I am making.

To reply to the NTIA, we should just concentrate on the transition plan. Implementation, we could not define or specify any date because it is outside our -- of our capability and knowledge because it depends on many, many other issues, so we have to be quite clear and also take into account what Keith mentioned. Keith Drazek. That reply to the NTIA, we should wait until we have more clear idea from the draft of the reply for CC -- from CCWG to NTIA. That would help us because that may contribute to our activity. So we have to take that into account. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: So I have Daniel and then I'm going to put myself in the queue and respond to a couple of things that have been said.

And then Martin, Michael, and Keith Drazek?

Daniel, go ahead.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Thank you, Alissa. I'd like to speak in favor of only one public comment period. I do not think we need more than one. I did also not hear any of my distinguished colleagues besides Kavouss actually supporting that, but that's a different matter.

I think one is enough because we're not inventing new stuff.

And the constituent proposals have had a lot of comments, so I think in the interest of experience, we can have -- we can plan one public comment period.

If it turns out that due to the comments we have to change things or the comments are so substantive that we need to go back to the communities, that's a different matter. We can always decide that. But we should not plan on it, and that is my point. We should plan for only one public comment period.

The thing that was mentioned by both also Kavouss and Martin, I believe, is the bottleneck in ICANN resources. That's exactly why a staged approach and actually starting now already -- and that's something we discussed under the staged thing -- is a positive thing.

And we should also assume a bit of ICANN self-interest here in actually giving this high priority, so I don't see this as a big problem if we do this thing staged and don't wait for a big-bang day when suddenly everybody wants to negotiate with ICANN.

I think those who already should -- should start with that and ICANN should be encouraged to actually engage.

Number three, the PTI implementation, my business experience is that one can actually also stage the setup of wholly owned subsidiaries doing one -- so doing some of the legal work and it can be done and can be refined later on, so that's also something that should be looked at.

I think we should concentrate on two things as the ICG.

We've been asked about, if I remember it correctly, what is the time that we need and what is the time that we expect needs to be reserved for the implementation of the plan, and that -- I think we should answer both questions. I think it makes no sense to -- for principle reasons only to answer the plan part. We can also give our -- our best estimate of the implementation at this point. Of course with the qualification that that's something that's not in our responsibility but we can give our opinion about that, if we can agree on one. I'm done.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Daniel.

So I wanted to go back to a few things that have been said, starting with one point that Martin raised and I saw Elise concurring in the chatroom, and Elise I wanted to maybe put you on the spot for a moment, which is that -- and you raised this before as well, earlier this morning, that IANA -- the IANA department and the folks who work for IANA will also obviously be affected by these implementations potentially happening concurrently, and I'm just curious if you think that there's some specific input that we, as the ICG, might benefit from, from -- getting from IANA, specifically. We asked the board, obviously, about the overall, but, you know, you've kind of said twice now that there's, you know, perhaps something that IANA itself could tell us about that that might influence us. I'm just curious if that's the case, if you think that's something you want to come up with, or if you just want it to be acknowledged in the response that this will -- this will put demands on your time and your team's time.

ELISE GERICH: I think it's probably best to acknowledge that it puts demands on the IANA department team and its operational responsibilities today, as well as other commitments, and especially when there are requests that are potentially going to

chain the -- change the systems and tools and the processes and procedures that we follow within the department to deliver the services.

When that takes place, that includes obviously some development work, some testing work, some changes obviously in the tools, some training, changes in documentation. And I think most of the proposals have dealt a lot with more of the legal aspects of things and less about the operational day-to-day work. And that's not every proposal but some of them for sure.

And so I'm -- I'm just raising the issue that we are a small team. We already have some commitments to do things for various parts of the community. I'll mention from the names, the framework of interpretation working group. That's a very high priority for the names group. And that also makes changes in our processes, procedures, and tools.

And all those things have to be balanced; and none of that has been scoped, to my knowledge. A lot of what we're talking about is back of the envelope estimates right now. So I think I'd like to acknowledge that as we go down the detailed path -- and I think that's what Martin said. We have to get to some of the details at some point.

