
DUBLIN – ICG Face-to-Face Meeting
Sunday, October 18, 2015 – 09:00 to 12:00 IST
ICANN54 | Dublin, Ireland

ALISSA COOPER: Good morning. I think we're going to wait a few minutes. I think some people are getting their coffee. So we'll start in a minute or two.

All right, good morning, everyone. Welcome back to the ICG face-to-face meeting. We're looking at our agenda for today, updated based on yesterday. So we'll start with talking about the CCWG dependency, then we'll get back to the transition proposal. Hopefully folks saw the edits from last night. I want to just chat briefly about the engagement session that we're having tomorrow on the ICANN agenda. And we'll have a break, and then we will talk about the public comment summary document. Any comments on the agenda? No? I'm sorry, Paul, speak into the microphone.

PAUL WILSON: Paul Wilson here. I was wondering about approving the outstanding minutes.

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

ALISSA COOPER: I think we bumped that to Thursday, yeah, so people have more time. Okay. So we will start on our first topic. So we're going to get an update from our liaisons. Thank you for coming before your other meetings, and just to kind of frame this, we'll get an updated about the status of the CCWG work. I think the question for us, as we've discussed on the list recently, is, you know, assuming that we essentially finalize the transition proposal this week, what do we do given that the CCWG proposal will not be finalized this week. So that's kind of the overarching topic for us. So with that, I will hand it over to our liaisons, whichever of you wants to go first.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Good morning to everybody. Thanks. Keith, because I'm going to GAC also other meeting, anyway, further to our discussions that we had on the last call and the note that Keith put on the mailing list and some reactions of colleagues, there has been serious discussions in the CCWG relating to what we are going to do. There was a topic discussed a few days before under the "where we stand now." It created a lot of reactions from the peoples, difficulties and, you know, just to briefing you that the CCWG navigating between various models, starting to the voluntary model, going to the designator, single model, going to the multiple membership model, going to the sole membership model and so on and so forth. Then after the receipt of the

ICANN proposals, first calling that this may be difficult to implement, there is a lot of things which has not yet been detailed. It may create the implementation problem. It may have the risk of the balance -- changing the balance between the private sector and other communities. And recently ICANN mentioned that the community is not well represented in the ICANN structure and so on and so forth. So various questions have been raised. To what extent they are valid, I don't want to comment on that. Nevertheless, CCWG has carefully considered the situations, and now I would wish to request Alissa to you, to Jennifer, if possible, to put a flow chart on the screen that we know where we are in the situation.

During the last three -- two days there has been considerable improvement, progress in the situations and areas that we have difficulty before. And after the ICANN proposal, as you all have seen ICANN proposal has three parts. There are 82 pages of comments, and a summary of 3 page. And that summary of 3 page having a table indicating three areas, areas that ICANN agree with the CCWG outcome, area that ICANN believe that there is a need to refinement, and areas that there are disagreement. One area of disagreement is budget and strategy plan and other is removal of the individual board member and the IRP costs and accessibilities. So these are the three main issues that they discussed. And now the CCWG is considering

perhaps two issues. One issue is coming -- not coming back but considering another model which is called sole designator model which removes some of the difficulties and problems that ICANN has indicated. In the meantime, this sole designator model might have or would have some difficulty that are indicated a minute briefly that lead us that I myself plus two other CCWG, we preferred something which is called Plan B. And this Plan B tried to overcome the difficulties that we might have with any model at this stage and the purpose of that was, as I indicated and Keith as well, that our main purpose is that the transition shall not be delayed further.

There are two communities among the three that are impatiently waiting for this transition since January 15 of 2015 and we don't want to wait further that and therefore we need to make every effort to have the transition to be done at the time that has been now fixed not in an incomplete way but not being delayed for some other thing that could be done later. That means we make every effort that transition be done at time.

If you look in this table, you will see various areas and you will see the (indiscernible) between various days. And, you know, look at the red areas that the difficulty that we had and now you look into the last day that most of those difficulties now the color has been changed, either coming green or coming yellow, and there is no more any -- any red line. That means the

mechanism, it is one of the most difficult issue that mechanism we should do. And this does not mean that the CCWG has withdrawn or fall back on the sole membership, but the situation is that what we could do at this stage in order that the transition take place at the time that has been now foreseen by end of 2016. So that is the situation.

There are areas that we have come to some sort of the good conclusions with respect to the objections or veto on the budget. We have now some sort of let us say agreement on that to remove the difficulty of the board. We also have removed the difficulty of the board concerns that the removal of individual board member. They believe that they should not have been done by the -- by the community designating them but by the whole community. There was some sort of action that has been done in a way that perhaps it also satisfied the situation.

There seems to be some more works to be done, but I personally -- I am confident that with hard work that we will do, we will remove all of these problems. The last 10 days or 15 days we had sometimes up to five calls per day and each call lasted between one and half hour to two hours. And you can consider how much preparation you need to have five calls. So a lot of works, hundreds of people working very, very hard, and I think that we will -- we will have at least the transition take place at the time that we want. It still remains some areas to be removed

and you can see the areas that we have in the last column. There are some few things to be done.

What I would like to mention, that the sole designator or designating model has still two areas that -- three areas that need to be look at that concerns the ICG and one area is rejection of the budgets and so on and so forth. Designating model or sole designated, arbitration is available for violations of bylaw but at the discretion of the board. So everything is handled the board. And we have to try to find a solution for that.

The second area we have, change on the fundamental bylaw, that discretion also ultimately is at the board level and we have to see whether we can find something, the community exercise its power.

The last but not least but the most important is area of the IANA functions including triggering of the PTI and separations that the sole designator given right to trigger board consultation up to a specified number of times with bylaw restrictions. Sole designator has standing to direct enforce consultation rights. Arbitration likely unavailable for separation decision itself because the -- the discretion ultimately rests with the board. So these are three areas. If we remove these three areas by some supplementary measures that I have mentioned very briefly, we may release all of the difficulties that currently exist for the

transitions. And all of these relates to the naming. The two other communities, they don't have any problem. In fact, they did not have any problem from the very beginning, and I have mentioned that several times, that they were very straightforward and the only thing is naming and we have to do that.

What we did, we tried to take into account the strict and explicit requirement of the CWG. If this requirement are met, that means we are on the safe side. So I don't want to take your time more than that. Perhaps Keith would like to have some complementary or supplementary or whatever he believes that could be added to that, in order to make our distinguished ICG colleagues in the picture. So I would defer you kindly to consult this document for further information on that and also you may, if you wish any more information, I would be available to discuss with you online or offline. Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thank you, Kavouss. This is Keith Drazek, for the transcript, and I would like to compliment you on your excellent summary and I will also offer some complimentary comments.

So I think just to summarize about where we were coming into this week. Where we are now, and what the path ahead looks like. I think everybody knows that there were still some pretty

significant areas of disagreement and distance between the various participants in the discussion around the CCWG accountability work. But as Kavouss noted, I think some important progress has been made over the last several days in the CCWG, working with members of the board and others in the community, to try to bring more detail and more focus around some of the areas that were still a bit vague. And areas that were, in fact, raising some of -- or causing some of the significant concerns. So as Kavouss noted, I think there has been progress. I think that progress is likely to lead to, as Kavouss noted, something along the lines of the sole designator model as the likely consensus position. I think it's become clear to me that the board's proposal from the public comment periods is not going to fly. I think there's a growing recognition that the sole member model or membership has probably too many concerns or too many issues to survive a consensus call. Primarily because in the words of the board, it is too significant a change to the governance structure of ICANN at this time.

The CCWG outside counsel have actually advised that ICANN in the naming community today and ICANN, the community bodies are actually today acting as designators. So the move to a sole designator model is actually not a dramatic shift in the governance structure of ICANN. And I think there's a growing recognition among -- and I can't speak for them but my sense of

taking the temperature in the room and in the hallways is there's a growing recognition that in order to reach a consensus position, the parties are all going to have to compromise and it appears to me that the sole designator model is the best shot of reaching that compromise. And as Kavouss said earlier, he said he was confident we will work through this. I agree. I am increasingly confident that we will have significant progress this week.

Coming out of this week, at a minimum we need to have -- the CCWG and the community needs to have I think an agreed-to blueprint or framework that will serve the community and the CCWG as the guidepost to say okay, here's what we're going to work towards. We're going to fill in the details. There's more work to be done, but we're all working in the same direction. And working towards the same goal as far as an implementation model. And I am hopeful and optimistic that we will be successful this week in doing that. It's -- nothing is guaranteed. There are still opportunities for things to, you know, go awry, but that's where we are right now.

If we can achieve that this week, then the hope is that the CCWG will be able to wrap up its work and to submit a final recommendation by the end of the year. Which would then likely require an intercessional meeting or certain members or certain community groups to adjust their typical practices. For

example, the ccNSO typically needs a face-to-face meeting to make big decisions. The GAC typically needs a face-to-face meeting to make big decisions. So if the decision will be pushed to early 2016 because there's a sense that Marrakech that may be too late, that there may be a need for either an intercessional meeting focused just on this topic or, you know, teleconferences or an sort of online process for the chartering organizations to approve or to consider and approve. So let me pause there. Happy to take any questions.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you. Thanks both of you. I have a question, just on that last point that you raised, Keith, which is about the timing. So can you go into a little more detail? Because I thought -- so I've seen the timelines from the CCWG which sound like a little bit later than what you just said, and then I've seen the timeline from I guess -- I guess from NTIA or ICANN which is a little earlier than what you just said. So can you summarize the feeling about the timeline?

