LONDON – NTIA IANA Functions' Stewardship Transition Coordination Group Meeting – FULL DAY
Friday, July 18, 2014 – 09:00 to 18:00
London, England

ALISSA COOPER: Can we try to start in one or two minutes, please?

Okay. Are we ready to start in terms of everything? Yes. Thank you, ICANN.

Welcome back, everyone. I think we have one or two new faces in the room. I don't think we should all reintroduce ourselves, but maybe the new people can introduce themselves, so I think that's Xiaodong.

Do you want to introduce yourself?

And I guess what we did yesterday was kind of lengthy introductions, so tell us who you are, what community you got appointed from, a little bit about that community, and how its processes work, perhaps, whether you are representing that community or operating as an individual providing your own opinions, and how you are employed and funded to do this work.

KUO-WEI WU: You can speak in Chinese. We have interpreter.

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: Yes, that's true too.

XIAODONG LEE: Okay. I try to speak English.

[Laughter]

So this is Xiaodong Lee. Now I'm the CEO of CNIC, which is the .CN registry. I'm selected on behalf of the country code top-level domain registry. So I'm real familiar with many of you because I used to work for ICANN, and I have been engaged into in community for over 12 years. Yeah. I'm anxious to try to work together with you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Do we have any remote people who are on today who weren't on yesterday? Do we know? Doesn't look like it.

NANCY LUPIANO: Russ is on at the moment.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. But Russ was with us yesterday. Okay. Great. So let's begin just with a little review of the agenda.

I've sent around, and hopefully it has been posted to the public, the -- an updated -- a slightly updated version of the agenda for

today. It's being projected on the screen. Of course nobody can read it, probably, but hopefully everyone has it in front of them on their laptop.

So this -- today is a mix of parking lots for discussions that we want to conclude from yesterday and then a few new topics. I've had a suggestion -- so we were originally going to start with an hour on the charter, scope, and expectations towards the communities. I've had a suggestion that we actually might want to revisit the coordination group participation and the letter that Lynn has authored for us to potentially send to the GAC; that we might want to do that first, so that we can -- if we agree to it, we can get it out to them as soon as possible and get that whole process moving.

So does anyone object to that?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Rest assured it's not an objection.

I would like to support Lynn's proposal just by adding an amendment, a friendly amendment. First of all, I should include that based on GAC request, we have accepted that the GAC representation in that group goes to five people. Secondly, we are aware of the working methods within GAC and therefore we understand that the number of five people would enable to enlarge and engage more GAC people in our group. So these are

the two elements that I think are really important to add to that text.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. So just a quick process note. Very much appreciated. We should note that for the discussion. The first question is: Can we have that discussion right now? And I will do a little reorg of the agenda. But very much appreciated your input.

Yeah, everybody's okay with that.

Okay. So why don't we launch into that. I know Jari has the presentation laptop next to him and it's between you, so if you need to project, I think we can do that and it will go into the virtual meeting room and I will work on the agenda to try and figure out how we can do this.

I think we should try to -- try to take this to 9:45.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: So I'm not certain if everybody had a chance to read the draft that I sent out last night. I did see a couple of comments on it. And Jean-Jacques, did you actually have a chance to read it? Because the two points you mentioned were in, so you're looking for a refinement of the language?

>> ---

Okay. And I don't know if somebody can just project the letter as it was sent up there and we can talk to it, just in terms of efficiency here. I'm not flipping things back and forth.

>> ---

No, I don't have it organized on mine yet either.

I think the only -- Kuo-Wei had a comment which we should probably come to first, to see if that supersedes any of the subsequent discussion, but you had asked on the list for a chance to comment, I guess, process-wise.

KUO-WEI WU: Well, I think I talk to, you know, Theresa about if this procedure-wise is complete, and I think basically from Theresa's explanation, I think I accept, you know, the secretary's opinion, you know, and I think it's okay now for me.

Originally I'm thinking about -- let me say that originally I'm thinking about it because the coordination group, the member, we are appointed by different constituencies, so if we are going to decide about more member from the GAC, in some sense we need to, you know, have some rationale and some kind of procedure-wise to go through. But when I check with Theresa, she said the coordination group, I think we can make a decision about, you know, all the process of this -- you know, the procedure. I think she explained to me. I think I can accept that.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: So if I understand, then, whatever question you had about the process has now been answered and you're comfortable with the process we followed yesterday to take that decision?

KUO-WEI WU: Yeah.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Okay. Theresa, are you saying something in the background?

THERESA SWINEHART: This was something for the coordination group to address, and if the coordination group is comfortable with the process that they had for that, that is completely appropriate from the perspective of the points that Kuo-Wei was raising.

KUO-WEI WU: Yeah.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: So I feel like I'm trying to read between the lines a little bit here and I'm not sure if there's been other input and you think the coordination group needs to just sort of reaffirm that we're

comfortable with the process we used to arrive at the decision yesterday or...

I just feel like there are things which are in the background that are not known, so let me just ask the question, then.

Is the coordination group comfortable with the process we ran yesterday and the conclusion we reached?

So lots of heads nodding and thumbs up.

So then with that, let's go to the letter which is now up on the screen there.

The comments that I've had, in trying to track this a little bit in real time, I like Alissa's edits on the rough consensus, an agreement that we would operate by rough consensus, judged more by the merit objections and the number of them. I think it's cleaning up the text that's there. Maybe a little more precise. But is everybody comfortable with that?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: I have a question.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Uh-huh.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: It is clear that the letter should include only for the GAC a summary of our discussions yesterday, because I may imagine that some other communities may find something strange that the GAC was judged differently, let's say, saying this is only for the GAC, and we are not to blame. If the GAC is not here at this room, they are on line. In fact, they should provide for an adequate representation.

So I think would it be wise to limit our letter to the fact that this group has accepted to extend to five the number of GAC representatives here?

And the second point that I mentioned before, why don't we explain the reasons, the grounds for this demand to be reasonable?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: I think maybe some people didn't understand the translation because the transcript wasn't up in real time and some people didn't put headsets on, but basically what Jean-Jacques is saying is do we actually need to put the details of some of our points of agreement or near agreement yesterday in the letter, and should we simply state that we have evaluated their request and are happy to appoint five individuals.

EN

ALISSA COOPER: So I have myself and Daniel in the queue and Kuo and Adiel and Joe.

Okay. So I think first of all, I thought Lynn did a really great job of characterizing the agreements as not just being directed towards the GAC but as expectations for all of our participation in the group, and as a result, I -- I don't see really a downside of making those public. And I also think that this -- although it's kind of a letter directed towards Heather, it's something that we should just make public anyway, so it's really kind of a statement of things that we agreed to, in addition to being directed towards the GAC.

I think there is tremendous value in linking those expectations with the decision that we made. At least from my perspective, there's -- there -- the decision is much more -- better justified if we include those.

Daniel?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: This is Daniel.

I tend to agree with Jean-Jacques here. I think we should be minimalistic in these communications. We can make the other points separately and they belong separately, but I think there's one additional thing that Jean-Jacques said, as -- if my French is not too rusty, is (a) just state the fact, you know, we're doing this,

and (b) we recognize that there is an intrinsic reason in the GAC and its composition and its proceedings why this seems reasonable to us. And I think if we say these two things, we've said enough.

ALISSA COOPER: Kuo?

KUO-WEI WU: I don't think we need a detailed explanation about it, but we need some kind of a simple rationale statement and put into our record. That would be good enough is my point.

ALISSA COOPER: Adiel.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: I just want to echo what everybody has said and agree with Jean-Jacques that we don't have to give the detail of our discussion and our proceeding, specifically to the GAC. That can appear in the report or the minutes of the group that will be published, but for the GAC, just acknowledging their request and saying that we agree on that will be enough. I will also reinforce the second point that he had, the rationale -- I think that will be fundamental because that will also have prevent everybody to start speaking of the decision we made. So the rationale has to be very well-put

and then elaborate in a way that people understand why we took that specific message. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. I think we don't need the elaborate nature of the statement that's made about the elements of the discussion, but I do think one portion of that is useful which is that we look forward to the participation of the GAC members not just in the narrow work of the steering committee or whatever we call ourselves but also in the specific work of the coordinating communities or whatever we call them.

I think to call out the fact that the GAC's participation is not just at the top line but also in the operational groups is a useful addition to the letter without having to go through we made a charter, we did this, we had a conversation. That's more than we need. But that one item coupled with the rationale items I think is important.

ALISSA COOPER: Mary.

MARY UDUMA: Thank you. I also support all these statements. I'm not going back, but I'm just being curious. Did GAC write this group? Sent a letter to this group? Why are we writing members of GAC? We have representatives of GAC here. Were online yesterday at least. heather was online. Are we sending this letter as a group in response to the request to this group? I just need clarification.

ALISSA COOPER: Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: I guess I'm going to be taking a minority position here. I'm kind of supporting the original --

ALISSA COOPER: Turn your headphones.

MILTON MUELLER: Okay. How's that? Is that better? Looks better, okay.

So as you recall, some of us, perhaps most of us, who supported additional GAC representation on this committee, were very conditional and qualified in our support for that. We wanted to make it clear that there were good reasons and bad reasons for adding additional GAC members. And what I liked about Lynn's original letter is that it sort of specified that conditionality that we

will be operating on the basis of consensus, we have expectations that they be liaising with their communities, and that that's the reason for adding additional people. We are not simply doing it because they asked for it. We are not doing it because they think this is a representative body in which there will be voting. So I think it is very important to condition our approval of these additional members on those kinds of criteria.

ALISSA COOPER: Jari.

JARI ARKKO: So for the record, I agree with Milton. And it's part of the deal. I mean, we can't put forward the other part without specifying the conditions, and I believe also we should operate all of our operations in a transparent manner and public manner.

ALISSA COOPER: I just got back in the queue in response to Mary. Oh, sorry, Adiel is also back in the queue. Thank you.

I don't think we ever received a request specifically from the GAC. I mean, it was sort of relayed to us by the ICANN staff. But I think we're sort of responding as we think we need to respond based on what we know, but it is not like they sent us a communication or anything.

Adiel?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yeah. Just for point of clarification, I think saying we operate through rough consensus and so on in the communication is fine. I think what is not -- from my understanding, what we don't want is specifically to send a report of our discussion to the board which will go beyond how we get to that consensus decision, et cetera, because as Jean-Jacques said, that will kind of create specifics. But I think the letter can contend the fact that this group operates -- will operate on a consensus basis, and the charter explains that the group is not a "decision-making group" for instance. Not more than that. I think what we're saying here is that the letter should be straightforward enough not to become a kind of letter of intent between this group and GAC kind of...

ALISSA COOPER: Jari, Milton, are you still in the queue?

JARI ARKKO: Just responding to Adiel, so what I felt was important in Lynn's letter proposal was Items 3 and 4. The rest at least as far as I'm concerned could go away.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Maybe I will try and put something forward in a moment here. Just to be clear, I want the letter to represent what this group actually agrees. And I did think that we had reached the point yesterday whereas Milton said in a number of the communities were actually quite clear that it was conditional, they were willing to accept this if X was understood or X happened. Maybe there's a trickier point of protocol here. I'm not certain how we actually were made aware of the GAC request and maybe that's a question for Theresa. If there was a formal letter sent in from the GAC, then it should get a formal response back. If it was, you know, a question which has just kind of been relayed, then I guess there's an option for us to maybe respond in kind but make it clear to Heather that it was on the expectation or assumption that these things were well-understood by them and that we ask Heather to actually transmit that back to the GAC members.

But I think it may depend on what was the form of the specific requests we got from the GAC.

ALISSA COOPER: Jari and then Keith and then Adiel.

JARI ARKKO: I think this should all be matter of public record. We should not worry so much about how we got the request. Our actions will be looked upon by the world. I mean, we added X people from a

particular community, why, and what were the conditions. I think it is an important part of the message that we're sending that, yeah, you can have more persons from this particular direction as long as we operate in this manner. I think a message needs to be sent to everybody, not just Heather.

ALISSA COOPER: Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you. Keith Drazek. I agree that this is a critical point that needs to be made to Heather and to the GAC, particularly those representatives who will be here among us to set expectations. And I think that we have consensus within this group based on our conversation yesterday that this is -- whether it is a condition or, you know, an expectation is that it's a message that needs to be sent.

I'm not so much concerned about whether it is a formal letter or an email to Heather. I think we can do one or both, and it really is not a critical issue for me. But I do support including that particular language and I support the draft that Lynn originally sent around and certainly with the edits that Alissa also made. So I support moving forward with that communication.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yeah, I just want to support the suggestion made by Jari. I would like to see the point 3 and 4 to stay in the letter, but I'm still not very sure about point 1 and 2. So 3 and 4 are critical and represent our consensus yesterday. But 1 and 2, I think it's not specifically needed.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: I'm trying to make a helpful suggestion here. Taking into account what several people have said, specifically Adiel, I think it would be a good idea to rephrase this in a way that we are much more direct and maybe less problematic in our expectations of the GAC's behavior here and not put it in the way you put it diplomatically saying "As you observed, we agreed" and all this kind of stuff. But maybe be just more direct and put the points 2 and 3 in there directly addressed to them because I share the concern that this looks like a communique that I hope we can make it the end of this meeting, but it seems displaced in that letter. In that, I agree with Jean-Jacques. So just a suggestion.

ALISSA COOPER: Narelle and then, Keith, are you in the queue still? No. Narelle?

NARELLE CLARK: Can you hear me adequately?

ALISSA COOPER: We have some weird buzz.

NARELLE CLARK: I have a lot of buzz coming through. I will do it quickly.

ALISSA COOPER: Narelle, I think we're going to try to love our audio issue. So they're going to redial out to you. Maybe, Lynn, if you want to go in the meantime.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Yeah. It's unfortunate not hearing what Narelle had to say, but we'll get her to come back in unless she can type her comment in.

I was actually going to see if we had enough consensus on -- and I could go forward and do the final edits in the letter with Jean-Jacques and anybody else, Adiel, who might want to come forward.

But I think there was support for taking the language on the charter and the scope out of the document, leaving points 3 and 4 in. I'm not saying -- okay, yeah. I didn't say that right either. I want to see if there is consensus on taking points 1 and 2 out and leaving points 3 and 4 in. That would mean removing the language about high alignment or reached agreement on a group charter and a scoping statement but would maintain the clear expectations -- and again this may be slightly edited, but maintain

clear expectations that the work be done in the respective communities with participation from all stakeholders, leaving the CG the relatively narrow role of coordination and a nascent agreement that we would operate by, and let's just text here, rough consensus judged more by the merit of objections rather than by the number of them.

So if we can just take that point for the moment. Would there be support for maintaining the letter otherwise largely as is but removing points 1 and 2? So Milton just said "no" here and then there's a queue that's forming that Alissa is going to manage.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Wolf-Ulrich speaking. In principle, I'm in agreement with the letter, besides some formulation about to be reformulated, yeah? And things. So for example, that we didn't have -- reached an agreement. Not yet. But simply with regards to the charter. That's one thing. And the other thing is I would like not to -- it's hard to see that. Oh, it's with respect to some formulation. Are we talking about formulations right here now or in a later group together with you? That's my question. I didn't get that. I'm sorry.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: I think we're trying to get agreement on the key points in the letter, and then I'm assuming that two or three people would go away and take responsibility for the final drafting.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. Good.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: But we need to get clear on the content now.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: There is agreement from my side. Thanks. Yeah.

ALISSA COOPER: Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Well, first of all, when people talk about Points 3 and 4 versus 1 and 2, I'm not sure what they're talking about. I see three main paragraphs here.

I don't see any of them numbered.

So again, I think in the first paragraph, which many people seem to want to get rid of, we're talking about -- we're talking about the alignment within the coordination group on the charter, scoping

statement, and expectations that work be done in the respective communities.

That's absolutely essential to make this point to the GAC.

ALISSA COOPER: So I think the 3 and 4 are the numbered 3 and 4.

MILTON MUELLER: Okay. So you're just proposing to strike those first two points. Okay. Not the first two paragraphs.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: No, no. No. Sorry. The first two points, the scope and the charter.

Does that change your --

MILTON MUELLER: Yes.

ALISSA COOPER: So just one other note from the edits that I had sent.

I thought it was a little strange that the letter didn't actually say what we had decided, so that was one other thing that I think should be considered in the editing. That's all.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: So that could be made more clear?

To the rationale point that both Jean-Jacques and Adiel commented on, is there a specific text you'd actually like to suggest or are you more comfortable now if we remove Points 1 and 2 and just get to the more conditional parts, I guess?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thanks. This is Jean-Jacques.

Yes, I feel completely comfortable with your suggestion, then, and if you're willing to hold the pen, one or two of us or two or three of us could join you and help you with that. Thank you.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: So I saw -- I heard Jean-Jacques' offer and I saw Adiel shaking his head "yes" to help with the final iteration on this.

Are we all comfortable enough, now that we both understand each other well enough, we're comfortable with the letter and you will allow the three of us to go away and do that? I think we need to do that in the background of the meeting so that we get that out to Heather as quickly as possible.

Theresa said that ICANN staff are actually getting some sort of queries as well, and of course it is a public record, since the

EN

meeting was yesterday, so the sooner we can turn that out and get a response back to Heather, the better.

Which brings us to I think it should be signed "The Coordination Group," and if possible, come from Theresa or some part of the secretariat at this point, unless we think we're going to be able to move forward more quickly with some of the other points.

But any -- looking for a quick response from everybody back here.

Seeing heads nodding and thumbs up for those of you that are virtual. Has Narelle come back on-line yet?

>> ---

And Narelle, I'm sorry. We couldn't hear you well earlier and I don't know if you've been able to follow what we're doing just here now, but basically we're proposing to go forward with the letter sort of substantially as-is, removing the point that says -- that talks about high alignment on the group charter and the scoping statement, and the final iteration of the letter will be done by Jean-Jacques, Adiel, and myself, and likely sent out by the secretariat, hopefully within the next hour or two, so that we can get that message out formally to the GAC, as yesterday's discussions were a matter of public record.

I don't say that to preempt you. Just so that you're fully up to speed with where the conversation is in the room here.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So you don't need more agenda time later for us to revisit this?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: I don't, but Russ Mundy -- thank you, Alice. Russ wants to get in the queue --

ALISSA COOPER: I'm sorry.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: -- and I think we're still hoping to hear from Narelle, too.

RUSS MUNDY: Am I up, Lynn?

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah. Go ahead, Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks. One of the things I wanted to ask the group to think about, if we want the first formal piece of communication out of the group to be this response, as opposed to, say, the charter or some other summary statement about the work that we're doing

these two days, I mean, it seems almost a little odd that the very first public communication would be a letter to the GAC talking about this particular issue without having other -- more ground rule basis set up for the group. It's kind of a meta question for the group to think about.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: This is Daniel. I agree with what Russ has just said. I think we should not be seen to be too much influenced by external pressure, specifically from the GAC. Our proceedings yesterday were open. Anybody could join. And I think it's -- I would hear -- like to hear arguments why this needs to be done in the next two hours. Otherwise, unless we can -- we have a clear rationale for this and we agree on it, I think we should take our time doing our work diligently.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you very much. Mohamed El Bashir, for the transcript.

My understanding of the protocol is that this is our last day and then at the end of our meetings, there will be outcomes of the meetings, including the charter, including the scoping, whatever has been agreed between us as a group, including a letter going out to the GAC with our decision. I'm not sure where the two hours came from, especially that we need immediately to respond to GAC, but I think we need to complete our work. Part of the

package of the outcome is a letter to the GAC in response to their request to us. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Joe?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Get the mic out of the electrocution zone.

The -- I think for me it's a similar concept in the sense that we are going to be getting some outcomes, and if they are, in fact, accepted as of yesterday's resolution as a member of the body, then finding a way to communicate with them on that fact would seem to be important. Otherwise, the question is, are we supposed to wait till the finalization of our outcomes until the notification.

I don't know what the answer to that question is from a process point of view, but I think it -- it raises the question and the -- the sooner we finalize that communication, I think the less that issue is relevant to our questions.

ALISSA COOPER: Mary, do you have your card up? Yeah? No. Paul.

PAUL WILSON: I'm just surprised this is taking so long. The meeting is open, so GAC members who are tuned in, including the chair, will know what the decision is.

I kind of agree that the -- that this -- this is secondary to the other work that we have, which is the charter and everything else which needs to be published as the primary outcome, and I think the formality of a letter to the GAC should follow that. But I think to me it's -- it seems as simple as that. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Xiaodong and then Jean-Jacques.

XIAODONG LEE: I have a comment. I just want to second the opinion of Paul Wilson. I think we need to spend more time on the most important things. We don't need to spend a lot of time on the GAC response.

Of course I support the letter.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. I would like to know if there is any other way to inform the GAC of this decision without it being a formal letter for this group. I just heard Daniel, Paul, Xiaodong, and I do understand that our main task, evidently, is to take care of the way in which our group functions and to agree on other important

issues, very important issues. In this sense, the GAC is secondary. I agree with that. But there is a political reality. If we do not have the full cooperation of the GAC from the very beginning, our task will be a lot more complicated. So this is not a proposal, actually, but a question. Could we think that some of us, even if this is not an elected representative because we haven't really voted, could that person represent the organization that is receiving us? For example, Theresa Swinehart, could she, for example, communicate directly with Heather Dryden by telephone or email, just to inform her on our behalf the following three points. And that's it. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Joe, are you back in the queue again? No? No queue.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Well, I think we need to close this quickly, given all the other work ahead of us.

Part of the impetus for a fast turnaround with some sort of reasonably official communication to the GAC was, of course, that we're about to move on to some pretty big decisions, and how they feel they're informed and when they feel they're informed will go to certainly Jean-Jacques' comments about some of the political reality of this. It will certainly, in any case, complicate

approval of the things that are in front of us for the rest of the day.

We -- why don't we work on the letter in the background. We have agreement on the letter. I do think documenting that would be helpful and is most in line with what a number of the communities here were quite of insistent, in fact, be understood or communicated, so that we maintain that and maybe we can send a brief email -- I can even send just a personal brief email to Heather now that says, "We're working on a formal communication, we expect it will come out sometime later today," but, you know, tell her that she can proceed with notifying the GAC first. Is that a happy middle route and that will allow us to move on?

So again, see heads nodding around the room here. If there are no killer objections from any of the remote participants, we'll move on and close this item.

ALISSA COOPER: So the next item -- so I just sent to the mailing list an updated agenda. The next item, we have an hour for charter, scope, and community expectations, so why don't we start with charter.

Jari?

JARI ARKKO:
Yes. Jari Arkko. And can we get the computer to display? Yeah? Okay. Thank you.

So just for background, we've had quite a bit of discussion yesterday in the group and then just in separate scope discussion some enhancements of that, and back and forth on the mailing list, so me and Milton and others -- and Mary met during breakfast and we believe we handled everything, all the comments that were made in the meeting or on the list or off line except two things. One was the word "legitimate" that was discussed, and the other one is that Joe and us had a discussion on how to make sure that there's, you know, sufficient introductory words in the document or in the charter, and that the -- the charter is appropriately balanced around the question of the directly affected parties and the rest, and that discussion is still -- still ongoing.

So what I thought I would do, I would just go over briefly the document as we have it on the screen and you have it in your computers in the mail thread, Version 4, and once we have gone through, then we could go back and, you know, go -- if you have issues, and then we need to continue the discussion with Joe on exactly how to address the question of...

>> ---

So you sent some proposed text after the one that I was sent last night?

>> ---

Okay. Maybe we can deal with that in a moment, but why don't we just go through this first.

Sorry. I'm switching over to the other mic so I can actually see the screen.

So -- and this is pretty small on the screen. Hopefully you'll see it.

But you have your own version on the computers, hopefully, as well.

So just explaining briefly what we did, we wanted to add the word "stewardship" here at the beginning, because it's -- that's what we're talking about.

We added a little bit -- or a version of the editing group's -- or the editing group had a version of Joe's introductory words. We wanted to say something about transparency, broad range of stakeholders, and stability and security, so we added the brief part of that and so that's, you know, one way of introducing some of the topics here without increasing the length too -- of the document too much.

And then yesterday we had a big discussion about the three or four communities, whether CC and G are part of the same or different, and now we're -- this particular proposal that we have now on the table is speaking about three main categories but

explicitly calling out that there's some distinction between the country code and generic domains, and we'll be even a little bit more explicit later on in the document, as you will see.

And then throughout the document you'll be seeing some text relating to the -- the parties, the three or four and everyone else. So now we're calling the three parties the directly affected communities and the others are, well, others or indirectly affected. Everyone's affected or everyone has interest, of course, but there's a, you know, slightly special role for the customers of IANA. As they need to produce proposals going forward.

And then yesterday we had worked on scoping and accountability text. This is the version that I got from -- well, it is basically Alice went down the edits in the group's discussion yesterday, and then Milton had done some further editing, just editorial stuff. And here you can also see, we can come back to this, but we had a discussion of the word "legitimate." And I think on the mailing list, it seemed to be clear to me that there was a fair bit of support for striking that. Anyone dispute that?

Why don't we go through the whole document and go through the issues one by one. That's one of the issues that has to be discussed.

And then we had the list of tasks. And here, again, this is one part where we try to take Joe's input into account, very important that we address everybody and not just the three. So now we are

talking about liaising to all interested parties and including the three but also everyone else. And then we need to assess the outputs from the three.

And then the liaising thing, we added a paragraph that talks about additional things. So what we're saying here --

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Excuse me. Can you go a little bit up, please? The last. Do we want to say that we want to assess only the outputs of the three directly affected?

JARI ARKKO: I think that's part -- actually, if I understand correctly, that we have probably not gone all the way in implementing the sort of equality among everyone sending us inputs. We definitely need to go through a particular process as in the outputs of the three.

Maybe it actually would be better if we go through the whole thing because some of these parts are related to each other, so we'll -- I will make a note of these two things that we just have to discuss. I just want to show the whole thing just to give everyone a feeling of what we have here.

So under Item 1 which is the liaising, we added text to describe what the official communication channel is to the communities that are sort of represented here. Of course, there are other

communities in the world as well. But, for instance, for the communications linked to the IETF is me and Alissa.

And then we explicitly say that the group expects a plan from the country code and generic name communities, possibly a joint one, a plan from the numbers community, and a plan from the protocol parameters community. This is just to be very clear of where we must get input. And then we say we are, of course, open for input and feedback from everybody. We also recommend that everybody gets involved as early as possible. Don't wait until the coordination group stage and bring their input only here because I think it will be a bad choice from a scalability point of view if everyone discussed only three the coordination group. I think people need to go to the cross-community working group and every other place if they want to have an impact.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm concerned about that last sentence in the read paragraph. If you want to flag that.

JARI ARKKO: I will add that to my list. Thank you.

Okay. And then continuing, step two, which is the assessment. And here we removed some language that talked about some of the things that the group didn't like yesterday addressing the consensus of the communities from this group's perspective was

seen as something we should not do as an example. But we added some expectations to the proposal that are coming to us that they have to document how they reach consensus and they have to document how they believe their proposal is practical.

And then we added also an explicit note that it's not in the role of the coordination group to develop proposals or to select among competing proposals.

Also Item 2, and let me go into assembling the whole in the complete proposal. Elise had raised yesterday an issue that there was some issues here with regards to what we are actually assessing and which one of those belong to step two and which ones to step three and we are wanting to be clear here that on this stage, we are talking about the assessment of the whole. Hopefully that will resolve your issue.

Russ, you have raised that, if there is -- if there was an issue at this stage, the original text was -- or Milton's version of the text said something about being able to make small changes and hear we basically just say if a change is needed, we need to work with the communities of interest and do this. They may need to rerun their consensus calls and things like that. So we will just refer to what we already described in an earlier step regarding the interaction with the other communities.

And then finally on step 4, part 4, information sharing added a statement that as this whole process will take some time, it is

important that we share information early and continuously. It makes it possible to iterate and detect early potential issues and also share ideas between the different parties.

So those were the changes. And we can now go back. I think the first one that I had marked was the issue of the word "legitimate."

Okay, so...

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I know we tried to deal with the differentiation of the communities with "affected" and "directly affected." And I think anyone reading this who wasn't in the room would never find that distinction existing because they would just see it as affected communities and they would not read the distinction to be real.

I understand why "operational" is not useful because it creates problems for those who do not have an operational component per se.

I was wondering if the concept of the entities engaged with IANA might be a way to do that differentiation because the beneficiaries of IANA are not engaged with IANA. There is no direct relationship. But those that are in the communities of interest do have an engagement with IANA whether it's contractual or not. And if that's a way to do the distinction, then I think it is a much more obvious distinction to the reader. And if that's possible, that would help, I think, create that semblance of

two types of entities in this process because you can -- "affected" and "directly affected" is such a matter of degree and that adjective just may be lost in translation.

JARI ARKKO: I kind of like that proposal, and at least I have no problem with it. I will point out one little fact, however, which is that there are some -- the community out there, the world, may actually directly interact with IANA. Like, a software developer who needs a port number may actually send mail to IANA.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: But that's different than, I think, being engaged. That's more a question of "directly affected." Is this an improper term?

JARI ARKKO: Fair enough. And I was pointing this out to make sure that we are all on the same page, and I understand the real situation.

How do others feel? Does it make sense?

Paul?

PAUL WILSON: I'd like to come back to "operational communities." I think -- I think we could use the term "operational communities" in quotes and actually explain what we mean so, for instance, in point

number 1 of the list of main tasks, if we said that we were acting as a liaison to interested parties, including the directly affected operational communities and then, i.e. those with direct operational service or contractual relationships with IANA; namely, names, numbers and protocols, then we can explain what the term means. And to me "operational communities" as a working term, I mean, it is really just a label. To me, I am comfortable with it and I think it does talk about an operational relationship with IANA rather than just saying we are the only people who do anything operational. That's what -- that's the approach I would suggest to take.