But right now we're giving estimates without having all the details there. And there are implications on the services we deliver now and the small team.

We're strongly supportive of all the activities. That's not the point. I just wanted to make sure that we have expectations of things from an implementation perspective. Might have to be phased. We talked about that this morning.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thank you. I think that point's well-taken, that we should incorporate into the response to NTIA.

So returning to a couple of the points that Kavouss made, first, I just want to go back and make sure we're all on the same page about what we were asked and why and so we're looking back now at the letter from NTIA. And I think it's important to remember that NTIA is trying to sort of plan for the fall, as the letter says. The contract has an expiry date, and they need to decide what to do as far as what happens when the contract expires.

They don't need to know on what day the transition proposal will be done or the implementation will be done. And so there's a balance there in terms of providing them with as much information as we can and some indication and estimates and

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires
21-25 JUNE 2015

so forth, which is what I think we can do versus knowing exactly what day any of these steps will start or end or even what month, to be honest, right? That's the way these contracts are written. They have extensions of many months or years. I think what we are trying to do is help with a ballpark estimate and not provide a very detailed time line other than if we can for the proposal finalization which we have some more detail about.

And so to that end, I think the question of when any particular implementation step starts is not necessarily that relevant. I mean, we don't even know how long the U.S. government review process might take. That's not something that's within our purview.

And so some of the implementation steps certainly won't take place until after that has concluded, and we don't know when that is. So I think we should focus more on the bulk, how much time the various items might take as opposed to when they might start or end.

I think we were also asked specifically about implementation, and we got some input from communities about implementation. So we should include that in our answer. Again, it might not be perfect. It might not be complete or have detailed time frames in there. But if we can give some

information, then we should. And I think we do have some information.

And then just the last point, separate point, about the single public comment period. We discussed this on the prior call. And the conclusion of the group was that we could insert the note into the time line that indicates that the time line may change, and we may need a second public comment period depending on what happens with the first one. And that was, I think, well-concluded by the group. So there's certainly the possibility open that we will require a second public comment period, but it's not included in the current time line and we have the note instead.

I would also say that while the experience of the CWG is instructive in some ways, the proposal that we put out for public comment will have been thoroughly vetted in the communities, all the separate components multiple times. And so I think the idea that it will change, you know, so dramatically, if it does change so dramatically, that we need an extensive further public comment period. All of the other pieces of the puzzle are going to take longer as well. We will certainly need to go back to the communities for much longer than we've planned and so forth.

So there's a lot of contingencies there. But my hope is that given how thoroughly vetted it has been, that we don't end up in that situation.

So that's all that I had to say. And in the queue I have Martin, Michael, Joe, and Kuo-Wei.

So, Martin. Thank you.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks very much, Alissa. Yeah, I put my flag up. Sorry to take the floor again quite so early after my last intervention. But I put my flag up about two consultation steps because certainly being by nature a pessimist, I always expect things to take rather longer than we thought and also that if anything can go wrong, it will go wrong. And, therefore, that's certainly why in the early discussions I put my hand up and said, you know, we ought to at least have a contingency for a second consultation.

However, like you, Alissa, I do think we have in the various communities gone through quite exhaustive, to say nothing of exhausting, work in preparing and validating the proposals. And certainly I think your analysis that if we do need to go out for a second consultation, we've got rather more problems than just going out for another 40-day consultation because

there's going to have to be some quite serious rethinking somewhere along the lines.

So certainly as far as I'm concerned so long as, A, we are aware that there is a risk and that we flag that risk but that there could be reasonable grounds for optimism -- I always having difficulty saying that word, "optimism" (chuckles) -- that we have got perhaps something that is workable.

The only thing I wonder about, though, is that if we get significant input that would allow us -- or that would require us to go back to a community to seek further -- further comment from them, that might again take us a little bit longer. But I'm reasonably happy that we can with a note express the opportunity for getting done with just the one consultation.