KEITH DRAZEK:

Yeah. Thank you, Alissa. Keith Drazek. Yeah, I think there's a couple of different views on that, and it's probably a range of views on exactly what would be required. Certainly if there are going to be substantial changes to the model that was proposed

or to the reference model in the CCWG's second proposal, the one that was most recently out for public comment, there's going to have to be another public comment period. If it's simply a refinement and an adjustment based on the public comments to the second model, then there is some question about, you know, is -- could we accelerate the process. But I think there's a general sense that we are likely to need another public comment period. Which is what pushes it to the end of the year.

I think if -- if we can have an intercessional and if we can -- or if we can have the -- you know, the online approval in a sense of the chartering organizations rather than a face-to-face, then I think the timeline can be accelerated, looking to a January delivery. Maybe February, early February at the latest. But if we have to stick to the face-to-face session, either intercessional or Marrakech, then I think that's the more extended timeline. So, you know, the need to -- the timing and the logistics and all of that to have an intercessional face-to-face could actually be a delaying factor. And something -- and certainly if we can't accomplish either an intercessional or the online approval, then it's Marrakech, which is the first week of March, if I'm not mistaken. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Kavouss, did you have something?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, I just want to complement what Keith said. CCWG currently considering three scenarios. These three scenarios, if you wish, we can provide it to you for as far as the timeline is concerned. One of the scenarios is to have a need for the third public comment. However, since the legal counsel, two legal counsel of CCWG, clearly indicated that the current method of the ICANN working is some sort of designating or designator model, perhaps coming back to the sole designator, there's a difference between multiple designator and sole designator. So I am sure that you have appreciated that. And the sole designator, all designator get together and have an unincorporated associations in order to have a person who'd to take action with respect to any arbitration or anything after that. Since this model is already exists to some extents, CCWG tries and in fact I, as one participant, want to encourage them to avoid the third public comment in order not to have a delay.

If this third public comment is avoided, in any case, the outcome should go to the chartering organizations. As a member of the GAC, yesterday, I raised the question in the GAC. And I hope other people in other communities will take the same questions. If we want to, as a chartering organization, comment on the final

proposal of CCWG, Marrakech would be too late. So we have to go to the online -- either the virtual meeting or mailing list and so on and so forth.

It has not yet been decided in GAC. But perhaps we're going to that direction, that doing online approval of that in one way or the other. Either we agree or we don't agree or we have some comments. So we want to avoid to postpone anything for Marrakech meeting. And all of this is not to have any delay in the transitions. So this is one thing that we have to take into account that these efforts should be made to avoid this third public comment. I think still we have few days in CCWG. We are working CCWG very, very hard and tried to streamline the situations. As I mentioned, this plan B, which could perhaps be a supplement of the designator or sole designator model, would be very useful to remove all those problems. The purpose of the plan B is that the CCWG would not withdraw from its sole membership totally. But they want to do it at a later stage. They want to proceed with the transition and so on and so forth. In order to reply to the ICANN that the current structure of the ICANN does not represent all involved people and so on and so forth, maybe need to have a change of the structure, so on and so forth. That would be the second step without any impact on the transition. So this is what we are doing. But still we are discussing.

Tomorrow afternoon we have another meeting, and after this week we have a few more meetings. We are confident that we do our best to not have the third public comment and try to find a solution at least the requirement of CWG be met, fully met. That is what you are concerned and we are concerned and ICG. The remaining of the CCWG what they do to the system. But I'm confident that the sole designator could remove many of the problems that ICANN indicated. Some people, they say that ICANN is overriding the community. I, personally, as a participant, as ICG liaison, I am not of the same view. I think if we do not take into account the ICANN views in any way, they will send it to the NTIA.

So we should avoid that NTIA received two proposals. One proposal from CCWG another proposal from ICANN saying we cannot agree with that. So we want to avoid that. If we have coordinated this that we would not have two opposing proposals, that will facilitate the task of the transition. So this is what we're trying to do. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you. Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Alissa. Keith Drazek. Just one final point. I'll make this quick, because I know we might want to get to questions.

The integrity of the process is something that is very important to everybody participating in this effort.

There are those within the CCWG who believe that without a doubt there will need to be another public comment period. There are others who think it really depends on how much of a change there is from the reference model that went out for public comment last.

I think there's a strong commitment within the CCWG and with the cochairs to ensure that whatever comes out of this process is -- has its integrity, is based on a process that is fully defensible. So, if there's any question about -- if we don't want anybody at the end of the process saying it is illegitimate because it didn't go out for public comment. I believe there is likely to be a third public comment period. It could be a shortened one, 30 days instead of 40. I think there's different ways that this could be accomplished. I'm not -- no decisions have been made on this. But I just want everybody to understand that the integrity of the process is something that the CCWG and its cochairs are, you know, acutely aware of.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Keith. Thank you, Kavouss. Both. I think that we very much appreciate your work in the other group and your very thorough and detailed summaries.

So I'd like to open the queue. Can we use Adobe Connect? That would help me out. I will say I think, again, the question for us is, assuming that we essentially finish the transition proposal this week -- and it's clear that the CCWG proposal will not be done this week, I think we can all agree to that. It's -- it sounds like there's still some uncertainty as to exactly when it will be completed. Could be as soon as end of this year. Could be later. Hopefully, it won't be until Marrakech. That's kind of what I'm hearing.

So the question for us is then what do we do? We've had some conversation on the list about this. Some people favoring that we, you know, complete everything that we can. We have the highlighted sections in yellow in our proposal that list the dependency and the fact that we committed to confirming with the CWG that their requirements have been met once the CCWG workstream 1 is done.

So we could finish, declare ourselves to be as complete as possible, and celebrate all the good work that's gone on in the communities and go into hibernation mode until workstream 1 is done and we can do our check with the CWG.

Or we could do something else. We could, you know, submit the proposal, as Paul has suggested, for forwarding to NTIA. Or we could do other things that people in this room might have ideas about.

So that's what we need to kind of come to some conclusion about in this room. What do we want to do given that the two timelines have become unsynchronized a bit?

So with that I will open the queue. And I think I have Russ Mundy first.

RUSS MUNDY:

Thank you, Alissa. Thanks, Keith. Thanks, Kavouss, for a great summary of what's happening in the CCWG. And thank you for all of your hard work. I know there's been a huge amount of work going on. Personally, I've tried to help a little bit. But I just haven't had the time to do very much. So I have gotten the insight to how much others are doing. And that's really much appreciated.

One thing I'd like to ask is whether or not, from a CWG perspective, for those that are involved in the CWG, has that group continued to think about and be active with respect to what are they planning to do in response to what happens out of the CCWG, which, of course, will impact us?

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Russ. This is Keith Drazek. So I can tell you that even this week the cochairs of the -- sorry, the CWG, Jonathan and Elise, were actually involved in the CCWG meetings. They attended and participated. They're very much aware of what's going on. Questions were posed about particularly the PTI separation question. And not to get too deep into the specifics, but there was a discussion a few days ago about whether the sole member model met the expectations of the CWG. And the response from Jonathan Robinson was, yes, it met and possibly exceeded in terms of the requirements around PTI separation budget imported especially.

So the follow-up question will be well, if the CCWG moves from the sole member construct to the sole designator construct, will that serve or meet the needs of the CWG dependencies? And I think that is still an open question. There is still work being done specifically around the separation question. I don't think it's an issue regarding budget as much, because there would be incorrect enforcement of the budget question. But this is still a topic of ongoing discussion.

So, to answer your question directly, is they are still very much engaged. The CWG is standing by to give the CCWG feedback or respond to questions. And, at the end of this process, certainly

as expected, the CCWG will ensure that the CWG's dependencies are met. That's a clearly understood obligation.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Keith. Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thanks, Alissa. And just in reply to your question, actually, I think by the time we finish we probably -- it's obvious we don't need to meet frequently face to face or have conference calls. But I think it's -- that we should maintain the mailing list, keep the channels open. And, again, I liked your question yesterday when you said whether we should ask this to the operational communities. I mean, we should take this decision also in agreement with the relevant -- other relevant parties. But I'm in favor of maintaining the mailing list and keep the channels open.

Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: So thank you. Just for clarification, are you -- so yesterday we talked about kind of our working methods and our role for implementation. This question is: Do we send it to the ICANN board for forwarding to NTIA at the conclusion of this week? Are

you suggesting that we should ask the operational communities for their opinion on that? No. Okay.

MANAL ISMAIL:

So I misunderstood the question. So, again, on the way forward for the ICG, this is what my intervention was. Whether or not we submit the proposal, I think we've already said that we will not consider the proposal complete until we seek the necessary confirmation from the names community. I just can't figure how we can -- I mean, don't go by what we have already said. I mean, we said we won't consider it complete until we check with the names community. So -- and, again, we've submitted with highlights of the interdependence -- sorry -- just thinking out loud. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Manal. Yes, we probably should take the highlights out before we submit it no matter when we do that. Martin is next.

MARTIN BOYLE:

Thanks, Chair. Martin Boyle here.

Yes, what do we do? It is obvious to me that, certainly at the end of this week, our job will not be done, that we'll not have a

complete proposal. And, therefore, we have nothing to send that will then go to NTIA. If I've understood the -- what I thought were nice clear messages from both Kavouss and Keith with a good bit of interpretation of their feeling of this sense of travel in that particular room, I get an optimism that suggests that perhaps at the end of this week it will be clear as to whether there is a document that will come out from the CWG and how the CCWG intend to deal with that document from which it ought to then be possible for us to identify a time scale. And that time scale will then indicate when we think we will have a coherent and complete proposal.

So I'm sorry. I don't think we can just send anything up at the moment. And just at the moment I don't think we're in position to say when we will be able to send something up. There is a lot of work to be done. We need to monitor that work. We need to understand that work.

And then, as Manal has just put it, we need to be ready to go to the CWG and say, "Does this meet your concerns?" And it's only at that stage will we have a document that we can then put forward. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Next I have Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thanks. Yeah, I would agree with the sentiments of -- I don't think we can submit anything that isn't complete to NTIA. Daniel had suggested in email that perhaps we do, though, an interim publication of where we are now on the draft with an explanation of kind of where we are and what's going on and then go into the hibernation mode unless we're poked by something.