While I've got the mic, I really think there's -- there is something missing in that list of four, which is Number 2, which is about soliciting proposals from the communities. We actually don't say in that list of four that we are actually soliciting proposals. We just say we are assessing the outputs. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Russ?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think the current text is better than the engaged text because there are a lot of people who do engage directly with IANA to get a port number, to register a media type, or such. And I think

while I understand the confusion with the current text, I think that takes us even more confusing than what we have presently.

And I do think Paul's second point that he just made was really important, that we do need to not just liaise but get, you know, the actual proposals from these communities. So I don't know if we need to divide that up. I hope we can come up with a simple fix to that first bullet.

JARI ARKKO: Russ, do you have an opinion about Paul's proposal?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I don't think "operational" adds anything other than "directly affected." So I don't really care.

ALISSA COOPER: So, I was going to suggest -- well, when Joe was talking, I was thinking about "engaged entities" in quotes and then have some definition. And I actually think I like Paul's a little bit better. But -- so my conclusion is anything in quotes with a definition, that might solve this problem. Putting "directly affected" maybe. "Directly affected parties" in quotes, in parentheses explain what it is using Paul's language.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Let me come back. If the worst fear of business is realized, which is that somehow the IANA transition goes woefully off the rails and the Internet no longer accomplishes its commercial function, then we are, in fact, directly affected.

So I am fine with Paul's construction. I'm fine with anything you want to qualify that construction on. But the concept of affected and directly affected really has a limitation for me in terms of what its descriptor means and how it applies.

PAUL WILSON: I just shared those words on the list, the proposed -- the proposal I made before.

JARI ARKKO: Okay. I think I am actually agreeing with Alissa a little bit that the definition is more important than the actual term.   Is that something that people would -- I mean, before deciding what the term is, if we use a term and then define it as roughly as Paul suggested, would that work for people?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: I think I hear a proposal about "directly engaged." Doesn't that make more precise?   Because "affected" is, you know, more wider.   But "engage," we can define those who are directly

engaged with the IANA function. And I think that can be more clearly, I would say, defined from my view.

JARI ARKKO: I'd like to say "directly contracting." But no one is contracting.

[Laughter]

Yet.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: "Customer," "direct customer."

JARI ARKKO: I'd be happy with that. Any reactions around the room? "Customer"?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: I think that for the users community around the world, we would understand what's the difference between the parties that are directly engaged or directly affected by the decisions. And then we go back to Joe's proposal that consistently mentioned "affected parties."

But I think that we should leave some door open for users as a whole because, in fact, users are not only customers. I don't know how to say it, but I don't have the exact word in my head.

But it's not only a commercial relation. Users, the users have rights.

And so do you think that is possible? Because I would favor any distinction between the parties directly affected due to their engaged contract or whatever and on the other side, the whole of users that will be impacted or affected one way or the other.

JARI ARKKO: You are right. But right now we are trying to find the word that describes the directly engaged or the customer parties and we do recognize that's also on my list to be dealt with later, that we have to make sure the rest of the charter has -- takes the other parties into account in the same manner as it does the others. So I think we are going to deal with that. But now we need to find a term and my current favor is the "direct customers" and then a definition. Is that...

ALISSA COOPER: I have James and Martin in the queue.

JAMES BLADEL: Thank you. James speaking for the transcript. Can you scroll up just a bit there? Sorry to take us back here. There we go. Where we note that the IANA functions are divided into three main categories, domain names, number resources, and protocol

parameters, one of the things I was trying to introduce yesterday and probably failing to articulate it very clearly is this idea that there is this fourth implicit function of IANA which is that it is this independent accountability structure on, you know, ICANN, on the -- particularly when we look at the naming community and that that is not captured necessarily in those three explicit functions of IANA. And I think that is something that is certainly causing or attracting some attention, at least in the naming side.

So the question is, do we want to capture that here in the charter or do we want to have a separate section for that or is this something that is narrowly applicable only to the naming community and, therefore, maybe should be left to that proposal specifically?

I'm looking for the group's sense on whether or not it is appropriate to include that in the charter.

JARI ARKKO: From my perspective, at least I'm thinking about anything that comes out from these groups. This is what works for us kind of thing and whatever "this" may be, they should be able to do, answer to.

I'm not sure we have to add specific words about that in the charter. But open to other people's opinions.

ALISSA COOPER: Martin.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thank you. Martin Boyle. I would like to confirm that "contracted" is not certainly at this stage, not in the foreseeable future, an acceptable way forward.

But I did rather like the concept of looking towards the customer and the direct customer idea for the service because it does bring back the fact that, you know, here is a service that without it working properly, the DNS is in jeopardy.

And I wondered whether to do that, if we put it around in the other way so that we don't actually directly use the word -- don't directly use the word "customer" and look directly at the service organizations within the DNS who depend directly on the IANA service. So, in other words, we are actually saying those people, those organizations, that part of the DNS which is directly impacted by what is happening in the IANA service as being the first line significantly interested parties. I wonder whether that might be a useful way forward. Thank you.

JARI ARKKO: Thanks. So "directly impacted." And I'll notice that Paul's proposal was -- I mean, for the actual definition was "those with direct operational service or contractual relationships with IANA." I think that's pretty good because it covers a broad range of

arrangements. Certainly follows well for us at the IETF, and I think for you as well.

Joe?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah, I mean, Paul's definition in terms of that scope was fine.

JARI ARKKO: Thanks. So "directly impacted." And then I'll notice that Paul's proposal was -- I mean, for the actual definition was, "Those with direct operational service or contractual relationships with IANA," and so I think that's pretty good, because it covers a broad range of arrangements and certainly falls well for us at the IETF and I think you as well.

Joe?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah. I mean, Paul's definition in terms of that scope was fine.

The -- just going back to when -- and I have no opinion on this, but when going back to the word "customer," people may perceive "customer" as someone who has a financial relationship and I don't know if all of the entities have a financial relationship in that sense, so I'm not sure if that word would just be appropriate, just from an optics perspective.

ALISSA COOPER: I put myself in the queue before you.

I like Paul's proposal. So the words that Paul sent to the list I think are good.

>> ---

Yea. The whole thing I think is good.

>> ---

Sure. Paul suggested the following: "The coordination group has five main tasks. One, act as liaison to all interested parties including the directly affected, quote, operational communities, unquote, i.e., those with direct operational service or contractual relationships with IANA, namely, names, numbers, protocol," or I would say protocol parameters. "Two, solicit proposals from operational communities and inputs from others. Three, assess the outputs of the operational communities for compatibility and interoperability. Four, assemble a complete proposal for the transition. Five, information sharing and public communication."

Daniel and then Milton.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: I pass.

ALISSA COOPER: Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah. I'd like to get out of this rathole as soon -- as quickly as possible, so I like "operational communities" but it seems like once you've defined that as "direct operational service or contract relationships" you don't need "directly affected" anymore. You could just get rid of that. Because as you say, you know, we're directly affected if PIR goes down and my Web site goes down, and that seems very direct.

So maybe, you know, I could accept that, too.

JARI ARKKO: So I read that as you're willing to accept Paul's proposal?

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah, if -- and I'm saying if we do accept this concept of "operational communities" instead of "customer," we also should get rid of "directly affected," which seemed to cause trouble.

JARI ARKKO: And everyone's fine with getting rid of "directly affected"?

Okay. So I don't see a lot of disagreement around the table, so we can just go ahead and implement that.

It's been mentioned a couple times here in the text, so I won't do it live.

Actually, Daniel has something to say.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Sorry. I want to get out of this rathole as well but could we live with removing "all contractual" as well? Because "service relationships" actually does it. And I was going to suggest to use the word "user" earlier but "service relationship" does it, because if we leave "contractual" in, that includes NTIA.

JARI ARKKO: Good point. Okay. So I'm seeing consensus around using Paul's text except striking "directly affected" and "contractual."

Okay. Moving forward, the other fun thing that we were discussing was this word "legitimate." It's only one word. Actually two, if you count the word "and." And so my read of this was actually that there was fairly broad consensus on the list that this is a little bit shaky and we should -- and adds no value in this particular context and we get rid of that -- those two words, except that Milton, I think you disagreed, so do you want to say something about that?

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah. It's basically -- it seems to be a legitimate disagreement -- ha, ha -- in the sense that the people who don't like the word believe that it invokes some relationship to law and regulation, which in some senses of the word is true, and I'm using it more in the political science sense, in that if you're establishing an authority over something, regardless of its technical legality, that you need popular acceptance of that as an authority. That's half the ball game.

And anybody who's been familiar with the interactions between ICANN and the rest of the world in the last 15 years knows that legitimacy has always been a problem. And in part, that is, in fact, because of its extra legality of -- of much of the multistakeholder model.

So what we have in there is we want the IANA functions to be continued in an accountable and legitimate manner. That is, we all agree that it should be accountable. We also -- and accountability and legitimacy are related, obviously, in the sense that if something is perceived as unaccountable, then people think it's an illegitimate authority.

So we wanted, and the people in my stakeholder groups agree that we want some reference to the legitimacy of the ICANN. Something that invokes its popular acceptance.

Now, taking into account Joe's response, he -- he said, "Is there another word," and I've been looking at thesauruses and I

couldn't find one really. You come up with really ugly things like "disinterestedness" or re- -- you know -- but I guess what my concern is, you say, Joe, "legitimate" has a compliance with rules and regulations connotation, and I'm sort of like, "So? Why is that bad?"

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Well, it -- in some cases, it indicates government legitimate -- that the government is the grantor of legitimacy.

But I think I have a word that makes this word only a political science construct and not of the legal construct we're worried about. The English sucks a bit, but if we say "accountable and legitimatized," because "legitimatized" is when you get the approval of the community rather than "legitimate," which has that rules connotation, I think we avoid some of the legal overhead related to that.

The other potential word, but it might not get to what you need, could be "recognized."

>> ---

ALISSA COOPER: Russ Mundy is also in the queue. Do you want to go to Russ? Yeah. Go ahead, Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Alissa. Russ Mundy here.

I think that Joe's suggestion for "recognized" is actually an extremely good word. I like it, actually, better than what I just typed in the text in the chat room, "appropriate," although I personally believe either would be --- but in the reality of the Internet, where the IANA output actually is legitimacy, is the acceptance and use by the broad community. It has really nothing to do with any kind of legal requirement or, you know, dictate from some higher authority.

Now, many of us have been involved in building separate and distinct kind of instantiations of what are sometimes called private Internets, and using exactly the technology but duplicating the things that are operated by the IANA for the public Internet. And the reason it works in the public Internet is that it is broadly and widely accepted, not that any legal authority has said "thou shall go forth and use."

So I think that one of these other replacement words besides "legitimate" are much better and appropriate.

ALISSA COOPER: So I have Martin in the queue but just one point of clarification coming out of the virtual meeting room.

Did you say "legitimatized" or "recognized"?

>> ---

Both were options. Okay. Sorry. Okay. Martin?

MARTIN BOYLE: And thank you. Martin Boyle.

Yeah, I actually do struggle with the word "legitimate," but because I feel that it is vague or rather badly defined in the con- -- in the context here. And I also struggle with the -- with the term "legitimatized," because again, you know, well, what do we really mean by it?

When we get to, you know, essentially it's an accountable manner and it's following recognized processes or, that is, following the recognized rules or the previously agreed rules, then I think that actually makes it quite clear that there is the basis and you can't go off and change those rules without going through the proper accountable process. And at that stage, I think it puts the -- what we're trying to say in "legitimate" in a very much clearer context as to what it is that we are trying to defend here.

So certainly "agreed," "recognized" I find to be very much the preferable phrases. Thank you.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah. So I'm in agreement with Martin, actually, and to me this is really about, you know, the systems are there and they -- they

have the power that they have because people choose to use them and believe in them, and that's more recognition than sort of something stemming from an, you know, inherent authority through a government or other system.

So -- and I -- but I mean, at the end of the day, I think we all want the same thing. We want accountability and some kind of recognition or legitimate position.

The reason why we're having this discussion is that some of us feel that the current word will invite maybe wrong type of attention.

So what I'm actually hearing, that the "recognized" word has some support and I think you, Milton, were also okay with that. That --

>> ---

MILTON MUELLER: If I could just comment. To me, "recognized" actually has more of an official legal connotation than "legitimate," in the sense recognized by whom? If you say "popularly recognized" or "popularly accepted," that would be okay with me.

>> ---

MILTON MUELLER: I understand. We do agree on the concept we're trying to convey here. Like Jari said, it's like we want it to be -- its authority to be derived from the fact that people accept it and use it, not from a particular intergovernmental or U.S. governmental designation of authority. That's -- we're totally agreed on that. We're just searching for the right word.

>> Let me offer "widely recognized."

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I was going to say "widely accepted," so I think we're really close.

JARI ARKKO: Going once... twice...

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Well, since this is in English, I'll be saying this in English.

"Representative of the affected communities." But then there is no risk of having to provide a legal definition, because "representative of" can be through our mechanism or through some other mechanism.

JARI ARKKO: I'm not sure that's going to work because part of the reason why this is important, actually, is that we do need the results of IANA to be sort of almost universally accepted around -- I mean, everyone who uses the Internet is to some extent employ -- or is employing some of these things that are registered in databases.

So I don't want to limit it to too much to the communities in this particular space, so I -- I'm still with "widely recognized."

Would you have a problem with that or is that acceptable?

Okay. So I am going to try and edit here. And I don't see any screaming around the table, so I think we're ready to move on.

And the next thing, actually, was -- just a moment. I'll look at my notes here.

Right. So one of the things that we wanted to make sure is that we have -- now we have been talking about the -- the operational communities and -- with Paul's -- Paul's definition.

Now -- and then there's others, and some of the text has been more tailored towards these particular communities because they will deliver a plan and we want to be equal in the sense that we, the coordination group, needs to take input from everybody and process and assess the --

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Jari, sorry. But "widely recognized" or "widely accepted." In the context, I think "recognized" is a little bit broader for me. Accepted, yeah, because in that specific context, if you see -- you read the whole sentence --

>> ---

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: "In an accountable and widely accepted manner."

JARI ARKKO: I -- yeah. I think that's okay. Does anyone object? Okay. Moving on.

So the -- the more substantive thing was that we want to ensure that -- that the group actually will have -- you know, is paying enough attention to everything or everyone, not just the three operational communities or the ones with more direct relationship, and for that one, I think we -- I mean, the text that came from Paul which basically says -- or adds an item here works for me.

Joe, since you brought this up, can you say if that helps you or if that's sufficient?

So Paul's suggestion was that we have five main tasks and the first one is access a liaison to all interested parties, including the directly affected operational communities, and then the

definition. Solicit proposals from operational communities and inputs from others. Assess the outputs of the operational communities for compatibility and interoperability. And then it continues with -- with the ones that we already had.

So to me, at least, I mean, there's now -- it's clear that there's all interested party -- we're liaising with all interested parties, we're soliciting proposals from the operational ones and inputs from others.

Will that help or -- and is it sufficient to resolve your concern, Joe?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I would just suggest a slightly broader construction of that, but I think in many ways what we're talking about is refinements of the liaison role.

So I think if we use -- and I think the question we would also ask is, are we only soliciting a proposal? Because when we go a little further in the explanation part of the document, it seems like we're not soliciting a proposal, we're providing requirements they need to answer related to a proposal.

We're seeming to give some direction as to what we're asking for, which is different than just soliciting a proposal. So, you know, we might be suggesting that we're providing requirements related to proposals to be submitted, which would be, I think, a more accurate phrasing of what we're doing with them, and what we've

-- we've told them that we want them to describe workability, we've told them that we want them to describe a consensus process. We're not just saying "draw up anything you want to." We're not constricting the proposal.

But there are some elements we're looking for that they answer as part of that proposal, so I do think we are creating some requests in that for the proposal. But then the other thing I would say is to differentiate, I would do -- so the liaison bullet the way it is. Sub 1 of the liaison bullet would be the -- submit soliciting proposals. And then Sub 2 would be solicit the input of a broad group of communities affected by IANA functions. And then if we wanted to have the explanation of that, it would just be one sentence: "While no set of formal requirements related to a transitional proposal will be requested of nonoperational communities, their input is welcome across all topics with the request that they channel their input through community liaisons." And I think that covers the topic completely then.

And it also suggests that they should not be all flooding their comments directly to the CG, but should be actually allocating them through the liaison that is appropriate for their community.

ALISSA COOPER: Paul.

PAUL WILSON: That sounds generally acceptable to me.

ALISSA COOPER: Keith. I'm going to Keith and then Russ. Sorry.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you. Keith Drazek. I support what Joe just described. And I think consistent with what he said and I think what we have talked about here, I think we need to characterize this as a request or a recommendation as opposed to a requirement. So in terms of making sure that if we're suggesting there ought to be a structure for a response that it is a request or a recommendation, not a requirement because if it is a requirement, that causes people to think that this is a top-down dictate as opposed to something that is truly generated by the community in a bottoms-up process. Better word.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I agree with what Keith just said, but I also think that what we're saying is we need a proposal. And the proposal needs to tell us why you think you reached consensus. That's for us to do the other part of the role, which is to confirm that consensus was reached. So we are just asking them to provide that information for us.

I think the definition we're looking to include in the text needs to go at the end of the second paragraph, which is the place where we say, "Based in the respective directly affected communities," is the word there. So if we place "directly affected communities" with whatever phrase we're going to use there, then when we get to the numbered points, the term's already defined and it will fit much better.

JARI ARKKO: So I'm also okay with this general direction. I don't have the exact words, or maybe they were in your email.

>> They have been emailed to the list.

JARI ARKKO: Okay. So I don't see people screaming, so perhaps the right way to go about this is to try to actually work through that, maybe not live here. I take it that's the group's direction that we're doing what Joe just explained. Okay? Yeah, we are finding some consensus or wide acceptance here, I guess.

So we are going to do that offline.

And then, Russ, you had an issue with the last sentence of the first item.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes. It says no one should wait, right? I think we're in the sentence before that being very proactive, saying what we want them to do. And I'm concerned that this is just -- the following stage is not well-defined either. So that is what caught my first -- I thought, heck, if we just delete this sentence, I think we end up in a better place.

JARI ARKKO: Daniel?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: I'm the guilty party for suggesting this language, so let me defend it. I think this is the one thing that -- people coming to this table without prior engagement and involvement are going to be our main problem when we come to stage 3. And I think we would be well-advised to be very explicit on our expectations there because it will help us when they come to say we were very explicit that this behavior is not what we were expecting.

ALISSA COOPER: James.

JAMES BLADEL: Hi, thanks. James speaking. I want to agree with Daniel. I think maybe we can salvage the language of this sentence here and capture the intent, which is that, you know, direct submissions to the ICG would be discouraged, something along those lines? We want to reinforce that they are encouraged to contribute those to the community level contributions as opposed to -- and I can tell you already, it is unlikely that will happen, but at least we can put our marker down and say that this is what we are encouraging and this is what we are discouraging.

>> I would support language like that.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Maybe getting to the gist of the last language without having to worry about the stage which I agree is not only ill-defined, it is confusing, would be "participation at the earliest appropriate opportunity is desirable."

JARI ARKKO: I thought we already said this.

RUSS HOUSLEY: What's nice with this -- or what was said previously is "participate in the community that's producing the proposal," not directly here. And that's the important part, I think.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Right. But you're going to have a timing issue of you will have a group of people who will wait until we have a final proposal to start to participate. And I think you need a marker saying, now, we can direct the participation to the relevant community, but the participation needs to be timely if it is expected to be considered. You can't have people sending something at the last minute thinking the process is now going to stop and think about what you've said at the very end if there hasn't been an effective participation earlier on.

JAMES BLADEL: I think we are missing a couple of words in the green text. I don't mean to derail it here. I think what we want to say is "without prior involvement in the contributions of the interested parties" or something like that "or contributions from the interested parties." I think we just need something in there.

JARI ARKKO: "Without contributions to interested the" -- "without prior contributions to the interested parties." No, actually, that's wrong.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Can I suggest to go back to the original ones and read it with the "no one" in there and suggest only a slight change and say "No one should wait until the later stage and bring input only to the CG," or "no one should bring their input only to the CG at a later stage."

I feel really very strongly of being very undiplomatic in this language.

[Laughter]

JAMES BLADEL: And I agree with you. I think we can do that. I think there is one other point, though, that we want to hit on which is that we don't want the first time that we have an issue brought to the ICG to be outside of a community contribution. I think that we want to say something about ensuring that the community contribution is not skipped.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Yeah, but I think that is captured by saying "only to the CG."

JAMES BLADEL: I think it is captured there, but I don't know that a casual observer would pick up on that. I think we need to be a little more explicit.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Conceded.

ALISSA COOPER: Martin.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks. Martin Boyle. I must admit I share those sympathies, and I also like Daniel's proposal that we make the wording here very, very blunt and very clear. In some fact, I wonder whether we could do that in the sentence that currently reads "The ICG recommends" and say "The ICG expects all interested parties to be involved as early as possible within their communities in the development of these plans" and then go on to say "and do not expect them to bring input only to the CG." So, in other words, we are actually, you know, moving it from it being a recommendation to a clear expectation that this is the proper process that you should be doing and so -- in that stage, we're saying twice, you know, don't bring it to us at the last possible moment. We are not going to be the judge. It has to go to the community process. And I think that is actually a very clear and important message to get over. Thank you.

JARI ARKKO: So I made an edit that reads "the ICG expects that all interested parties get involved as early as possible in the development of

these plans and do not expect the input to be brought only to the CG."

MARTIN BOYLE: I actually said "within their communities." In other words, they're not trying to bypass their community process and Say, okay, I didn't get it through the community process and, therefore, I'm finding some ways to get it through by approaching directly which would be a not particularly legitimate approach to this sort of discussion.

JARI ARKKO: "In their communities."

Is that better? "Get involved as early as possible in their communities and do not expect input to be brought only to the CG -- ICG."

>> That works.

JARI ARKKO: Anyone has an objection? Daniel seemed...

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: It is not an objection, but it is a question. Because of the order of the sentences when we have as the second sentence, "the ICG expects a plan," et cetera, it sounds like the input we are then requesting is only related to the three plans or four plans, however many there will be gotten as opposed to someone may have a concern about the role that we may be choosing related to transparency. "We don't think the ICG is working in a sufficient," we also want that to go through the community that's appropriate. So if a business constituent who may have two community choices as to how to participate should go through one of those with that comment.

But the structure of the sentences, because we have that as a second sentence seems to make it limited to that. So perhaps if we just put that as the first sentence, the first sentence becomes the second, then we're open across all of the topics and not just limited to the three group topics.

Does that make sense the way I have articulated, or have I just confused people more?

JARI ARKKO: I think that made sense. It is also open.

To reading this now, "The ICG expects that all interested parties get involved as early as possible in their communities and do not

expect input to be brought only to the ICG. In addition, the ICG is also open for input and feedback from all interested parties."

Contradiction.

>> That is a contradiction.

>> Absolutely.

JARI ARKKO: Suggestions?

ALISSA COOPER: Demi and then Narelle.

DEMI GETSCHKO: I'm not sure what we are telling the people, "not expecting input to be only the CG." If we want to be explicit on this, we have to show the alternatives. Maybe we can leave this out simply. Not sure what is the message that we don't expect the input to be brought only to the CG.

ALISSA COOPER: Narelle?

NARELLE CLARK: Hello. I hope this is okay. I hope this is a clearer line now.

ALISSA COOPER: Yep, it's good. Go ahead.

NARELLE CLARK: Okay, good. I've just posted text into the chat room, but it's not completely (indiscernible) on the table.   I'm okay with what you've got there, but I think it does need to be clearly set out the process and to be set out more the actions rather than --- community. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: I can read it, if you want. Okay.

I'm not precisely sure what she's suggesting to replace with the following. But this was the suggestion. "The ICG will be calling for proposals over defined time frames. Community members should bring their contributions to their community designated representatives in order to ensure full consideration within the community context prior to consideration by the ICG."

So I have a queue still, I think. Elise and Mohamed and myself and Joe.

ELISE GERICH: This is more of a wordsmithing question, and I think it's to Daniel's point because he wanted to be very explicit is what we are trying to say that if the coordinating group receives input directly, that the coordinating group may refer that input to the appropriate community for their evaluation or whatever instead of saying, you know, you can send it to the coordinating group but we want it early. We are trying to encourage them to send it to their appropriate community.

So, Daniel, what you are trying to say is if you send it to the coordinating group, the coordinating group will refer it to the appropriate community for evaluation with their proposals? That's a question.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: I don't want to contribute further to this way at all. I just concerned that we say very clearly that the behavior is that we are expecting because that will serve us in the long run, and how we do it I care less and less. But it should be -- we shouldn't be diplomatic. That's my main point. And I don't want to suggest -- I suggested language apparently that wasn't good enough. Let someone else come up with it.

JARI ARKKO: I kind of like Alissa's suggestion that we -- because the problems that we may -- there are two classes of inputs that we might get.

One is that we actually should get it directly, and the other one that perhaps should have been sent first to the communities. And we want to reserve a possibility of referring that to the right place. So just saying that might actually work better.

Let's try to do that. "Input received directly by the ICG may be referred to the relevant community discussion." Would that work for people?

ALISSA COOPER: In the queue I have Mohamed, Joe, myself and Adiel.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: The latest update has already covered my comment. Thank you.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Actually, Jari, my previous comment had been related to the first and second sentence of the paragraph itself because when we interpose the second sentence, the topic of the three constituencies developing plans, it makes it look like the second part of the paragraph is only dealing with those three constituent plans. So the concept was, is that sentence about the three constituencies will be submitting plans something that could be added to the end of the last paragraph?

And here we are just talking about the input parameters related to things that are coming so we don't give the impression we are

limiting them to the three -- the three constituencies that are submitting plans.

JARI ARKKO: Yes. This should be about the general input and not just the three parties. So -- but I think when we are editing your earlier comment, then we can return back to this and make sure that that's actually visible here, but I'm breaking the paragraph here, just making sure that that's separate.

And I'll increase the font size a little bit. I'm not sure if this is actually going to work. Let's see.

Okay. So do we still have a queue?

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, we still have a queue? Joe?

>> ---

Does this achieve what you were just talking about? Because when I heard you say it, I really thought you said something different and I was going to try to suggest that, because I think it was better than what we have now.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah. What I had really suggested was just taking the second sentence of -- because the first sentence of this paragraph is important to the last portion of the paragraph.

What I had just wanted was that the section that says "The ICG expects a plan" to be associated with the paragraph before that, and then everything else stays part of one paragraph, because that's the part that gives the misimpression that you're only asking for comments about the plan.

JARI ARKKO: Okay.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So then can you scroll down a little bit, please?

So then I would suggest deleting "in addition," and then I think it works.

Although I do have one other suggestion, which is that I think the sentence about expecting a plan from each of the parties is important enough that you might just want to make it its own stand-alone paragraph, instead of the last sentence of the prior paragraph, but otherwise, I think this works.

JARI ARKKO: So which sentence was that?

ALISSA COOPER: The one you just moved. The green one.

JARI ARKKO: There's many green ones.

ALISSA COOPER: "The ICG expects a plan from the country code," blah, blah, blah.

JARI ARKKO: And where do you want that?

ALISSA COOPER: Just separate, yeah.

JARI ARKKO: Okay.

ALISSA COOPER: So Adiel and then Daniel.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Okay. I have two comments.

                        The first one is that I think we are struggling here because this
                        seems to be a more process -- process issue, definition of the

process, how we work, than the charter of the group itself, so maybe we should keep this in mind and refine it in the process.

The second thing I want to -- I want to add is at the end of the -- before last paragraph, before "input," "in their community and the related process," because what we want them to be involved in is the process relative to this from their community.

So I would add "process" at the end of "community." "In their community's process."

JARI ARKKO: "Community's processes"?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yes.

JARI ARKKO: Okay.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: And the last sentence, "inputs received directly by the ICG may be referred."

Okay. Maybe here -- it may addresses my concern, but I'm not sure we want to force this into all the -- all people.

As per our discussion yesterday, there are people out there which does not, by choice or by legacy, identify themselves with those communities so may not find it, you know, easy or convenient to send their input through their community process because they are not bound by that community, you know.

So is it our role to force them to work within those communities or is it our role to open the door and allow them to send us --

I'm not -- it is not a very hard concern, but I think it's something that we need to look at.

JARI ARKKO: So I would actually have two things to say there.

So the first thing is that here when we say -- we made a change to say, you know, "get involved as early as possible in their communities," I would actually want to say "get involved as early as possible in the relevant communities." Because maybe I -- I have an issue with, I don't know, what the RIRs are doing. It's not really my community, but I mean if I have an issue with your thing, I have to come to your community and make a comment, right?

And then your question is, should we force people to do that.

My recommendation would be, yes, we should force people to do that, because otherwise this is unscalable.

ALISSA COOPER: Daniel, you were in the queue. No, you're not in the queue.

Kuo?

KUO-WEI WU: My question is, do we really need that phrase that say "possibly a joint one"? I don't think that is necessary. You know, separate and joint one actually is pretty descript in the paragraph already. We don't necessary to emphasize there is a possible joint one. It could be coming from a different charter is fine. We don't need to specify that. That's my comment about it. Is there any particular reason we have to have that strong statement, "joint"?