I also sort of picked up on the point about the -- at what stage would the various communities start to do the preparatory work. And I think, again, while I'm in an optimistic frame of mind -- so make the most of it, guys -- that it would be worthwhile talking to the communities to find out when they think that they are likely to be prepared to invest a lot of effort in doing the pre-decision preparatory work. Because while I take your point that

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires
21-25 JUNE 2015

the actual date they start and the actual date they finish is irrelevant, they'll have a block of work that will overlap with other people's activities. And, therefore, we need to be aware of those potential interactions and how they might hit the bottleneck.

So I think it is worthwhile saying, do you feel optimistic again -- darn, that word again -- to such a point that you will invest the resources, the effort to start thinking about among other things the PTI legal structure, the legal -- the framework you want to put into place for PTI? You know, do you want to do it now? Start it now? Or will you actually wait until you're damn sure that the ICG is going to put its proposal into an envelope and send it on? So I think that sort of needs to be -- needs to be thought about.

And the last point I wanted to make was on the implementation. And I understand Kavouss' point. And I think it's a very important point about we are not responsible for implementation. But a proposal that comes from us I don't think will be complete if we do not understand the implications of the implementation time lines. So it's not for us to say how long these things will take to implement, but we do need to get the

communities to give us fairly good advice that we can then put forward. So I think that is an important part of our eventual proposal. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you.

Michael.

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Yeah, I wanted to come to the consultation issue. And my thinking concurs very much to what Alissa and the pessimistic Martin said. It brings me to question whether or not I understand things correctly. If we put something for consultation, I understood that we will ask questions. We are not going to do a (indiscernible) consultation of what has been consulted already. So that we are kind of rehashing what the communities have already rehashed individually. I'm understanding that we are looking at how things work together and whether the criteria of the NTIA is fulfilled. So we're not opening the whole ball game again. So that limits what can go wrong in this thing.

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires
21-25 JUNE 2015

And then we have basically three scenarios. One is that everybody says great, everything works. NTIA should be happy and all that. So nothing.

Then we will find that some people are not really happy, but the ICG thinks their reasoning is not very founded and there shouldn't be anything brought back to the communities. So the ICG would have to justify that because we are building a public record and kind of public access but not go into a consultation.

Only in the third case when there is something really discovered which will need the communities to put their hats together to make it work, only then we would need this kind of secondary consultation mechanism because we will have to go back to the communities.

So I'm just checking whether that kind of understanding is correct or whether I missed something.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Joe. Did Joe drop?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, he dropped.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay, Joe's comment is in the chat. He was supporting Martin's first intervention, noting that we should include detail about possible contingencies in our response to NTIA.

Kuo-Wei.

KUO-WEI WU:

I'd like to share my experience when I was the IANA Committee Chair. If I remember correctly, the last contract between IANA and NTIA for the IANA contract, the IANA Committee is not going to review or make any comment about IANA office operations. We only check procedure-wise, nothing more than procedures.

So I expect if the ICG brings the proposal to the NTIA, eventually whatever the structure to overlook the IANA, might need to think about IANA operation is based on all RFCs and guidebooks. And even the ICANN board, we never, never to make a comment or discuss the operations. So I think this is very important.

If some of the people doesn't understand how the IANA Committee is running, I think this might be a very good time to share with the ICG members when you prepare your proposals.

The second issue I would like to raise, too, is -- this is my personal opinion. The ICANN board I think is basically -- if this proposal is very sophisticated and complicated, I think that there might be a risk for eventually the numbers and names protocol might be in a different direction. And that would mean the IANA office running as a single unit or running consistent. It might have some risk. I wish we also think about it.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you.

Daniel?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Thank you, Alissa. Just to pick up with Kuo-Wei there, I was a bit concerned when I heard Elise saying that she expects a lot of procedural changes or things that she needs the community to review because the workings of the IANA are expected to change because of this transition.

I have a (indiscernible) the protocol parameters and numbers proposal. And both of them are adamant that none of this is going to change at this stage because you do not change the pilot and the engine at the same time while the aircraft's flying.

EN

So I would expect that the CWG would be wise enough also not to propose any technical changes, changes of procedures, and so on at the same time.