And I think that seems to be a fairly appropriate concept. Because then we are reactive to when CWG tells us that they're ready to move forward. And then we have to make a determination as to whether the amount of changes, if any, in the CWG proposal require us to do any comment related to that. So that would meet -- for me, would be the most straightforward process that is also in keeping with what we're supposed to do in our charter and what NTIA has asked us to do, which is to not forward a proposal that isn't complete.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Joe. Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. Good morning. This is Jean-Jacques. A couple of remarks on the point of ICG's way forward.

The first is about or triggered by two notions. One is the interdependencies; and the other is the completeness, the necessary completeness of our proposal to be submitted to the NTIA. I very much agree with everything that my colleagues have said so far this morning on those two themes.

I would like to enlarge the debate a bit and come back to one of the points I brought up yesterday, which is that, in all our discussions yesterday, of course, the operational communities were in the forefront. That's completely normal.

But I did make a remark and I want to repeat here that I consider that anyway forward for the ICG would have to be in its present format, meaning, of course, the three operational communities but also all the other communities represented around this table or remotely.

So building on some emails I reviewed this morning from mainly Narelle, Russ Housley, Wolf-Ulrich, Keith Drazek, and Paul, there was a sense that we should bring this forward and perhaps formulate something in our communities in order to announce or seek feedback on this notion of ICG way forward.

And, in that respect, I would kindly refer you to our current charter, which on its page 2 says the coordination group has four main tasks. First, act as liaison to all interested parties,

including the three operational communities, et cetera, et cetera.

So this is a small item for most of you. But I think for the outside world, it has its importance, more than symbolically. And I, for one, as a representative of civil society and more specifically designated by the ALAC, I would want to make sure that in any future iteration, the ICG going forward would remain as it is today. And also keep in mind that, of course, the three OCs are very important. But we should not neglect the others. Thank you.

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

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko, for the record. I wanted to thank first everybody for the descriptions of where the CCWG work is. It sounds quite positive not only from your descriptions but also from other people that I've talked to. And I'm particularly happy about that you seem to be, you know, respecting the integrity of the process and making sure that there still is something that we can stand by once the work is completed and not, for instance, just heeding to a single party's comments. And you actually do the whole work and listen to the whole community. And that's

really, really important in order for the result, whatever it is, to be something that the whole community is happily backing.

So that's that. On this topic of what are we about to do sort of divided in three parts, one of which is done and the other two were yet to do. And the first part that's done is that we have done our work, have done a design and correctly characterized dependencies where they exist and where they don't exist and described everything. And we have that.

And the second part is, what do we do in various kinds of circumstances in the future. I think it's too early for us to, you know, try to send things to the NTIA or, you know, play any of the other actions here. We have a result that can be used in multiple different ways, depending on the circumstances. You know, I -- I think it's not looking likely that we'll get the result, the whole result, and then we could just go ahead and we'll do that. You know, if tomorrow someone announces that they need five more years, then we'll need to go into another kind of discussion, but we're ready for that because we have a good understanding of what the dependencies are and parts of the system. So I propose that that part of the discussion we basically postpone until there's reason to return to that.

And a third thing is kind of publicity or being clear about where we are. And I think that scenario where we could do something

more now, I think we need to very clearly and publicly conclude the public review and its conclusion needs to be documented. And we need to be clear that, you know, what -- you know, where we stand. What's the situation. What's ready. What's -- what are we still waiting for and so forth. I mean, not to paint a too rosy picture but not to give an impression of nothing is done either. So those three things I think are important.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Jari. I have Paul, Patrik, Daniel, and then I will put myself in the queue and maybe we can try to wrap. Go ahead, Paul.

PAUL WILSON:

Thanks. Paul Wilson. What I understand is that we're going to complete all the work that we can do on the ICG's proposal either at the end of this meeting or sometime soon after. We don't know yet. But we'll do everything that we can do. And then as -- as Joe said, we'll go to sleep for a while or hibernate until the CCWG finishes its work and it has its proposal for ICANN accountability. And when that happens, we will be able to submit our work to NTIA with the declaration or the public knowledge that the CCWG result is satisfactory to the communities and therefore the ICG proposal can be considered complete. That's fine, if it works within the timing, but I'd

suggest that before we go to sleep we set an alarm clock and that should wake us up at the last moment at which we can possibly realistically submit our proposal to the NTIA and have the NTIA accept it and clear us for implementation by the 30th of September next year.

If we don't do that then we'll go on sleeping and we'll find that we've missed that particular boat. So if it happens -- and this is just a contingency plan -- if it happens that we get woken up by that alarm and the CCWG still hasn't finished its work because of its own meeting schedules and because of the need for full public comment period then I still suggest that we would want to submit our proposal to the NTIA with the full -- full and public declaration that the accountability piece isn't finished yet, that the NTIA should please commence its review and its consideration of our proposal on an understanding or a hope that they will hear soon enough that the accountability piece has been completed to the satisfaction of the -- of the communities. That's all I was trying to suggest in my email last week. It's just a contingency plan, but I think it's worth thinking about what we would need to do under those circumstances. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Paul. Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. Patrik Faltstrom. I think what Paul is saying very much makes sense. But I ask myself on top of that whether the proposal we have today actually is what we can submit if it is the case that we are doing a submission that perchance should result in, like, call it incremental or rewritten of the contract the NTIA has with ICANN or something. Maybe it's the case that we have to send something that is slightly different which means that I would like to -- in the timer that you point out, I would like to also add some time for us to review what we're actually going to submit to see that what we are submitting actually makes sense, given the context within which we are in at the time when we are submitting it. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Patrik. Daniel.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Hi, this is Daniel. Can you hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, we can hear you.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Okay. Thank you. I think what everybody has said makes -- makes great sense. Specifically Paul's suggestion I think is -- is a very good one. I was slightly surprised at what some people said is that we might want to revise our proposal based on developments in the accountability process or additional requests by CWG. That has not been my understanding so far. My understanding has been that we are waiting for CWG to tell us that their dependencies are met, basically the accountability process has concluded to their satisfaction. I have not envisaged any changes at that point. So therefore, I think it's a very good idea to, when we are finished and at the end of the Dublin meeting period or shortly thereafter, we should clearly publish the state of our proposal as it is at that point and say that we do not at present expect any changes and expect to submit it as soon as CWG and maybe even the other communities, as Paul has also alluded to, just looks better if we also ask the other operational communities, whether they're fine. But that we then intend to submit this. That would enable anybody, including the ICANN board and the operational communities, to review it now so that we have some overlap so that we will not in the -- be in danger of getting another discussion when it's time to submit.

So in summary, I think we should as soon as we consider ourselves done, we should publish this and say this is the

proposal as it stands. We expect to submit it as soon as we get the okay from the community -- operational communities and then go into hibernation mode. And I agree with the suggestion to set an alarm clock prior to the expiration of the current NTIA contract. And I can't speak to the other role of monitoring implementation, but I don't think that's on the agenda right now. So thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Daniel. I think just -- just to avoid confusion here, I think the question about whether the CWG proposal will get modified relates to -- well, let me back up. I think the notion of our proposal getting modified could arise if the CWG decides to modify its proposal in reaction to anything that may happen in the CCWG. So it wouldn't be the case that we would initiate changes to the proposal or anything like that. So that I think there is, you know, some small possibility that that may happen. And we certainly, you know, don't want to put a proposal forward to NTIA that contains a CWG portion which is not in line with what the CWG actually thinks it should be. But I think that's kind of a remote contingency that we just have to wait for. And we -- we have no intention of initiating changes to our own proposal.

Okay. So I have more people in the queue now since I was thinking of closing the queue, but I see no need to really cut this discussion off unnecessarily since we have the time. So I will have Kavouss next, then Milton, Michael, and Wolf-Ulrich, and then I may try to summarize again at the end. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, something may help the colleagues to decide, Jennifer, could you kindly indicate the three draft timelines of the CCWG. That would help the people to understand when they have to make a decision to send the document to the NTIA, and then I have some other comment with respect to what Paul and others said. Just waiting for Jennifer to indicate that if she would be in a position to do that.

As I mentioned, until she prepare that -- three scenarios, yes. First put it in scenario one. Look at the timeline that mentioned. The timeline is 18-19 November finalizations of Work Stream 1 which is relating to the -- everything to be prepared or committed to be available before the transitions. 18-19 of November. This is scenario number 1. So that give you some reflections. And Jennifer, could you go to scenario 2 that we have -- the next slide, that we have public comments. Yeah. Public comments, we have the scenario 2, and you also would see that the finalizations of the Work Stream 1 again 18-19

November. There's something after that, you will see. If you go to the third slide, which is expedited manner, and then still you have that situation when the finalization will be done, 21-26 of January. The -- no. Yes, 18-19 call -- CCWG call for -- CCWG call confirmed, Work Stream 1 defines, and CCWG call for sign-offs, yeah. And finalization. 30-31 of January. So these are the three timelines. These three are still draft. I hope that we could finalize that CCWG. In any case, you have some deadlines that indicate maybe around end of November in the best possible way, if you don't go to that long public comments.

As I mentioned before, because the designator model already were in the public comments 1, so the community is aware how it works. Maybe, as Keith mentioned, the duration of the comments may be reduced. It could happen. If you remember the ICG reduced the duration of the comment for charter to one week. I'm not suggesting that CCWG do it from 40 days to one week but maybe reduce that. So that would help. So you have this states how to do it.