JARI ARKKO: We added this to be sort of open to whatever the names community wants to do, so that we're not -- the ICG is not dictating that you must have one or you must have two. It's up to you.

KUO-WEI WU: Yeah, I agree.

JARI ARKKO: If we take the parentheses part of this out, I think it's still kind of open and up to you, but it's maybe not as clear, so people might misinterpret it.

But --

ALISSA COOPER: What if you said "separately or jointly"? Is that where the confusion is?

KUO-WEI WU: I don't see any difference if you take this phrase out. Any --

JARI ARKKO: So what is the suggestion? Would you like to have --

KUO-WEI WU: Just take it out.

JARI ARKKO: Take it out? Any thoughts? I -- I don't feel strongly about this personally.

Take it out?

Okay. Done.

ALISSA COOPER: Joe, are you still in the queue? No queue. And we are coming up on what should have been a break, and so let's think about what we have left.

JARI ARKKO: Okay. So we have some homework to do but the only item that I had left on my list was that we must say "solicit for the proposal," but that's already part of what Paul was suggesting in his text so -- and we're going to do that, even though we haven't edited that yet, so this would be the moment to bring additional things up that we haven't brought up yet or we could go to the break.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Jari, thank you. I would like to back up to the topic we just discussed about the possibility of one or two plans from the numbering -- I'm sorry, from the naming community. I'm sorry. Maybe one -- because I think it is important to note that it may be more than one plan. It may be two. Or proposal.

And so maybe the way to address that is to say "The ICG expects a plan or plans from the country code and generic name communities," and just leave it at that, rather than the parenthetical.

I'm going back to the comments that Keith Davidson made yesterday that it was important to draw the distinction, and I think it's important for us, the communities, and, you know, sort

of casual observers to note that there actually may be two plans coming from the naming group.

ALISSA COOPER: Can I comment on that?

I think "a plan or plans" implies there could be more than two, and that's a -- I think that's a problem. So I like "separately or jointly" or "one or two plans" or --

[Laughter]

I don't think it should be an unlimited number of plans.

KEITH DRAZEK: Agreed.

[Laughter]

ALISSA COOPER: Martin.

MARTIN BOYLE: Well, actually it's just, you know, so, well, how many plans?

I think we do have to recognize that there are a significant number of ccTLDs who are not members of ICANN communities and some of them do have quite strong views about the risks or

obligations that might be attendant on their engagement in that community.

So I suppose we do need to recognize that, you know, there might be a group that gets together and does the third plan.

I'm not saying that's definite, but I just think we do need to recognize that it is a possibility, and that's as far as I need to go.

I think it is actually covered in the input received directly by the ICG, and may be referred to in the relevant community discussion, but in fact it may then have to be considered separately because of specific objections.

JARI ARKKO: If I can just quickly respond to that, I think -- and I don't know how the exact words -- how to say this, but the situation that we want is that you guys in the naming community are free to choose how you divide the work up, as long as you deliver complementary plans that fit together rather than a set of competing proposals from different parts of the community.

ALISSA COOPER: So Russ Mundy and Keith Davidson in the queue. And are you in the queue? Okay. So Russ Mundy.

Russ, are you there?

RUSS MUNDY: I am. Are you hearing me now?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes. Go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY: Okay. Thank you. I think we must have some way to identify the fact that there could be a small number of plans, but even saying two maybe is a little over restrictive but personally I like the original wording. It inferred there would be one or two but didn't dictate it. So I suggest going back to the original parenthetical.

JARI ARKKO: So the -- based on the previous discussion, I -- the version that I have now have on screen is "expects a plan or complementary plans from the country code and generic name communities."

Russ, would that be acceptable to you or do you disagree with that?

RUSS MUNDY: Well, the reason I prefer the original wording is it infers there would be either one or two but doesn't explicitly say you can only send (indiscernible). This approach would say (indiscernible) with

three or four or five complementary plans. That would be extremely difficult to evaluate.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah. I think I understand your point, that it might be the case that some of the coordination that the coordination group is expected to do comes between coordinating, say, gTLD and ccTLD proposals, if they have some -- something to coordinate, and we should not necessarily expect that everything is pre-coordinated or already arranged in a perfect way when it comes to us. Although, of course, we said that that's the case but we should not require that, perhaps.

Does anyone else have an opinion? I'm --

ALISSA COOPER: Keith. Keith Davidson was in the queue.

JARI ARKKO: Okay. Go ahead.

ALISSA COOPER: Keith, are you there?

KEITH DAVIDSON: Hello. Yes. I'm speaking.

ALISSA COOPER: We can hear you.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Oh, great: I would prefer that (indiscernible) original wording (indiscernible) the original (indiscernible) that the names (indiscernible) and (indiscernible).

ALISSA COOPER: Keith, unfortunately your audio is pretty bad. You have a lot of like static on the line or something. So I don't know if you can type what you were going to say into the chat or try to reconnect.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Yes, I'll type.

JARI ARKKO: Did you mean to say that you prefer the original?

KEITH DAVIDSON: Yes. I prefer the original.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you.

JARI ARKKO: Okay. So we've been going back and forth on this a lot.

                     Now, I am fine with any of these things but you guys need to tell me which one to put into the text. The latest proposal on the table is go back to the original, which was a parentheses saying "possibly a joint one." Does anyone object to that?

KUO-WEI WU: I'm not object. Actually, I really prefer the original one. The reason is the constituency, no matter it's a CC or G, you know, just like Martin mentioned about, they should work it out, you know. If they have a different opinion written into print, it's okay, but they must be -- come out with some of the dialogue among them instead of let's send all the separate, you know, result dialogue and send to the CG asking us to resolve for them.

                     So I think the original one, I much prefer. The original one. It's a plan. In the plan, you have a -- you can have a different opinion, but at least we understand they have some dialogue in their constituency.

JARI ARKKO: Just to make it clear, so this text, the way that I read it, it leaves the possibility for you guys to deliver two plans or your definition of the plans, not requiring you to do a joint one although we give you an opportunity for that, so that leaves room, at least.

And I don't see screaming around the table. Is there a queue?

Okay. I think we should call it done and this is Version 5. I'll send it to the mailing list and Joe and me and others will work on the remaining edits during the break or during the next session, perhaps.

Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Jari. Okay. So in terms of the agenda, we ran a little bit over with that session and we also did not make it to the community expectations piece that Paul was going to lead.

I think we should certainly take a break because we've been sitting here for a couple hours now, but the question is, when we return, if we should get to some of the other items that we haven't talked about yet at all. Namely, the next one we had on the agenda was internal and external communications needs for this group, which was teed up prior to a discussion about the secretariat tasks, which we had for this afternoon.

So should we kind of move on to those things and come back to the community expectations in the parking lot that we have in the afternoon or should we rearrange to get to the community expectations earlier in the day? Do people have opinions?

My opinion is we should put your item in the parking lot, Paul, but that's my opinion. Yeah.

PAUL WILSON: The community expectations is being -- well, there's a second draft under the title "Requirements for Community Proposals" which went around the list, the internal list, just this morning. It is not very well developed, so I would prefer to deal with it a little later if -- if folks can please take a look at the document and maybe give it some thought in advance of the discussion. But if they can do that, I'm very happy to leave it till the parking lot later on. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: I'm not seeing any objections to that so let's go with that plan.

One question before we take the break. It seemed on the mailing list that we had consensus to make the mailing list archives public, so are there any objections to going ahead and doing that? ICANN will do it right away if no one objects.

Okay. Thank you. So let's reconvene at 11:30 and we will be talking about internal and external communications needs led by Martin.

[BREAK]

ALISSA COOPER: We should get started since we are already a little bit behind schedule. Okay. We are missing some people but I think we should start. So turning it over to you, Martin.

MARTIN BOYLE: Okay. Thank you very much.

The discussion that we're supposed to be having now is about internal and external communications. Some of the issues have come up when we were talking about self-organizing yesterday. But I think we just need from this process now, of which I think we got about half an hour, is it?

ALISSA COOPER: Half an hour would be excellent. But 45 minutes okay.

MARTIN BOYLE: Is to identify what tools we think we need to do the job. And while we are looking at internal and external, I think it would probably be quite helpful if we tried not to mix those two. And it seemed to me to be appropriate for us to start off the discussion of saying internally what are the tools that we need so, in other words, what additional to that which we've already got. And then when we've tried to identify those, I think the next step then is to move to external and then this wider communications.

And for these, really, again, on both subjects, I'm looking for input from you around the table. Will you be watching for the flags, Alissa? Pardon?

ALISSA COOPER: If you would like, I can, yes.

MARTIN BOYLE: Please. I can't easily see -- oh, there is nobody down this side.

[Laughter]

So for the internal, currently we have got the mailing list, a single mailing list. And the question on the exam paper was whether we need private mailing lists for our own work. Well, I think that is fairly obviously yes. But I would like to hear whether anybody has got any views about the mailing list and, indeed, any other tools that we might need internally. And then I would sort of come in with things like, you know, sort of whether we look to a Wiki, whether we look to summary collections of the mailing list so that we can actually then find something reasonably easily and then reference documents and easy access to those reference documents in one place.

And then looking forward to when we get to the stage of pulling the various bits together, whether we should be looking at some common platform, I have notes that I was very impressed by the

platform that was used to support the development of the NETmundial document because it made it very easy to see who had put comments in, where and they were all associated directly and clearly with one paragraph. So do we need something like that?

So can I throw the floor open, whether anybody sees that what -- have got clear ideas that they would like to see to support our work?

ALISSA COOPER: Russ?

RUSS HOUSLEY: So I do think we need a Wiki. I think something where all of us are able to make the updates is important, and I think the Wiki would be a very reasonable place for the reference documents as well, that are easy to accommodate in that kind of an environment. I'm not sure that we need a private mailing list. I don't think -- we want to be as open and transparent as possible. And so I don't see this group making, like, personnel decisions or anything like that where private communications is necessary.

So what are you seeing that led you to say "obviously" we need a private mailing list?

MARTIN BOYLE:	Probably fairly sloppy wording because I was thinking of the mailing list that we would use for carrying out our business. Whether that is then something that is publicly available, I saw as being the second part of the discussion, the external, do we throw that open.
	And then I would also then have a question, if we have a private -- a mailing list for doing our job, do we throw it open to people outside this group to also be able to post into that list, or is this actually a support for our private working space?
RUSS HOUSLEY:	So now I understand your point. I think we do need a mail list that only we can post to for doing our work, where the archives are available to everyone so that we're open and transparent. And then we will, as we get later into our processes, need some way for people to provide us feedback and that should not be the same mailing list as the one we use to communicate with each other. So if that's what you meant by "obviously," then I'm totally okay with it.
MARTIN BOYLE:	Okay. Then I stand corrected. That is really what I meant by "obviously." Anybody else want to put in? Or are we taking that, yes, we need a Wiki; yes, we need a mailing list where we can post and where our deliberations are then made public through

an archive, and I think certainly Russ' point about we need a separate route in for feedback is quite a useful -- actually, a vital addition to our armory.

ALISSA COOPER: I would also support the Wiki.

ELISE GERICH: This is Elise. Don't we already have the internal CG list? Isn't that one that only we can post to and has now been made -- the archives are made public?

RUSS HOUSLEY: --- one of the two.

ELISE GERICH: Excuse me?

RUSS HOUSLEY: It would meet the needs of one of the two that we talked about.

ELISE GERICH: Right. I just want to make sure we already have the one, that we're not creating something else.

ALISSA COOPER: I guess I was thinking that was maybe the second part of the discussion because we're going to have a different secretariat and maybe our own Web domain or something. So I agree that we should have a list for us. But whether it remains this one that I thought was set up temporarily to bootstrap this meeting or not, I think, is TBD.

ELISE GERICH: I find it -- I don't know -- more disruptive to change lists. I like to keep the list we have going because otherwise people have to look in multiple places. They have to look at where we started and then find out where we ended. But that's a personal opinion.

ALISSA COOPER: So Xiaodong.

XIAODONG LEE: I support to have a private list and also support to have a Wiki, but I'm not sure because now, you know, it is the Internet age. I'm not sure if you need some kind of group talk based on instant message so folks (indiscernible).

ALISSA COOPER: So I think just to respond to Elise, to me one of the important considerations for both this topic and the secretariat topic is the extent to which this group functions as an autonomous body and

has independence in particular from ICANN. So that's why I think that at least contemplating the idea of having our own hosting and, you know, separate secretarial support and all of that is quite important. I think that one week's worth of mail and an archive that became public ten minutes ago, I think people will in September of 2015 not remember that we made a transition, if we do decide to transition.

Dan?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Maybe I can offer a compromise here. I recognize that something at icann.org has problems down the line. But we could just change the domain and the name and just transfer the archives because I'm a big fan of a complete history in as little places as possible. So I totally agree with Elise.

But that's not the point I was going to make. The point I was going to make is that when we are discussing the mechanisms for communication, we should be cognizant of the row that erupted around closely related mailing lists maintained by ICANN that was converted into a, quote, modern, unquote, way of discourse and be very cognizant of that before we rush into conclusions.

MARTIN BOYLE: I think that probably is quite a timely health warning. If I'm getting the message right, yes, we need to keep adherence

through mailing lists. There are some views that suggest that we probably need something that is a little bit distanced from ICANN. And I have no strong feelings one way or another, but I can certainly see a useful separation of this if people so want. So would there be a reasonable consensus or at least no objections from around the table if we were to suggest that we look for another host for the list and that we transfer the whole of the archive over so that we do have that full historical record? I see nothing but nods.

Oh, and I see nothing but nods and thumbs up.

Okay. So can we go on that way and then, as I said earlier, it seems to me to be quite clear that the idea of a Wiki would be important. Nobody picked up particularly on the drafting platform idea that I just threw out. Do people feel actually we don't need such a thing?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Martin. This is Jean-Jacques. I think it's always useful to have a drafting and editing platform to be used by authorized members in the community. From a technical point of view, I don't know what's preferable, but in ALAC, for instance, our user group, whenever necessary -- well, we set up a specific or special page in order to exchange ideas and improve a document.

This is not a permanent tool. This page is created upon members' requests when needed. Thank you.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: One thing. The reason I didn't react to the drafting platform thing I hadn't been part of the NETmundial thing, so I just don't have an opinion about it and going into the direction of Russ saying that a Wiki might be it.

But if there is another thing we're going to use, I think we should be cognizant of the row that I just mentioned and be very careful to not exclude -- to not use a platform that excludes certain people or that they feel excluded and we should be cognizant of the fact that Vint Cerf mentioned in that particular discussion that mailing lists seem to work everywhere, even if you have very low bandwidth and stuff like that and that the more modern stuff has the perception of only being accessible to a certain part of the world.

Now, that shouldn't keep us from using it if our members in this room who need to be active on it are comfortable with it. But then we will have to have a mechanism that makes the results and makes the whole process accessible to people who are not comfortable with it or even don't have a possibility to access it. Did I make myself clear?

MARTIN BOYLE: Yeah, I think you make yourself perfectly clear. I think certainly when you're getting to discussing a document, it is very hard to follow iterations on a mailing list. And I think one of the things I liked about the NETmundial platform was that when people had put their comments in, you now had a record of all the comments that had come in against the paragraph, which made it very easy to understand.

But it also looked like, as you say, quite a -- quite a complex platform that while it did get inputs globally, yes, it -- and didn't require any additional software, it was quite a -- it might be seen as a barrier by some, whereas just doing it on the Wiki, if necessary, doing it over the mailing list. You know, I have no real views at this stage as to how complex a platform would need to be, whether it's just within the Wiki space or over mailing list.

And perhaps we won't really know until we get to the point of seeing what people are producing. But I'm not getting a feeling that anybody really is putting their hand up and saying, "We need to have some sort of drafting platform."

ALISSA COOPER: So I have a bit of a queue now. And I'm in it first.

I just want a clarification. Were you suggesting the drafting platform for us developing our own materials, like things that

we've been doing today? Or you're suggesting it to solicit public input on things down the road?

MARTIN BOYLE: My first and immediate thought, because we were looking at the internal part of the discussion, was using is internally. However, if you do do something like that internally and it works, then that might be the way that you -- one of the options for soliciting comments later on but not necessarily the only source for soliciting comments.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. I think for our internal purposes, we are probably not going to be creating that much text ourselves. And so it seems like a bit of a heavyweight approach for the kind of editing that we would need. I think for external purposes, we don't need to decide yet.

I will just say for the record, I think one of the major drawbacks of the NETmundial platform was that there was no place where you could comment overall on the document, like not just on a paragraph, which I think is an important requirement that we're probably going to have too. So just something to think about in the future.

So I have Joe and Adiel -- and you took you were self out? Yeah.

Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thanks. This goes to a concept of document management that isn't directly related to whether or not we have a technology assisting us. But as versions of documents start to float around, from an archive perspective and from an external user who is trying to see what we're doing perspective, understanding that we have a methodology of how we name versions I think will be tremendously useful to those people who are trying to see what we're doing so they can figure out what's the history of a document as well as which is the current flavor of the document. So something -- you know, if there is a technology that automatically versions something, well, that's great and that's nice and we can use that. Otherwise, it is just something we should keep in mind as documents flow back and forth.

ALISSA COOPER: Adiel.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yes. I want to answer two questions. The first one, about the mailing lists, private or public, I would like to express my support to have a private mailing list. And to answer Alissa's question, maybe the keep the current one as the private one and create another one to be public so that we don't lose track of what we have already done in the current one.

The second aspect about the tool for collaboration on editing documents, I would like to say that we will need some, because as we go on, we will have documents -- not much -- but having an on-line platform is always useful.

And the tool used at NETmundial, I personally will prefer that to a Wiki for two reasons.

The first one is that it's -- it replicates what most people use for editing a document in Word or any other open-source word processing document because you can see the comments inside and see everybody who has commented as comment. And it's not that complex. I've talked with the NETmundial team. This is a plug-in of WordPress that does that.

So we can -- we can easily implement that for our own use, which will make it accessible to those who are not very comfortable with technical collaboration editing.

To be honest, Wiki is something that is very, you know, text-oriented and good for people very friendly with typing comments and stuff like that, but I'm sure that not everybody in the -- in some parts of this community are comfortable, that while the WordPress tool is just editing, you click and add the comment. And it can be set up to address Alissa's comment about commenting over the document. You can set how you section your document and how you want to collect the comments. So I think that can be easily solved technically.

'so I would strongly support having a collaboration editing tool internally but one that can be easily used not only with bandwidth limitation but also usability for everyone.

MARTIN BOYLE: Were there anymore?

Okay. Well, I think that actually puts us into a fairly useful space and perhaps we've got the internal bit sorted. I like the idea of -- well, unless anybody's got any strong objections for an internal list, we could keep it exactly where it lies but converting it over to somewhere separate might be quite important when or if we decide that that mailing list should be archived publicly. And I thought I'd heard around the table, by and large, people thinking that our mailing list should be archived publicly.

ALISSA COOPER: The mail list we have right now has already been -- the archives have already been made public.

MARTIN BOYLE: So essentially we stay as we are.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah. Alice did it during the break.

MARTIN BOYLE: Okay. And therefore, there seemed to be one or two people who thought it useful to go to a new host but transfer the whole lot.

Is this something that we ask the secretariat to explore so that we at least show to the outside world some independence from ICANN, even though I think that we're fairly independent from ICANN anyway?

So if we were to ask the secretariat to investigate that, is everybody reasonably happy? Paul?

PAUL WILSON: Considering ICANN's role in facilitating or hosting or convening this process, I don't see a problem with it being hosted by ICANN. I think it makes -- it makes sense and is not controversial. Thanks.

MARTIN BOYLE: Any opposing views on that? Looks like we have a decision then.

ALISSA COOPER: I think it's controversial.

MARTIN BOYLE: You do?

ALISSA COOPER: I do, yes.

MARTIN BOYLE: Okay. If -- if some think it's controversial, then can we go and investigate a new host for it?

Okay. So action on the secretariat.

And there was, from Adiel, fairly strong input on the need for a collaboration tool, and again, I think that that is something that should be being seen. It's not urgent at this stage but it is likely to become urgent as we start getting contributions in. So again, can we simply ask the secretariat to look at options and report back to us with concrete proposals? Would everybody be happy with that?

I see no objections. Okay.

Can we now perhaps turn to a third level of the internal that I think we started discussing yesterday, and that is the monitoring what is going on in the various communities, and that, for example, would include the cross-community working group activity.

Now, we've all got responsibilities on us for liaising directly with our community. Is that in its own right sufficient to meet this objective or do we need to be looking specifically at establishing liaisons with any drafting groups in specific communities or is it something that as those communities get established, that we seek to decide then whether we want to have a close ear on what they're doing or whether we stand well back?

Wolf.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Martin. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Well, I would agree to the last, what you have said, because -- in the setup of this cross-coordination working group, or cross-community working group, and there may be an overlap between members of this group here and the other group, and then we have to discuss, well, and to decide, well, whether we need a liaison, really, or whether it is enough to have those memberships, both memberships in parallel for this job. Thanks.

MARTIN BOYLE: Everybody happy with that? Good.

And in the few minutes that's left to us, can we now just turn our mind to external communications? And I -- I think, actually, we've already said that we are going to be fully transparent, that we're going to be archiving our working group in public space, we're going to be sharing our material, and I suppose the question that we discussed yesterday about authoritative communications channels to and from the community, that's a discussion I think for later on today, as was in particular the dealing with press or press inquiries.

We've, I think, just agreed that we would -- that we are already publishing streams and transcripts, and mailing lists are

accessible, so do we have anything additional that we think that we need for helping people access and understand the working of this group?

In other words, do we need to have a Web site that helps people identify where to find things?

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you. This is Keith Drazek.

So just thinking maybe at a -- one step up, and the question came to mind about how do we summarize and explain the work of the coordinating group. And I -- I'm thinking it's probably important that we summarize our work and communicate our work and our progress, as opposed to having it summarized for us.

So, you know, I was -- I had my hand up in the queue earlier because I was going to, I think, echo what Alissa said about I didn't think that we were going to have a tremendous amount of drafting or sort of -- you know, drafting work that would require a platform, but now I'm sort of second-guessing myself and wondering if we need to have a regular schedule of updates to the community, a formal statement, and that could certainly still be done on a mailing list. I'm not suggesting that it has to be done on a drafting platform.

But I do think it's important for external communication that we, as a coordinating group, determine the messaging that goes out

to the community, as opposed to having someone else monitoring our mailing lists or our inter- -- our discussions and then summarizing our work for us. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: So I completely agree with you, Keith. I think having our own Web site would be very -- we will find it to be a very useful vehicle for setting down the markers as to, you know, when a status update is provided. Then we can have a nice place where all the status updates live together and anyone who wants to see the history of them can go find them easily. I think it's also important because we have so many diverse communities that are going to be running their own separate processes that there be a separate portal where people who are not familiar with, you know, the IETF or the cross-community working group or whatever it may be can go and get a snapshot of what's happened and also links, if they want to, you know, follow the conversation in more detail of how they can do that and when and where the conversations are occurring. So I think having a central portal like that for us would be -- we would find it to be extremely useful.

Mohamed and then Daniel.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I'd like just to emphasize the point that Keith raised. There's many stakeholders outside the room that are focusing and looking

at what we are doing, and we should -- beside the Web site, I think we should also look at different channels to ensure that our message is sent and received by a lot of stakeholders.

Thinks like press releases. Using social media. I mean, this is a very important work for the future of Internet governance, so we shouldn't limit ourselves just to using mailing lists. We should really look to the maximum channels that we can utilize to ensure that our messages and our data are sent to, you know, our public. Thank you.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: I think we have should have a Web presence. And I think we should have a very effective means of people to have the state of the current discussions, specifically since we don't have parallel discussions.

From my experience, I believe that there is a difference between summarizing and drawing conclusions and I have the suspicion that if for clear summaries we depend on the time of the people around the table, we might do a less than optimal job. So I'm not completely in agreement with what Keith has said. I think we should delegate some of the clerical tasks of summarizing and categorizing stuff while being very cognizant of the fact that a long summary can have an influence.

So we should check it, but my concern is that if we say -- if we don't get any support in summarizing and categorizing, we will not have enough energy to do a good job.

MARTIN BOYLE: Okay. So can I just play that one back, what I think I've heard, is that we rely on the secretariat to produce summaries and that we obviously are going to have to cast our eyes over those summaries because we have a certain ownership of it but that we are not going to be spending all the rest of our lives just trying to wordsmith press releases and communications. Does anybody have any oppositions to that as a way of communicating broadly with the community? I certainly like the idea -- and I heard somebody used the word "portal" because there is a whole load of people out there who will come to the discussion late or later and will want to understand it. And having an easy access to information is, I think, the least we can do in ensuring accountability of this group.

Okay. I think that's -- I'm sorry. I think that sort of gives us quite -- again, quite a reasonable way forward.

Any other views, comments, on communications? Paul.

PAUL WILSON: I think this is linked to the discussion we had yesterday about media contacts, and I had a sense that yesterday we were aiming

for a fairly lightweight model here where we were not going to be manufacturing messages which were going to be statements of position or the kind of message that you'd want a single spokesman to be giving out.

I would prefer to think that the communications that we have is really -- although not diminishing the importance and level of interest in this, I think we still are in some way obliged to keep the communications to a very practical, pragmatic, factual level. And it is the sort of thing that would be done, I'd suggest, by the secretariat. So it could be an announcement of minutes having been published, our reports having been published, meetings coming up, and so on.

I think if we keep a pragmatic straightforward, lightweight approach to this, we might avoid to sort of going into areas that start to almost to create an organization out of this group with the need for spokespeople and messaging and these sorts of considerations.

I think we've agreed to have co-chairs of this group. Did we discuss yesterday the three co-chairs? So I suppose if anyone is liaising with the secretariat on what messaging might be appropriate, then the co-chairs would be discussing that. But I'd hope the co-chairs would may be the contacts to the secretary for that. But, again, I would hope it could be kept at a fairly lightweight, as I say, factual, pragmatic level. Thanks.

MARTIN BOYLE: Yeah, I think that's a very helpful reminder that let's keep it lightweight because it would actually be nice to have some time to do some real work and activity here rather than concentrating on going through.

I think one of the words that Keith used was summarizing the work and processes, and I think that is probably quite a useful thing to have, albeit perhaps in some general introductory text, then allows people to find the information that they are looking for.

But, again, I think we're probably now at this stage looking for the secretariat to identify what they think they can do conveniently, simply, and I like the idea of co-chairs being the interface on trying to get the -- trying to ensure that the information is correct.

Jean-Jacques, I see you waving.

ALISSA COOPER: Joe and Daniel are in the queue as well.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. Martin, do you think now we could speak about another task for the secretariat, or should we go on with the communications only?

MARTIN BOYLE: The discussion is to talk about communications. Is there a separate session for looking specifically at secretariat?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, after lunch.

MARTIN BOYLE: Okay. So that's the right place to do that.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thanks, yes. I was saying as we start to park some functions in the secretariat role, we may also want to know what capacity the secretariat has before we park some functions with them. So I think these are all concepts which perhaps become the job description of the secretariat. So it would be an input into then finding out who has the appropriate skill set to do that minimalizing PR function or some of the other things we're asking for.

I just want to keep in mind that the ask and the person or group who's responding to this have to be commensurate to each other.

MARTIN BOYLE: Yeah, that's a good and healthy warning.

Right. I think we've come to the bottom of the list of things that I'd written down on my pad that we needed to just get some general agreement on. I think we've got a fairly clear way forward, and we've, I think, very usefully asked the secretariat to do a lot of work for us and that will probably come back to haunt us when we do the discussion after lunch.

So unless anybody's got any additional views, comments, things that I've missed, I think I will call the discussion to an end.

ALISSA COOPER:	Yes. Thank you to all the voluntolds.

So I think first order of business is that we had a new person join us in the room.

So, Tracy, the way that we ran introductions yesterday was who have you introduce yourself, tell us who you are, which group appointed you sort of --

[Laughter]

We might be a little more familiar with your group as well.

I will read the list of items, what the group does, who participates in it, what its decision processes are, whether you are representing your group or participating as an individual, how your group's work, you see it relating to the coordination group and where you work and how you are funded to be here with us.

TRACY HACKSAW:	All right. I just flew in literally -- is it morning still? So I'm Tracy Hackshaw from Trinidad-Tobago. I'm interim -- I'm not sure, interim GAC rep. I understand the decision has been made to have the five reps join.

The GAC, I believe as was said yesterday, is really here to take the information back to the overall GAC and have the discussion there. So my role here is not to provide input on behalf of the GAC but to take the information back for discussion at the GAC.

I think that's about it I would like to say now. I think Heather spoke yesterday in detail about what the GAC is doing. So thank you very much.

ALISSA COOPER: So it looks like lunch is almost here and we were meant to have a lunch discussion led by Jean-Jacques about the framework for the transition. We're still good to do that?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Are you suggesting that I will be deprived of lunch?

ALISSA COOPER: So what I was thinking was that maybe we reconvene in 20 minutes or so, give people time to get their food, get the food out, get their food, give you a little bit of time to eat and then have the discussion starting at 12:40. Does that work? Okay. So let's do that.

[LUNCH BREAK]

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. If people want to start migrating back, I think Jean-Jacques is going to start in a minute or two. Thanks.

Why don't we start, Jean-Jacques. The people are filtering back, so...

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Good afternoon, folks. This is a real challenge for me because of course there's only one other situation in which a speaker can be embarrassed and that is after lunch because everyone is dozing off, so it's pretty bad like this.

But --

>>   ---

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yeah. And some have not yet finished lunch.

So in any case, I will be speaking in English because I'm not sure that all the cabins -- all the interpreters are in place.