If that's not the case, then we really have a problem of stability. And I think everybody who is concerned about the stability of the system should raise multiple red flags in order to pass.

So I can't see frankly for myself a lot of additional demands on the IANA department other than checking that the proposed SLAs are roughly identical, (indiscernible) identical to what's been there before with NTIA.

And, thirdly, I would caution really anyone making a proposal (indiscernible) assuming there are technical changes, changes to procedures of actually doing your work at the same time. That's just not good practice.

Which brings me to the other point I wanted to make when Martin said that we need to ask the communities about when they are prepared to do the work or some of the work of actually doing the implementation. And I can only note that both the IETF and the RIRs and CRISP have spoken to that in response to our questions. So we already have that information. Just a note.

I'm done.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Daniel. That's a good point that you just made at the end. And I'm wondering if we could sort of informally try to gather the same -- the answer to the same question from the CWG this week, not that they're not busy. I don't know the answer to that question. Definitely wasn't communicated to us. So we should probably think about a way to get that information from the CWG.

My queue is empty, I believe. Oh, no. Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, two things. I think the reply we will provide at some time to NTIA should not be in contradiction with the reply provided by CCWG, at least should be more or less in line, is not identical but more or less in line, number one.

Number two, the reply should be in a way that provides some information to the NTIA with respect to the duration of the extension. If we say that we don't achieve 30th of September, does it mean that contract will be extended six months, one year, two year, and so on and so forth. So we have to have something at least help or assist or reply to the -- to the letter.

With respect to the implementation, the colleagues are concentrating on the PTI. The issue of the naming is not only PTI. It's PTI, IFR, CSC, appeal mechanisms, fundamental bylaw,

and there are many, many other things, so I don't think that three or four months is sufficient to implement that.

So that is something that we have to –

Coming to my proposal for the two public comments period -- okay? -- with the -- let us say some sort of arrangement or consensus is emerged that if you put some contingencies that if it is required qualification, there would be another public comment, I have no problem with that. We could not exclude that that is okay.

But we should quite be careful about what we -- what we reply and not to just concentrate on something that we don't know.

With respect to what Elise said, I think that this is a comment from somebody who operates the system, so I don't think that we should say that it is valid or not valid, so that is something that they know better than us what are the involvement, what changes they have to make. It is not identical to what they do today. Not totally but is different. How is different and how much time involve, it is something that we have to consider.

So I could go so more to agree with what she said. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Okay. So there's one other issue that I thought it would be useful for us to discuss here which relates to the response that we got from ICANN, and that relates to the bylaws changes. So if we could get that -- the response from ICANN projected, that would be good. Because there's some text in there about following normal process for bylaws changes, and I know we had some traffic on the mailing list about this, so it would good to have a little discussion about that.

Milton, if you want to kick that off, thank you. I was just trying to get it up -- get that portion of the response up on the screen here.

MILTON MUELLER: Yes. I think the key question is the extent to which implementation means that ICANN is -- ICANN's board is essentially passing bylaw changes that would be required by the proposals and that would already be drafted, or would they be drafting them themselves, which means they would have to put them out for public comment and then we would be reviewing them in their typical 40-day comment process. Hopefully it would be the former. That they would be given the bylaw changes.

However, in discussing this with some people during the break, it was recommended and -- I would like to get Kuo-Wei's response to this -- that is it possible for ICANN legal to start working with the CWG and the CCWG to make sure that the actual language is drafted not by ICANN legal but by the -- the working groups, but certainly in a way that ICANN legal would not object to or would not see problems with going forward.

This is kind of an improvised response to the problem, but -- and again, it's a CWG and CCWG issue, but of course it impacts us because if by implementation ICANN means that they're running their own bylaws modification progress -- process, then we have both control issues and delay issues to contend with.

ALISSA COOPER: Kuo-Wei, do you want to speak to that?

KUO-WEI WU: If the CWG or CCWG is required to send a request to the ICANN board, I think we can talk about it. But again, if they are talking about a bylaw change, of course the ICANN board, we also need legal advice, you know, regarding for the complexity and the implementation stuff.

