

----- (02/07/2015 08:50) -----

Yannis li 2: Welcome to the ICG Face-toFace meeting # 4 Day 2! Please note that chat sessions are being archived and follow the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior: <http://www.icann.org/en/news/in-focus/accountability/expected-standards>

----- (02/07/2015 08:56) -----

Alissa Cooper: Hello

----- (02/07/2015 09:01) -----

demi getschko: hi!

----- (02/07/2015 09:07) -----

Jennifer Chung: Hello All, please find the link to the live scribe text here: <http://www.streamtext.net/player?event=Olivia-7Feb15>

----- (02/07/2015 09:18) -----

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Russ +1.

----- (02/07/2015 09:20) -----

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: and Daniel +1.

----- (02/07/2015 09:21) -----

demi getschko: +1 . To both communities

----- (02/07/2015 09:22) -----

RoomOp(David): Remote Participants please mute audio if you're not speaking

RoomOp(David): mute microphones

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (echo in Alissa's audio)

Alissa Cooper: yuck, sorry

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Jari: yes.

----- (02/07/2015 09:37) -----

Alissa Cooper: Daniel said what I was going to say.

----- (02/07/2015 09:47) -----

demi getschko: (no trascript on Adobe...)

demi getschko: ok now! thanks

----- (02/07/2015 09:53) -----

Yannis li 2: Please found the timeline graphic at <https://www.dropbox.com/s/7p0m9w5hmrwdlh9/TimelineGraphic-v7.xlsx?dl=0>

Mohamed EL Bashir: The projection is not helping, you can refer to Alissa email with the updated time line

----- (02/07/2015 09:55) -----

Jennifer Chung: All - the link to the timeline spreadsheet is also available here: <https://www.dropbox.com/s/ofsiog3bfk7f85a/TimelineGraphic-v7.xlsx?dl=0>

----- (02/07/2015 10:58) -----

Yannis li: We have just encountered some technical problems. The meeting will be resumed shortly after a coffee break

Lynn St.Amour: ok, thank you. could you give us 5 mins. notice?

Yannis li: @Lynn ok

----- (02/07/2015 11:15) -----

Yannis li: We will be reconvening shortly

----- (02/07/2015 11:21) -----

Yannis li: The meeting is resumed now. And we are on the agenda item of the ICG timeline.

Lynn St.Amour: Thank you.

----- (02/07/2015 11:24) -----

Yannis li: You may refer to the Proposal Finalization Process at <https://www.dropbox.com/s/1lm1ioo9er1kcpf/proposal-finalization-process-v5-clean.docx?dl=0>

----- (02/07/2015 11:33) -----

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): Thanks to Patrik and Alissa for suggesting a constructive path forward. I agree that any changes to the ICG timeline should be informed by the latest target dates provided by the CWG-Naming. It's logical to take the June date and extrapolate our own work requirements and timeline from there. I would strongly prefer to avoid pushing the ICG's target date out beyond what we have previously communicated. I would prefer we try to identify opportunities for efficiencies and compressing the work of the ICG wherever possible. The recommendation from Patrik and Alissa will help us do this.

----- (02/07/2015 11:35) -----

Mohamed EL Bashir: +1 Agree @Keith

----- (02/07/2015 11:36) -----

Lynn St.Amour: @Keith +1 and good path forward suggested by Alissa and Patrik

----- (02/07/2015 11:39) -----

Lynn St.Amour: @Martin - good suggestion to get ahead of our likely questions

----- (02/07/2015 11:41) -----

Daniel Karrenberg: I think it is a recipe for disaster to try to change the already process and time-line for our work once we have all proposals on-the-fly before we are on the spot on Monday.

Daniel Karrenberg: already agreed

Mary Uduma: Keith which deadline are you referring to ? Sept, 15?

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): @Mary: Yes

----- (02/07/2015 11:43) -----

Daniel Karrenberg: Our position should be: "The situation has changed since we are missing input from the CWG. ICG will continue to do all the work we can do at this time. Our current plan calls for us to deliver our product 6 months after we have all the input."

----- (02/07/2015 11:45) -----

Alissa Cooper: +1 Michael - we need talking points even if the talking points are "timeline is under discussion"

Mary Uduma: Comment period??? Keith?

Daniel Karrenberg: I think "timeline is under discussion" will create FUD

Alissa Cooper: someone is going to ask

Alissa Cooper: so we need some answer

Daniel Karrenberg: The answer should be "Our plans are currently unchanged. Expect result 6 months after we receive the response from the CWG."