They are. Okay. Okay. Thanks very much. Well, perhaps I'll go to French then.

Thank you again, Alissa, for giving me this opportunity to say a few words.

Now, in order to avoid any mis- -- I said I was speaking in French. Pardon.

[Laughter]

Thank you, Alissa, for this opportunity to share my thoughts and my views with you.

I would like to disappoint you, because maybe you think that I will be speaking about the framework, the working framework of this coordination -- coordination group, and I'm not going to speak about the group's structure.

What I would like to speak about now is a shared view or the wider context in which we have to include or insert our work. What is the reality for the entire Internet right now and what are the challenges that the Internet, and not only the IETF, the IAB, or ICANN have to face?

So I'm going to be sharing with you a geopolitical and geostrategic reflection, and I invite you all to participate, of course.

There are several points that I will be addressing, not in a specific order. I have not thought out a logical order for the points that I will be addressing, so with that, the first point I would like to address is that most of the community that is now following up on our work is not within my geographic area or region. In this case, western Europe. And they are not within North America either.

This mirrors a reality that entails that Internet is expanding faster, not only now but it will be expanding faster in the future in Asia, Latin America, the Gulf region, eastern Europe, et cetera.

So it is this sensitivity that I would like to share with you. That is, that beyond our exact mandate and the mandate that we are trying to fulfill, there's a global perception that we are within a stage that falls within a far wider evolution, far wider and larger than what I would call the globalization of Internet structures.

Of course in ICANN, we are used to speaking about ICANN's globalization, and I am cognizant of the efforts in place, especially for the last two years, along these lines.

But I believe that we have to be cognizant of the fact that users worldwide have plenty of expectations so that these will, in turn, be transferred or translated to other Internet-related mechanisms and procedures.

Let me now give you an example from a different scenario that is not related to Internet governance but this is something that is taking place which, to my mind is an extremely important development.

You, of course, are aware or cognizant of the Bretton Woods agreement by which the IMF and then the World Bank were created.

Well, as it happens, last week and this week, too, meetings -- very important meetings -- were held, and the most important emerging economies -- that is, Brazil, Russia, India, and China -- participated in those meetings. That is the BRIC countries. B-R-I-C. And also South Africa was included. Thank you, Hartmut, for that reminder.

So the aim of this meeting was to reinvent a financial -- an international financial and monetary system that would be different from the system arising out of the Bretton Woods agreement. That is, the new system

would be competing with the Bretton Woods system. Whether we like it or not, well, that is not significant. The truth is or the fact is that these -- these country leaders have already made this decision.

And we can start foreseeing several consequences.

For instance, the venue is going to be in Shanghai, China, and secondly, there are going to be two financial structures. First of all, the fund itself that would also have -- or whose operating capital would stand between 50 and 100 billion U.S. dollars only to begin with or as a seed fund.

And if we focus on the distribution, China is going to be the most important contributor, followed by India and Brazil, and then Russia, and finally South Africa.

This is very significant.

In addition, a decision was made to set up a fund specialized or focused in financing public infrastructures, large public infrastructures.

This fund will initially be equivalent to 100 billion U.S. dollars.

Now, why am I bringing this up when -- or while you are very slowly digesting your lunch and this is not related to the Internet and let alone to the work of this coordination group.

Well, I believe this is a sign of the times we're living, and as people say in English, I believe that we're hitting the writing on the wall.

The risk to the Internet and to the Internet users is that one day for several reasons, political and not only technical, we will see the implementation of a threat or the materialization of a threat. That is,

that Internet will become fragmented. And we will have a system with several Internets running in parallel.

This is happening because -- to some extent because, in fact, in several Asian countries there is an intranet that has a potential control of incoming and outgoing information, but for the time being, even this great Asian country, if it wants to, has access to all the global Internet and people outside this country can engage in exchanges with people inside the country.

I see this -- or I find an analogy in this that perhaps is not as surprising or as farfetched as it would seem initially. But I see a parallel here or a parallelism here and we have to anticipate these geostrategic developments that may be taking place or that are foreseeable in the horizon. Once again, I believe that our mandate is far more limited or restricted but I would like to share this in my capacity as somebody that usually thinks about events from geostrategic concepts.

Now, let me focus on globalization. Globalization does not only imply a geographic concept that is where ICANN, ISOC, or other institutions may set up offices. It implies knowing the tasks and responsibilities specific to these offices.

Let us focus on ICANN, by way of example.

In the prior CEO's -- or during the prior CEO's term, a decision was made to set up another office in California when, in fact, the community had been requested, for several years, that a new open -- that a new office, sorry, would be opened somewhere else, not in California. So Fadi Chehade, the incumbent CEO, got this message and announced the

opening of a new office in Geneva. And this is in line with a recommendation we made to the ICANN board in 2009 in a document that was called "Improving the" -- or "Institutional Trust in ICANN," or "ICANN's Institutional Trust." Theresa was part of that working group. And that recommendation implied creating a new and different legal entity, and we thought about Geneva for several specific reasons.

The current ICANN CEO had a positive reaction to this proposal, although he did not acknowledge the origin of this proposal but that is something positive. This is a way of internationalizing or globalizing, but we need to go beyond, so that all the structures that will be focusing on Internet governance and the Internet will be able to move even further in terms of balanced representation. Not only in terms of gender but also in terms of regions, nationality, culture, and language.

And this has a direct consequence that applies to this small group.

Not only now, but in the coming months.

I believe that we have to bear this in mind at all times, being cognizant that our group's temporary secretariat that for the time being is in the hands of ICANN has gone very far in preparing this work.

We have very qualified staff supporting us, but we also have interpreters, translators on a permanent basis.

This implies considerable expense and effort, and that's why I am speaking in one of the U.N. languages, which to me is far more natural than speaking in English.

Another aspect that we have to take into consideration has to do with the formation or creation of -- or rather, the representatives of this coordination or coordinating group.

We have to be cognizant of the fact that the public, our communities, will be closely watching or looking at aspects we did not take into account. That is -- or, for instance, the nationality of the three co-chairs of this group, the geographic origin, the language skills, et cetera.

Finally, and to sum up, I would like to tell you why I believe that the formation of this coordination group is important, and it implies a significant stage in the brief history of the Internet.

First of all, as from ICANN's creation, the American authorities that supervised this initiative had stated their intention to allow for a transition of this responsibility in the hands of one nation -- that is, the United States -- the transition to another structure. But I realize that this has not been the case in the last years. Why didn't this take place five, eight, or even three years ago? Why not do it in three years' time or in five years' time? Why March 2014?

Any historian or sociologist would find it interesting to see that even if we have divergent opinions on this topic, it is important to know that it was the Snowden revelations that somewhat triggered these developments.

I understand that Washington does not like this type of analysis that I hear on many occasions, but I believe that our American friends have nothing to lose in recognizing this fact because this confirms the urgency of this ongoing transformation.

This transformation implies a significant step towards the internationalization of the Internet. It is, in fact -- it is so, in fact, because this structure is already global. The internet is very international. But we have to focus on the steering or stewardship arrangements.

It is there that progress is still to be made.

I am not going to keep boring you with these old diplomat's considerations who is, indeed, very happy to be here with you and does not regret having retired from his prior job, but since I am the only one here that has been a career diplomat for so many years, I thought it was my duty to share these observations with you.

Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. I'm looking at the timing agenda on the screen. Our next topic was the secretariat tasks and selection to be moderated by Daniel.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Thank you, Alissa. Can you keep the queue, please, for me. I'm bad at multitasking. So I sent an hour and a half ago -- let me put it this way. Yesterday I asked for input on this session, and I sent -- about an hour and a half ago, I sent a summary of this. And I'm going to read the beginning of it. We are already behind schedule, and I believe it's important that we are not rushed when we prepare the communique from this meeting.

So I will charge ahead and summarize the discussion so far. I hope that this will enable us to come to consensus about the secretariat more quickly than scheduled. I suggest that we do this as a two-stage discussion. First, agree on the tasks and then agree on how we get them done. And please bear with me. I'm not intending to have an end run on any discussion we are going to have. I just try to be constructive here.

So if I don't hear immediate objections, I would like to just jump into the tasks. And I compiled this from an email discussion and face-to-face discussions. And it is projected right there and you have it in your mailbox for almost two hours now.

The first group of tasks I took from -- mostly from input from Russ Housley, those are what we called yesterday the "keep the trains running" tasks. And I might read them: Minute taking, action item tracking, calendaring for meeting and teleconference schedules, mailing list management, Web pages -- and the purpose of the Web pages would be to facilitate meeting information distribution -- information dissemination to the public, Wiki pages as we discussed during Martin's session, posting draft documents, posting meeting transcripts, audio streams. And I think we can probably add a couple more menial tasks to this. I don't think that would be very helpful unless somebody feels that there is one of those "keep the trains running on time" things that we forgot.

Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Daniel. This is Jean-Jacques. Consistent with what I just said in my boring presentation, I think that we should recognize and call for a continued effort on the part of the secretariat as represented temporarily by ICANN for the translation and interpretation services.

I put this on the table because I know that in certain units we represent, it has been decided over the past few years that English would be the only language. But as someone coming from the ICANN and especially the At-Large community, I think that is a great benefit. So should we discuss this, or should we just note it?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: I will accept it as a friendly amendment to the "keep trains running on time." It is just an omission. So we can add that. I don't know whether we need to do it on the screen. But this could -- I consider this "keep the trains running." I don't think this is anything complicated.

Anybody else on the train schedules bit?

Okay. And then the next bit is meeting venue arrangements and travel arrangements. I think we need -- we need this. It might even be part of the first one, but somehow it got separated.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Daniel, the reason I separated that in my note to the list, those are things I think ICANN is providing as part of their facilitator role and it is not clear that the secretariat will be part of ICANN.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: That's noted. I tried to be -- that would be the second stage of my two-stage --

RUSS HOUSLEY: I could tell why it was separate.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Sure.

ALISSA COOPER: Sorry. Scroll back up a little bit. Yeah. So I think as long as "meeting venue" includes teleconferencing, not just the calendar but the actual technology and whatnot.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Anybody else so far?

                       Moving right along, and this is where we had some discussion in the earlier session about internal and external communications, so I expect it to be a little bit more controversial in talking about the next three points.

                       Operate and manage contact points for the community, compile and summarize input from the community so that it is easily digestible by CG members so we can dive into details when needed, and copy editing of documents, output and whatever else we might need help with.

And this input comes from -- just give credit where it is due, from Patrik Faltstrom. So is that something that we see a secretariat doing? I will give you a couple of seconds to contemplate that.

ALISSA COOPER: Kuo.

KUO-WEI WU: Regarding the communication with the community, I would like to just bring it up. In early of August, there is an Asia-Pacific regional IGF meeting in New Delhi, India. And I think they already have agenda. It is talking about IANA transition stuff. So if the secretary can give us, you know, the information we are working on these two days, put it all together, I think that is -- might be a good time for us to talk to the Asia-Pacific regional people regarding the IANA transition, the status of what's going on. I know Paul Wilson will be there also.

ALISSA COOPER: Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah. The list I think is okay. I'm a little concerned about the "summarizing the input from the community." Perhaps we can say "summarize subject to review of the community" or something like that. But I would like a community to have a shot at having a comment on what the summary is, if the secretary just does a summary.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Can I suggest we say, "Assist or help in the compilation and summarization?" That was the intention. I'm not speaking for Patrik, but I think that's what Patrik intended.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I'm a lot more comfortable with that approach.

TRACY HACKSAW: Tracy Hackshaw. I'm not sure that I miss doing things like position papers and so on. Would that may be something that you may want task the secretariat with? That kind of leans with what was just said about the IGF sessions. So I know in the Caribbean IGF, a session on IANA transition is being done as well. I'm wondering if that kind of work -- who's covering that kind of work and presenting it to the coordination group. Or is it we're relying on news or other people to bring it back? The secretariat can track that information and provide compilation papers, I think, to the group. That's something that could be suggested.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah. I guess if I'm understanding the suggestion correctly, to me that's the kind of thing that I think we should actually do ourselves as opposed to asking the secretariat to do it, if we're actually -- if we have come to some conclusion about something or we're providing a status update, that's the kind of thing I would want us -- I would want to see us doing.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Can I ask you to park this for a second? And if it's still at the end of this discussion, it's still an issue that you think needs addressing, then to

suggest some language, what we should put in here. Because I have the suspicion that when we come to the non-tasks, it will actually be discussed.

Anybody else on those three points before we talk about press?

Okay. Moving on. And this is language that I inserted, those next two points about the press. So I'm responsible. I'm ready for the tomatoes. And it's based on some discussions we had yesterday and some discussions that we had during the session that Martin Boyle led. And my intention is to say that the secretariat, if they get inquiries, just point out where our products can be found and where the record of our meetings can be found and assist the press in actually finding the stuff and accessing it.

And the second point is if there's any request for a discussion, an interview, an interpretation, the only thing that the secretariat should do is give the press person a complete list of the ICG members and say, "Take your pick, talk to them" because that I think was at least the emerging consensus that we had.

And I'm very uncomfortable personally, while I have the floor, with the turn it took this morning, again, at giving a special role in this to the chairs.

My personal opinion on this is, while I have the floor, that actually the chairs should be more reluctant to speak to the press than the other members of the group because of the perception that they speak for the group that they cannot avoid.

Now, the tomatoes.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Not a tomato but an observation. The press is going to be asking for questions to be answered related to what we are doing as a whole. And getting answered by a constituency view of what we are doing as a whole is far from an answer to their question. So perhaps we want to then develop a process whereby we agree on a statement that responds to a set of questions as a collective.

But I think we will be doing ourselves a disservice by never answering the question we are actually asked and only suggesting that they can get pieces of answers from people and hopefully draw a conclusion from that.

ALISSA COOPER: So a couple of observations. I have a very good friend who was a reporter for many years, and so I feel okay saying this because he's the one who said this to me.

Reporters are lazy, as a general matter. And so giving them a list of contacts, a list of 30 contacts with no indication of who might be the most relevant person to talk to about any particular subject, I think, is going to, I think, create what Joe just talked about, which is that they will either not get the information that they need or they will make it up or they will go ask other people in the Internet community who are willing to talk to them when they need to write a story because they will need to write stories.

I think this process is going to attract media attention, already has attracted a lot of media attention. I think that's going to ramp up as we get closer to the end.

So my personal preference, I think, as I stated yesterday, would be that the -- when we have incoming press requests, that they get forwarded to the full group of us, that we do a brief amount of coordination if we have time, someone can volunteer and say, "Oh, yes, I will call this person back before their deadline." And if that doesn't work, that we have a couple of fall-back people who are the point people for responding to the press.

I don't think we need to be afraid of the press, frankly. I think in terms of this group, we won't have much to say for ourselves until many months from now. And when we do, I think we are all capable of speaking to a set of talking points and, you know, statements that we will have previously made together without going off into the woods and, you know, misspeaking too much. I feel like I trust us to stay on message.

And I think we could use the press to our advantage by communicating those messages when we are going to have good messages to send. So that would be my first preference.

If that continues to be sort of anathema to people, I think a possible middle ground could be allowing a point person or all of us or some set of us to at least talk to reporters on background. So that even if -- the thing that we're afraid of is being quoted, we can at least help educate reporters who are covering this topic from our perspective from the inside as opposed to letting whoever else is out there educate them.

JARI ARKKO: Was it me?

ALISSA COOPER: Jari and then Adiel.

JARI ARKKO: I think you already said, Alissa, most of the things I was going to say. I agree with you and Joe. The press could perhaps be our friend. And you can think about this. It could be either us or, you know, actively in a well-designed professional manner, engaging the press or some other people doing that.   Think of your favorite politicians or your non-favorite politicians, for instance, saying things about the coordination group and its work.

                          So I think we need to do that. And the way to structure that in the best possible way, to do it professionally, is that we develop those positions, we equip all of us and, you know, maybe some people, perhaps even more than the rest because they will naturally come to the chairs, specifically if we have chairs, or -- so it is important we have the talking points, we have the stories. I don't think we should be afraid of that.

ALISSA COOPER: Adiel.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yeah. I just want to echo some of the previous comments and reinstate what I said yesterday, that I think we need to have a clear -- identify the

people who will be the preferred contact for press for two reasons as well. I think dealing and interacting with press, not that we are afraid, but is something that you improve as soon as you are going. And it is in our interest to have somebody that will speak for the group. It will be very dangerous that when we speak as members of the group, we start talking about the position of our constituency, which ones do good. I think it is in our interest to have people who can be directed to.

Now, that being said, as I said yesterday as well, we should all agree to answer to press when they contact us directly through talking points. We can develop talking points. As soon as we address an issue, we have talking points related to that, that anyone can take and use when dealing with the press.

And if we always wait to get agreement on the list before talking to the press when requests come, we will miss a lot of opportunity because generally, they want to contact someone. They want to talk with someone but it is, like, now or yesterday. So we have to be prepared to deal with that.

So...

ALISSA COOPER: Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Alissa. This is Jean-Jacques. I have one remark and one suggestion. The remark is that from a long experience -- and I've had a great number of interviews, TV, newspapers, et cetera, and not on

technical subjects but on things which even had perhaps a real political context to them so they were especially delicate.

And this brings me to the conclusion that, no, media are not our enemies. We shouldn't be afraid of them. It just takes a bit of care, training, and awareness of where the debate is at that particular moment you are called upon to speak, meaning very high awareness of the context. So that was my remark.

The suggestion is this, that we do it in two steps. First step, we agree right now that it is more important to have agreement on the general thrust of our message at any given time in one month, in one year. And that would require us, through internal consultation. Perhaps the three co-chairs or one of them would send us a note about main points which could come up in contact with the press, and this is what we would say. Not verbatim, of course, but in general lines.

In other words, we must agree on a musical score and then not worry so much immediately about which instruments are going to play the score.

And my second suggestion is that if we put this off to, let's say, a bit later, if we can't agree on this today, then we will have time to think a bit more about the respective merits of either having a focal point, someone among the three co-chairs or anyone else designated for that, or, as Daniel has suggested, the staff's task would simply be to feed the media with a list and say, "You choose anyone."

Frankly, from my experience and from the vantage point of my age and having done a lot of things elsewhere than only in my home country, I think giving a list sends out the wrong message. It's really, "We don't

trust ourselves. It's not that we don't trust you, the press. We don't trust ourselves, so we don't want to have a spokesperson." Thanks.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Okay. Let me -- thank you, Jean-Jacques. Let me try to focus this -- okay. Let me say two things.

First of all, we're on the subject of the secretariat and what I -- what I sense is that from the discussions yesterday, the discussions we had in the internal/external communications session, and now the discussions that we have here is that we have an unresolved issue, and let me take Jean-Jacques' suggestion to park it and move it further on, and let's focus on what we want the secretariat to do or not to do and not about how we want to structure our press relations.

Would that be acceptable? And then with that, I open the floor again.

MARY UDUMA: Thank you. I just want to raise the issue that we are from different constituencies and in our constituencies, who speaks to the press? Would everybody in the constituency speak to the press?

We run our businesses. When we want to speak to the press, would we ask anybody in the business or in our organization to speak to the press?

And if we're a team, then -- and if we are to be taken seriously, I think we should have a focal point that would be speaking to the press. We are thinking of having the chairs, so one of them should be identified to speak to the press on behalf of the team, and that's how we'll build

trust and that's how we'll build oneness, unity, and it's only when we work that way that the external -- or those that are outside this room or this group will be able to get -- you know, get our communication well.

Because if each and every one of us speak to the press, at the end of the day we'll sing different tunes and I don't think it will all go well. I support finding a focal point. If not the chairs, but just (indiscernible) that is very good in communication. One of us should be designated or two should be designated to speak to the press. That's my submission. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Xiaodong?

XIAODONG LEE: So I prefer to speak Chinese.

As for the press and the secretariat, I would like to express my views.

In my past experience, I've faced a lot of press occasions. I would like to say what you say, how to say is very important. This will dispel misunderstandings. But we do not have to fear the medias. They have their own rules. If we can make good use of those rules, it will be good for us. I would like to say two points. First, we can have a spokesperson. For instance, the chairs or co-chairs could be our spokesperson. But everything have to be expressed by the spokesperson or the media can contact not just the chairs or co-chairs or some other groups' members. Second, what you say and what

should not be said is very important. It's an art to say or not to say something.

Everything can be helped from the secretariat. The secretariat can give us a contact or some materials or focal points so that they can help us to let us know what you say or how to say. I'm sure that each and every member of this group know what to say and what should not be said. We have the capability to do so, to safeguard our interests. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So I have myself and then Kuo. Nobody else.

Okay. And Milton. Milton. Okay.

So following on your suggestion, Daniel, I guess I was -- and also, I was just looking back at the email from Tracy regarding what he said earlier about external fora. I wonder if the way that we can characterize this role of the secretariat for now is something to do with a communications channel for external requests or, you know, a -- something about how they can help us with relations to the external world and kind of leave it at that until we've resolved this question for later. And that might cover both the press and other fora. Regional IGFs and so forth.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Can I take session leader's prerogative and -- to move this along? And I'm not forgetting the next two people but can we just, for the concrete language that we have here, just park the "providing the press with a complete list" bit and say "further definition of the secretariat's role in

external relations and press relations is for further discussion," and also note that in the next section where we have secretariat non-tasks, there's one thing saying that talking to the press other than specified above says, you know, we clearly want to have the prerogative to direct the secretariat in what they do and don't do.

And then can I -- can I ask the people who wanted to speak whether it's fine to move on and park that discussion? Not forget it, but park it for the time?

Okay. Seeing no --

You want to speak?

KUO-WEI WU: I think it's a good time for me to exercise my Chinese, though.

I would like to say I support what Xiaodong just said. My principal -- I think in this coordination group we should have an official press release to let people know what we have decided. It doesn't have to be complicated, but we need to have a press release for the media. Just now we mentioned whether we have to have a spokesperson. We can be -- discuss this later, but other than the spokesperson, I believe that each and every people should express your own personal views when you are talking to the press because we have our differences in viewing all the work we're doing.

So everything -- the official thing should come from the press release. Other than that, we can express our personal opinions to the media. Thank you.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: -- give Milton the opportunity, if he wants to.

>> ---

MILTON MUELLER: I just thought I was either in the queue or not in the queue. I didn't think my ability to speak depended on whether it was judged fair or not, but I guess I'll speak anyway, so okay.

>> ---

MILTON MUELLER: Legitimate. Okay.

So, yeah, let's not make a mountain out of the molehill with respect to the media. Yes, when the group makes a formal decision and writes a communique or issues a document, that's an official product and we will have specific formats and channels for doing that.

The rest of it is completely open, right?

The media will want to contact us. We may want to speak to the media in our capacity as individuals or -- or as representatives of individual stakeholder groups. There's absolutely no reason to regulate that. Indeed, it would be counterproductive and counter to the spirit of

openness and transparency for us to try to control communications between the members of this group and the outside world.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Okay. Trying to focus back on the topic, secretariat, can people live with the language starting with "providing press," just to strike the four interviews thing? Because I think there's no harm in them giving out the list, right? Or strike it completely. I don't care. And let's move on with the secretariat, because otherwise --

I think we should agree to park this issue and come back to it.

Okay. So --

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Instead of "talking to the press," I will use the word "liaising with the press," because that liaison --- but still on the secretariat, I think we need to maybe look further into the -- into the other responsibilities of the secretariat related to communication in general, which includes the relationship with the press and others, because what we are doing here will have and attract a lot more attention globally which will lead us to have a very clear communication strategy, kind of, and that's how I believe that the secretariat will have a big role in helping us in that area.

So I see the communications strategy globally falling under the secretariat responsibility or role.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Okay. Can we move to the -- just not discuss this press stuff and scroll down a little bit further?

Can the person operating the screen scroll down, because there's one other non-task? Yeah. And that spoke to some of the contributions earlier. It is that we should make it explicit that it is not a task of the secretariat to develop conclusions from or interpret the material that we're discussing, both from ourselves and the communities, and I think that's uncontroversial.

So is there anything that's missing from the -- from the secretariat task list?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: In the "trains run on time," had we -- because part of what they would do which would be useful to us to develop conclusions would be to maintain appropriate minutes and things of that nature. Was that in the "trains running on time"? I can't remember.

>>   ---

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Okay.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Yes, it's there. It's the first item. Anything missing from this list of --

ALISSA COOPER: Mary, do you have your hand up?

MARY UDUMA: I just saying maybe we start from -- because of the digression on press, I'm worried about other ones that we had up. If we can pull it down, please.

ALISSA COOPER: Can you guys scroll back to the top, please? Thanks.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Mary, can you say that again? I just didn't get it.

MARY UDUMA: You've done it.

                        [Laughter]

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Okay. So let's agree on this one now. That's the task list.

                        Now comes the interesting bit.

>>   ---

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Sorry?

>>   ---

MARY UDUMA: Excuse me. Can you explain -- can you explain that -- the first one on the second page?   "Operate and manage contact points for the community." What is it that you have in mind?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: That's -- that comes from Patrik Faltstrom, but I interpret it to be what did the -- the infrastructure that we -- that we discussed earlier. Purely facilitating. Yeah.

                         Does that answer the question?

MARY UDUMA: So we say "facilitating" and not say "operate and manage contact points for the community." Because we already have representatives and then -- so which are the contact points that we are managing?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: It's the infrastructure, the Web infrastructure and things like that, so that, you know, there's a framework for finding the -- the state of the discussions and all that -- that thing.

                         But if it's -- if it's -- if the language is unclear and offensive, I'm quite -- is unclear, I'm quite happy with striking it because I think we have it in other points.

ALISSA COOPER: Maybe just to clarify that it's not managing humans.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Yeah. Exactly. That's the point, yeah. It's not managing humans. It's -- you know, I'm open for better language, if we consider it important to get this absolutely right.

ALISSA COOPER: So it's -- sorry. It means contact information?

>>   ---

ALISSA COOPER: Oh, okay.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Yeah, I think that's what's intended.

ALISSA COOPER: Sounds good.

KEITH DRAZEK: Maybe "compile and maintain contact information" is what we want.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Yeah, "compile and maintain contact information." I think that's what was intended. So if you can edit that, that would help, yeah.

Anything else before we get into the interesting discussion?

Okay. Then I declare that we have -- at least for this language, we have -- we have consensus. We have parked the press thing for later resolution. And now we get into who's going to do it.

And I've already sent some language to -- to the mailing list but I'd like not to be the first one to speak to this, so I open the floor for discussion on solutions here.

Or if you'd like me to speak first, of course I can do that.

ALISSA COOPER: So my understanding is that the -- the proposal to create this group indicated that the secretariat -- that ICANN has funding to hire a secretariat for this purpose, and I thought I had heard from Theresa that they need to basically put out an RFP to find that secretariat, but if you want to comment, feel free.

THERESA SWINEHART: The choice of how the coordination group wants to manage the secretariat is really up to it. The process document reflected comments from the community itself. Obviously from a resourcing aspect, one would need to look at that. There is some budget available for the NTIA stewardship transition process, but that budget covers a range of areas, including obviously the support for travel for the coordination group.

So from that standpoint, it is up to the coordination group how they want to handle it.

I would suggest that avoiding duplication could be good, and obviously efficient use of resources is desirable. So thank you.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Okay. If nobody else wants to speak before me, put the thing that I was thinking before us.   I get the impression that the emphasis is on expediency. So I ask the concrete question: Would it be acceptable to ask ICANN if they are prepared to do this work as we specified just before and as we will continue to evolve with the specification provided that they will provide dedicated people for the duration and clearly instruct them to take direction exclusively from the ICG, from us, and that the Web presence and outside communication is not ICANN branded.

Wow.

ALISSA COOPER: Keith and then Lynn.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you. Keith Drazek. So my feeling is that to the extent that we as the coordinating group and the community can take ownership of this process and to the extent of, you know, including Web address and Web page and all of that, we should. ICANN has set up this coordinating group. As we've talked about, it was a top-down decision. But the coordinating group is here. And now it's time for us to take ownership

of this process. And I think that it's important for it to not be perceived as being controlled by ICANN. So I support your recommendation.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: I actually support Keith's comments as well. For me it is almost a question of first principles. And this is absolutely no comment on obviously ICANN's staff's ability to do it or motivation. So I would like to be very, very clear on that.

But I think when external parties look at it and see ICANN as the IANA functions contractor, they are an interested party. And if we want to ensure that we hold this entire process to the very highest standards and minimize any possible pushback or points of confusion, then I think having a separate identity, if you will, for this effort is just very important. So, again, for me it is a matter of first principles, not at all a comment on ICANN capabilities or motivations.

ALISSA COOPER: So I have myself and Adiel in the queue, yeah.

I completely agree with Lynn. And I think additionally the inclusion of the ability for the secretariat to be independent from ICANN was a change that was made during the public comment period about the proposal for the creation of this group. And so I think it's -- and, you know, came via community feedback essentially. I know in our community I heard that particular item from people quite a bit.

So I think it would be important to be responsive to those community comments, if that was something that was viewed as important. And I

also personally agree with them, but I think that's another aspect to consider.

Adiel.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yeah. I would like to echo that and say that the results of what we're going to do, the weight that will be taken will really depend on how much we run this as an independent group as ICANN is an interested party.

That being said, I think if we go that route, we have to be very proactive ourselves to quickly, very quickly, set up and agree on who will be the secretariat and who will be running all of these administrative things. We have to do that before leaving this room. Because as soon as we start the process, things are going to go very fast. And instead of us being focused on trying to do that when things will start flowing in, we need to solve this very quickly so to allow us to do the real work.