So I think basically to respond to Milton's question, if the CWG or CCWG sends a request to ICANN -- the ICANN board, I think we will respond for that.

ALISSA COOPER: Milton, how does that sound?

MILTON MUELLER: I think it sounds acceptable for the time being.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Since -- the chairs have to think about that a little bit in the context of our response to NTIA, which is kind of due next week, or the week after, and I realize this might not be totally sorted by then, so we'll use some fancy words to make that clear.

Yeah, go ahead, Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Patrik Faltstrom.

Let me ask a question to the people that are involved in specifically the CCWG accountability.

Regarding the bylaw changes that you might envision, is your plan -- or is it included in your plan that the word -- that the explanation of the bylaw changes you provide will or might be word by word the actual bylaw change itself or is it more only the intention behind the bylaw change that then must go through the process that the ICANN board is using?

The reason why I ask the question is that if it is -- if you have envisioned to include to work out the precise wording within your process that can then go through your public comment period, then at least it might be the case that the chance is sort of higher that the bylaw changes might be accepted as-is.

ALISSA COOPER: So in the queue, I have Kavouss.

Kuo-Wei are you back in the queue? Yes?

KUO-WEI WU: I'd just like to remind you, one thing is as you know, the -- Fadi's term is finished by next month, so of course we'd like to respond as quick as possible, but remember, the ICANN board, at least during this time, we also have

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires
21-25 JUNE 2015

additional work we need to do on the CEO search committee, so there will be a little bit of tension, particularly in the timing.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Okay. I have Kavouss and then Manal and then Keith Drazek. Go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: To reply to Patrik's questions, I don't think that it is appropriate to talk about intention of change of the bylaw. It should be the detail word by word modifications because the devil is in the details. I give you one example.

Among many, many unanswered questions, I take one, which would be in the bylaw, saying that privately led process. There has been a lot of objections to that, saying that it should be modified to talk about multistakeholder, open, transparent, and inclusive, rather than saying they are privately led organizations or process.

There are many type of that questions.

The preliminary assessment of the legal counsel in a pre-draft document was, it takes about a year to provide the detailed bylaws. However, there is still a lot of questions whether particular things or a particular provision or provisions should be in fundamental bylaw, should be in a traditional bylaw, a problem of some of the AoC should be in traditional or fundamental or should not be, and the -- another issue whether some other things should be in the procedural and general rules application, neither part of the fundamental bylaw nor the traditional bylaw, something operational.

There are many unanswered questions. Therefore, I don't think that ICANN would be in a position to start to do something without having clear picture of the situation. And what we have also heard, ICANN could start when they receive something and based on some element which already properly defined. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL: Just to seek clarification. Milton, you mentioned that the ICANN legal could work with the cross-community working groups on this, but does this, again, exclude the public comment period? I

think there was also a public comment period requested by -- for any ICANN bylaws changes, and I think this was also one of the points raised, so now we have two things, the ICANN legal to agree and then also the public comment period, right?

MILTON MUELLER: Well, the point is that we would have the CCWG handling the public comment rather than a separate -- an additional ICANN public comment process. That's what I would be shooting for.

So that ICANN would hopefully be able to work with the CCWG in providing adoptable drafts of bylaw changes rather than going through their own process to propose bylaw changes and then having a public comment period in which people say, "Oh, you know, we want you to change that again," and that would just be added onto the CCWG process. So I think that would be really pushing the time line out quite a bit if we do it that way.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you. I was not clear how this would solve the one public comment period, so thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Keith?

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

So in response to the question does the CCWG anticipate providing explicit language, recommended language for the bylaw changes, or more directional advice, in a sense, I agree with Kavouss. I think because the devil is in the details, I think specific language is going to be necessary before this process can move forward, but I think the specific question you asked about where in the process does that take place, we -- I think we need to take that back to the chairs -- the co-chairs of the CCWG and ask them that specific question and then come back to the ICG with the answer.