Now, the second issue is from a external experience. Perhaps it would help the NTIA that they receive your proposals or our proposals with those conditions that Paul referred to, a public announcement that there are subject to certain requirement and so on and so forth. It will help that they will read what we have. Because the CCWG would not change the essence of our

proposals. It's just talking about some condition. Whether the CCWG -- CWG are met or are not met or whether are met to some extent and so on and so forth. So that may help. So this is -- I'm not suggesting something. This is helping ourselves to see what we can do. So this is the situation. Perhaps these three timelines at the end of the CCWG, once it is finalized, if it is not publicly available, I will -- and Keith send it to you. It is publicly available. You read it on the mailing list and you can have the situation. However, we have 18-19 November, something that we can't move before that. Because still we have to wait a little bit of that. So just to give you not to be -- not to hurry up. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah, I don't know if I'm understanding people properly, but if anybody is thinking that you can sort of release the proposal before the CWG is done, before the CCWG is done, you're just wrong. It can't be done. All we're doing is confusing people. We're not helping NTIA. They can't -- the NTIA's review of this proposal is going to be embroiled in a fairly political process involving congressional hearings. We cannot be ambiguous in

the slightest about what our proposal is and where it is. We release the proposal when it's finished. And it's not finished.

What we can do, and ought to do, is release our public comment analysis. I think the people who commented deserve to see that and deserve to see that quite rapidly. And that also signals to NTIA or anybody else who's interested how much public support there was for the proposal and what kinds of issues were raising attention.

So I would favor forgetting about any kind of talk of a partial release of the proposal and focusing our immediate energies on simply getting a document out that summarizes the public comment.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks, Milton. So maybe I will actually jump in right here because I think we're actually all basically agreeing, although it might not sound like it. So what I am hearing that people would like for us to do is, assuming we essentially finalize the proposal but for the dependencies at the end of this week, coming out of this meeting we, as we have often done in the past, you know, make a statement on our Web site about what our status is in terms of our work, right? And be just -- be factual about what the status is so that everybody knows exactly what the situation is. We have on our agenda to work on the summary document

of the public comments, so hopefully we will finish that in relatively short order as well and when we do we will publish it and let everyone know. And then we, I think as the chairs, can set an alarm clock for ourselves and, you know, continue to follow what happens in the CCWG and I would say, you know, let's -- let's set that -- there might be a multiple-phased alarm that happens here. We can set the first phase for, you know, beginning or middle of December. Patrik and Mohamed and myself will make sure that we're monitoring the situation with the CCWG and if it looks like we need to revisit this topic at that point, we will schedule a call or send an email to the list. If things are going swimmingly and we want to, you know, set the next alarm for January and check in again, we can do that and proceed from there. So, you know, we -- we do as much as we can. We tell people what we're doing, and in two months we come back and say are we still good to go? Are we still waiting? What are we doing? And, you know, at some point, when we do those let's say monthly checks it might come to the point where we say well, do we need a call? Should we revisit our decision to be in hibernation mode? Is there anyone who objects to that plan? I know I have a queue. I will come back to the queue. Jari objects to the plan. Go ahead.

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko. So I would like to -- I agree with what you said, but I would also like us to complete the edits that we have done and publish the results, not misrepresenting what it is. Not claiming that this is done and will be sent to the NTIA. But I think as a result of the public comments we want to have the edited document out as well.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Hear, hear.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, agreed. Everyone else seems to be in agreement that that is a way forward. No, Michael Niebel go ahead.

MICHAEL NIEBEL: I just want to understand correctly, because I understood you in the sense of Milton, what you said, we're going to have first a summary of -- and the reaction to the public comment period and then we look with the timing then whether we go forward with a report. But I would also share the warning that right now to go out also with a document which is a preliminary document would create confusion. So at this point in time I would not do that. I think we have to give a reaction, we have to say where we stand, we have to give a reaction to the public comments, but I would at this point in time not favor to have an incomplete

document. And it's also -- it's not like the NTIA is not aware of what we're writing. I mean, it's not -- I mean, that's not -- it's quite clear that it's not to give them -- they are following -- following our discussions. So I share the worry at this point in time if we come out with a document that is incomplete and it cannot be delivered as such.

ALISSA COOPER:

So, I mean, maybe we're just like exploring shades of gray here. All of our documents are public. Like they're all sitting in Dropbox, right? I think what I was envisioning is that we, you know, accept changes in Word so that we don't have a red line. We produce a PDF and we attach that to our little statement that we put out about the conclusion of this meeting. So I don't know if -- no, we're not allowed to conclude from the meeting and produce a clean copy of the document? I mean, that's like our standard operating procedure. Like, I will be very upset if I'm not allowed to produce a clean copy of this document once it's done. So yeah.

MILTON MUELLER:

Just don't make it part of the public announcement. Say today we're releasing our announcement of public comments. We have modified the proposal, and we're awaiting the word that we need from CWG to complete the proposal. But you don't

actually put that up on the Web site in a public link and make it part of your public announcement.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So maybe that's where we need to have the discussion, because I find that strange. But maybe we should go back to having a queue. Now I think we've narrowed the scope of what we're discussing a little bit. Let's go back to the queue. If people can use Adobe Connect for the queue, that would help me. Wolf-Ulrich, next in the queue.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. Just briefly, I'm pleased with that proposal on going forward. And I would like to urge all of us not to go in any kind of sleeping mode right now. Because time is too short. If you look at this, what Kavouss is showing here in the scenario two, even to the extent it now means from now to the end of the ICANN meeting is just three months. So that is really -- and many things are going to happen in between. So there's no time for any kind of sleeping. Thanks.

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

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. Joseph Alhadeff, for the record. I think, from a transparency point of view, from a clarity point of view, having the document available for people -- and we can call it status update on ICG proposal. So no one can mistake the fact that it's a final proposal, and we can caveat the attachment language that says we are attaching this for your information. We are still awaiting CWG endorsement or whatever you want to call it in order to finalize the proposal and have it ready for submission. I don't think anyone can misunderstand it.

But, if I'm a person who is not in this process every single day, then I'm going find it very hard why aren't people referencing the proposal the way they used to? This is a community in which conspiracy theories abound with nothing behind them.

So I see no problem. I've got no problem with Milton suggesting that we have to caveat it so it's not misunderstood, because there is a confusing process for those people who aren't in the middle of it. But I would strongly object to not having a version of the document easily accessible to people so they can see where we are. .

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Joe. Jari.

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko. So I don't think this is difficult. I think we just need to find the right words to describe where we are. And that's part of that announcement or status update or report from the meeting, whatever it is. But I do think that we need to attach the latest in -- you know, our interim proposal version into any communications that go out. Like, if we say that we've addressed the comments in this way and this is the summary of the comments, the document naturally goes there. And that's an honest explanation of where we are. And I don't think we should hide that. We need to be clear that this one thing that we're waiting on still -- so it's not complete. We're waiting on the accountability work to finish. End of story.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Jari. Daniel.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Thank you. Yes, we should produce a clean document and clearly document our consensus that this is as far as we can go and we have consensus on that particular language. And we should say that we will submit it once we have confirmation from all three operational communities that they're okay with submitting it. I don't think we need to reference the accountability work, because that's indirect.

So we should just, basically, do our work. We should finish our work. Say, okay, at this point, we're done with the language. This is what it is. We're waiting for -- we will submit it as soon as we have confirmation from all the three operational communities.

If then the contingency happens or the unexpected thing happens that one of the communities says we want to change our input, that is unexpected. Yeah.

So we should just say our work is done. This is what it is. And we'll submit it as soon as we have confirmation from the operational communities that it's okay to submit it. Done.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Paul.

PAUL WILSON: No, I pass. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I think we have some responsibility with respect to the entire community looking for output from the ICG. There is a way to

indicate where we are with a proper title, whether it is a draft 1 or draft 2 or draft 3 or draft 0.

But we should mention where we are, where we stand today. I don't think that we could put everybody in the dark. We should have disclaimer. We should have conditions. We should have many things. But we should say where we are. And we put it at ICANN 54, end of ICANN 54, that we know this is the date. Perhaps we should have something. It is not something sent to NTIA. But it is something that summarizes where we are today. We could sit down and look at the proper title for that. There are some precedence elsewhere either in the ICANN or outside the ICANN, how they categorize various degrees or various nature of the report before it becomes a final report. So let us take something along that line. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Kavouss. It occurs to me that, actually, writing the words of the status update and the disclaimer that would go on the front page might solve the difficulties here. Go ahead, Lynn.

LYNN ST. AMOUR:

Lynn St. Amour, for the record. I'm just going to make a couple quick comments, because I put some comments in the chat room. But I do think it's important that we report out where we

are coming out of this meeting. I think the current version of the document should be there. I think, Alissa, in terms of shortening this conversation, if we could look at some actual text in words for our meetings on Thursday might take away whatever discomfort remains in the room.

One other point I'd mention, we use words like "hibernation." I think I would be quite careful about choosing those words. People that aren't deeply engaged with this process, for us to put out something that we purport is kind of complete or we're in hibernation or we're going away, I think sends a message that the folks that are responsible for evaluating this are not going to understand. And I think it's time we do what our communications now that we actually look to the people that are actually going to be responsible for approving this process and just keep that in mind in our communications as opposed to we're not just communicating to the ICANN community or those people that are deeply engaged in the process.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Lynn. Russ Mundy. And then we're going to wrap up.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Alissa. Russ Mundy, for the record. I agree with your just recent suggestion that getting words down to look at so we

can review them I think should help a lot with respect to what we're going to say. Conceptually, though, I think it's very important that we include some amount of reference to the CWG and CCWG status. Because, if that work were, in fact, already completed, then, in fact, we believe that we would be sending things off. And so I guess that it's -- how much of a point we make of it or how we say it, I don't -- I'm not that concerned about. But I think we do have to say something about that relationship or the pieces. And that's -- and, in stating where we are, I think that's a matter of statement of facts.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Russ. Okay. So I think the chairs will take an action to draft up the status update statement and the disclaimer that would go on the front page of the proposal when we make a clean copy. And we can consider those on, let's say, Friday, assuming that we actually finish our document work on Thursday or some other time on Friday.