And the experience of the NETmundial organization, we can use that as well and maybe recycle some of the resources which were used. I think we need to find ourselves a way of addressing it as soon as possible.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Okay. As a facilitator, can I just ask for clarity here? And then run the queue again. What I proposed is that we ask ICANN to do this and not find another structure, another organization, another contract, whatever with those conditions, that they are dedicated people, possibly specifically hired for this and with the clear instructions that

they take direction exclusively from us and that the external presence and communication is not branded by ICANN but still we are asking ICANN as an organization to do this.

And I heard some people speak to it and I imagine Keith and Lynn saying that's fine with those provisions. Maybe I misunderstood.

I heard Adiel say something different. So I think we need to be absolutely clear here.

KEITH DRAZEK: This is Keith again. I apologize. I probably misheard the initial introduction, so my preference would be similar to what I heard Lynn say, is that this should be an autonomous or independent function. So I hope that clarifies my comment.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: So you said that --

LYNN ST. AMOUR: And that was my request, yes.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, me as well.

Paul.

PAUL WILSON:	I would just like to comment on this and sort of clarify something I said before, when I said I thought that ICANN's role was not controversial. I would like it not to be. I would like ICANN's role in supporting this process to be uncontroversial and for there to be no questions or misperceptions about it. I think it can be purely logistical. It can be as they have been asked to do a role of convening or facilitating.

However, I don't think -- controversy is not a matter of opinion. If there is controversy out there, then I can't do anything about that. If there are misconceptions out there that are hard to change, then I can't do anything about that. So I think if there is enough people here who are really feeling it is better to have an independent secretariat, then I would have to go with that because I just don't think we can -- we can sort out the sort of issues that are out there that are pointing in that direction. I think we just need to acknowledge the reality of the situation and go with the best and safest option. Thanks.

DANIEL KARRENBERG:	I would take facilitator's privilege again.

I observed that there is controversy. And the only way I think we can move forward is that we have a -- hang on.

There is controversy, so there's no agreement to just -- that I can do it even under those conditions. That's clear to me.

It is also clear to me that everybody wants this solved very quickly. And I fail to see -- as a facilitator, I fail to see how we can achieve that. And I would really urge you to now concentrate on concrete suggestions of steps how we would establish a secretariat that is not ICANN, is

different from ICANN in an expeditious way so that we can get on with our work.

And personally I'm exactly where Paul is.

ALISSA COOPER: Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah. I think there's a qualitative difference between I selected the meeting venue for you, I arranged for the rooms to be all set up, the equipment is in the room, the translation is present and we helped figure out people who needed assistance with travel. None of that is controversial. All of that can be continued by ICANN.

The concept of we're summarizing your documents and we are reaching out, we are liaising with press or whatever, and we're doing other things, that is the committee. And that should be a person that is dedicated to the committee or a group that serves the committee. But that is not -- you know, I think to Theresa's point, that eliminates the overlap functions because we are now picking up people who would otherwise already be doing this stuff in another capacity. So all of the logistics planning and all that stuff, ICANN already has the information. They have the relationships. They have the people. By all means, let's let them do that. And they are probably much more cost effective at doing it than any secretariat we would find, one would hope.

But on this other stuff, I think there is a qualitative difference to it. And there the optics are that it should be an entity or person dedicated to us in a secretariat function.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Who? How do we select them? That's what I want to hear. I don't want to have a reiteration of what has already been said. Please speak to how we get it done. I really appall everyone to do this -- appeal on everyone to do this. Otherwise, we will not move forward.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: The same way we expect to do administrative assistants in a company. You put out an RFP you take a look at a couple of candidates, and you hire somebody. What we would need to know from ICANN --

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Four months later...

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Maybe that's the company, but that's not -- I mean, that can be done in a lot quicker time than four months.

ALISSA COOPER: So the queue that I have is Jean-Jacques, myself, Adiel, Mohamed and Keith, and Russ Mundy, right? I think.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Alissa. This is Jean-Jacques. Trying to build upon what Joe just said, I think if we're going down that avenue which is two distinct functions, one which is administrative and technical support and, on the other hand, perhaps one person has a sort of manager inside the coordination group, then I have a question. I find that's a thing that we should explore but I do have a question actually to ICANN staff.

I don't suppose that our group will have at any moment a budget of its own. So what are we talking about? Are we able to pay for someone who would fit with the definition which has just been given by Joe? Or should we put the question to staff on ICANN that, okay, we would like you to take care of all the arrangements, all the administrative and technical responsibilities. But is ICANN willing to pay for one or X people who would not be connected with ICANN.

I think that's a straightforward question. And the second question following on that is: Can you give us a sense of reality by saying in answer to Daniel's preoccupation about time scale, do you think that can be done within two, three weeks? Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Do you want Theresa to answer those questions, or do you want to put her in the queue?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: To answer the question is that is exactly what I believe I tried to propose. So I don't understand the controversy about it.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Well, so...

I'm next in the queue so maybe I'll talk for a second here. Okay. So my understanding is ICANN is able to pay for an independent secretariat, i.e. hire outside people to perform secretarial functions for us, which is I believe what Theresa said at the top of this conversation, which is different from what you were proposing. Okay.

Okay. So ICANN is able to hire outside people to perform secretarial functions, outside people/outside organizations. I think that's the case. I will put you in the queue, okay?

And I think that this is a process, as Joe said, that can be completed very quickly. We have a great list of tasks that we have just agreed upon. We have, I think, many people in this room who have been through this process a million times. The IETF has a secretariat that we have contracts with. We have RFPs. We have tons of them that we could use as models. And I think if we got a small group of two or three people from this coordination group who have that kind of experience and have done it before, they could take this list. They could turn it into an RFP. ICANN could put it out, and we could be done with this in a pretty short time frame.

So I'm not really concerned about that. I mean, I even know that our IETF secretariat is already aware of this process and understands very well what the kinds of needs are. So I don't think -- I'm not too concerned about how much time it would take. And I think the trade-off of getting independent people is totally worth it. So that's my attempt to answer your questions.

So I have Mohamed, Keith, Russ Mundy, Russ Housley, and Theresa in the queue and Adiel and then back to Daniel.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I think I will give my speaker slot to Theresa to respond. And then I think after that I can comment. Her response is important.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you very much. I certainly appreciate the ability to respond to this. So, yes, we would be in a position to hire an independent person that is working directly with the coordination group and responsible directly to the coordination group.

Likewise, utilizing any of the infrastructure or whatever else to utilize that and make things easier and expedite the process overall. So to answer the question and the -- I think as I understand Daniel has outlined it, that's fairly straightforward and can be done on very short notice with the coordination group identifying who they may want to have in place or allocated to that.

My observation from some of the community feedback, though, is if there is a look at either an entirely separate entity or a call for proposals, it would probably need to go through some sort of consultation process with the community or figuring out how a certain place has been identified in order to reach that.

It is a broad stakeholder community, and that's just an observation from some of the community feedback that's been identified for that. So if it is a completely independent one, probably an RFP process, if it is a

different location. It would seem to me, at least from community feedback but certainly that's all available for the coordination group to look at to determine how that's been selected.

So those are just observations overall. Meetings facility, interpretation, translation of documents, all of that is obviously available and ready to be provided.

And just one final point on the budget, while the budget has been allocated, community feedback is now being incorporated. And so you will see the answers to that. We received quite a bit of community feedback in questions around the budget allocated to all the subject areas, around the NTIA transition, which includes the accountability track. So those numbers are not fixed. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Mohamed, did you want to follow up?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I can put after the response maybe a practical approach. I think until that we decide on an approach either to have an RFP or to have a short-cut process where ICANN could provide us a contractor, according to the (indiscernible) which doesn't require that length process to function as admin and maybe the secretariat work until we find one of them.

ALISSA COOPER: Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Mohamed stole my thunder. I was actually going to say the same in terms of the possibility of an interim phase while we identify an independent secretariat where ICANN could continue to provide support. I do want to note that elaborating on my earlier comments is that ICANN does a great job in supporting these meetings logistically. We get great support from ICANN stuff on the policy front within the GNSO certainly.

So I want to make clear that my comments were not in any way to undermine or call into question ICANN's capabilities or their professionalism. But I think to reflect Joe's earlier comments that this is a particularly sensitive subject. And we need to make sure that even the perception of ICANN controlling this process is avoided at all costs. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Russ Mundy.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Alissa. My concern is that what we're really talking about is the difference that is really have a distinct --- either way ICANN is saying if we go through the effort to hire a contractor, who will they actually work --- the contractor will be picked by ICANN because that's where the money comes from. That's where the legal entity exists. And so my concern is that we're causing a lot more effort and work that could be avoided if we were to adopt essentially those words that were put forth by Daniel in the beginning where ICANN would provide a person or persons that are working exclusively in this direction of the coordinating

group, and that would be no different in any realistic --- from a contractor that's hired to do exactly the same thing, paid for with exactly the same funds. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: So I have in the queue, Russ Housley, Adiel, Hartmut, Daniel, Lynn, Joe, Keith.

Paul, is your flag still up? Okay. Russ Housley.

RUSS HOUSLEY: As Alissa said, it is very important at least in our community that the secretariat be as independent from ICANN as possible, and I think there's a difference between a contractor paid for and employee of to address Russ Mundy's point.

In addition, while I was IETF chair, I managed the transition from one secretariat contractor to another. There are a lot of organizations that have the capability to provide the services we have listed, and I think we could actually get some very good proposals in a matter of weeks and pick them and move on.

As Keith and Mohamed already suggested, ICANN can fill the gap while that process is going on so that our work can continue. I think that's the best way forward.

ALISSA COOPER: Adiel.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yeah. I will start with supporting the suggestion of Keith and Mohamed about the transition period and having ICANN continuing doing it. Going forward, I think there are several mechanisms or ways of doing this to maintain or preserve the independence of the group. I would like to, again, point out to the NETmundial, all proportions set aside, the NETmundial organization is quite similar to this. And I think Hartmut and Demi can tell us a little bit more how they have done this at the High-level Executive Committee and the independent thing because that's the same thing we are trying to do here.

And in terms of who paid, there is also a way of doing that and anchoring this to another organization which is independent, an university, an institution, whatever, which will be the contractor. That person will be (indiscernible) to the group to do this. There are mechanisms. We don't want to reinvent the wheel and spend too much time around it because that is my worry, that we spend a lot of time doing this and while we have to. So I second the point that ICANN can continue doing this in an interim period but, second, we learn from past similar experience and move forward with what's already been done. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Hartmut.

HARTMUT GLASER: Let me explain the way do it at NETmundial. We use the money from ICANN. They were willing to pay. But ICANN has an entity that they can pay personal in every part of the world. So they hire an outside

company, outsourcing company, and I select the final person who will work. So we hired four or five people to work in Brazil for five months from generally until the end of May. We signed a contract between nic.br and ICANN, received this morning, and we paid the people, if this was easier.

Or we use the money to pay directly. So we have two ways. ICANN pays -- some of you probably know Daniel Fink. Daniel Fink was hired, and his payment was done directly on his account. He received his money every month on his personal account. We hired press and some other support for the Web site. We hired nic.br and received money from ICANN, and we paid directly.

So two ways, it was very short process. We don't need to go to the international market to look for a company. We don't wait months or weeks. We decide this in three, four, five days and in one week everyone was in place. So we can use the same process probably also for our infrastructure.

ALISSA COOPER: Daniel.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Okay. I take off the hat of the facilitator of this session and speak on personal title.

If we -- I sense that we really want to go forward independence. If we're serious about this, we should be paying the bill. ICANN should not pay the bill because follow the money. It's just -- if we are going to

the trouble of setting up a separate structure, separate reporting lines. If we are doing all this superstructure work, then I think we should pass the hat around and collect our own money from the people around the table, the organizations that have an interest as the IANA customers and be really independent.

If we don't do that, my personal opinion is we should just do what's now suggested as the interim solution.

I'm also personally very in favor of clearly establishing consensus on the interim solution. I hear that ICANN continues, and I would posit that we would ask ICANN to do that based on the principles that I suggested that the dedicated people take direction exclusively from us.

ALISSA COOPER: Lynn.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: A couple comments. I want to go back to my first comments. We are all here because we are vested in this transition and the importance of IANA. These comments reflect not at all on ICANN's ability to run -- they run absolutely excellent meetings from go to the end. This is not a comment on that. This is really a comment on independence and perception from third parties. I mean, whatever the decision here, I think that should be kind of clearly noted, the broader community being what it is.

With respect to some of the comments about independence. I mean, the analogy here is exactly what The Internet Society does for the IETF

secretariat. We pay for the secretariat. In fact, the contracts are actually taken in ISOC's name. The IETF area director is in name for administrative purposes an ISOC employee because the IETF is unincorporated. But it is completely clear that the IAD takes its directions only from the IETF. The entire external set of contracts they have -- and there are a number -- are managed by the IETF against their statements of work, et cetera. So there is a model that can work, and there's some discussions going on in the chatroom here in Adobe. But if the issue is that, you know, they think that there's not a similar benevolence I think was one of the words used in this greater model, then there are ways to make that clear and get agreements between the appropriate organizations that would ensure that there was an appropriate independence and arm's length taken.

And I'm a little surprised by some of the Daniel's comments here to my last point about the financing. Just in terms of the way this financing for IANA has always gone and the way this whole process is managed, I don't think we are doing anything that's out of the ordinary. And I don't see a reason for this community to in some respects, for many of the members here, pay again for a transition that supports the overall model because, in fact, that's how ICANN is funded in the first instance, is through registry and registrar payments.

ALISSA COOPER: I have Keith, Jari and Daniel in the queue. We have two minutes left in this session, so I would suggest that be the end of the queue.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks. I'll take myself out of the queue. It's been covered.

ALISSA COOPER: Jari?

JARI ARKKO: Yeah. I just to the mic line to respond to Daniel's comments about the financing. I think -- I didn't follow the logic or understand the logic that you're setting up, but I don't actually agree.

I think, thinking back from this a little bit, it is actually the case that -- that we are all in this together, if we went around the table; that ICANN, we want the transition to succeed. As part of the transition, we're willing to put in resources, time, money, other things, and we make some observations about our environment.

For instance, that there is an argument that could be played against us later by someone else that, "Okay, this is too much controlled by one entity and we want to prevent that from happening," and therefore we set our structures in a particular way such that they are independent, and that's just a sensible way of organizing this. I think it's still in the best interest of all of us to put in the resources that we are putting in, whether it's ICANN or any of us.

So I -- I don't see a need to tie this too tightly into the financing question. Just my opinion, of course.

ALISSA COOPER: Russ Mundy had his hand up in the chat but I don't know if he has audio. Russ, can you speak to us?

>>   ---

ALISSA COOPER: He's not on the phone, okay. So we'll -- Russ, please type your words into the chatroom, and Daniel, you're last in the queue.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: I think we have basically two alternatives. One is we can say what I proposed earlier is to ask ICANN to do this work and provide dedicated people that take direction from us exclusively, and whether that be contractors or people on the ICANN staff is secondary and the preference would be for contractors, as far as I hear it right here.

And the other is that we want to project more independence for various reasons, including the ones Jari just mentioned.

My point is that if we're going to that length to protect ourselves from the perception or even the malicious destructive things that could happen later by people claiming that we weren't really independent, if we go to that length, I think it would be totally incredible if we set up a chimera of independence if the money is still coming from ICANN. It's just not -- the perception will be the same. It will not -- all the work we're going to put into the pseudo-independence will be for nothing because we'll be open to that attack which is something that we all maybe understand isn't quite real, but once you get outside this room

or outside the next room, it will not matter because that's what the argument is going to be.

I think the -- the organization of the IETF, with which I'm very familiar because I had some responsibility in it, is not a good analogy because ISOC's role is about six orders of magnitude less controversial than the thing we're discussing here, and there's a long-standing well-developed consensus about it, whereas from this discussion, I have to conclude that there's no consensus even in this room about ICANN's role, which is actually quite distressing.

ALISSA COOPER: So we need to wrap. Is that how you intend to wrap this up?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: So, well, okay. So I'm the facilitator so I see we have no -- we have agreement to --

Let's start with the positive. We have agreement about the tasks, at least the initial set of tasks. And I understand that we can develop them.

We have agreed that we'd park the press bit because it was discussed in various contexts and we didn't reach agreement.

So all that is good.

I think there's also consensus that we would like to ask ICANN, for the time being, to provide us with these services.

I think there is a -- there's significant contention about the way we -- we're going to --

I wouldn't say "contention," but I don't see any consensus about the way we would go about setting up a separate structure.

The -- to me as the facilitator, it wasn't always clear where the specific suggestions were as to proceed, so I cannot draw a conclusion on that. And I think that's all I would want to say as the facilitator.

ALISSA COOPER: Just a thought for you really quickly.

Should we take a hum? Try to get a sense of the room?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: About what question?

ALISSA COOPER: On the question of contracting for an independent secretariat versus not.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: And possibly concerns about the financing, because I mean I did hear Daniel expressing some thoughts about it, and one or two others, but there are some number of close to 30 people. It would be nice to hear some of the thoughts from some of the other CG members as well.

JARI ARKKO: Just a process suggestion. Sorry. So I don't think we have a lot of time for that and maybe we shouldn't even waste too much time on it any more today, but taking the hum just -- I mean, the purpose of the hums in the IETF is just to see where the room kind of is, and if it's like one person against 26, then we see it clearly. Or if it's 50/50. I mean, that gives us some information. So then maybe that might be useful to do, even without -- I mean, with the understanding that we have not completed this discussion, this is not a vote where we make a decision, but we're trying to get some information on where the group feels they are.

ALISSA COOPER: Mohamed.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Just for the sake of time, I guess, if we need to -- I think there is an aim for us to be independent financially, even, as has been said, but we need to consult with the different communities currently, so I think it would be from the coordination committee seeking advice from the different communities involved currently in this work regarding possible, let's say, solutions or options for being financially independent, and let's hear what the community's inputs are on that.

ALISSA COOPER: All right. So let's do Jean-Jacques, Tracy, and then decide what the next step is.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thanks. This is Jean-Jacques.

Same remark as Mohamed, and going back to all the previous statements, can we finance independently, really independently? Otherwise, why all this long discussion if, in the end, we admit and we recognize and we accept that an independent chief of secretariat will be funded by ICANN in any case? So where are we going? Can we examine an alternative that ISOC, in fact, will be paying the secretariat? Or any other body? But why -- then the question is: Why ISOC? Why -- et cetera. I mean, we come back to the same problem.

So honestly, for the sake of efficiency, time saving, et cetera, et cetera.

There is a human factor also. I think we can trust the kind of people we -- we employ. There is a -- there is a contractual relationship which will be set up in any case with whoever is designated as the secretariat contact point or whatever.

We'll be providing that person with a list of dos and don'ts. Shouldn't that suffice?

ALISSA COOPER: Tracy?

TRACY HACKSHAW: Okay. I was going to stay silent on this, but having -- hearing what's happening here, I'm not representing the views of the GAC in this statement but I do imagine what will happen when the GAC representatives arrive. They would, given the discussions we've had in the GAC, prefer an independent secretariat, and also independently

funded, and I'm going to say that so in the event that a decision is taken here, I would imagine that the members who will join you subsequently, they may have their views on that position.

So whether we take a hum in the room or not, I think there's going to be some debate on the matter beyond this -- this today. Just giving that feeling of what the GAC members will bring to the table. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: So maybe let's try this: Let's try three questions, just to get -- again, just to get the sense of the room, so we can table this and figure out what to do. Maybe we'll come back to it for 10 minutes in the parking lot and decide what the next step is, so just take the hums and then move on.

So let's try three questions. And you can hum for any of them. You can hum for all three; you can hum for none; you can hum for one or two.

First question is: Are you in favor of secretarial services by ICANN?

The second question is: --

>>   ---

ALISSA COOPER: I will throw out the list and then we can bash the hum questions.

Second question: Are you in favor of an independent secretariat paid for by ICANN?

Third question is: Are you in favor of independent funding for the secretariat?

Go ahead. Bash the questions. Go ahead.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: So I think -- I think if -- the first one should be on the conditions that I outlined. Dedicated people --

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Under Daniel's conditions.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Yes.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay.

>> ---

DANIEL KARRENBERG: To -- would it be accept- -- I ask: Would it be acceptable to ask ICANN if they are prepared to do this work as we specified, provided that they will provide dedicated people for the duration and clearly instruct them to take direction exclusively from the ICG, and that the Web presence and outside communications is not ICANN branded?

EN

ALISSA COOPER: Other question bashing?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: I had one.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: I mean, I think calling it ICANN funding is slightly a misnomer as well.

                        I mean, the funding is from registrants, registries, and registrars, so --

>>   ---

LYNN ST. AMOUR: It is virtually from every community in the room, with one or two exceptions. I said "virtually." And there is no money that's just going to fall from the sky that isn't attributed or ascribed somewhere. I mean, some part of the community is not going to feel comfortable about large I.T. companies giving money or governments or The Internet Society. And I'm really thankful I don't have to answer that question. But there is no money that's not going to be associated with something that some part of this community doesn't find offensive.

                        I'm not sure why we are opening up a question about ICANN funding which that has been, I think, pretty much understood by the community

EN

as an appropriate place for the funding to come from. So that just goes to the second question, but I'm not sure I have a...

ALISSA COOPER: I think it came up enough in the discussion that we should at least ask again. We will take the hums, and we will go to the next session and come back at the end. Is that okay?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: I'm at a loss here because I don't know how to hum on the second and third one because they are interlinked.

[Laughter]

ALISSA COOPER: I'm sorry. They are not meant to be interlinked. The second one is ICANN provides the funding but the contract is with an outside organization. The third one is someone else provides the funding, not ICANN, and the contractor -- unless someone is willing. Does that make sense? Mics off. All humming. I will turn my mic off as soon as I read the question.

KUO-WEI WU: I think for the third question you are asking, first of all, we have to figure out who pay that. If we don't fund it, that means even if you are voting for Number 3, we still need to find money anyway.

MILTON MUELLER: This is a common thing among legislators, to allocate money without any idea how you are going to get it or where it is going to come from. Everybody is in favor of that. Lower taxes --

ALISSA COOPER: Imagine who you think it would be on that basis.

Okay. Question Number 1, hum now if you are in favor of an ICANN-funded secretariat using dedicated people for the duration of the coordination group who are clearly instructed to take direction only from the coordination group and the outputs will not be ICANN branded. If you are in favor of this, please hum now. And I'm turning off my microphone.

(Humming.)

Question two: Please hum now if you are in favor of a secretariat funded by ICANN but contracted to an outside party. I will turn off my microphone now.

Question number 3 --

[Laughter]

Please hum now if you are in favor of financing for an independent secretariat coming from an independent entity, not from ICANN. Turning off my microphone.

-- learned something as Russ Housley likes to say.

So I don't want to characterize the consensus I'm actually taking.

I'm -- Jari, you do it.

JARI ARKKO: So, I mean, clearly finding new sources of funding was not popular. But the other two options are still on the table. And at least at this point in the table, I could not hear a difference. It was sort of equal. So further discussion needed.

ALISSA COOPER: Good. So maybe we'll chat about this on the break or something. We'll try to come back at the end of the day and figure out what the next step is on this one.

And now moving on to just equally uncontroversial topic which is self-organization which we're going to pick up again from yesterday. And this will be led by Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: We sent out a summary of essentially where we were overnight and realistically we had two things that we were looking at which hadn't really been agreed on. And one thing I raise with significant trepidation because it was -- we hadn't answered "how do we talk to the press question correctly." And based on our previous conversation on this, I don't know that we are in a capable spot of answering that question. But it is one of the things that had been on the docket. I think I will take that as a second, time permitting, because I don't think we need to necessarily answer that question today as much as we do need to think about the other concept.

And so there had been a suggestion that it might be useful for us to have chairs. The chairs as we know had more of a convening function than a directive function. They were some of the people who worked with the secretariat to make some of these concepts and then the other theory was that, also, obviously setting agendas and things of that nature. And there was also the concept that if we weren't able to organically emerge a consensus, the chairs would help us drive to that consensus.

For some reason, there had been a magic number suggested as three. They were suggested as co-chairs to be equal. There was a suggestion online that perhaps it would be good for people to nominate themselves using an online procedure which was to send your name to the list. To date to use the French date, we have (saying French phrase in French) because we have more than three. Since we have four, that's four more than we had yesterday when the call for volunteers first came out. That also doesn't mean we don't have room for more because obviously not everyone may have been participating in that process. Some people have just arrived, so I don't want to preclude the fact that there may be someone else who is also interested in a chairing capacity.

With that, let me just open up where we are to that level just in case people haven't been reading email to date. I think Russ, Alissa, Patrik who apparently, his vacation is a disaster -- [Laughter] -- Keith and Jean-Jacques have been -- I apparently can't count, that's five -- have been nominated to date. With that, let me open just for discussion the concept of chairs and the ideas of whether there are other people who want to nominate.

The other question I would ask people to think about is we certainly need to get the chairs issue solved in short order. But I do know that there are some people who have not been able to participate in this meeting, and I do know that there may be some people who want to have a conversation with a constituency related to a selection. So I don't want to preclude the fact that we absolutely must resolve this today. If we can, I think that's great.

But I also understand and I would like people's comment on what they think. If we are not resolving this as we are present, I would suggest that this should be something that is resolved within a week. This is not an issue that needs to be open for a long time.

So I would suggest time frame-wise this issue can be resolved within a week. I think all the candidates are fairly well-known to all of us in the room. But if anyone believes it would be useful to get a little more information on the candidate or a statement from the candidate as to what they think they can add to the process, we can also go through that type of event.

And -- sorry. I'm completely blind to this side of me.

ALISSA COOPER: Tracy.

TRACY HACKSAW: Thank you. So just echoing those observations, because the GAC members have literally just joined, I don't think many of them have seen the (indiscernible) yet. I would like to leave a time for them to see the

discussions and so on. So a week, I think, would be good. But just to let -- relet the list know that this is happening because those -- they wouldn't have read the archive. So let them know again. Thank you.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: And this doesn't preclude the fact that the time could be beneficially spent. But just -- in an effort to be as transparent to the new nominees as possible, I copied a couple of members of the GAC asking that this -- that the concept be sent for information but the question of self-nominating was not brought to them so they are -- they are without question a bit behind the curve.

ALISSA COOPER: Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you. Keith Drazek. I think it would be helpful probably to all of us as we get into this discussion and get into a week down the road a decision-making phase to talk more specifically about the role of the chairs or the co-chairs because I think that's going to have a significant impact or the answer to that is going to have a significant impact on the level of interest and maybe -- I don't know, sort of how people approach this in terms of deciding how to the construct.

I have a follow-up that talks a little bit more about sort of the structure and if it is three co-chairs, is it a representative group? So I have a follow-up. But I would like to talk a little more specifically about the actual role of the co-chairs and what they will be expected to do.

I understand that it was really sort of a facilitating function coordinating, getting the agendas set, working with the secretariat, keep the trains running on time.   But I think we ought to just make sure that everybody's in agreement on that point because if it is anything more than that, then I think we're going to have some concerns about sort of community representation and equal -- you know, equal representation. And that gets to be a slippery slope. Let me just stop there and see if anybody has thoughts.

ALISSA COOPER: Martin.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks so much. Martin Boyle. Actually Keith just said what I wanted to say. When we have a better idea of exactly what these jobs are going to do, it is going to be easier to identify how sensitive the role.

However, the second point I wanted to make is that to support the comment that -- well, we have it out for perhaps a week which would allow us to refer back to our communities and identify whether as a community whether as a community we should be putting somebody forward for one of the -- one of the co-chair roles.

I just put that down as a marker. And I understand that it is important that we make the choice and we make it quickly. But I think we have to make sure that the co-chairs that are identified are co-chairs and to look at the differences. And I would welcome a week to sort of get that process sorted.

ALISSA COOPER: Are you in the queue?

JARI ARKKO: I just wanted to say we should not take this too seriously and not disagreeing with everything that has been said. I actually agree with everything that has been said. The chair role should be relatively lightweight. And as we have seen during these two days, we can find session leaders and people who are drafting particular areas of our effort. It should still continue in the future. I would expect to see an (indiscernible) proposal and things like that within the group as opposed to the chair or the chairs doing everything. That would be bad from many perspectives.

ALISSA COOPER: Joe. Oh, Russ, sorry.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think we talked a little bit about this yesterday, and I think the things that Alissa did to make this meeting happen, the agenda planning, the twisting arms to get session organizers and those kinds of things are the kinds of things we are talking about a chair doing.

I think there is one additional thing that didn't apply to this meeting, and that is tracking the action items from the previous meetings and making sure that the material for the future meeting is done and distributed on time. I think that's just nudging the people who had agreed to do it and making sure that it's actually coming out. We are all

busy, and sometimes things fall through the cracks and it is just management 101 kind of a task.

ALISSA COOPER: Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thanks. At the risk of having all of the volunteers disappear --[Laughter] -- the term I had when I first drew it up listed next to the chair was "herding cats." And that is essentially a lot of what we're -- a lot of what we're talking about. The one role which had been discussed which is more than herding cats was there had at one time be the concept of the phrase "calling when we reach consensus" and we've kind of shifted that phrase to presiding over the process that leads us to consensus, if consensus isn't emerging. So it is not kind of a dictatorial edict but the chairs will presume to create a process that will lead us towards consensus.