I tend to agree with Kavouss that the -- that the details need to be there. The question is at what point is that done? Is it done, you know, for the next public comment period? Is it something that takes place subsequently? You know, I think that remains to be seen. So I would ask for, you know, 24 hours to come back with an answer to the question.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. I think that would be very helpful because that's basically the crux of the matter is if there -- if all of the bylaws changes are going to go out for public comment as part of the next CCWG public comment period, then the -- the ICANN board

doing the same process afterwards seems duplicative, but if not, then it's a different issue.

So go ahead.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Alissa.

Just to follow up, also to the recommendation, I think that Milton raised, about, you know, could ICANN staff or ICANN legal work with the CCWG and the CWG, you know, I think that's one possible approach, but we need to remember that both of those groups have legal counsel. They have their own legal advisers that I think will be working very closely with the community working groups to develop language, and of course ICANN legal would need to be involved in that process. But I don't think it's a matter of ICANN legal simply working directly with the CWG and the CCWG because of the existence of its own counsel.

ALISSA COOPER: Well, sorry. Just to follow up on that, I -- I thought the point is that it's sort of like the two sides have their legal representation, right?

So the -- the legal advisers are there kind of offering suggestions and negotiating on behalf of the CWG, but ICANN legal is there

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires
21-25 JUNE 2015

because ICANN is the other party to all of these changes that are taking place. Is that -- that's right? Okay. So they all -- they both need to be there, essentially.

Okay. Kavouss and then Milton.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. Let me reiterate the following. Until all questions are not properly answered, it is not appropriate to start to draft the bylaw partially.

Among many, many examples, I give you one example.

Currently, for modification of bylaw, there are two versions.

One, in the membership model, the bylaw could be modified by ICANN and community comment on that, accept or reject that.

Similarly, in the membership approach, the community could initiate modification of bylaw. In the designator model, the community could comment on the modification made by ICANN but could not initiate the modification of bylaw.

Since there has been no decision on whether designator model or membership model will be implemented, or voluntary model, there is no possibility to start to draft a partial bylaw. Would be

repetitions and would be waste of time, money, and energy. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Anyone else in the queue? No? Okay. So I think on this -- on this question, the -- Keith and Kavouss have the action item to try and get more information from the CCWG about the plans as regards to the bylaws changes text and when that seems like it would appear in the proposal or not and whether it will go for public comment.

And then we'll act on that based on what we get back from them.

I think as far as the rest of the response that we need to put together for NTIA, we have all the pieces ready and we need to -- the chairs need to write some words down. I think that would include, again, a reference to our time line, noting the contingencies, references to the input that we got back from the three communities, some discussion about the contingencies amongst those communities, some discussion about the fact that the IANA team will bear some of the -- you know, will require some resources to do the implementation steps as well, and I think that's about all we had for the response.

So we are going to endeavor to put a draft response together tonight so we can have some discussion of it tomorrow and then hopefully conclude by next Thursday or so.

So that's the plan there.

Any other comments on this topic?

No. Okay. So what I would propose is that we take a 10-minute break and then at 4:40 -- so that question can convene with the secretariat on the wrap-up items, and then at 4:40 we will have a summary of what happened today and some thoughts about tomorrow, slash, tonight. People have things to do tonight, I know.

So Kavouss, did you want to say something before we break?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, I want to say something. That if ICG allow us, that we participate, to the extent possible, tomorrow in CCWG in order to -- not to present, but still at least convey the views of the ICG to the CCWG and get back to you, so we will not be able -- at least myself, I will not be able to be the whole time tomorrow in your meeting and so on and so forth. I have to attend the CCWG, so I just wanted to inform you as a member of ICG. Thank you

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah. So there's -- is there a detailed agenda available for the CCWG? I think I saw one earlier in the week. But during this 10-minute break, let's convene with the liaisons because I'd like to try to plan our agenda so that you guys can maximize your time in both groups.

So let's break until 4:40. Thanks.

[BREAK]

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Can people please take their seats?

(Bell ringing).

So let's try to wrap up today and see where we are.

You see on the screen the action items and decisions taken. Let's try to go through them. And let's go through them one by one and see if anyone has any issues.