Sound like a plan? Okay.

Great.

So let us move onto the transition proposal. So we're going to talk about this for 30 minutes and then take our break. We're a

little bit behind schedule. But I thought that was important for us to get on the same page about that.

Oh, I'm sorry. Did -- have you been subsumed? I'm sorry. I was using the queue and Adobe Connect. I'm sorry. Kuo-Wei was in the queue, and I completely forgot. My apologies.

KUO-WEI WU:

Thank you. First I have to thank all ICG members work very hard. Very comprehensive of the recommendations. But as -- I have to say that, if you remember in ICG in the very beginning, you say that ICANN board we can not change any words in your proposal. And we agree upon it. But don't forget that we'd like to know when you will submit your proposal to the ICANN board so we have enough time to go on to read your final text. And we have to decide we want to add additional comment or not. So, please, once you have a precise day to deliver the final proposal to us, we would love to see it. And then we will be come with our official board positions.

The same thing I'd also like to comment some people talking about reporting about CCWG. Actually, the ICANN board participated in the CCWG engagement. That is only in our personal position. It is not an ICANN board position yet. Because, before we see the final proposal, it's very difficult for us to say this is our board position yet.

So, you know, but we very helpful. We like to engage with the CCWG to then go through the process to generate a proposal as soon as possible. So you can see in Los Angeles and also over here, the ICANN board, even including our financial officer, you know, participate in the CCWG. It's a group discussion. All we want to do is help the CCWG converge on the documentation as soon as possible. So I'd like to let all of you know we very much appreciate your effort. But we also are waiting for the final proposal to make our final board position. Thank you very much.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks, Kuo-Wei. I think that reinforced our understanding of how the process was going to work.

All right. Let's just take a quick look at the transition proposal. So I sent some edits last night and just wanted to make sure folks had a chance to take a look and that no further edits on these pieces are required.

So, if we could start on paragraph 2.

Yep, that's it.

Okay. So there were some smaller edits on various things. But I wanted mainly to get people's eyes on the new text that was added in response to this discussion about how the

communities collaborate and coordinate. So this was the text provided by Lynn and Patrick.

So, in going through that, I added text in two different sections. This is the first one. So this is a kind of edited version of one of the paragraphs from that email. And this is the bit of history about IANA. So this seemed to me to fit here. And I think we got feedback that this is a helpful piece of context for people who might not be familiar with the history. So wanted to make sure everyone is okay with this. And then we will go down to the compatibility section, which is where all the more detailed examples about collaboration got added. But anybody who has any issues with this, please flag now. Go ahead, Lynn.

LYNN ST. AMOUR:

Lynn St. Amour. Not an issue with the text that's there. I think it's a very good summary. I just, though, that it's still missing the specificity that the three communities have existed for some time. And, when we think about the model and when you look through the first few paragraphs of this section and the executive summary as well, which I think has not been fully updated to reflect the changes in the part zero. So I'd like a confirmation of that.

But I don't think it makes that point clearly enough. And, even in the executive summary in I think it's the 6th or 7th paragraph, it

talks about the process we're doing today is based on input from the IAB, you could actually look at that paragraph and interpret it as this is a process we put in place and identified through communities for the purpose of this proposal.

When, in fact, that's not what we did. We saturated the world that we operate in today. And that was the natural world to place this activity.

ALISSA COOPER:

If we could go to paragraph 4, I was thinking about this when making these edits. And the thing is that in paragraph 4 we have the sentence already, which I thought really captured this.

"The ICG, therefore, chose to ground the proposal development process in the three communities with direct operational and service relationships with the IANA" -- please don't scroll -- with the IANA functions operator. Come back, come back. Okay.

"Reflecting the fact that the policy and oversight responsibilities for the three functions reside in three separate communities and has for decades."

I couldn't think of anything else to say that wasn't -- you know what I mean? I looked at your text and says, well, this says that.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Well, I think this paragraph does say that. You're right. In the executive summary it doesn't say that --

ALISSA COOPER: So it's a matter of taking this and just reflecting it in the executive summary.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: And looking for confirmation, I think that the executive summary in total has not been updated to reflect the part zero changes. Is that correct?

ALISSA COOPER: No, it has been. The thing is there was a lot of editing that happened in part zero, including lots of additions of new text. And we had a whole conversation about making sure the executive summary remains executive. So I didn't actually always reflect everything back into the executive summary. But, if these bits people feel are important enough that they should be drawn up there, then I'm happy to do it. So I can make that change if people want or think it's warranted. Yeah?

Okay. Okay. So that's -- that's one action I would take.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Paragraph 3x0003 is the one that would need to be updated in the executive summary.

ALISSA COOPER: Let me look at it.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: It starts out, "The ICG took note of guidance from the IAB pointing out" –

ALISSA COOPER: So that paragraph X003, I believe, is exactly the same as paragraph 4.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: It does seem to be. I may flipping back between different versions of the document.

ALISSA COOPER: I did not add. Go ahead.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: No, it does seem to be -- I may have been flipping back and forth between too many versions of the document.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. But so I did not add the history of IANA to the executive summary because it seemed like a little more in the weeds than what we should have in the summary. Do you agree with that decision?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: I do agree with that. I do have another comment on the executive summary though, and it refers a lot to some of the comments we received in the public comment period. And if this is meant to be an executive summary of the proposal, I'm not sure I'd put in summaries from the public comment period. I actually think that's a little distracting. And maybe once we do the comment period summary document that stands as, this is what we heard and what we did on the basis of the input we received from the public comment and the executive summary should be just a straightforward executive summary of the proposal.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. We'd be interested in people's thoughts about that. I'm happy to take out the new bits that refer to the public comments. That would make it shorter. Okay, so I have a queue now. So Joe is next.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you, Alissa. Joe Alhadeff, for the record. I was thinking as you get to the Part 0, because it might be useful to have kind of everything in one chunk that deals with kind of history and evolution of IANA and Lynn had done a couple of really good paragraphs in the work that she had done in relation to coordination, so it might be that introduction is just the first paragraph. Then we have kind of another section called history and evolution of IANA where we have the founding by Postel, those couple of paragraphs by Lynn, and that puts the history and kind of where we are now in a really clear space so you don't have to sit there and make sure that you make the linkage between the second paragraph of the introduction and the third sentence of another thing to figure out what this is and how these pieces play together. So that might just be a clarification. And then I think if we can make the executive summary -- at a minimum we should bifurcate between a process summary and the executive summary and a proposal summary so that if people are just interested in the proposal they can look at that time proposal summary. If people are interested in the process, they can look at a process summary. But I think we should be as clean as possible in the executive summary.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thanks, Joe. So on the first point, the difficulty that I had is that Part 0 is written very sort of procedurally. The whole

structure of it essentially is structured according to the process that we followed to produce this document. So it's a -- it's kind of awkward to try and find a place to stick in like oh, and here's the history of IANA and how the communities collaborate, which is why it ended up the way it is. If we go down -- sorry to make you scroll, but if we go down to -- let me find it. 55, all of the rest of the good text about how the communities collaborate is together here in paragraphs 55-58. So really it's -- it's not too much split up. It's like the one paragraph at the time which is the history of IANA and then 55-58 which give all the examples of collaboration and cooperation and restate, you know, the good restatement of the communities' commitment to do so going forward.

So I guess the question is if you think that structure is still too confusing and we should -- we should better, you know -- just put it all together. It's not -- the thing is this is not really about history. I mean, it is about history in the sense that this has been going on a long time, but it's meant to give some current examples, I think. Which is why I ended up splitting them.

So my question is, if you think you can live with this structure.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I don't (indiscernible) but I (indiscernible) I know there are other people ahead of me.

ALISSA COOPER: Well, I'd like to just have a little back and forth for a second to see what you think about this since you raised it.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: For me, the three paragraphs are fine where they are. But Lynn's -- in Lynn's draft there were two paragraphs on the way in which IANA formed that was a little more detailed than just that one sentence of saying there were three entities. And I think that level of detail has been lost. And I think that level of detail is useful. And the purpose of the proposal is to make sure that people understand it when they read it and have a grounding in it. And so I think if we put a little history and introduction, that is part of the process question of how we got here in the first place. And it gives you the wherewithal to better understand the proposal. If we want to put the history as an annex and refer to the fact that there is a history in the annex and we have four paragraphs on history in the annex, then that's another solution, if you feel it interrupts the flow. But I do think we owe it to our readers to provide them context because we can't presume that they necessarily understand where all these pieces came from. And I think that leads to some of the confusion we saw in some elements of the comments.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. I guess my difficulty is that between paragraph 2 and paragraph 4 I believe every detail that was in the text from Lynn and Patrik is now -- is reflected. So that's why I added paragraph 2 to provide the history and paragraph 4 already talked about the -- what all the registries are and the communities that are associated with them. So maybe I -- I know that you're back in the queue again. If someone could find the details that are actually missing to be added, that would help me. Because in going through it seemed to me that with the addition of paragraph 2, they are all there. And next -- oh, the queue just cleared, oddly. But next I had Paul.

PAUL WILSON: Yeah, this is just a note that -- this is Paul Wilson. A note that I noticed in reviewing the minutes of the last meeting that there was some discussion about the .ARPA, handling of the .ARPA domain. There were a couple of references -- supporting references that were posted by Alan and Russ to IRP and RFC documents and the minutes note that Wilson and Clark suggested that those references be added to Part 0. So I'm not quite sure where in Part 0 they should go, but they haven't been added. Yet so I'll try and give some specific suggestion about that. Just thought I should mention it. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. I thought -- I thought they did get added, based on your -- I thought you put them in.