So I think the description of the chair's roles to date has been a fairly appropriate and accurate description. If it is helpful. I'm happy to try to do a draft of that description and then to the point that was being said about people wanting to perhaps touchback with constituencies. We can just ask each of the volunteers to put -- actually, I think we have all put together a short bio that's on the Web already, so people can link to that. But if people are comfortable saying, you know, if a volunteer would like to have a short statement of why they think they are qualified to herd cats, then that would be another appropriate thing that we could circulate, but I do want to -- I think it is an important role

not because of the significance of the role but because of the fact that the role will have a perceived view from the outside that this person is taking a role. So I think the combination of the chairs to the point that was made earlier needs to be something that has a visibility and acceptance and a recognition by the broader community. I think that is an appropriate concept.

I think we also have to understand that when you're setting agendas, there are going to be some technical issues so that the chairs will need to have some capacity to be able to look at those issues because otherwise, it's more difficult to set the agenda, and I don't think that these are going to be unilateral things. The same way the agenda was set this time, it was like "I think these topics are great, here's a draft, let's get some comments on the draft." It's not a fiat or edict of what comes out, but the leader of a collaborative process is perhaps the best way to term it. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Daniel.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: I'd like to echo to Wilson and Joe have said. It's helping the trains run on time, which mostly will be executed by the secretariat, and it's presiding over all proceedings and helping the group to do it -- to do its work.

I'd like to call out a couple of things that we might want to give as guidance to you, if you are drafting this.

One thing that I'd like to have clarity on is that the chairs will have the equal opportunity to participate in the discussion. This is what we've done so far, but sometimes that's not understood without question. So they can insert themselves in the queue and all that kind of stuff. I see no dissent.

The other thing is, if we're asking someone to help our discussions along, I think we should express in some way how we empower them.

So what I would suggest is that we give the chairs the biggest possible leeway in organizing our meetings as they see fit   --- questions of procedure, rules of order, and similar things.

I think the modus operandi should be that we trust the chairs to do this, and if we no longer trust them, we replace them, but that we do not waste time on making up rules for them.

ALISSA COOPER: Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you. Keith Drazek. This has been very helpful, and I have to admit that as I was thinking about the co-chair situation last night, you know, the number three that we were talking about that we discussed earlier today sort of popped into my head, and I realized, "Well, you know, with three co-chairs, well, three sort of main components of the IANA functions." So naturally I said, "Well, doesn't it make sense that if there's three co-chairs, that there be one each for names, numbers, and protocol parameters."

And I'm not suggesting we go that direction. I'm just explaining that that was my thought process. And that that leads to a question or a concern about sort of representation of various interests. And you can see the slippery slope here, because in addition to the three main components of the IANA functions, there are other groups here. We have the user community, we have the business community, we have the GAC. Frankly, we have 13 individual groups that we represent here, or that sent us here, and I don't think we want 13 co-chairs.

So I guess I was identifying in my own thought process the slippery slope of saying, "Oh, okay, we've got three and what does that mean, how do we -- how do we determine who the three are in a fair and equitable way that reaches the sort of acceptability from the community" --- decide who our three or whatever the -- maybe it should be two instead of three. Actually --- in terms of three components, three co-chairs. Maybe it should be two and not three. I'm just throwing that out there as a suggestion.

But -- and maybe for further discussion. And then the final question is, again, how do we decide? Is there a vote or questions of procedure, rules of order, and similar things? I think the modus operandi should be that we trust the chairs to do this. And if we no longer trust them, we replace them. But we do not waste time on making up rules for them.

ALISSA COOPER: Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you. Keith Drazek. This has been very helpful. And I have to admit that as I was thinking about the co-chair situation last night, the number three that we were talking about that we discussed earlier today sort of popped into my head and I realized, well, three co-chairs, while there's three sort of main components of the IANA functions. So, naturally, I said, well, doesn't it make sense if there are three co-chairs, there would be one each for names, numbers, and protocol parameters. I'm not suggesting we go that direction. I'm just explaining that was my thought process and that that leads to a question or a concern about sort of representation of various interests. And you can see the slippery slope here because in addition to the three main components of the IANA functions, there are other groups here. We have the user community. We have the business community. We have the GAC. Frankly, we have 13 individual groups that we represent here or that sent us here. And I don't think we want 13 co-chairs.

So I guess I was identifying in my own thought process the slippery slope of saying, Oh, okay, we've got three and what does that mean? How do we determine who those three are in a fair and equitable way that reaches the sort of acceptability from the community?

And so I guess that brings me to the next question is: How do we decide who are three or whatever the number is? Maybe it should be two instead of three. Then that brings us back from this question of where my brain went in terms of three components, three co-chairs. Maybe it should be two and not three. I'm just throwing it out there as a suggestion and maybe for further discussion.

And then the final question is again: How do we decide? Is it a vote, or is there another way we decide on our representatives? Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you very much, Alissa. I have a question because I think that in the hypothesis that mentioned, Keith, about three co-chairs that at least so far we have understood there would be four candidates. The four nominees might have been self-nominated or proposed by some others. Four or five -- five members, five nominees, as Joe is saying. So perhaps it may be related to geographic regions, nationalities.

I would not like to talk about competence and jurisdiction but about the principles followed by these tables. Each of us has their own talents, their own capacity but we have the same level of trust and competence, I may say.

So with respect to the four nominees I'm aware of or have seen, some comes from the same geographic regions, the geographic regions that match ICANN's regions.

And perhaps some of them have the same nationalities. So I think there should be a rule forbidding this.

What I want to point out right now is that the community may reject this repetition of nationalities, particularly the community of users, internationalization. The globalization of ICANN involves some other institutions that are involved in the Internet, are engaged in the

Internet. And these also shows a development in terms of nationalities and in terms of regions. That was my first comment.

Secondly, I would like all of you -- I would like to thank all of you because yesterday when we tried to reach an agreement about five positions, would the five GAC representatives be allowed to this group, ALAC mentioned no condition and had five representatives. ALAC did not request anything of that sort.

So it would be fair to recognize the increasing representation of the users and as Fadi said at ICANN's meeting in London, that this is applicable to all of our organizations, not only for ICANN. Fadi has said that this is the time to be focused on the end user. It is the end user that ALAC represents.

ALISSA COOPER: Keith and Jari and Paul. Sorry, Paul. You're out. Okay.

And Milton. Okay.

Someone -- a friend of mine who is watching at home commented we seem to be a numerology club here. He only saw the GAC session yesterday, and he only saw this session today. We are only talking about numbers.

Speaking of which, what came to my mind when you were talking, Keith, was Russ Mundy's observation yesterday that sometimes less -- a smaller number can be less politically charged than a larger number. And I think that might apply here as well. And I'm sympathetic to your comments, Keith, which is that three starts to look a lot like five and we

start to have -- or 13 and you start to have this difficulty of where do you draw the boundary in terms of how do you select.

And I think if we really are sticking to the kind of role that Joe, you, and Keith were talking about, that probably the most important thing is who do we collectively think can fulfill these functions that we're asking these people to fulfill. And we can pick two people to do that, and hopefully they would be capable people. And I think we have a lot of capable people in the room.

So to me that would -- that should be our one guiding light, and it might be a little easier to get there if we did two instead of three.

Jari.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah. I guess I'm agreeing with that. So approaching it from a slightly different angle, which is that in order to put three people or more resources into a position, then we would have to see some reason that that is actually required in terms of how much effort there is. I guess we're just starting, so that can't be any evidence.

But I'm approaching this a little bit like the question about the subcommittees. We'll create one when we need one. If you guys are spending -- or whoever gets nominated is spending 24 hours, seven days a week on the co-chair job, then we can consider adding a third one.

ALISSA COOPER: Adiel.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: I understand of having a larger number. I am personally in favor of three. I'm also in favor of the diversity in the co-chair for two reasons. The first one is no matter what we say or do, the perception out there will be important in this kind of job we are doing. People will watch that, and we have to take that into consideration when deciding. So having the ability to have the co-chair giving the fact that they will de facto represent the group at some place with the press, with different community. Having a kind of diversity in that group of people as much as we can will be beneficial for the group.

                     If we cannot cover all kind of diversity in that group, three can allow us to have some kind of balance in there and ensure that we have diversity in terms of the constituencies which are represented in the agreement in some general agenda limit. But we can try to manage that with a number that's a little bit -- two, three, to cover that. Because perception would have to manage a lot of perception in this process.

ALISSA COOPER: Paul.

PAUL WILSON: I may be accused of being not as sensitive to risk as I should be, but I don't -- I'm not quite so concerned about this process. I think the group seems to be -- we've designed the coordination group to have a very limited remit of the scope and mission objective documents make that pretty clear. I think the chair can only operate within that and, yet, it seems to me we may be assigning a lot more power to -- to these rules

than we ever could possibly have. I think there's some straightforward rules of proceedings are going to be important. I'm not sure how much time we need to spend on this.

Apart from that, I just have one comment on the diversity issue I think without suggesting that chairs represent -- in their roles as chairs, they represent the constituencies from which they come. I think diversity is important. And there wouldn't be diversity in selecting three chairs from the three stools of the IANA model. I would prefer to look at the stakeholders as defined in the broader Internet governance scene and suggest that someone from technical community, someone from government, someone from business, and someone from At-Large is a full possibility. And we should have at most one from any one of those to make up the three. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Milton and Joe, I have the queue and if we can wrap in five minutes. That would be good.

MILTON MUELLER: This is just a plea for an emphasis on the executive as opposed to the symbolic functions of these chairs, vice chairs, whatever they are, co-chairs. They have to do things and that's all I care about, okay? I don't care at all about whether I share their nationality. I don't really care that much about the public perception; I really don't. I think the chairs should do their job. And the committee as a whole is quite diverse, and that's really what should be brought to the forefront. So the chairs are facilitators of activities, and I really think it will be a mistake to choose

people for these positions because of how they look or where they're from rather than what they do.

ALISSA COOPER: Joe. Adiel.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thanks. I just did want to highlight, Adiel, I'm not sure there is a "they will de facto be representing us to the press or in other capacities" function. I think that's a function that when the chairs step up to that function, we will have to define that function at that point in time. And it may be that that function is a representative function with a task.

So I don't want to presume that that latitude is inherent in the way we've defined "chairs" so far.

ALISSA COOPER: Daniel.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: I find myself in pretty good agreement with Milton. We should look at functionality. And when we consider the group that we want to build, I think we would want to look for complementary skills and interoperability, i.e., can they work together and do they bring different skills to the table.

ALISSA COOPER: Adiel.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: I agree with you, Joe. "de facto" may not be the right word. But I disagree with you, Milton. I think diversity is incompatible with capacity for doing the job. I'm not saying we have to rule out their capacity to do the work. I'm saying that capable people but with the diversity. So we have to bundle the two together because we cannot, that is -- that is being naive to say that we don't care about perception. It's wrong. What we are doing will have -- some people will see it with, you know, because they are not part of this room. They are not part of the process. We have to deal with that. I think we need to take it into consideration.

ALISSA COOPER: That's the end of the queue. Oh, Mary.

>>   ---

MARY UDUMA: Mary Uduma here. Can we just have one chair and the rest will be subcommittee members? Let's establish subcommittees and those are the ones who head the subcommittee and help the chair manage the group? So we'll have only one chair, then the rest will be subcommittee members, so it might be more than just the three we are talking about. Because it seems to me that we are not even agreeing on whether there's going to be -- the method of selection is going to be skill-based or diversity-based or perception-based.

So instead of us dragging this, that's my thought. I don't know. I may sound out of tune with other people. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Wolf-Ulrich, are you in the queue?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks very much. Well, just to support here what Milton and Daniel was saying, so I'm fully in agreement with that.

We are here in a different process. Sometimes it seems to me that we are thinking about whether we have this separate line of -- to be discussed, the accountability stream here, so in this sense, if you look to that line which is a different one, I fully agree that we should be more open to -- in that sense with diversity. But here in this respect, I understand we have to do a job, a technical-related job, mostly, and managerial-related job, and therefore, I support what was said by Daniel and Milton. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: That's the end of the queue and we need to move on, so thanks.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Let me just do a one-minute wrap.

The -- we've had a request to lower the number of chairs. There was -- anywhere from one, two, or three is now the options on the table. I think the only reason we were staying away from one is because travel commitments make it difficult that the chair may not be able to attend

every meeting and we certainly wouldn't want someone doing a remote call-in to chair the meeting, because that would be problematic.

So perhaps a chair and an alternate or at least two would seem to be the minimum number we should consider.

There was a request to make sure that the first role of any chair should be the functional capacity of the chair, with a concept that the public perception of the chair should be taken into account as well.

I'll draft a kind of chair's responsibility concept. I'll send that out over the weekend. Any comment on that, come back on Monday with that, or by Tuesday, shall we say, and then we'll have the slate of consideration for a week, and so hopefully by middle of the following week we'll be able to close this issue out.

Does that seem appropriate to everybody as a process going forward?

Perhaps we can hum or just violently object if we disagree.

ALISSA COOPER: So the proposal is to resolve the number issue on the mailing list or...

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah. Well, I think the number issue is really between two and three, because I think one just becomes a geographic problem if the person can't make it to a meeting.

So I think on the mailing list, we can do the -- we can do the list of the chair functions, we can make a suggestion of one or two, do a popularity contest across that.

Was that a request for -- okay.

PAUL WILSON: Paul here. I've seen so many times when meetings end with an agreement to go back to the mailing list and decide things and often it doesn't happen because there needs to be a chair to make it happen, so I -- I really would like to make some decision about this interim chair or one of the -- one or more of the co-chairs before the end of this meeting, if we can.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Well, there had -- at the beginning of the meeting, there had been a request by at least -- by a couple of people to, before deciding on a chair, go back to a constituency base.

I think for the purpose of -- you know, if there is a person who would be willing to remain interim chair until we resolve this issue, that would be perfectly fine. If there is a volunteer for the interim chair, I think that's -- that's perfectly acceptable to go forward.

>> ---

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah. I would nominate Alissa, if she's willing to do it, as interim chair until we resolve this. You have the most experience of all of us in chairing --

ALISSA COOPER: Right. A whole three days of managing agendas. Sure. Yes, I guess. I mean, this isn't going to last very long, as I understand, and everyone knows that next week is the IETF meeting, so that notwithstanding, that's fine.

The other thing I was going to suggest was a two versus three hum.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yes, please.

ALISSA COOPER: You don't want to take a hum?

>>   ---

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: So go ahead. You can do it.

ALISSA COOPER: Do you have a suggestion, Mary?

MARY UDUMA: I still come back to my -- I don't know. Nobody considered what I said? Are we not just going to form subcommittees? Are we just going to work with just the chair and -- the chair and co-chairs? Are we not going to form subcommittees so we consider diversity in the -- diversities in that subcommittee chairs? Thank you.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Okay. When we had discussed this on day one, there had kind of been the desire by the group to illustrate bureaucracy, where possible, and I think subcommittees was one of the things that people didn't look to the creation of because they thought it would create another layer of bureaucracy and there wasn't that much that this committee was tasked to do that we thought we needed to develop subcommittees.

At a maximum, I could perhaps see having a -- I mean, if we have -- if we want to have a chair and a vice chair level, then, you know, Paul's suggestion that you kind of get one from every category, but that's, again, another layer of bureaucracy which was attempting to be avoided here.

So perhaps the first hum is -- is that question, and then we go to two and three? I --

ALISSA COOPER: We'll just do the three -- you want to do three questions?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah.

ALISSA COOPER: Ah. The two-tiered hum almost never works.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah.

ALISSA COOPER:
So the first question is going to be if you're in favor of two co-chairs. The second question will be if you are in favor of three co-chairs. And the third question will be if you are in favor of a single chair with subcommittee chairs of some sort.

Anyone want to bash the questions? No.

Okay. Question Number 1: Hum now if you are in favor of two co-chairs. And I will turn off my microphone now.

Hum now if you're in favor of three co-chairs, and I will turn off my microphone now.

Hum now if you're in favor of a single chair and subcommittee chairs in addition, and I will turn off my microphone now.

I heard a rough consensus in favor of the second option, which would be three.

Is that what other people heard?

Yes. Okay. So why don't we proceed with that. Thank you very much, Joe.

Okay. The next topic is the overall time line, which is being moderated by Russ Housley.

RUSS HOUSLEY:
So I sent the document to the list. I hope we can have that up on the screen.

>> Alissa, there is a question from the chat, if you're taking the hum from the chat into consideration.

ALISSA COOPER: Right. I forgot about those. No, I can't tell -- they all hummed at some point.

[Laughter]

ALISSA COOPER: I don't know when.

So if you guys are on audio, if you don't -- if you don't want to be identified -- well, it would be pretty hard for you guys not to be identified as to which one you're humming for, so I have Jon, Russ Mundy and Narelle who hummed in the chat and they hummed for -- Jon says "at two," which I think is probably for the second question, which would be three co-chairs. But if not, Jon, please correct me.

Jon hummed for two co-chairs.

Narelle for three.

And Russ for two.

>> ---

ALISSA COOPER: Right.

>>   ---

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, I don't -- I don't think this changes the outcome. Yeah. Okay. Okay.

                        And Russ says he's also fine with three. Okay. So I think -- I think we're good and we can move on to the time line. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. So whoever is doing the projector found the document. That's good.

                        This is basically from the mail list just put in a form that it would -- could fit on the slide kind of a thing.

                        I just want to quickly go over what we see the five steps as, and then I'm sure we can argue about the steps and when they need to be complete.

                        This was actually built starting at an end date. If NTIA is to make the decision by twenty- -- September 2015, we had to make a guess as to how much before that they needed to receive a proposal in order to act by that date. The guess was that they would need it at the end of July 2015. It's unknown, really, if they -- whether that's enough time or not.

                        I can tell you that yesterday I sent Larry Strickling an email that asked him whether this was -- whether he had a guess as to how much time

he needed, and he said he had no idea because he really didn't know whether Congressional hearings were going to be required or not. So I think the best we can do is make sure that they know when it is coming so they can do as much planning as possible.

It was discussed on the mail list that we thought it was a good idea to actually use the system we're proposing for some amount of time, and that way we can demonstrate to NTIA and the rest of the world that the proposed system is actually working, and so that backed off the need to complete that testing or at least have it test- -- a few months of that testing before the proposal is submitted, and so that's kind of how the Step 4 piece landed.

So then Step 3, the discussion was we need to confirm that consensus is reached and that's going to take this group's very active involvement with the various groups that we represent and reaching out to others.

So that leaves the -- let's go to the other end of the time line. It says, "So how much time do we need -- or how quickly do we need our communities to come up with those plans and proposal text?" And the answer was "By the end of the year."

And so then that leaves us the time in between -- roughly three months -- to pull those together, get questions resolved, make sure that the overlapping places are actually dealt with and so on.

So we have a pretty aggressive schedule here to get the communities to give us a proposal by the end of the year and then in three months stitch them together into a complete proposal and then reach out and

confirm that there's consensus with that result and then actually implement it and use it.

So enough of the monologue. Tell me what you think, and I don't think we get to create more time.

ALISSA COOPER: James and then Elise and then Wolf-Ulrich.

JAMES BLADEL: So James speaking, for the transcript. Thank you for taking a first stab at this.

One thing that is missing, I think, is that at each of these milestones -- and maybe it's implied in some of these. I realize these are broad brushstrokes, but I think that at some point there will be some check-ins with the various broader communities, including public comment, and incorporation of those public comments back into the final proposal. So I think, you know, whether that's implied at the end of the coordination and alignment phase where we put out, perhaps, a draft proposal for public comment or -- or revisit that as part of the testing phase, I just -- I think that that maybe needs to be explicitly called out in this -- in this roadmap. But otherwise, you know --

RUSS HOUSLEY: So I think that was actually implied more than one place.

JAMES BLADEL: Okay. Good. Good.

RUSS HOUSLEY: And that, you know, testing always uncovers bugs, so I would hope that that means you actually loop back and fix the bugs, or at least make the community who's working with that piece of the puzzle aware so that they can use their own processes to fix the bug.

JAMES BLADEL: Do you anticipate that each community would also put its proposal out for public comment prior to submitting to this group?

RUSS HOUSLEY: That really depends on the community's process. I can tell you that the IETF would not submit something here that hadn't at least gone through IETF last call, so I'm pretty sure that other communities would have similar --

JAMES BLADEL: Oh, the GNSO never does that.

[Laughter]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

[Laughter]

JAMES BLADEL: Sarcasm. Sorry. For the transcript and translation, the humor doesn't always come through.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yeah. I'm just assuming that nothing we see will not have been reviewed significantly before that.

JAMES BLADEL: Thank you. And then the other part would be what? That there would be -- in addition to public comment, that there would be some sort of -- and I hesitate to even put this on the table but some sort of an independent legal review by -- you know, by some sort of -- just to make sure that this holds water and does not run counter to the bylaws of ICANN or any other organization that's involved?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I would hope that each organization that's doing that would make sure that their piece of the proposal fits within their framework, and it depends what the proposals look like what kind of thing needs to be done in that regard.

It's not clear to me that --

You know, for example, if the IETF community was to come forward and say basically, you know, "These are the things we've been doing, these are the RFCs that define it," and there may be some additional documentation required about special use registries or something like that, I don't see a need for a legal review of something like that.

Something that says "In order to provide the accountability within ICANN, we need to make these bylaws changes," well, that's a -- that's an entirely different kind of thing.

So I don't think we have a one-size-fits-all answer to your question on that.

ALISSA COOPER: I have in the queue -- oh, sorry. If you wanted to say something else, I'm sorry.

>> ---

ALISSA COOPER: Do you want to manage the queue?

>> ---

ALISSA COOPER: The same excuse every time, you folks.

[Laughter]

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Elise, Wolf-Ulrich, Adiel, Jari, Joe. That's who I have in the queue. Not you. Okay. Elise.

ELISE GERICH: Hi. This is Elise.

So based on our experience as the IANA functions operator under contract, I think a six-week window for an NTIA evaluation and approval is a bit unrealistic, and I wondered if it might be a possible consideration to run the testing and the NTIA evaluation and approval kind of in parallel somehow.

I know we may discover bugs in the testing, which could then change somewhat the -- the proposal, but I think since you have the proposal wrapping up around May, if that's our target time frame, and testing starting then, obviously we would be keeping NTIA informed all along about where we were with the process, but it would certainly give them a head start if we were to submit the -- the draft proposal, I guess, in May and run that in parallel with the testing time frame and they might be able to jump-start their review and evaluation and give us some input early on in the testing phase of things they might see that would be unacceptable, and there might be a better opportunity that they could meet the time line of September 15th.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So I think what you said is that the -- assuming the testing shows that the system works, we're not going to stop anyway, and so just keep it going and draw some conclusions after the -- a month of testing and then -- as to whether the proposal is mature enough, and if it is, submit it to NTIA at the end of June instead of the end of July. Is that your proposal?

ELISE GERICH: No, that's not my proposal.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay.

ELISE GERICH: My proposal is to give the draft proposal to the NTIA at the end of May at the same time you're starting the testing.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I see.

ELISE GERICH: So one reason, NTIA may come back and say somehow, you know, after a first look, "You should tweak what you're doing," and you could tweak it in your testing at the beginning of the test phase instead of having finished the test phase before you send it off to them, and it will give them more opportunity to put things in place, with the assumption most of the testing will be fine. But -- so no, I -- you were off by a month.

ALISSA COOPER: Wolf-Ulrich.

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

Well, it's good to have a time line and it's -- it's absolutely necessary to have that, and thank you very much, Russ, for your preparatory work for that.

The -- well, I would like to echo what the question was -- what James was saying as well with regards to the implementation of the supporting communities, you know, behind us who are doing the work.

That means we are setting out the time line right now but we are not in the position, as we are organizing ourselves, to really manage it in that way that we have the -- let me say the means, the pressure on putting on the structures behind us, well, to do it and to -- to finalize in that way as we are doing here.

So that's one point.

As I mentioned yesterday, for example, the GNSO is just in the status -- and with other structures with the ccNSO -- to establish the so-called cross-community working group and if that -- if they succeed, they will have a charter available in four weeks and then the group will start its work, and that's one of these groups that have to do a lot of this work.

And they're starting behind -- you know, the structures behind the stakeholder groups and constituencies, they have to fill up those groups and have to do that work.

So what I would like to say is when we come up with that time line, we have immediately to start to communicate that, and -- to those groups, to tell them, "Okay, that's how we see it," because we came back from the end of the time line, from the -- September of next year, and if we

would like to achieve that goal, then that's it and you have to take that into consideration, if you can. If you can do so.

I wouldn't be in a position to be blamed here as a member of this group when I come back and have to say, "Oh, I'm sorry but the structures behind me are not in a position to -- to meet the goals we have set here."

So communication is essential -- is very essential here. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Adiel?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yes. I agree that communication is essential and quick release of the time line is essential.

As I said during the conference call, it is important that the community know what we are expecting so that they define the time line.

So my -- my first comment on this is probably a plea for giving a little more time to the first step, the community work part, because if I'm looking at the -- what time line we have at the NRO level, which includes the consultation at each RIR level, our, you know, proposed date to have I think is kind of end of January, for instance, already here, which takes into consideration the different comment periods with our community, consolidating, going back to the community, making sure that it's -- it comes.

It follows our own global policy development process but I'm not sure end of December will give enough time for the community to thoroughly consult their own community before coming back, so I don't know how we can squeeze this in there. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So Adiel, I recognize that six months is really fast, but what is realistic, yet aggressive?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: I would -- I mean, my suggestion would be to extend this and decrease the time that we look -- work on the document. That means the coordination and alignment is -- here it is three months. Maybe decreasing that to two months because it gives us -- it gives the community itself time to consult and do their own, you know, because we will do only the last part. And the acceptance, communication, wrap-up, and the testing altogether is also another three months, if I read this correctly.

>> ---

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yeah. So, yeah, my thinking is to give more time to the community to do the background work properly on their side and put -- give us the resources to shorten the time to spend on the document, on the outcome. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Joe?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. Joe Alhadeff.

The only thing I notice in the time line is, if you think about the -- using the new term of art that Paul gave us, the nonoperational communities or nonoperating communities, they will not likely be part of a direct consultation inside the operational communities and we don't really have a point where we talk about the publication of those plans to get a broader range of comment related to them.

So it would just be an acknowledgment that we will actually also act not just as an internal consideration of that, but seek input on those plans once we receive them, as well as then our work in alleviating the conflicts or whatever between the plans that we'll be doing.

But I think that step is an important one to highlight because it goes to the transparency of the process.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think that's basically one of Jon's points as well, sure. So highlight that as we get a plan, we can make it public and ask for comment.

ALISSA COOPER: Jari?

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko. I wanted to talk about two sort of psychological things. One is that when we present this thing, it's very easy to think of this as -- as a water flow that like looks nice on the screen but it adequately -- you really need to overlap things and repeat and I wasn't (indiscernible) that that's been taken care of.

The other thing relates to this discussion we just had with Adiel and others that -- you know, how much time do the communities need, and I'd suggest that it might actually be harmful for us to nail down like this. Like we make the perfect solution and then shoot it off to the communities, because this is really a negotiation. This is and should be a straw man that we send to others and then we discuss, you know, is this a reasonable starting point? What would you like? As opposed to, you know, the coordination group comes, you know, down from the top and tells you that, you know, you have five months or six or seven.

So it might be a better approach.

ALISSA COOPER: Demi?

DEMI GETSCHKO: Yeah. First, what Adiel said, I suppose we have some extra time here because until the end of the Step 2 we cannot go back to the communities and get some kind of feedback.

But going over Elise's point, I think that we all have the major work finished in May, as I understand it, and we'll have the consensus reached then.

Then in May, the only thing we can do is minimal arrangements or minimal fixing of things.

Then I suppose we will really get time, if you submit this result to the NTIA, at the same time we begin the testing. Because it will be very bad if we have a good concept and a good proposal that cannot go forward because of the shortness of time until the end of the actual contract.

Then more or less I'm, you know, in the same line with Elise that if we can -- as soon as we have the finished document before we would begin the testing, if we can in parallel submit this also to NTIA for comments. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Paul?

PAUL WILSON: Yeah. A few comments.

Some of them are around the sort of sequential nature of this time line and how we can introduce some parallelism into it, and in particular some cycles of feedback and sort of repetition or refinement that -- that might actually be necessary, just as Adiel said. I share those -- those same concerns and have said as much at least a few times during the Singapore ICANN meeting.

But first can we put in a Step 0 which is the solicitation by the coordination group so we're actually telling communities what they are expected to come up with so we actually are able to advise when that announcement is going to happen so we are not sending people off on a

vague mission that starts immediately and then at some point telling people what we actually expect? And then so really the word "plans" in Step 1, it wouldn't be "plans," it would be responses to what's being asked.

I wonder whether in Step 2 we could call this a first analysis or a draft plan by the coordination group, which is then issued. And it may not be a complete plan. It may be something partial or indicative or something without all of the details filled in. And that's something that can go back out publicly. It could also go to the NTIA at the same time.

Then in Step 3, we weren't looking for acceptance and communication, we were looking for a community response by the 30th of May. And we may also have a NTIA response then. Others may have -- and I may have missed really what testing is about. But I would like to shorten that testing time, whatever that means, to actually ask for final -- the community response in Step 3 by the 30th of May, and then a final plan by the coordination group by the end of June. And if there is a testing phase, then it is a month -- the month of July which would achieve that. Then Step 6 -- so Step 4 would be the final plan from the coordination group. Step 5 would be testing. Step 6 would be NTIA approval by September the 30th.

I think the parallelism there is in asking NTIA to respond early, at the same time as we ask communities to respond to a draft -- an initial draft plan by with an issue on -- sorry, I should probably write up a text just for this because it gets a bit messed up in terms of the specific timing.