Action item number 1: ICG chairs to draft a question to go to the communities regarding the IANA trademark and domain name, send to the internal-cg mailing list and discuss and finalize during day 2 of the face-to-face meeting.

Kavouss, do you want to say something?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, deadline for that? Identify a deadline, within some time zone, not leave it totally open.

ALISSA COOPER: Tonight. It's going to be done.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: The answer from the community. No, no, no. I know that you are doing -- the answer from the community. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, it will have to include a deadline. And we'll do that and talk about it tomorrow. Good point.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you.

Action Number 2: ICG liaisons to CCWG accountability to go back to the CCWG co-chairs to clarify when the bylaw changes will take place in the CCWG process, specifically when the actual text is to be produced and bring this information back to the ICG.

Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Perhaps the liaison also mentions to the CCWG, not to just the co-chairs, but the whole meeting the link between the reply that ICG is intending to provide to NTIA and the reply from the CCWG, at least not to be in contradiction. What does it mean? That means that we need to have more information about the reply that will be pushing the CCWG to provide a reply that would help us how to formulate our reply to the NTIA. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yes. Thank you. Yes, we added a little bit -- we were a little bit too specific in the text we proposed. Of course, you as the liaisons, we trust you to use the best process and whatever process that you find appropriate to find the answer regardless of whether it's to communicate with the co-chairs or however you are gathering the data.

Number 3: ICG chairs to draft a response to the NTIA letter, including references to the ICG time line and contingencies, input received from the three operational communities, and resources for the IANA team, send to the internal cg mailing list for discussion on day 2 of the face-to-face meeting.

And then we have the decisions, three decisions. The first -- oh, four, okay. Sorry. Thank you.

The decisions taken, number one, volunteer group to complete individual assessment of the names proposal by July 7 in time for decision on the ICG call on July 8. Volunteer list: Russ Housley, Russ Mundy, Alan Barrett, Keith Davidson, Martin Boyle, Mary Uduma, and Demi Getschko.

Decision Number 2: Volunteer group to complete individual assessment of the combined proposal by July 14 in time for discussion on the ICG call on July 15. Volunteer list: Lynn St. Amour, Milton Mueller, Manal Ismail, Keith Drazek, Russ Housley,

Joseph Alhadeff, Paul Wilson, Narelle Clark, Xiaodong Lee. And, of course, this is -- this is, of course, dependent on we receiving the -- the proposal as expected.

Number 4, ICG liaisons to the CCWG accountability to continue to flag issues that may -- excuse me? I skipped 3?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Yes, you did.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you, Daniel.

Volunteer group to look at formulating public comment questions to be the same volunteer drafting team for the combined proposal preface, executive summary, introduction. Alissa Cooper, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Lynn St. Amour, Milton Mueller, Martin Boyle, Russ Housley, Manal Ismail, and Joseph Alhadeff.

Kavouss, did you also want to be on that list?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: No. Add my name to this list. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So you want to be added to the list? So please add Kavouss to the volunteer group of decision number 3.

Martin.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks, Patrik.

Can you give any clues on time line for that particular decision because they're not there at the moment.

And, secondly, I don't actually remember volunteering for that one.

[Laughter]

ALISSA COOPER: So back when it was called the preface, I believe --(laughter) -- I believe you said something along the lines of I guess I should be a part of this something or other.

There's a lot of people there, and, you know -- the idea of that really was to have a small number of people sort of get something together and then share it with the larger group. So if you want to take yourself off, that's perfectly acceptable. You have other things going on.

MARTIN BOYLE: Okay. Now that's clear, me and my big mouth. In that case, if I am on this group, timing is actually quite important because of holiday commitments. I'm going somewhere very, very remote, and I'm hoping not to have any WiFi connection whatsoever.

And, secondly, if I don't take part, then I would notice there's nobody from the CC community. And I think it's actually quite important that we do get a bit of balance in the community which is why I put my hand up going back to a time when I can no longer remember. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: So this is just the drafting group. You will certainly -- and all of the CC participants will have an opportunity to comment on all the text when it comes back to the group. So it's not -- yeah, okay.