PAUL WILSON: No. I put in a lot of other references, a stack of others, but not those ones.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Yeah, if you can send your suggestions for where to put them in, that would help. I don't have anyone else in the queue. But I would like to kind of close on this question about the history. I don't know if you -- I was responding to you in the chat. I still don't understand what's missing, if something is missing.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So to be able to answer your question I needed to go back to Lynn's and my text because I also tried to understand what Joe was talking about because there seemed to be the case that people sort of maybe there is some information missing that people seem to maybe want to have in what is now paragraph 2, including myself. But I would like to go back and compare and see whether there's actually something missing or if I'm just tired now. What I really -- what I think that people might suggest and maybe what Joe suggested is that if it is the case that there

is something missing here in clarity or maybe some text that were added to section 4 or later that maybe should be part of section 2 which means moving things, maybe section 2 is not really part of introduction. It is something new that is sort of background before we start talking about process. So I think people agree with you that it's not part of the process to talk about the history of IANA that we actually had the three operational communities from the beginning. It's more part of sort of a background. It's not part of the process. So maybe it's even the case that some of the things we added later should really go in this second section but it's not part of the introduction. There is something in between which you have pointed out which I also agree with but I think I at least have problems either saying exactly what is missing or this text is good at this very point in time. I would like to go back to the text that Lynn and I wrote and also think about the feedback that Joe gave and come back on this.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay. Maybe we can pick that up after the break. Is that okay? Okay. So I have no one else in the queue. I think what I was hearing also from Joe on the executive summary I think is sort of a agreement with Lynn to take out the -- the bits about public comment and, you know, sort of return it to its original structure that goes through substance and process. So I will -- I will do

that, take an action to do -- remove the bits from the executive summary about the public comments. Anything else? Yeah, go ahead, Lynn.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Lynn St. Amour. I like the suggestion, I think we should keep those bits as well because they're probably useful in the summary document, if they've not been pulled from there or sent there.

ALISSA COOPER: They're all in Part 0 anyway. They're just abbreviated in the executive summary. So we -- they're there.

Okay. So there's just one other substantive issue arising from one of the changes that I wanted to have people take a look at and that is going to be in 107, paragraph 107. We lost -- we lost the document. Okay. Well, people have the document on their own machine, so have a look at 107. This is the bulleted list and the implementation inventory. And I just wanted to check, if we go down to the items required by the names proposal, which kind of folds between page 31 and page 32, at the top of page 32 there had been a bullet which was called establishment of issue resolution mechanisms, full stop. And Joe had commented that this is vague and it was not clear what this was. And so I went

back to the CWG proposal and the CWG proposal has really two annexes that specify either new processes for customers of IANA to -- to complain about the performance of the naming functions and then to escalate, there are annexes I and J. And one is about complaints and the other one is about problems. So I edited this bullet to provide a little more detail. And it now says, "establishment of issue resolution mechanisms for complaints and problems related to the naming functions." I wanted to check with the people who participated in the CWG, if you feel that this is accurate because the -- the text from, you know, where this came from is -- is a -- I think it's paragraph 1105 in our document. It's like a summary in the CWG document and all it says is "establishment of issue resolution mechanisms." So I just wanted to make sure that this is actually correct. And I'm looking over in my corner at you fine folks who participated, if you have any idea if this is an accurate representation. Go ahead.

MARTIN BOYLE:

Martin Boyle here. I think that this is more specifically related to the Independent Review Process that is proposed for dealing with direct names related IANA issues. And on that basis, I think the -- the wording here is probably satisfactory. But I wouldn't mind going back to the original CWG text when they're talking about the IRP to make sure that we have reflected all of the

different elements within that. My initial hunch is that sounds around about right.

ALISSA COOPER:

If you could just do that check and come back to us, either at the end of today or Thursday, that would help me out. Thanks. Anything else on the transition proposal?

Okay. So what I have from this conversation is, I will remove the public comment summaries from the executive summary, Paul is going to find the places to put in the appropriate references concerning .ARPA. Patrik is going to come back after the break and tell us what we need to do on the history, and Martin is going to check on this issue resolution mechanism bullet and make sure it's correct. Did I miss anything? Okay, great. So let's take a -- we had a 30-minute break scheduled. So we'll come back at 10 after 11:00. We'll come back briefly to the transition proposal and then we'll talk about the engagement session tomorrow. And coffee is downstairs because we don't have coffee in the room today. You know, Sunday. It's the day of rest. So you got to go downstairs to get your coffee. Sorry.

[Break]

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. We're going to get started again, and we are going to spend a couple more minutes on the transition proposal. There is a mail on the mailing list from Patrik that has a suggestion for the history/background section.

So I will turn it over to Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSROM: Thank you very much. Lynn and I sat down and took on the action item immediately and try -- and rewrote the section, the second paragraph, and suggested on the basis of Joe that proposed this to be more history background, it's not an introduction and it's not part of the process.

So what we did was we copied text from what Lynn and I wrote earlier, and we tried to see what is not added later on regarding corporation and coordination.

There are a couple of things that we would like to point out. First, as this is not process, we discussed the wording of communities and operational communities. And we find that our first suggestion is in this text we should not talk about operational community. We should just talk about communities because "operational community" is something we as ICG discovered based on the input from IAB. That's the beginning of the process section.

That's why we talk about communities here. It's also the case that there are other communities then, IETF or RIRs and ICANN, that ask IANA to do things like W3C and there could be other communities as well. So we try to talk in general terms.

The next point we would like to make is in the second paragraph, the second-last sentence. It reads, "Each such resource is operated under a policy defined by a specific community." So that's a new thing that you have not seen. We tried to point out that IANA is actually taking care of multiple things. Each one of them is under a policy defined by one community.

And then there is not so much to say about the rest of the text. We just copied it in. And Joe just suggested that last paragraph is actually done, with the coordination and collaboration text later which we sort of -- it ended up being there. Just we wanted to have an end of the history background thing. And this might then be a paragraph that should be written differently, or maybe it's not needed at all. Maybe it's enough to just say, "The web of relationships," blah, blah, blah, done. That's sort of the story behind in how the text ended up being as it is.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you for this. I think this is really helpful.

I have a couple of questions. One question is I agree with you about not using what, I guess, has become this term of art, "operational communities," in this because it's later introduced. But it does appear in the fourth paragraph. Did you not mean to do that?

PATRIK FALTSROM: In that case, it is a mistake.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. That's my first question. My second question is the last paragraph, as you say, is actually -- I had incorporated most of it into paragraphs 55 to 58. So I'd rather it be in one place or the other and not both. I don't really care which place.

PATRIK FALTSROM: So I suggest in that case, we remove it. I'm currently under the text, by the way, of information for the secretariat, and I will send a new version. So the last paragraph is removed.

ALISSA COOPER: My last question is, in the third paragraph when I had tried to adapt this for the proposal, I had done some editing just like ISI is not expanded. Like, if you are new to this, do you really know

what ISI is? I had alighted the "Teranode" word, because again what is the Teranode contract. It's given out of context.

So are you okay with some of those edits, or would you rather stick with it as it is here?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I'm happy with you spinning out what you did with ISI, so I think I would change that. I didn't really think about it.

The thing -- more consciously, I did keep the Teranode contract because from my personal perspective, I think it was important that it was really a contract between the U.S. government and ISI, not only research project, even though it was only a footnote. And that's what I'm trying to say, that it was named Teranode doesn't really matter but it was contract. I would like in that case to have the change be made in that direction.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. I guess I just feel we either need to explain what "Teranode" is or not use the word "Teranode."

PATRIK FALTSROM: In that case, we will not be using the word "Teranode" but I would like to say "research contract," not "research project."

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, got it. Can you make that change in your version?
Thanks.

Now we have a queue. Joe and then Kavouss.

Go ahead, Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. Joe Alhadeff for the record. I think that's great. I
think it's very helpful. I agree with Alissa's edits.

The only thing, Patrik, that I had also suggested to add to the
last sentence of the next-to-last paragraph was not just say a
"Web of relationships" but also "ad hoc mechanisms of
coordination." So this way we touch on both topics so people
know the coordination is not something new; it's something that
has existed over time and highlighting that it's ad hoc means
that there isn't a fixed method of coordination.

PATRIK FALTSROM: That is noted. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, thank you, Patrik.

I almost agree with you with respect to the reference to "community." However, since about a year we are talking of operation community. I suggest that after "community," you add "including operational communities as referred to" somewhere because the people who says we have talk about (indiscernible) on community many, many times, many discussions, ICANN, ICG, CCWG. And all of a sudden we go, "I agree with you" but at least first time it appears you put that one. It is harmless totally. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSROM:

Let me ask you a follow-up question. I do fully agree with you that we should use as few terms as possible. Terminology is important.

My question to you is the definition of operational communities in this document is in the following section that talks about process. So my question to you is: Is it okay to mention the term "operational community" here which will be the first time we use the term and then have a forward reference to a later section? To me, that was confusing and that's why I rather used a different term and then you come down to process where we mention where the term "operational community" is coming from.

So when you say we should have a reference, my direct question is: Are you okay with the forward reference in the document?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: What I'm saying is as long as we have a reference to the operational community, it will be okay but the first time we have not saying that this exclude that one or this is -- so I want to make a link between the remaining part of the report talking about operational community and the first time that the term "community" appears in any way that you wish you put that, either including operational community as referred to in following paragraph or any other style that you want to do.

PATRIK FALTSROM: Thank you. I will try to find a way to handle that. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Daniel.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Thank you, Alissa. I agree with all the suggestions so far. And more importantly, I agree with having this level of detail in paragraph 2. I think we need that for the uninitiated.

I have one additional suggestion, just to make the language clearer, to drop the term "resource" totally and replace it with

"registry" so we only talk about registries. It makes it more clear.