But that's basically it, to try and involve the NTIA earlier to try and give a second cycle to clarify what testing means really and hopefully to be able to shorten that. That's all. Thanks.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So, Paul, maybe you misunderstood what I meant by "testing" but was to actually run the IANA process as it is being proposed, in other words, show NTIA it is not just a paper model. It actually works.

ALISSA COOPER: Xiaodong.

XIAODONG LEE: I don't think that step one we need almost six months. I stress we can try to narrow down the step one.

And I also have a second opinion. Maybe we can do some testing and other works parallelly. I think after step five, I remember that NTIA, at least the community prefer to finish the work next September. So if we only -- leave only two months to NTIA to evaluate and make a decision, that is -- the time that is not enough. So I prefer maybe we need more time for that last step.

ALISSA COOPER: Daniel.

XIAODONG LEE: Thank you.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Daniel Karrenberg here. I think all the discussion about the details is avoiding the real crux here. And the real crux is: Do we really want to be ready in time such that NTIA can make a decision in September? I fear if we do that, we run a number of significant risks and also, I think, we are kidding ourselves. Let me first talk about the risks. The risk, number one, is that we do not do self-governance as it should be done.

We already heard Adiel say the numbers community would need until January to do diligent work. Personally, I think that's optimistic.

I absolutely do not agree that the first step should be shortened. But, anyway, I think the main risk is that we are not following our own processes. And, therefore, the result will be worthless.

Second risk, if we get really focused too much on this instead we will introduce a breaking point at which there might be -- some communities might be ready and others might not be.

If we are at that point, there will be a big incentive for the communities that are ready to break off and basically say we're done. We've done everything and we do not want to be part of the failure of the other communities which will be a disaster. And I don't think this scenario is unlikely.

And the third risk is the general risk of perceived failure. If we are setting our goals too ambitiously -- and I think we are absolutely on the way of going there -- and we don't make them, we will have widespread perception that our process failed for no other reason than setting the goals too ambitiously.

And let's face it, this goal is an external -- this time goal is an external time goal that we perceive to be set on us by two things: A, the expiry of a contract that, in fact, has options for extension. So it is not like the IANA functions won't be secured anymore if we don't make the deadline. There is actually a clearly defined mechanism for them to continue, so there's no operational risk.

And the other, what I've heard a couple of times, was sort of internal United States politics and the likelihood of this going through and the ambition of making the deadline so that finally we can get this through and maybe things change afterwards in internal U.S. politics so that it will not go through this time.

I think that is not something that should be of concern to us because it is something that's imponderable anyway. I think we should concentrate on running our processes in a professional way and in a well-structured way and in the way that we want to be seen as working self-governance, and we shouldn't put ourselves into a position of failure just because we don't make a specific date.

So what I'm proposing is actually to move the final goalpost. That will solve a lot of things.

ALISSA COOPER: So I think I'm going to echo that has been made maybe once or twice already, which is that I think we should view this as kind of guidelines that we give people and we can be a little bit fluid about it. I think the most important ones are the expectation about when we will receive proposals from the communities and fully appreciating that running

consensus processes in these communities is very difficult. But I think it would be -- we would be really remiss if we didn't allow enough time for each of these steps and set an aggressive deadline on that -- in that step one, even if it is a little later than what's on the screen right now.

To your point, Daniel, I think I have kind of the opposite view which is that I think that missing the September deadline is equal to any other kind of failure that you could imagine because I think this is a great opportunity. And I think the future after September 2015 is extraordinarily uncertain. So that's, I think, you know, difference of opinion. But that's why I think having firm deadlines is quite important now. It is not important enough to pervert these processes. So we need to be cognizant of that. But I believe that the global Internet community can get this done on -- by the September deadline so providing some guidelines in that respect I think is something that we should take responsibility for, and we should try and help the communities with.

Jari in the queue and then we need to wrap this one up and move on, and there is no one -- oh, Jari, Wolf-Ulrich, and that's maybe it -- and Daniel.

JARI ARKKO: Just to follow up on yours and Daniel's comments, I do agree with you, Alissa, that we probably should be done by September '15 or else. But I take Daniel's comment that there is this danger of perceived failure when we didn't have to take a failure. Maybe that is something we should actually think about when we communicate this, when we formulate the text that we are actually very clear that we, for instance,

describe this as an aggressive and optimal but not the only possible timeline or something like that and make sure that people understand that.

ALISSA COOPER: Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Yes, Daniel, I take your comment very seriously. And I have, to some extent, from the talks I have with the communities behind me also sometimes the impression, well, there are question marks about this.

But here and every communities as well, there is not a clear view on that so -- whether we can or we cannot. So there are opinions that we can do it in that timeline and others are saying, "Okay, we have risks."

I would stay in this respect also with saying, Try it. Let's try to do that. We put that goal, and we are transparent to detail this timeline in terms of the timelines behind us, with the structures behind us they are going to set.

As Jari is saying, so we communicate in this way that we say, okay, it could be this one and we have to communicate because of our -- thinking of working that the structures behind us are doing the work and it has to be detailed and it may then be rediscussed after a while.

But this is normal. So from a managerial point of view, I would say it's normal. We set the goal and then after that -- and, therefore, we have milestones to be satisfied to review what we are doing. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Daniel.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: I'm sympathetic to the aggressive timeline. So that's something I didn't make clear. You know, I would really, really like to see us achieve it in this order. I just don't see any possibility that we will realistically be able to do that.

And one thing I have also forgotten in my last intervention was that actually I foresee that setting the step one deadline will actually create some resistance from some of the communities already because of the feeling that we are trying to rush things and put it -- and not take their processes seriously. So that was something I forgot in my last intervention.

Now, to be constructive, I don't think that if we just qualified this as an optimal or aggressive timeline, that will be heard anywhere. That will not change the perception of failure if we don't make it. You know, we can say this all along. We can print it in 26-point font on top of it. It will be lost in translation and thus in evaluation at the end.

So the only realistic way I see in maintaining this and say this is our optimal timeline is actually to publish an explicit second final goalpost and say -- maybe in a managerial sense make a milestone and say, If we don't make those milestones, we will reevaluate immediately and not just at the end because then you don't have this failure point. And then say, if it becomes clear that we don't make this, then the next one will

formulate or something like that so we are sure we leave enough time for the U.S. government to discuss it next time.

That is something I could live with because then we could -- if we don't make it, it is not this total failure and it also gives us -- it doesn't have all the other -- mitigate somehow all the other risks I mentioned.

RUSS HOUSLEY: What would you label that if it is not labeled "aggressive"? "The lazy schedule"?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: The real schedule.

                      [Laughter]

>>   Sarcasm.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I did.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So I have Russ Mundy, Keith, Jari, and possibly myself in the queue. We are half an hour behind schedule right now. We were supposed to wrap and -- Elise, I'm so sorry. I thought yours had gone down.

So the agenda for today has us finishing at 5:30 and I believe dinner is at 7:00. Anyone from ICANN? There is no shuttle. Yes. Okay.

We should decide to finish at 6:00 instead of 5:30 and then we would still want to move on to the next topic really soon but maybe we should clear this queue and then try to wrap up. Is that okay?

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Alissa. I think we have a real opportunity to exercise our liaison with those who sent us. If we can at least reach a tentative agreement that this schedule or something like it is what's needed to meet what was requested in the '14 March letter, that is an opportunity for us to get to the community and say, Here's what we believe it will take and if you have a different view, you better come let us know, we can take the appropriate action. But we see this as what is required to make that date that was in the 14 March letter. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: I would like to second what Russ just said. I think that the key here is for us to, to the extent possible, agree on the date to which we need to deliver to the NTIA the final product and work backwards from there within our respective communities, to come back and to basically -- from the bottom-up process in the communities to actually take ownership of your own or our own processes because we have distinct processes. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Elise.

ELISE GERICH: I support what Keith just said and Russ said, but I wanted to go -- say something directly to Daniel about the backup schedule. If we were to think about the World Cup that just finished and Brazil's having to get prepared for that, I can just imagine if Brazil had come up with "We will have everything done by this date but if we don't hit that, you can have your World Cup next week or next month" and I think that's a little bit where we are right now.

We have a deadline and all of our communities should realize we have a deadline. And it is not like Brazil couldn't have decided not to start the World Cup on time. So I think we have that same kind of deadline, and coming out with an alternate schedule is just a copout in my opinion. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah. I was sort of following on to that. I think -- I don't think we can assume anything after September 2015 at all. I mean, we don't know. It is completely up to NTIA what they do with this contract regardless of the fact that we are all gathered here and working on this and knowing just a little tiny smidgen of what went into the announcement in the first place, I think anything could happen. So I would rather not make a big plan for something that could change and just have one timeline.

The end of the queue.

Were you back in the queue again? Sorry.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So I will try and update this based on what I heard and then I think that the suggestion is we send the aggressive timeline to the communities and see whether they can buy into it. And if they can't, then we'll be having this discussion again.

Does that make sense?

Yes, Jari.

JARI ARKKO: So now I remember what I was supposed to say. So the -- so a late pull-off of what Daniel was saying earlier, and I think it actually makes good project management sense, assuming we do it the right way, and the way that we interpret his proposal is that we put in a milestone where we evaluate current progress and decide whether the time plan needs -- time or other plans need adjustment, place it at the same time as we are supposed to get the results from the communities, and that gives us a credible explanation why we are changing things, if we are changing things at that point.

And it is something we would do anyway, right?

So...

ALISSA COOPER: Are we good? Do you have your --

>> ---

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm sorry. I'll write it up, send it to the mail list, and we'll continue the discussion there. But clearly this needs to go out to the communities pretty quickly. Hopefully you're all delivering the message to your communities, "Start now," even though we haven't actually formally requested it. It's very clear, I think, what we are going to want, and in fact the charter discuss already detailed what's going to be in the request.

So please, let's get started, let's not wait, and at the same time I'll get this out as soon as the IETF agenda allows.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So we have three topics left.

We have the -- our own meeting and conference call schedule. We have the -- a parking lot which is probably going to be used for community expectations and perhaps a quick revisit of anything else we need to come back to, and then we have a summary session and we need to discuss our statement, possibly, coming out of this meeting.

We could take a break now and then do those three or we could do our own meeting schedule and then take the break. Do people have preferences? Do you feel that you're ready for a break or not? Yes. Okay. So let's take a break now and come back at 4:10. Thanks.

[BREAK]

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. We should start again.

Okay. With our intention to wrap up at 6:00, we have 1 hour and 40 minutes left, and so I think in talking to a few people, there's really two big topics and one small topic and a wrap-up, is what seems to make the most sense.

So the first big topic is the -- our own meeting schedule, which Milton is going to lead.

Then we're going to have just a quick five-minute follow-up on next steps with the charter from Jari.

And then we're going to talk about the meeting statement or communique that hopefully people have seen some discussion on the mailing list, and Keith is going to lead that one.

And then we're going to wrap up.

So let's try to do our meeting schedule in 30 minutes, Milton, if possible.

Do you need it projected? Do you need anything projected? Probably -- or no? No. Okay. So over to you.

MILTON MUELLER: Okay. Welcome to the travel club section of the meeting.

[Laughter]

What did I hear about Hawaii? Marrakech? Okay. All at ICANN's expense. This is going to be great.

[Laughter]

All right. So we're agreed there should be as many meetings as possible in exotic locations, warm climates and good beaches.

All right. I'll get serious now.

[Laughter]

>>   ---

[Laughter]

MILTON MUELLER: So in my initial primitive note, basically I proposed two face-to-face meetings in 2014 and reliance on monthly conference calls in between. I figured that for the remainder of July and August, we will be completing the work that we've been doing here on email and that there was some doubt as to what -- there was some question raised as to whether we should have a face-to-face in the IGF in Istanbul, which would be very early September, basically the -- depending on whether we did it during IGF, before IGF, or after IGF, it would be the last day of August or the 5th or 6th of September.

Another option was to hold this face-to-face at the ICANN meeting in Los Angeles, which is in mid-October, but -- and on the list, there was various advocates of either one. I think the debate centered on whether, you know, a lot of us are already going to ICANN meetings, and on the other hand, people said "Those ICANN meetings are so busy,

we may not have time to meet," and other people said that the IGF meeting attracted a much more diverse and broad crowd and a lot of us would be going there anywhere also.

So I'll leave that discussion up to you at this point, but let me begin by just asking you: Do you like the idea, the general idea, of -- the general framework of monthly conference calls for the remainder of 2014, a couple of face-to-faces, and -- can you keep track of the queue?

[Laughter]

I'll keep track of the queue but I promise I will do it badly.

>> ---

MILTON MUELLER: Okay. So you like the general idea of --

The two meetings in 2015 were -- we're using Russ' time frame, and we were trying -- I was trying to pick a venue that would be likely that we would have some proposals to discuss, and in particular, if we want to have our contributions by the end of March, I was looking for a meeting that was as close to the end of March as possible, considering that it would be likely that possibly some of the operational communities might be coming in right at the deadline rather than before the deadline.

So that was why I proposed, I think, IETF 92 or 91, which was in Dallas. 92. Which is like the last week of March.

So we could actually push the deadline up to like March 22nd or something to make that more viable as a meeting. Or not.

And then I thought the other face-to-face meeting was just before we had -- just before we would release the final proposal, the stitched-together proposal, and so that we could all agree on what it was, and presumably we'd be discussing public comments, making decisions about whether to send things back for revisions and those kinds of complicated decisions, I think, would best be made in a face-to-face context.

So it was two -- two more in 2014, two in 2015, and monthly conference calls in between.

So I'll open it up for general discussion of that approach and that model, and of course I've seen some of your comments and I know what some of the controversies are, but I'll let you take it from there.

ALISSA COOPER: Kuo and then James.

KUO-WEI WU: The first question I'd like to ask on this is how long you expect for the conference call.

>>   ---

KUO-WEI WU: How long you expect for the conference call? Two hours? Three hours? Because if it's too long, I think, you know, in a conference call usually it's quite tough, you know.

MILTON MUELLER: I was thinking 90 minutes.

KUO-WEI WU: Oh, that would be nice.

[Laughter]

KUO-WEI WU: That would be good. Okay.

The second -- well, I not insist, but the reason I'm talking about it the ICANN LA meeting, because I tried to figure out, I think almost 24 people will participate in the ICANN meeting, but don't -- I'm not insist, you know, because I also heard a very good rationale to go to the IGF, you know. So I'm fine.

ALISSA COOPER: James?

JAMES BLADEL: I'm going to go ahead and withdraw. I mean, I think everybody has a number of concerns or ideas or comments so I'll just wait for the schedule to shake out a little bit.

ALISSA COOPER: Joe?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thanks. In light of the fact that we framed the calendar that we were working on just before this as a negotiation, perhaps before we finalize on the two dates next year we find out if the negotiation is going to shift those dates.

So I think their proposals are usual because they're with our current inflection points but our inflection points may change so if they do, we should try to piggyback on a meeting that is more appropriately timed for a new inflection point.

As to the -- I mean, for me I'll be in the region at both the time the IGF is in Istanbul, I'll be participating there, and I'll be around at the time of the ICANN meeting, but the reason I think the IGF is useful is while the IGF is tied very directly with Internet governance, it is also a meeting that draws a lot of people that are outside of the realm of what I'll call the operating communities.

And as such, it is a little bit different in nature than the other meetings and is probably the one opportunity for us to have a meeting in a venue that is a little bit different, and there is already planned, as one of the sessions within the IGF, a discussion of transition issues, and so it seems like there is starting to be perhaps some benefit for being there.

One of the other concepts is the -- the IGF may have -- may be an opportunity, if this group wants it, to interact with a broader group of

people outside of this group on this topic in terms of transparency and openness and -- and responsiveness to the community.

So all of those things are -- are things which I think make the IGF attractive. The downside I would point out to the IGF is that when you at ICANN, that's already there. At the IGF, that belongs to the U.N. and I don't know that we can use it.

So the question is, the translation and some of the other facilities, especially if we're not having a long meeting, become a significant amount of overhead related to what might not be a long meeting if we haven't been able to do that much between then and now.

So one of the questions is also, is it appropriate for resources. It may be better for optics and worse for resources, in which case we have to decide how that pans out.

ALISSA COOPER: Russ Mundy?

RUSS MUNDY: One of the suggestions that I'd like to make is that we have -- do have meetings in conjunction with other meetings, but we should absolutely not try to schedule them on top of the existing time. Either at the beginning or at the end. I've just had an experience in the ICANN NomCom where it was overlaid with a meeting and it was just untenable. So I think we need to plan our scheduling that way.

And I can also say that after just about two days of being on the phone here, it is doable, given these facilities, so we don't necessarily all 30 of

us have to be in the same physical room for a face-to-face meeting. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So I have myself, James, Jari, and Martin and Mohamed and Wolf-Ulrich. Okay.

I like the idea of meeting at the IGF -- well, I like the idea of not only meeting at ICANN meetings, and the IGF is a very convenient next step, and it's fairly soon and I think we talked about a lot of things today that we hopefully will have wrapped up, you know, two or three weeks before the IGF, and it will be a good place to talk to people there about them in addition to having our meeting.

So that appeals to me.

The other thing I sent to the list -- and just repeating for the room -- is that my experience with groups of this size or slightly smaller trying to get specific things done is that the beat of a biweekly call tends to be a little more reinforcing than a monthly call. It's very useful to have a deadline that you can see fairly close in the distance if you have to get something done, something that -- you know, you have an action item.

So my proposal would be that we schedule a biweekly call and we can always cancel if we don't need it at a particular time, but I think a shorter call more often is better than a longer call less often and will keep us accountable, I think.

James?

JAMES BLADEL: Just a thought, going back to what Russ was saying, and I did agree that, you know, just the way the schedule lays out for the rest of this year, let alone the first part of next year, we should probably establish some minimum threshold of what would constitute a quorum, if we're going to establish face-to-face meetings, so that we can understand who's going to be where and whether we can tack on -- you know, whether it's a one- or two-day session of this group either in parallel or before or after that calendar, and if not, then maybe look at the next -- the next window.

ALISSA COOPER: Jari?

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko. I just wanted to make the point that the -- this group's meetings at a particular location -- say the IGF -- is different from being visible to the people at the IGF. So if we meet there and separately, they don't see us, but even if we are not all there, some of us could be there on stage explaining what is this coordination group.

So keep those things two -- separate, and I, of course, would very much like to go to the IGF and I will be there, would like to have our meeting there. Nothing wrong with the ICANN meeting either. But good places both.

ALISSA COOPER: Martin?

MARTIN BOYLE: Thank you. Martin Boyle.

Firstly, picking up on the IGF, I would note that there is a Day 0. There are rooms available on Day 0, and the United Nations will be providing interpretation during that week. And I found out, for my own personal uses for a workshop in the IGF, that it's normally possible to arrange to pay for the interpretation facilities.

So that would give us one -- at least a one-day opportunity of having a meeting.

But the reason for doing it in IGF -- well, there might be two reasons.

Reason Number 1 is because lots of us will be going to the IGF, so that's convenient for us, but I also heard the idea that, "Well, yeah, but there's a lot bigger and a different community at the IGF." So if we are going to be doing a meeting at the IGF, then surely a lot of what we're doing at that IGF meeting is engaging with that wider community, and therefore this will be a different sort of meeting to the meeting we've had over the last two days.

You know, I think it is a matter of communicating what we think we're doing and getting people to understand the role and the importance of the overall job.

I certainly empathize with the comments that were made that we don't lay another track of meetings on otherwise massively overcrowded meeting schedules, and so my plea would be that if we do it at the ICANN meeting in October, or whenever it is, that -- well, the Friday is an empty day because -- or in theory an empty day because the

Thursday is the board meeting and the close of the ICANN meeting, so really we're talking about doing Friday-Saturday, for that period.

And I do think that doing it at the end of the ICANN meeting would be quite useful because a number of the communities that we are looking at for providing their input into our work will have -- have their first face-to-face meetings about their progress and program and how it matches with our program, and so doing it at the end would allow us to at least take stock of what we've just heard and what that might mean for what we're trying to do.

So I -- I would actually say that in the ICANN week we should be engaging with communities that are there and the big job that we will have and, you know, why are we doing face-to-face meetings? We're doing face-to-face meetings because we are going to achieve something from doing those face-to-face meetings.

And that's it for me. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Mohamed.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah. There are two things.

First, I think IGF could be a very good fora for engagement and outreach to other communities. There is a main session on the first day of the IGF which is about IANA transition. It's already there in the schedule now.   So I think we need to start coordinating with -- with IGF secretariat from now on. At least members or at least chairs or co-

chairs, future co-chairs, need to be in the -- either there and speaking on behalf of the coordination committee.

I'm not sure about the group meeting in the IGF, but definitely a workshop could be definitely useful if we can try to coordinate that with the remaining time. I know the workshop submissions close date has already passed but if we can reach out to the IGF secretariat to ask about this main session on 4th of September and also trying to have a workshop, that would be useful.

I -- I like the idea of the biweekly teleconference. At least it keeps the momentum for now. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks. You covered it.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Paul. Paul, were you in the queue?

>>   ---

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. I put myself back in the queue just to respond to James.

I think if we have remote participants, they should be included in whatever quorum count we may have, so I think we should use the Internet as much as possible to meet, and they should be treated as first-class citizens. So --

JAMES BLADEL: Certainly. And I think there was -- maybe I wasn't clear. In the planning of whether or not to hold a face-to-face meeting, determining how many people will participate face-to-face versus remote I think should be a deciding factor of whether or not we meet at one of these events.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Xiaodong?

XIAODONG LEE: I think I agree with -- with Martin that ICANN meeting is the right place to have the coordination group meeting, but I also think that it is appropriate to have some kind of informal discussion during IETF or IGF, other meetings, because I think -- I do believe there are so many people -- I think many of us will have an opportunity to meet with each other in subsequent meetings.

And I'm not sure, maybe -- maybe if we have a secretary, maybe they can list all of the meetings -- I mean, the international meetings and how to meet together. I just remember that for ICANN -- for example, ICANN SSAC, every ICANN meeting, SSAC have meeting, but during the IETF, they also have SSAC meeting. So it depend on -- I mean, so how

many people will join the IGF or ICANN or IETF, so we need to do some analysis.

MILTON MUELLER: I'm just going to grab the mic here as the chair of the session.

It's been mentioned the outreach during the IGF.

The IGF, we cannot do a workshop. That's been very competitive this year and it's over. But they have something called an open forum and I'm not sure -- open forums are sort of dedicated to international organizations to showcase what they do, and we might be able to get one of those arranged, if -- if -- like I said, it would depend on room availability, but that would be something for -- something to look into if we decide to meet at the IGF.

ALISSA COOPER: Joe?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thanks. Just two quick comments. One of them is that Day 0 is already getting pretty crowded at the IGF, so we might even be looking at Day minus 1 or Day plus 7, whatever the -- the side of the equation you want to play in.

The other thing I would say is -- and I don't know whether this is a possible thing, and those of you who have participated in this kind of endeavor more than I have perhaps will -- will have a feeling for it, but the concern I would have is when we talk about (indiscernible) groups

of us getting together and having conversations and discussing, we start to get into a question of what is the transparency then related to those efforts.

There will always be places where we will be socially engaging and this topic will come up, but that is different than saying, "We're having an informal meeting."

Because are there hallmarks to an informal meeting that then need to be reported back, and do they need to be in multiple languages and all of these other questions.

So I think we just need to be a little careful on what we consider a meeting to be and how that would operate.

MILTON MUELLER: I would just say with Day 0 of the IGF, I run an academic organization, Giganet, which is meeting that entire day. So if we had it on zero day, I would be out of the picture completely even though I would be at IGF.

ALISSA COOPER: Tracy.

TRACY HACKSAW: I would also like to make a plug for the IGF. I believe several governments attend the IGF more than the ICANN meetings and so on. So from the government perspective, the IGF is a very good forum for having one of these meetings and having sort of an open discussion

along the lines of an open forum perhaps or some sort of event where they can have their views expressed. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: That's the end of the queue.

MILTON MUELLER: Sounds to me like there is substantial support for our next face-to-face to be at the IGF and I want to hear more discussion or support or opposition for Alissa's suggestion regarding the frequency of the conference calls. Do we prefer these biweeklies or do we prefer monthlies?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: I actually support the suggestion of every two weeks because in the chat room there has been a discussion on fortnightly versus biweekly. So just to be clear, we are talking about every other week there would be a call. I support that suggestion.

ALISSA COOPER: Just to clarify what I wrote in the email was that we just pick either one or -- one slot or alternating slots if we want to share the time zone pain and we just have those be set so every other week it would be the same slot or it would be the same slot every fourth week.

MILTON MUELLER: Shall we take a swim?

[Laughter]

I mean a hum. I didn't hear any opposition to biweekly. It's a lot more work for whoever the chairs and secretariat are. So since we haven't elected them yet, they can't object, right?

ALISSA COOPER: You assume the chairs are doing all the work. I mean, setting up a WebEx is not a lot of work for the secretariat.

[Laughter]

I mean, one thing -- oh, sorry. Do you mind if I continue on this soliloquy for a second? One thing Joe and I had a little bit of back and forth is whether the calls would be translated and transcribed, and I assume they will be. Certainly more work for the -- well, it depends. If you have a 90-minute or two-hour call every month or a one-hour call every two weeks, it is not really more work for the translators but just another item to think about.

Adiel.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: I would just -- I want just to comment on the biweekly teleconference at this stage. Can I suggest that we gradually move down to the biweekly when they will have intensive work to do and start with a monthly now and when we reach the phase two and three of the timeline then we have a biweekly because we have most extensive work to do so from now to then, we will have the two face-to-face meetings plus a monthly teleconference. And then when we reach the other phase, we have a

biweekly because, you know, overloading it with biweekly I'm not sure will make any difference.

MILTON MUELLER: I like that suggestion. You know, originally I just perceive no need for phone calls until September. I think we can be finishing up most of our work using email. And when -- the only thing I am unclear about your proposal, Adiel, is when you next talk about the "next phase," what is your marker for the phases?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: When we start consolidating and coordinating their requests which comes in. Yeah, December, end of the year.

MILTON MUELLER: So, basically, 2015 we go biweekly.

JARI ARKKO: I think the timeline is overlapping so we might have significant coordination activities but we can take this on a per-need basis as well so start with 30 minutes and then if we actually need more time, then we increase.

ALISSA COOPER: Just one response on the call frequency, we do have a bunch of items coming out of this meeting that won't be resolved today and so maybe one call between now and the IGF might be a useful marker. I know the

people are going to disappear on holiday, but even getting some number of us together might be useful one time in August.

MILTON MUELLER: So that's all been quite smooth in terms of our discussions. One question I wanted to raise, did anyone want to raise the issue of tools that we're using for communication? Are we happy with the email list and assume -- are we using Adobe Connect for the conference calls? Are we using Webex or something else? Do people want to propose -- how about that platform that they put on the IANA transition email list which went over so well with the people on the list, is that something that we want to run with?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Because it flew so well.

MILTON MUELLER: I'm just trying to tease Theresa, but she's ignoring me.

>> ---

[Laughter]

MILTON MUELLER: That's why I said that.

ALISSA COOPER: Go ahead, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks. Keith Drazek. I strongly support using Adobe Connect. I think it is a very valuable tool that many of us are familiar with, and I feel lost without it.

ALISSA COOPER: I have stand up for Webex, but I understand in ICANN world you use Adobe Connect.

>>   ---

ALISSA COOPER: That was it.

MILTON MUELLER: Wow. This is too easy. So I think we can bring this home, and let me just summarize. I think we're talking about a next face-to-face meeting in September starting monthly -- face-to-face meeting at the IGF in September. Actually, there is an issue we haven't resolved and that is, do we want to also meet face-to-face at the ICANN meeting the next month?

It is true so many of us will be there anyway. It just means an extra day carved out of our schedules.

ALISSA COOPER: We can decide in Istanbul as well. We don't have to decide today.

MILTON MUELLER: The general lay of the land is we will be starting monthly teleconferences after the IGF and ramping them up to biweekly or semiweekly, if you want to be precise in your language, because nobody knows what "fortnightly" means anymore. It isn't old England. And we would be ramping that up starting in January. And we are planning on two face-to-face meetings in 2015, but we're going to be flexible about the dates because of the likelihood of not knowing when those dates need to be.

And we have a speaker over here. Elise?

ELISE GERICH: I'm going to back to should we meet at the ICANN meeting. And there was an idea that we wait until September to decide. For some people who are making travel arrangements, it would be much nicer if we could just decide sooner rather than later because if you wait till September, the fares get more expensive. You have already bought your ticket. You have a change fee. It can be -- for those of us in the U.S., it is not very difficult. But for others coming into the country, it might be more difficult. So I would ask us to make a decision sooner.

MILTON MUELLER: Really. Thank you for making that point. It is actually really important. Indeed, ICANN has already required its constituencies to tell them who they are moving to the L.A. meeting this month.

So I hear general assent that we should meet at the ICANN meeting in Los Angeles on the Friday, right? One day. Well, we could meet -- I don't know if you like watching board meetings, but I don't.

KUO-WEI WU: But I have.

MILTON MUELLER: Well, you are just a liaison to the board.

[Laughter]

Who needs you.

I'm kidding. I'm kidding.

So we could do it half of Thursday and all of Friday. That would be the 16th is Thursday and the 17th is Friday.

Yes, 16th and 17th of October.

ALISSA COOPER: Martin, go ahead. Go ahead. Were you in the queue, Martin?