Alissa Cooper: not sure we have consensus about that, but hard for me to know not being in the room

----- (02/07/2015 11:48) -----

Daniel Karrenberg: i observe that there is no consensus, there is confusion. Michael raised the important point about what our message should be.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: can we discuss this under AOB?

----- (02/07/2015 11:51) -----

Mary Uduma: My understanding is that we are going to receive more input from the chairs in line with Patrik's proposal though, the talking point is not yet agreed. May be the chairs would propose something for all us to comment.

----- (02/07/2015 11:53) -----

Alissa Cooper: From the RFP: "Commenters should be aware that ICG will direct comments received to the relevant operational communities if appropriate. The ICG will review comments received as time and resources permit and in accordance with the overall timeline for the transition. That is, comments received about specific proposals may not be reviewed until those proposals have been submitted to the ICG. The ICG may establish defined public comment periods about specific topics in the future, after the complete formal responses to the RFP have been received."

----- (02/07/2015 11:55) -----

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): Adding on to Daniel's suggested language, how about: ""Our plans are currently unchanged. Expect result 6 months after we receive the response from the CWG. Once the ICG receives the CWG proposal, we will look for any opportunities to accelerate our work while ensuring a predictable process and the necessary public consultations."

----- (02/07/2015 12:01) -----

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: @Keith: I suggest to discuss it under AOB, it's too important for coming to a conclusion here

----- (02/07/2015 12:16) -----

Milton Mueller: My i just point out that names proposal will come last and therefore we must process comments just before we send the entire thing out to public comment. So we will deal with lots of public comment on the names proposal, and we will have to decide whether the entire thing has enough public support to send to NTIA. We therefore need to look carefully at the initial round of comments to ICG Forum in that light

----- (02/07/2015 12:18) -----

Milton Mueller: heh, I wasn't insinuating that Daniel wanted to ignore comments, i was directly stating that his approach to them would appear to everyone as if we were

----- (02/07/2015 12:26) -----

Lynn St.Amour: Martin, can we draw you in as well?

----- (02/07/2015 12:28) -----

Lynn St.Amour: @Russ Mundy - do we REALLLY think that will happen?

----- (02/07/2015 12:30) -----

Alan Barrett: digest makes sense. If there are many comments saying the same thing, or one person who keeps on asking the same question over and over, there's no need for more than one response.

Alissa Cooper: +1 Milton

Lynn St.Amour: +1 (twice) Milton

----- (02/07/2015 12:34) -----

Alissa Cooper: I think we would need to actually ask the community, not ask Jari or Paul

----- (02/07/2015 12:45) -----

Milton Mueller: "solving for the negative, perhaps the imaginary" - well said, Lynn

----- (02/07/2015 12:46) -----

Alissa Cooper: we got an actual question for izumi, it wasn't imaginary

Alissa Cooper: *from

Lynn St.Amour: the imaginary problems was what we were addressing by our concerns about this "process" not the comments themselves

Milton Mueller: right

Lynn St.Amour: and I did say maybe imaginary problems :-)

Yannis li: There will be 15 min break and we will continue the session at 13:00. Thank you

----- (02/07/2015 13:03) -----

Yannis li: We are waiting for people to reconvene and the meeting session will be starting shortly

----- (02/07/2015 13:07) -----

Yannis li: The meeting has been resumed now and on the agenda item on proposal finalization process

----- (02/07/2015 13:15) -----

Daniel Karrenberg: Milton: I suggest you re-read the transcript: MILTON MUELLER: WELL, AS YOU PROBABLY KNOW, THIS IS MILTON MUELLER. I DON'T AGREE WITH DANIEL. I THINK, YOU KNOW, IT TOOK DANIEL BASICALLY -- I DON'T KNOW -- FIVE MINUTES TO SAY THAT HE THINKS WE SHOULD JUST IGNORE COMMENTS.

Daniel Karrenberg: i took no offense. I just wanted to make it clear that this was not what I said.

----- (02/07/2015 13:18) -----

Daniel Karrenberg: i agree with keith drazek's suggested addition to our position. to me it goes without saying that we will try to work as fast as possible, but i agree with keith that it would be positive to make that explicit.

----- (02/07/2015 13:33) -----

Lynn St.Amour: @Alissa - I do think that is important -- in any case we would have the best possible information available to us.

Lynn St.Amour: whether complete or not, it will have been significantly informed by the ICANN week.

----- (02/07/2015 13:39) -----

Alissa Cooper: which question?

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): Adding on to Daniel's suggested language, how about: ""Our plans are currently unchanged. Expect result 6 months after we receive the response from the CWG. Once the ICG receives the CWG proposal, we will look for any opportunities to accelerate our work while ensuring a predictable process and the necessary public consultations."