PATRIK FALTSROM: Noted.

ALISSA COOPER: Russ Mundy.

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy for the record. As much as I have to disagree with Daniel, I'm going to have to disagree with Daniel. Registries are a mechanism for storing the information and the important part is the information itself. And they are the unique identifiers. So we need to figure out a way to say it clearly and accurately. And I agree that registries are the term of practice that's used within this community. But it's not used widely at all outside of this community.

So we need to figure out how to clearly say that. And I hope we can do a little bit of quick editing of this on the mail list and talk about it more to get to closure on Thursday because I think it is a very important section. And we'll add a good deal of context for folks that have not been involved for a long time.

I think we do need it, and this is about the right degree of detail. And I think we need to work hard at getting the words accurate and consistent and understandable.

PATRIK FALTSROM: Patrik Faltstrom here. Let me ask a clarifying question, Russ.

Was your point that you find it being important to distinguish between the shared resource that is coordinated via a registry where it is recorded how the shared resources is shared. That's your point, right?

RUSS MUNDY: My point, especially in terms of the terminology used here, shared resources I don't think is actually a good depiction of it because the resources themselves collectively have to be identified in such a manner that they are not inadvertently used by more than one party. And so to use the term "shared resources," if you're talking about the complete and total set, then they are shared.

But it really is a unique resource that gets assigned to each one. So "shared" itself is a somewhat misleading word if you're not part of our inside community already.

So uniquely identified resource -- unique identifiers I think is perhaps a better way to say it. But that may not be the best term for the broad community.

ALISSA COOPER: Alan.

ALAN BARRETT: Alan Barrett. If we are writing a history section, I'm just wondering if we should just add a few dates to it, like the date when Jon Postel started performing the function, the date it was moved to ISI, and the date it was moved to ICANN.

PATRIK FALTSROM: Noted. Let me try to add that to the text and mark the registry resources part. And then I will send out a new text in the Word format so we can do red line passing around. Still people in the queue. Let's go through the queue.

ALISSA COOPER: No one else in the queue. Okay. So that's the plan. You will do that. Patrik will send it in Word so people can edit a little bit more on it and let us finalize that on Thursday.

Okay. I think we are good to go on the transition proposal. There's also now an email from Daniel about how we describe the dependency.

I think if people -- people should take a look at the email from Daniel noting that we described the dependency on the CCWG in a few different ways, and please respond to that email. And based on how that -- how the emails come in, I will try to make some edits before Thursday, and we will finalize that on Thursday as well or Friday. Thursday for a two-hour meeting is starting to get a little crowded. So please take a look at that mail as well.

DEMI GETSCHKO: A short comment. Maybe a suggestion also to have a note to the NTIA document of '98 white paper or green paper or something like that because that was the beginning of transition to ICANN. I don't see anything on this. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Reference the white paper or the green paper?

PATRIK FALTSROM: Okay. That is something that is possible to add, yes.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So let us move on to our next topic, which is the engagement session tomorrow. Do we have the slides?

So we have an engagement session tomorrow at noon for one hour. And the rough plan for this engagement session is we wanted to spend about, let's say, 15, 20 minutes maximum talking to the community about -- or presenting to the community about the work that we have done. So this is primarily -- if we could get the slides going.

So just a very brief review of everything that happened up to the public comment period, and then there's a few slides about the comments themselves. Could you scroll down? Thank you.

So you've seen this. This is just a cleaned-up version of the slides that we used in Los Angeles. So overview of the comments received. Next.

The support for the proposal, there's something wrong with that, with the legend in that. So we'll fix that. Not sure what happened.

Giving a review of the themes that emerged from the public comments.

And then next brief review about the relationship between the comments and the support for the NTIA criteria.

And then this I intended to fill in after we had our weekend meetings. So I think the idea here would be we say we have basically final details that we expect to resolve by the end of the week in our remaining meetings and, you know, give the explanation of what we intend to do that we discussed this morning.

And then the next one is the ICG status. So this would be where we say that what we agreed to yesterday, that we will remain as a body through into September of next year but that we are thinking about how to ask the communities what our role should be as far as implementation.

And then we would open it up for Q&A. And our plan is to have the people who took the lead as far as analyzing the public comments and dealing with the matrix to be up on the stage with the chairs. So I think we have agreement from all of those folks. So there would be seven or eight of us up on the stage during the Q&A period.

Comments and thoughts about the engagement session? I see Daniel in the queue. Go ahead, Daniel.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Thank you, Alissa.

This is a good plan. The one thing that I have a problem with is that we're going to say that we plan to ask the communities about what our role should be during implementation. I don't think we have consensus that we want to ask that question.

I'd be fine with basically, saying in the engagement session if anybody wants us to take on another role -- in an informal way in the engagement session, if somebody says -- if anybody wants to -- wants us to take an additional role, please communicate that to us, that would be fine with me. But we shouldn't say we plan to formally ask the communities because we don't have consensus on that.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay.

Paul is next.

PAUL WILSON: Paul Wilson for the record.

I think this was discussed previously. And if it's been resolved, then excuse me. But the slide that characterizes the responses as being either in support or in opposition, how are we determining what is support and what is opposition? Do we have -- I mean, is it the case that those responses that are

counted there are explicitly stated as responses in support or in opposition? Or is that some sort of judgment that's been made about the content?

Because, I guess, there may be responses that are explicitly stated that way. But if they're not, then it may be better to describe it in some other way. So it's either a case of counting the explicit -- the ones that describe themselves being explicitly in support or opposition or something more nuanced than that. It just seems rather polarizing to describe the responses in that way. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER:

So the bit that is missing from this PDF for some reason, although it appears in the PowerPoint, is the green chunk which is neither support, nor oppose. So if it was unclear from reading the comment, whether the commenter was generally supportive of the proposal or generally opposed to the proposal going forward, then they landed in the green chunk. So that category exists. It's just unfortunately not showing in this display.

PAUL WILSON:

I mean, if we got 61% in support, does that mean that the respondent said "I support the proposal"? And otherwise in

opposition that "I oppose the proposal?" Or is it a judgment that's made on the basis of the content of the comment being sort of supportive or in opposition? I mean, I just think if someone has written a response that has three specific complaints about the proposal, that may not mean that it's in our position. It may be supportive. I'm just wanting to clarify how we've characterized the three sets there.

ALISSA COOPER:

Yeah, so I guess what I'm saying is if it wasn't clear then the comment landed in the green chunk. And if it was clear, then they landed in one or the other. Yeah. Yeah. Okay. And this is exactly what we have in the proposal itself as well. So this isn't just like for this presentation. This is the same graph and calculation that we have in Part 0. Okay. I think Kavouss was next. Go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Sorry. I don't have Adobe connection because I'm in the two meetings. I am not comfortable to refer that our role it means that we want to create a role for ourself. I prefer to say that term of reference and the scope of activities but not role. It doesn't look good that we're trying to invoke something that we are looking for another role than what they have. So scope of work and term of reference, if you want to continue.

With respect to whether we -- or not we ask or refer to the community, that is something people could discuss. I have no opposition or no favor for either of the two. But I am not very comfortable to refer to that our role. Term of reference and the scope of work.

ALISSA COOPER: Understood. Makes sense. Mary.

MARY UDUMA: Thank you. Mary, for the record. Kavouss has said what-- one of the things I wanted to say. And again, I want to ask if the community asks us, not us asking. If the community asks us what we will do next, so at least we should be prepared to know what our response should be. You understand what I'm saying? That we are not asking the community but the public engagement and somebody stands up to ask, are you ending your activities or your programs just as soon as you submit, so what should we answer. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: So I think the answer is that we are -- we are remaining constituted as a body. So we're not disbanding, but we are -- we are currently having discussions about what any further scope of our work should be, if any. That -- yeah? Okay. Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Alissa. Just to seek clarification, I'm sorry I was not in the room yesterday, but I noticed that there is an action item that we're drafting questions to the operational communities on the ICG role during the implementation phase and now I hear that there is no consensus on this. So I'm a bit confused as where we have concluded. I'm sorry I was not in the room. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: So what we asked yesterday is there were some people who -- who want us to invite input from the communities about what -- if they think they need something from the ICG or there's a particular role that they want us to play. There were some people who felt that we shouldn't just ask an open-ended question, we should, you know, specify there's three different things we could do, which one of these do you want us to do? There's some people who don't want us to ask at all. So we don't -- we don't have a clear path forward at the moment, but people are supposed to make their proposals to the mailing list this week and then we're going to take this up again at the end of the week. So I think that's why, you know, as far as what we can say tomorrow is that it's under discussion. We don't have anything really concrete that we can say. Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thanks, Joe Alhadeff, for the record. Alissa, my question was just in the green zone of the pie, is that where we put people who opposed the transition conceptually but didn't even comment on the proposal?

ALISSA COOPER: No, those people are in the red.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Because I think we may -- there was a not -- (indiscernible) whatever but they -- you know, I think because in the summary document we kind of highlight those as being treated in a certain way. So I just wonder whether we should represent that there was the group that did that. I don't think it's -- I mean, obviously they opposed the concept altogether so they wouldn't support a proposal so I don't think it's wrong to keep them in red but I just wonder if there's any use in breaking them out.

ALISSA COOPER: Would be interested in others' thoughts on that. That would involve someone going back and making that determination, so going back to the matrix, which might not be too hard actually because I think even in my original annotation I had tried to note

who was just opposed to the transition overall. But if you have a thought about that suggestion, put yourself in the queue, please. Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yes, Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Coming back to this implementation question, what I took from yesterday is that there was almost a board agreement on the question that the initiative should come from the operational communities and the -- all the workload to be done with the -- with regard to the implementation is with the -- with the operational communities, that's what the opinion is, broad opinion here, and I think that should be communicated in that session as well. So this is what I think is a kind of triggering the communities, the broader community and the operational communities from our side that we are of the opinion that the terms of reference towards us should also be a point of discussion on their side and we are keen on to hear something from their side with regards to that. So I wonder whether we shouldn't do that tomorrow. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, I think that's fair. I mean, I think we can just -- we can be, you know, frank with the community that within the ICG we have a variety of opinions about what the scope of our work should be as regards to implementation but we have fairly good

agreement that the initiative for us doing anything should come from the communities. Does that seem fair? Okay. Lynn.