So the timing of this, I mean, these things need to be done at the end of July. And it would be better to get them done sooner because then our two calls in the middle of July really will be dedicated to assessing the proposal most likely.

So I would say the timing on this is, you know, immediately after the ICANN meeting, we want to be closing on this, I would say. Although some of it will have to wait until the very end of July.

So end of June, intense period. End of July, intense period for this.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Martin, can you just clarify, you're good by still having your name there? Is that what you said?

MARTIN BOYLE: Yes, I did. It's the week of the 15th that I'm not going to be around. Thanks.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: As Alissa said, I think we -- the week of 15 we will be with other things than this specific item.

I also note in the chat that Daniel Karrenberg requested to be added to group number 3.

So Decision Number 4: ICG liaisons to CCWG-accountability, to continue to flag issues that may impact ICG's assessment process. Volunteer group to look into CCWG accountability's work and how that will impact ICG's assessment of the CWG/IANA proposal and find combined proposal. Volunteer list: Lynn St. Amour, Milton Mueller, Kavouss Arasteh, and Keith Drazek.

Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: One procedural problem. "Liaison" in the CCWG has a specific meaning. I would suggest that you change that ICG contact group with -- not liaison because if you have "liaison" that means ICG has now instead of two assigned, more liaison officers to the CCWG. I have no problem with that.

But I think the intention of this volunteer group is to discuss the issue that requires to be raised or flagged to the CCWG. So I suggest that you change the "liaison" with "contact group" with CCWG accountability to continue to flag issues and so on and so forth. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much.

Michael?

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Would like to be added to the group.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: That is noted. Please add Michael to the group.

Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL: So by continuing to flag issues, is this an ongoing type of working group or does it have some deadline time plan?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: This is an ongoing -- this is a group that we decided to -- we saw a need to create the group so that we -- the ICG faster could discuss potential issues so we can react quicker if there is need for it. So I envision this group to be needed as long as we are, depending on the work or outcome that is coming from that work.

MANAL ISMAIL: Fair enough. So just to flag potential interests when done with other voluntary work, volunteer work. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much for continuing to donate time to our work. It's much appreciated, Manal.

Names can either be on the list or not be on the list. The secretariat just asked me whether your name should be added,

and I said yes. But it is noted that you don't have time at the moment because of other commitments.

Martin, is that an old flag or do you want to say something?

So, Alissa, back to you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Thanks. And we'll circulate the final versions of these to the list.

If we can look at the agenda for tomorrow briefly. It's getting bigger which doesn't make it less blurry necessarily.

Okay. So for tomorrow, this was the agenda that was circulated previously, not really knowing necessarily what would come out of today. I think we do have these two follow-up items for tomorrow. One is the question to the communities about the IANA trademark and domain name, and the other one is discussing a draft response to -- starting to discuss a draft response to the letter from NTIA.

I'm not sure in terms of the two slots that we had reserved for overflow topics, we probably -- we might not need that much time. Certainly not for the IPR one. That one will be straightforward. We will try to condense the morning part a little bit so that the folks who are attending the CCWG can make

sure to get over there in the afternoon when the time line discussion is happening. And they'll be going over there in the morning as well, in and out, is my understanding. But we'll try to accommodate their schedules as best we can.

And then the afternoon material, a lot of it is about planning for next week and after next week. So that part you can miss and not miss any of the substance. So we'll work with this a little bit and change it for tomorrow.

So, Kavouss, did you have a response?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, it is a good subject, the first one, outreach. It was discussed in the CCWG when the reply came -- and we had almost about 45 to 48 replies. Although the number of replies are 54. But there are double reply from -- reply from one person in two different areas. And it was mentioned that there is a lack of reply for many areas in the world and so on and so forth. It would be good.

My question is: What is your plan to have that outreach? What procedures? What course of action you propose to have that outreach? Or in brief, what is the modality to that have outreach? Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:　　　　Yes.　That is the question.　That is a question for discussion tomorrow for sure.

Okay.　So we will see everyone tomorrow at 9:00.　Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]