Alissa Cooper: not sure we need "Once the ICG receives the CWG proposal" since we are already looking at ways to accelerate

----- (02/07/2015 13:42) -----

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): Agreed Alissa, no objection.

Milton Mueller: Result = integrated names, numbers, protocol param proposal sent to the NTIA?

----- (02/07/2015 13:44) -----

Milton Mueller: I think this language needs to be amended as suggested by Jari to leave open the possibility of an incremental change (e.g, independent submission of numbers and protocols to NTIA)

----- (02/07/2015 13:45) -----

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): I support Joe's comments and suggestion.

Milton Mueller: talking points?

----- (02/07/2015 13:52) -----

Mohamed EL Bashir: 1+ to talking points for ICG open session in Monday

----- (02/07/2015 13:57) -----

Milton Mueller: certainly Joe's phrasing is safer ;-)

----- (02/07/2015 14:02) -----

RussMundy: very much support Joe's current statement!!

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): +1 Joe

Daniel Karrenberg: I just added an additional talking point on the mailing list. The intent is to be nice to the communities that did deliver and to prevent anyone from asserting that our work is now blocked.

----- (02/07/2015 14:05) -----

Alissa Cooper: oh I thought everyone was leaving for the GAC

----- (02/07/2015 14:07) -----

Mohamed EL Bashir: GAC members not everyone

Alissa Cooper: I disagree with the first talking point, for the record.

----- (02/07/2015 14:11) -----

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: Hmm....ok, Alissa, let me try differently. If the question is "Does the ICG think that there is a realistic chance to reach the original target date ?", can you please suggest an answer? "We do not know" or "we do not think it is realistic"

----- (02/07/2015 14:14) -----

Alissa Cooper: thanks milton for translating

Milton Mueller: We need to eliminate the second statement under the first question, about numbers and protocol proposals

Milton Mueller: i thought we did not agree on that

----- (02/07/2015 14:17) -----

Alissa Cooper: probably easier not to repeat similar talking points in multiple places

Milton Mueller: not just easier, but better

Narelle Clark: How about: "The ICG will continue to work with the proposals it has."

Milton Mueller: minor nit, on first question "expect result" is awkward english, we should either say "expect a result" or "Expect results"

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): I agree with Joe's concern about the specificity of the "6 months". If we refer to 6 months from receipt of CWG, the headline coming out of this meeting will be "ICG says new Deadline is December 2015!"

RussMundy: +1 to Joe & Keith's statements

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): +1 Paul

----- (02/07/2015 14:22) -----

Narelle Clark: "The ICG is working actively towards assembling a proposal from all three communities as it receives each proposal. At this stage it is optimistic that a complete proposal will be compiled no later than six months after receipt of the work of the CWG. Should this be completed earlier, then the ICG will do so."

----- (02/07/2015 14:23) -----

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: @Milton+Keith: 1+1

Jari Arkko: suggestion: ... with the proposals received => with the proposals already received.

Jari Arkko: the new formulation on the last paragraph is a bit negative in tone. "complex". "we are doing it carefully and we want to ensure we the best possible design"

RussMundy: Like Milton, I liked Keith's original words that said once we get the names proposal we can proceed as we've previously described

----- (02/07/2015 14:25) -----

Milton Mueller: i like the way joe specifies the dependencies

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): Me too.

----- (02/07/2015 14:27) -----

Milton Mueller: true, "seriously damaged" is too negative and "derailed" is slightly negative, but i think we need to squarely confront the idea that the CWG's additional time is somehow a threat to the success of the process

----- (02/07/2015 14:30) -----

Jari Arkko: +1 to what milton is saying now

----- (02/07/2015 14:31) -----

Milton Mueller: how about just delete the word incremental? "we will make progress"

----- (02/07/2015 14:34) -----

Lynn St.Amour: +1 Patrik

----- (02/07/2015 14:37) -----

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Agree to Patrik. Only question is how the truth is going to be communicated

Milton Mueller: Talking points are SUPPOSED to be simple bullet points.

Milton Mueller: Question now is, WHAT ARE THE BULLET POINTS?

----- (02/07/2015 14:40) -----

Milton Mueller: "We will make progress on the proposals that we already have"

----- (02/07/2015 14:41) -----

Milton Mueller: Like Jari, I have not trouble sticking "incremental" in there between "make" and "progress"

----- (02/07/2015 14:50) -----

Yannis li: The meeting is adjourned now. Thank you all for your participation