LYNN ST. AMOUR:

Lynn St. Amour. I do think -- I agree with Paul's comments that we should probably go back through and scrub them a little bit more. And I'm happy to do that, either alone or with you, if you've already got something. Because a lot of them said no but gave no reason or said no because it wasn't up to the U.S. government to drive this process, and I don't think those are valid opposition to the proposal. So -- anyway, I'm happy to help in any manner.

ALISSA COOPER:

Can we record an action item for Lynn, with glee, that Lynn will go back through the comments. And I think this -- and let's see, how do we phrase this? To verify and possibly adjust this breakout of support versus opposition, including taking up Joe's suggestion or separating opposition to the proposal and opposition to the whole transition. Thanks. For Thursday or Friday. Yeah. Okay. Thank you. Okay. Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thanks, Alissa. This is Jean-Jacques. I hadn't really paid attention to this before but as it's on the big screen now, I'm

obliged to look at it. And it seems very -- excuse the pun -- very black and white. I mean, you either agree or you disagree. Having been in the little team which examined each and every public comment, I must say some of them were more ambiguous, less affirmative or negative in that sense. So it bothers me a bit that it comes out finally -- the end product comes out black and white or blue and red, as it were. Neither support nor oppose, I remember there was some comments which talked about the sex of angels, had nothing to do with the transition of oversight. So that I agree is a category in itself. And that's 12%. But would there be -- I don't have a proposal but would there be any way of simply pointing out that it's less clear-cut than this?

ALISSA COOPER:

So I think there -- in the proposal itself there are words to this effect, I think. I would have to go -- take another look. But I -- I mean, I completely agree. It's -- it's a question. I think people like to get a sense of overall, you know, what was the tenor of the comments and it's nice to be able to illustrate it. But you lose a lot of detail when you do that. So we don't have to do this. It was a framing device for the Los Angeles meeting. You know, we can pull it from the proposal and from the deck, or we can present it but try to, with -- with words, give the surrounding context. Go ahead.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes. This is Jean-Jacques. Frankly, I think that at this stage of our work it would make more sense to have a written comment, a few words, saying that according to our tally a majority of public comments were clearly in support of, et cetera. And a minority or a clear minority, between brackets, less than 30%, was opposed, something like that. Because the problem with -- with a chart, with a visual aid like this, is that some people will remember only that and they'll say okay, so there's no problem. We have 60%. You know, it's like elections. And some will say well, an opposition of almost 30% is -- is too important to overlook. So I'd do away with this chart altogether.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. I will -- I did just find the words, so let me just read what is in the proposal. "The majority of comments, 61%, were generally supportive of the proposal or expressed qualified support accompanied by questions, request for clarification, or criticism. The rest of the comments either opposed the proposal or the IANA stewardship transition overall or made no clear indication of either support or opposition." So that's what it says in the proposal. But now it's on the table of whether -- so we could say that and present the graphic or we could not present the graphic at all. I think those are basically the two

choices. I will put you back in the queue, Kavouss. Daniel is next.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Thank you, Alissa. I agree with Jean-Jacques that we should not use this graphic and we should not actually do this tallying. I think it's a very good idea to add another category that says, opposed to the transition in general, and only once we've done that tally should we consider actually presenting statistics about this. And the same goes for in the proposal, so we should amend that in the proposal but we should not present the thing as it stands on -- in tomorrow's session because that's -- I totally agree with Jean-Jacques, that's the thing people will take away from it and that's not what we want.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Well, I just think that once you get the distinction made between people who are against the transition and people who are actually against the proposal that you've solved most of these objections and that we should continue to use the pie graph because that clearly conveys the overall thing. The thing -- you know, comments -- people who are against having the transition

are effectively discounted because, of course, the NTIA has had -
- has decided to have a transition and we are conveying the
notion of public support to the NTIA. So taking those out of that
red zone is fine. Other than that, I don't agree, I'm not even sure
I understand why you don't want to show this graphic at all.

ALISSA COOPER: Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I endorse the three previous speakers. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Well, okay. Milton wants to show it and Daniel doesn't want to
show it, so how do you endorse both of them?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I think -- let me make it clear. I then want to oppose Milton's.
But I think this visualized diagram may mislead the people,
because the opposition has various aspects. Sometimes maybe
partial, sometimes maybe total and so on and so forth. It is
better you have the paragraph or you explain that rather than
this one. This might be good for some other purposes, but not in
the engagement with the community. That will mislead the
people or we're trying to make a sort of publicity for our work,

that what we have done is supported by the community. So let's make the paragraph or explain it part of the paragraph that within the comments received there are this various categories of oppositions and so forth. But not this diagram. This may be misleading. So let us correct myself. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay. So folks, we have four minutes before this meeting is supposed to end. And we have to figure out what to do here. So we could do, based on some of the -- the suggestions in the chat, what we could do, and based on Lynn's availability, is to try to break this thing down into more subcategories, make it more, you know, closer to the granularity of the actual evaluation that we did of the comments and we would end up with -- instead of it looking black and white it would end up with a few different gradations, you know, support, qualified support, opposition, opposition to the transition entirely and, you know, neither of -- none of the above. So we could try to do that and turn it around this afternoon and have people take a look at it and if you really, really can't live with it being shown tomorrow, you could send your opinion to the list. Or we could just can it altogether for tomorrow and, you know, put some bullets on a slide that describe it qualitatively instead. So I'd like to get a sense of which of those two options people would like to pursue. So option 1 is revise this slide, make it more granular, circulate it on

the list this afternoon, and unless anybody screams and says absolutely not, then we'll show it tomorrow. That's option 1. And option 2 is, scrap it right now ask just write some qualitative description on this slide instead. Who is in favor of option 1? People in the chat, let me know if you like option 1. Okay. I think I have about nine in support of option 1. Who is in support of option 2? Two. I feel that the rough consensus is in favor of option 1. Joe says he can go either way. Classic. Okay. So we will put out a revised version of this slide this afternoon to the list and if you really can't live with it, then send email and we'll put out a different version that doesn't have a graphic on it. Okay?

Okay. So we have come to the end of our session. We didn't make it to the public comment summary document. Is everything okay over here?

MARY UDUMA:

Mary here. I'm going to say, whichever side we take people still interpret the other numbers as they make out that there's 30% or more, 30% opposition. So whether we do it qualitatively or we do it graphically, I think, whichever way. Those that are sharp will catch it and they will still raise the issue. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, I mean, it is what it is, right? The numbers aren't really going to change. It's just going to be reflected differently. So yeah. Okay.

So we will take up the summary document on either Thursday or Friday. I really encourage people to review the summary document and send comments to the list because we haven't had much discussion of it at all. It just came out right before this meeting and if we are intending to finalize it, people really need to take a look at it. So I had just for Thursday started listing the items that we said that we would get back to and this list now is a lot -- is somewhat longer because we have more items from today. So we will come back to the transition proposal, including the implementation inventory, we will come back to this question about our scope of work during the implementation period and other reflections from the ICANN week, and then we will try to do -- try to finally get to the summary document and the minutes. And a lot of this is going to bleed onto Friday. My apologies. It's listed for Thursday, but we only have two hours on Thursday. Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. If I were in the community I would have raised the following questions to the ICG, do you have any date that you submit your proposals to NTIA after discussions in ICANN 54? And question

two, in view of the extensive discussions in the CCWG and the proposal or the comment of the ICANN do you see to encounter any difficulties to do so? Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: You're saying those are the questions that you expect?

You are saying those are the questions you expect us to receive?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: So your question is what should be the answer of ICG.

ALISSA COOPER: Oh, I see. So I think -- no, we don't have a specific date, right? That's what we said. We don't have a specific date. We are following closely the process in the accountability group, and I don't think we have any anticipated difficulties other than we're just waiting. Yeah.

Lynn?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Lynn St. Amour. Just to be clear, I will take a shot at the deadline for revising the gradation of the comments this afternoon and get that back out.

But I was going to -- I wanted to echo what Kavouss said. And I was going to say that I think there's some questions that we can anticipate getting from tomorrow and maybe we should circulate or get some other folks to volunteer to anticipate those questions and circulate some text here so that we're in agreement on some of the -- you know, what impact do we think the CCWG process is going to have on our time lines? Some of those questions.

Again, just get some text agreed in terms of responses. So that would be a call for volunteers, I think, to try and identify those questions and the responses.

ALISSA COOPER:

Yes. I'm all in favor of that. If people want to do that, that would be a great help, I think.

Anything else? Okay. Then we will be back together as a group on Thursday.

So enjoy the meeting.

Oh, Manal. Go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Just referring to Joe's comment in the chatroom asking people to fill the missing parts in the summary report, we have some

missing parts in the public comments summary report that we couldn't get the final text for. So if colleagues here are -- do have this final text ready and can point us to this, we can maybe include it in our discussion on Thursday or Friday. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSROM:

Patrik Faltstrom. I have got privately some question from ICG members whether we as chairs do believe that we need the meeting time on Friday. Let me just say to all of you, given that we could not finish all our work today and Thursday is only a short session, we do absolutely think we need to meet on in Friday, although we might end early. So unfortunately the people that asked whether I personally think they can fly home a day early, I must say no.

ALISSA COOPER:

Sorry.

[Laughter]

All right. I think we are done. Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]