MARTIN BOYLE: But I don't really want to interfere until we have properly nailed down the IANA meeting times, meeting dates. Are we there? Because I actually would like to go back to the IGF. Okay. If you're happy with that, the IGF, it would be useful to know if we're going to do it over the

(indiscernible) of the IGF, when we're going to do it because it is even more expensive, getting even more expensive to Istanbul.

I personally couldn't make the end, but I could do the weekend before. But I would like to know one way or the other. Thanks.

MILTON MUELLER: So I don't know whether I will get rocks hurled at me for this, but my view of the IGF is that it is less demanding in terms of our schedules and it would be possible to have a meeting during one of the days of the IGF. Some of us will be in workshops or plenary sessions. But that only would mean we would miss two hours of a coordinating group committee meeting if we were -- if we did have a conflict. It wouldn't be like wall-to-wall meetings or with these day zero where you are basically missing the entire day. Any reactions to the idea of having it on the Tuesday or Wednesday, 2nd or 3rd?

Any reaction to that aside from Russ who has a chunk at lunch on Wednesday and doesn't want to do it on Wednesday?

ELISE GERICH: Some other of us are at that same chunk on Wednesday at lunch, so a different day would be good.

MILTON MUELLER: It is a conspiracy.

[Laughter]

ELISE GERICH: I certainly hope so.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: The problem is that that folks use the lunches to schedule bilats and other meetings with delegations so lunches tend to be a dicey period of time for lots of people. I mean, that doesn't mean there couldn't be a morning session and an afternoon session and we leave the lunch period alone and then you are back to your original concept of your missing an hour here or an hour there.

MILTON MUELLER: It sounds like the Saturday, August 30th, would be less objectionable? That's the minus one, yeah.

MARTIN BOYLE: Saturday is minus two. Monday is zero. Sunday is minus one. Saturday is minus two.

MILTON MUELLER: Okay. So Sunday is my conflicting event.

                          [Laughter]

                          Because there is a lot of events on that day. I thought that was zero day it was considered. So Labor Day, as we call it in the United States because we don't like communists -- (laughter) -- Labor Day, September 1st, is the beginning day of the IGF. Is it not? Does it start in the morning?

MARTIN BOYLE: It is day zero of the IGF. The IGF itself starts on the 2nd of September, the Tuesday.

>>   The zero day on Monday already has a plan, a high-level minister meeting and a NETmundial presentation. It is officially on the program day zero Monday. So this day is not possible.

MILTON MUELLER: Okay. So that day is bad. Zero day, okay.

ELISE GERICH: What happened to Wednesday? Is that still bad? I mean, we just don't have to come for lunch.

MILTON MUELLER: Wednesday? And are we talking one day here or half of Tuesday or what?

    All right. Wednesday. Going once? Going twice? Hum.

    (Humming).

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Okay.

NANCY LUPIANO: Can I interrupt just one moment. It is Nancy Lupiano back here on the control board. We will be in touch with the IGF. And, of course, we have to find out what space is available from them. They may have every room booked on Wednesday. But as soon as I can get the information available, we will let you know. And I'm already checking space in Los Angeles preICANN conference 51 and post ICANN 51 so we can have some better answers for you.

MILTON MUELLER: The voice of God, thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: So we're done?

MILTON MUELLER: I think we're done.

ALISSA COOPER: Great. So we have one little item on the charter that I wanted Jari to talk about and I think we need to just confirm before we launch into the meeting statement which is the next topic.

So, Jari.

JARI ARKKO: So the topic is the charter. After our discussion in the morning, we started with the results of that edit and performed two things that we discussed, addressed Joe's issue and used Paul's formulation. And that

has been sent out on the list, and I have not gotten any complaints about it. I got one email from Patrik. And my interpretation of that email, even though it was maybe a little bit unclear -- sorry, Patrik, if you are listening -- but the -- I think he was okay with the result as it is.

So wondering if you guys have had a chance to take a look at that, and are we ready enough for that at least to go out to others, like your communities? We should, of course, talk about exactly how do we finalize this. We decide here right now that, okay, this is the charter at least for now.

We wait until our next call and then decide after some feedback from our communities or we launch a more elaborate feedback period.

So I make one observation that there are different types of decision items for us here. One type is something that is kind of internal to us, and the charter is at least somewhat internal and other things like the timeline which is clearly more of a contract between parties where we need to have a discussion which we could not unilaterally decide.

Personally, I'm in favor of the approach where we try to make the decision in the next meeting, next phone call, that this is the final charter and we provide a quick review round, one round, with the relevant communities who are interested in making comments, but maybe before that, the question is if -- if anyone has any issues with the text as sent to the list today.

Paul, did you have something? No?

Okay. Going once... twice...

EN

Done.

So this is at least going forward somewhere.

The next question is what -- what is the decision procedure? Is everyone happy with the idea that we approve the charter for this group in the next phone call after a review round?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Quick question. Are you going to change the "Version 3" in the text to say "Version 6"?

>> ---

JARI ARKKO: Yeah. We can --

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Just so we know which Version 3 we're voting on?

JARI ARKKO: Just to second the record straight, the file names are v6.x and we in the IETF always want to have Version 6, whatever the version actually is.

[Laughter]

JOE ALHADEFF: Yeah. Just one quick question. Since the things that Paul has been working on which we didn't have a chance to speak to are related to an element in the charter, which is the community expectations and suggestions, should there be any hook in the charter to what will come out as Paul's work? Because I don't think we built that into the charter. It's referenced as a concept, but I don't think we reference it as a potential annex or thought or I don't know how we do that.

JARI ARKKO: Right. I think that's kind of hinted by the charter that we need to have that and we need to communicate more accurately with the communities on what those details are.

I don't think we should delay the high-level abstract task definition with, you know, completion of the tasks appointed by this high-level charter.

So I think it would be fine to leave the two separate, and that -- I think it needs -- needs some work, at least, so...

MILTON MUELLER: Okay. So you're talking about -- I didn't understand why you're talking about approving the charter -- not until after the IGF? Because I think we want to go into the IGF with the charter approved --

JARI ARKKO: I do too.

MILTON MUELLER: -- and we didn't have a phone call scheduled between now and then, so we can schedule that, I think, if you want to, but there was no plan for it.

JARI ARKKO: Okay. So I didn't actually realize that small detail, that we don't have a phone call scheduled before that.

No, we don't actually need a phone call. We could also just have a date and, you know, discuss it on the mailing list. That's fine too. And we could set that at, I don't know, two weeks from now, or -- is that reasonable? Or three weeks from now. There's an IETF in between. Some of us are busy. Two weeks from now? I think we'll go with that.

So email procedure and two weeks from now.

And -- but -- yeah. Tracy doesn't want to speak.

Paul, did you want to say something?

PAUL WILSON: Yeah. I think let's try and finalize the requested information for the community proposals by the same time. I think we can -- we can aim for that, if -- I think we've got two -- two weeks left.

JARI ARKKO: That's good. And that's also something that we need for IGF, I think.

PAUL WILSON: Yes.

ALISSA COOPER: So Keith, would you like to shepherd us through the communique thing?

KEITH DRAZEK: Yes.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you. Keith Drazek. So just to set this up, thanks to Jari for taking the first cut at this draft. Just over the last half hour, I took the opportunity to make some edits of my own which are now being -- the whole thing is being projected on the screen so we can go through and make edits on the fly, and I also emailed this out to the list, so if you wanted to look at it in its entirety, feel free to do that.

So let's go ahead and get started.

I will read this as we go through and then, please, folks, stick up -- stick up your placards if you want to jump in with any recommendations.

So "In March 2014, the U.S. Department of Commerce's National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) announced its intention to transition its stewardship role of IANA functions to the global multistakeholder community. As a part of this transition, the Internet community has launched a bottom-up multistakeholder effort to develop and deliver a proposal to enable this transition and to meet the criteria set out by the NTIA."

Any comments? Any suggested edits?

MILTON MUELLER: Is this a press release?

KEITH DRAZEK: This is the statement that we will issue.

MILTON MUELLER: Okay. Typically a statement has this -- what the journalists call an inverted pyramid form where you give them the summary story at the very first sentence. So the summary story is that we met and we decided some things. And this is explanation. This current first paragraph is sort of background, and that comes later because it's less essential to what we're announcing.

KEITH DRAZEK: So I hear what you're saying but I think because this will be picked up by a lot of people who may be very new to this and who may not understand the context, that it's important to at least in this first communication sort of establish the context and the background.

                         But I hear what you're saying. Let's see if there are other thoughts.

                         James and then Joe.

JAMES BLADEL: Actually, I agree with Milton. This is probably the second paragraph. I think the first paragraph is, "The group formed, we met in London, we

decided we made -- you know, we self-organized and we made some critical decisions." Then background.

You know, I think there -- you know, I think what you're getting at, Milton, is we need to have our headline first and then we need to set the stage.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. I've got Joe and then Jari. Alissa.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah. I think -- you know, I'm -- I'm -- why don't we go for a little gluttony. Let's call this the report. Then we should draft the press release as the next draft of the report.

Because the press release is less useful when someone comes in -- into an archive six months after we've started. Then the report is what they want to read, not the press release.

So I think we have a utility for both things. That a report is useful in the archive and is less punchy and is less of a sales job and a press release is more punchy and more of a sales job because that's what it's -- it's meant to get right to the meat of the matter and to give you a succinct statement where you might not even include all of this background in something that is a press release.

So I think we have room for perhaps both. We didn't draft the two of them today. This has been more of the report format that we drafted today, and I think we could easily cobble the press release together

because it would be just a subset of what's here, written in exactly the reverse pyramid order that you were talking about.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Jari?

JARI ARKKO: I actually agree with Milton, and not just for press releases. I mean, it's often useful for the -- you know, any reader who is going to look at the first paragraph to understand what's going on, so I think that would be a good change.

The other thing is that -- and this was sort of in the back of my mind and maybe that was wrong, but I -- what I was thinking of, that this is somewhere between a press release and, you know, a more substantive explanation, but we will actually need a -- a proper meeting summary written up later. It's just that that probably takes -- takes a while, or maybe that's a separate activity.

So this is just the highlights, not the full report.

But it's -- I don't think it should be intended just as a press release. It's also something that we could send out to our communities, "Hey, this happened."

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER: I think this document also needs a title. That's all.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. I agree.

                        [Laughter]

                        I'm also encouraged that we're talking about the order of the
                        paragraphs and not the actual substance, so...

                        [Laughter]

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah. I guess just to follow on that, I think the idea is to try and close on
                        this before 6:00 p.m. Actually, before like 5:50 because we may have
                        some other stuff to do.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay.

ALISSA COOPER: So that's why I said that is because like we need to write down the title
                        in the document if we're going to close on it, and the same thing with
                        the ordering of the paragraphs.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Any suggestions for a title?

>>	---
	[Laughter]
ALISSA COOPER:	"Statement from the First Meeting of the IANA Coordination Group."
KEITH DRAZEK:	Okay. So what I'm going to suggest is that we go through the text and make any adjustments to the actual text, and then we can come back to the order question. And I think it will be pretty easy to reorder to address Milton's comment and everybody else's support for Milton's comment.
	So the next item is "Substantial efforts are already underway in the respective impacted communities. For instance, for names, in ICANN and country code communities; for numbers, in the RIRs community; and for protocol parameters, in the IETF."
	Any suggested edits? Comments?
	Okay. Mohamed.
MOHAMED EL BASHIR:	Yeah. I think a general text about "work is already undergoing on the different communities involved," or at least "in the process," that might be better than specifying, because if you look, the government or GAC community is not there, the At-Large users community is not mentioned here. Something just to say that the different communities involved in

the -- in the process, they already started work in their Internet consultations or preparation.

KEITH DRAZEK: Could I say "including, but not limited to" and then list the three that we've -- list -- so "Substantial efforts are already underway in the respective impacted communities, including, but not limited to: For names, in ICANN and country code communities; for numbers, in RIR community; and for protocol parameters, in the IETF"?

>>   ---

KEITH DRAZEK: Can't you hear you.

MILTON MUELLER: I said those names don't -- whether the noncommercial stakeholder group is mentioned or not doesn't mean anything to anybody but the noncommercial stakeholders group. You know, if this is for the general public, these distinctions don't mean anything to them. The -- it's -- and most reporters, you know, they don't know all of these 75 different acronyms about -- referring to different pieces of ICANN. It's just -- it's not, you know, what you put in there. I have what you have there now is about at the right level of description.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Okay.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: May I raise a nit? Have we decided to use "ICG"? Because the time line uses "CG." This document uses "ICG" for the acronym of the group. Can we just make all of our documents use one or the other?

And while we're in nits, is it IANA transition coordination group or just IANA coordination group?

ELISE GERICH: I thought we decided on "IANA stewardship."

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah. That's what it is in the charter.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I think the charter say ICG and I think we need to use ICG --

ALISSA COOPER: Yes.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: -- and find a definition for the "I."

ELISE GERICH: So maybe that's for somebody -- the secretariat? -- to make sure we do "ICG" instead of "CG" and that we add "stewardship" or whatever the right title is.

KEITH DRAZEK: Right. So "Statement from the First Meeting of the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group, (ICG)."

Everybody on board? Okay. Okay. So give me a second here. "Included, but not limited to." This is to address Mohamed's comment.

Okay. Next paragraph: "To facilitate these community efforts, the IANA stewardship transition coordination group (ICG) has been established to coordinate the development of a proposal among the communities affected by the IANA functions.

The group has one deliverable, a proposal to the U.S. Department of Commerce (NTIA) recommending a detailed transition plan of NTIA's stewardship of the IANA functions to the Internet community consistent with the four key principles outlined in the NTIA March 14th announcement."

Comments? Questions? Suggested edits?

>>   ---

KEITH DRAZEK: Sorry?

>>   ---

KEITH DRAZEK: Got it. Sorry. Thank you. Okay. James, go ahead.

JAMES BLADEL: Just a second. I'm looking at the announcement because I don't trust my memory on this, but the -- the NTIA mentioned that it would not accept a proposal that replaced the NTIA role with a government-led or intergovernment organizational solution which was outside of the four key principles. It was actually its own paragraph.

So I don't know if we want to say "four key principles" because it would leave out that other part.

KEITH DRAZEK: Maybe we ought to see "five key principles."

JAMES BLADEL: Or just "key principles."

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. That works. Okay. Thanks, James. Anyone else?

Okay. Let's move on.

The next paragraph: "The ICG will conduct itself transparently, consult with a broad range of stakeholders, and ensure that the final recommended" -- sorry, "final recommendation supports the security and stability of the IANA functions. Creation of the ICG was initiated and facilitated by ICANN and the membership of the ICG has been

defined by the Internet communities participating in it namely" -- and then it goes on to list the 13 groups.

And Milton mentioned earlier that he thought that that might be too much detail. Do we -- sorry?

MILTON MUELLER: If you like lists of acronyms, that one takes -- it should make some kind of a record. I mean, it's just...

KEITH DRAZEK: We could -- in this -- in this sentence, we could actually reference the link on the ICANN Web site that lists out all of the participants in the various communities.

MILTON MUELLER: Excellent idea. And I would just say that if you could come up with more generic descriptions, like "the people who administer IP addresses," "the people who are involved in the supply and use of domain names" in --

LYNN ST. AMOUR: "Critical Internet resources."

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah. "The representatives of individual Internet users," those kinds of things.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: And maybe footnote it, even, rather than referring to a link somewhere. I mean, the more people start to understand that this is distributed and it's operational and there are lots of other entities, lots of entities around the world involved, the better off we all are.

MILTON MUELLER: I'm an academic. I like footnotes. I don't know if anybody --

KEITH DRAZEK: All right. So Milton is on tap to take of the footnoting. Noted.

All right. Next paragraph. This gets into the substance of what we accomplished.

>>   ---

KEITH DRAZEK: Oh, I'm sorry. Mohamed. Go ahead. I didn't see you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Sorry. Just a general comment about the formatting. Are we going to get some support and help in terms of what's missing?

And formatting in the one on, let's say, press release or statements format, that could be -- we could have a document that is well-accepted and received by let's say even media, and if this is going to be submitted (indiscernible) even the traditional channels be sent to media as well, so ICANN can provide that support in terms of looking at the format,

suggest words missing that do not affect the substance which is -- we are finalizing now, but I think we need to have a very good professional product outcome of this. This will reflect when people look into what we're doing here.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Mohamed. I think that's a good suggestion, one that I support. I think if we had more time, I feel confident we could do that ourselves but because of the time line, time pressures that we're under, it probably makes sense to reach out to ask for some additional support.

Okay. Any other comments or questions before we move on?

Okay. Next paragraph: "The ICG met for the first time on 17-18 July 2014 in London U.K. Most members of the ICG were on-site while others connected remotely. The meeting was also streamed live to all interested observers in six different languages.

In this first meeting, the ICG completed a proposed charter and scope for its future work, discussed a proposed time line for the transition proposal and communication needs, and worked on the ICG's internal organization and participation processes."

>>   ---

KEITH DRAZEK: Seven languages?

>>   ---

>>   It's all of the U.N. languages plus Portuguese. That's what we have here.

KEITH DRAZEK: And that is seven, correct?

>>   ---

>>   Six.

KEITH DRAZEK: Sorry?

>>   ---

>>   Yes. It's the six U.N. languages plus Portuguese.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you.

>>   Portuguese.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you. I was just looking for the number. All right. Thanks.

                                    [Laughter]

                                    Okay. Any other comments? Questions?

JOE ALHADEFF: I don't know. Just when I say see something that says it was streamed live to all interested observers, there are probably people who might have been interested who didn't know it was happening, and so I would just say it was streamed live to observers.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. I think that's a reasonable adjustment. Any other comments?

                                    James, go ahead.

JAMES BLADEL: Does our discussion and interaction and decision regarding the GAC warrant mention here? That's one thing I'm being asked about.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Good question. Is that something we want to include? Go ahead, Jari.

JARI ARKKO: I don't know if this matters, my personal reaction was to leave it out because if the first thing this committee produces is a statement that says, yeah, we gave more seats to the government, I don't think that looks right.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Jari.

Tracy, do you have any thoughts on that, that you would like to contribute?

TRACY HACKSAW: I think it's useful for the minutes. I think it is a statement for the minutes.

KEITH DRAZEK: All right, great. James, is that all right?

JAMES BLADEL: We could even just say something about the group discussed its structure because I think that also fits in with our discussion about the role of and independent secretariat and leadership -- the various leadership options that we considered. So if we can shoehorn that in there someplace that makes sense, I think that covers it.

KEITH DRAZEK: Added "discussed its structure and a proposed time line for the transition proposal," et cetera, et cetera. It is a bit of a run-on.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Maybe you could say "discussed and finalized the structure."

JARI ARKKO: Can I just interrupt? Further down it said -- scroll down a bit. It said, "Discussed its internal organization and participation." That covers a lot of ground.

JAMES BLADEL: Okay. I will withdraw that. Go ahead and control Z the Apple.

JARI ARKKO: You have covered it there.

KEITH DRAZEK: "Removed, discussed, and finalized its structure." Actually it is "discussed a proposed "...

Any other comments or questions?

Next paragraph? "The meeting minutes and recordings are available at," insert URL, "and draft charter and timeline," et cetera, et cetera.

"In the coming days and weeks, the ICG will be starting its dialogue with Internet communities. Encourage all interested parties to engage early and often in the bottom-up multistakeholders -- "multistakeholder discussions now underway." and that's the end of it.

Paul?

PAUL WILSON: I was sensitized earlier this year to overuse of the jargon. So I just -- just, for example, I would -- I think the words on the next page, the reference to "bottom-up multistakeholder," we can just take that out. We're encouraging everyone to be -- to engage in the discussions which are underway. And I think the additional qualifiers are kind of jargony and don't really need to be there. And I'm not -- you know, the same comb could go through the document just as a final edit, I think, just to question whether in every case, every use of the words that are there is warranted. It is an important thing for non-speaking readers as well.

KEITH DRAZEK: Any other thoughts on that? I mean, my initial reaction is that in this first communication where we are announcing decisions we have made and the work that we did, we are trying in a sense push people back to the communities where the work is going to get done and that it is important that this is recognized as a bottom-up multistakeholder process.

                                 That was my rationale for including the language here. If the sense of the room is that we want to remove that and just say "engage early and often in the discussions now underway," I'm okay with that but I wanted to explain the reason that I included it at that point.

                                 James, go ahead.

JAMES BLADEL: I actually agree with both of you. I think we can probably remove "bottom-up multistakeholder" and replace it with "engage early in the discussions now underway" or "getting underway in their communities," something to that regard. Direct them to their respective communities and the efforts that will be launching soon. So I think -- I agree that we use "bottom-up multistakeholder" so much that it's starting to sound like a cliché.

But, Keith, I think if we can work the word -- if we can preserve that by redirecting them to the community, that would be good.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Great. Thanks, James. I just deleted "bottom-up multistakeholder" and inserted the word "community." So "engage early and often in the community discussions now underway." Okay?

Joe and I have Russ in the queue online.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: If we can scroll back up. I just think just to be clear, I think we should say "draft charter and proposed timeline" because the whole concept of the timeline has a little (indiscernible) element. There might be some give in the timeline. This might make people think we are giving them a finalized timeline.

KEITH DRAZEK: Great, thanks. Thanks, Joe. That was helpful. I agree.

I've got Russ in the queue, then James.

RUSS MUNDY: I'm hearing myself. Am I coming through?

KEITH DRAZEK: We can hear you know. Thanks, Russ.

RUSS MUNDY: Okay, thank you.

I would suggest in that URL-URL sentence above here that's not on the screen, we've replaced starting its dialogue with "dialoguing" because I think many of us already have had discussions about the whole planning and the whole activity. And this wording infers that nothing has really started yet. And I don't think that's accurate.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Russ. Could I say we'll continue our dialogue or continue its dialogue?

RUSS MUNDY: Sure. That would be fine.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks for that input. James, go ahead.

JAMES BLADEL: If you could scroll up, I think it was a minor issue in a previous paragraph, maybe just needs a comma.

Let's see here. I think "discussed a proposed timeline for the transition proposal and communication needs and worked "-- it seems like "communication needs" is part of the timeline. Maybe it is just the way I'm reading it. Maybe there should be a comma there and strike the "and"?

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah, I think you're probably right about that. Let's see. "Discussed a proposed timeline for the transition proposal."

JAMES BLADEL: "Its communication needs."

KEITH DRAZEK: "Associated communication needs," "supported communication needs."

JAMES BLADEL: You could say "its communication needs." Yeah, thanks.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, James.

ALISSA COOPER: I think you a "and" instead of a comma between "the proposal" and "its."

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I think if you go back up, "the ICG completed." So "completed" is the verb you're working on. We didn't complete our communication needs because that's what it reads like now. I don't -- we don't -- did we do a proposed timeline for transition proposal and communication needs? Because that really wasn't what the timeline was addressing. So we could just say -- after "transition proposal," comma, after "and "addressed or discussed its communication needs" and then "and worked on." You don't need the "and." It would just be a comma then.

JAMES BLADEL: I think this sentence is starting to get a little overloaded.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah, yeah.

JAMES BLADEL: I know Keith is already typing, so I don't want to fluster him.

KEITH DRAZEK: No, no, it's fine.

JAMES BLADEL: I actually think "communication needs" belongs down with "internal organization and participation processes" because that's more background administrative, you know, and not substance like the timeline and the scope.

KEITH DRAZEK: Here's a suggestion. Why don't we just put a period here and say, "In this first meeting, the ICG completed a proposed charter and scope for its future work. It's also" -- so we break it up a little bit. "It also discussed a proposed timeline for the transition proposal and" --

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Now you can take "and discussed" out. Comma.

KEITH DRAZEK: How's that? So let me read it. "In this first meeting, the ICG completed a proposed charter and scope for its future work. It also discussed a proposed timeline for the transition proposal, its communication needs, and worked on the ICG's internal organization and participation processes."

PAUL WILSON: ---

KEITH DRAZEK: Yep. Thanks, Paul.

JAMES BLADEL: Sorry, I'll wait. And then for "proposed timeline" can we say draft timeline because I think "proposed timeline for proposal" is too many "proposals."

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: You need to delete the "and." It could be "its communications," comma. "Its external communication," comma. Too many "ands" right there. If "communication" could be sufficient without -- without specifying external or internal and you could end up "and participation processes."

KEITH DRAZEK: I'm struggling here.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Here is a way to take care of it. Take "communication" out of that part of the sentence, "And worked on its internal organization, communication needs, and participation processes.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Joe. Thanks, Mohamed.

So, again, "In this first meeting, the ICG completed a proposed charter and scope for its future work. It also discussed a draft timeline for the transition proposal and worked on its internal organization, communication needs, and participation processes." All right. I think we got it. Any final comments or questions?

All right. I will take offline the recommendation in the interest of time, take offline the recommendation to reorder this and we'll circulate an update to the list. Okay?

EN

ALISSA COOPER: So on what timeline are we trying to close on that? By 6:00? Okay.
Great. Thank you.

I think we have reached the wrapup phase. I wanted to go through the
list of action items from today. I have a little list here. Some of them
may have been overtaken by events in the mailing list. I haven't been
able to keep up with everything. So let's just go through them. And if I
get them wrong, let me know.

So, Lynn, you are working with a drafting group on a letter to Heather
Dryden. Is that correct?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Like the magic IETF number, we're on version 6.

[Laughter]

No, we actually have agreement. I'm waiting for Jean-Jacques to look at
it one time. But Adiel, Jean-Jacques, and Narelle and I think -- and I hear
Jean-Jacques saying it's good. I think then the issue is who sends it and
presumably that goes out after this other communication because we
didn't want this to be the first.

LISSA COOPER: Right.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: And I guess we should probably send it -- I know this is a little bit of a
knit but send to Heather as GAC chair first and then the list because
otherwise they are all on the list. So maybe that -- we can work that --

ALISSA COOPER: We want to communicate.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Maybe we can work that out with Theresa.

ALISSA COOPER: That will be sent with Theresa. Is that what we decided? I can't remember.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Or the interim chair.

>>   ---

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, fine. That's fine.

I think -- so in talking to the ICANN coms folks, when we get the statement hammered out, they will post it on their site and that's where we will post the other things that we are linking to from the statement. So I would propose that we also probably also post this letter to that site. Does that make sense since it is one of the outcomes of the meeting? Any objections to posting the letter to the GAC on the ICANN site after -- after? So it is not just an email in the public archive, there is also another place where people can find it. Yes, okay. Good.

The next one is the proposed expectations for the communities which we didn't actually get to come back around to today. Paul, do you want to talk about what the next steps are with that?

PAUL WILSON: Sure. Just very simply, I've said that if there are further comments on the document actually that Joe sent this morning, then please send them -- circulate them on the list by Tuesday next week and I'll attempt to create a new version by the end of the week.

I note that if we are going to try to finalize this in the same two-week period, then it may not -- well, do we want to put it out for community feedback in some way as the charter and scope documents are being circulated? And if so, do I need to accelerate that request in the work that needs to be done?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Maybe we can do the timeline document and that one at the same time and do the charter first because that's really the core document. Just a thought.

PAUL WILSON: Sure. In any case, comments on the timeline for this document as well, please circulate them on the list. I will keep the edit token and try to get a version back as early as possible next week after I have received any remaining comments from you. That's all. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Then for the timeline, Russ, you have the token to do an edit and we will try to wrap that up when? Next week as well?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I will try and do the edit on the plane tomorrow and get it out when I land because then I will be consumed by the IETF meeting.

ALISSA COOPER: Right. Okay. So what we're hoping to do is wrap up both the community expectations and the timeline by next week and then we can have community feedback for a couple weeks on those.

Yes?

PAUL WILSON: That's a good point.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: I have to leave in, like, five minutes to catch my flight. I was just commenting on the communique versus the next week deliverable. In the communique, we say that we have worked on those documents. So if we do not publish them with the communique, people will come out and say you have done work on them. Where are they? Either we wait until the work is done, it is completed so we can show it or we change the language in the communique a little bit to say it is work in progress and it will be published soon.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, I think -- did you catch that, Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK: No, I'm sorry.

ALISSA COOPER: That we might just want to tweak the way that we characterize the community expectations and the timeline in the communique to indicate that their work is in progress because we're not actually going to publish them as final documents today.

KEITH DRAZEK: Got it. Thanks. Thanks, Adiel.

ALISSA COOPER: Great. Okay. Then we had sort of two items in that secretariat discussion. The whole issue of how do we relate to the press and then the selection of the secretariat.

Daniel, who had to step out for another meeting, has sent his summary of that discussion to the list. And we basically have outstanding items there.

He does in the want to continue to be the point person on those topics. So if anyone else would like to be the point person on those topics, you can wave your hands wildly in the air right now or let me know privately or send a note to the list. But we need someone or two people or a team of dedicated secretariat-interested persons to take that up.

MILTON MUELLER: Let the record show that the IETF representative is advocating hand waving.

[Laughter]

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, because in the IETF we are all volunteers. So it is one way to identify you are a volunteer, is to wave your hand.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: I will join.

ALISSA COOPER: Adiel, are you willing to be the point person and recruit help?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: ---

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Okay, great. So Adiel is going to be the point person and other people who want to help him with that should contact him.

Joe had an action item to specify the role of the chairs going forward. Are you going to do that next list on the or you already did it?

>>   ---

ALISSA COOPER: It will be out by Monday. Okay. And then describe the next steps after that.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: The next step was we -- I mean, it will go out over the weekend. I was saying we should give until Tuesday to anyone who wants to comment Tuesday or Wednesday. I know some of you guys are going into meetings. Anyone who wants to comment on that description. And then start one week from there, and then we'll close the process at the end of that.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So starting one week after comments have closed?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah.

ALISSA COOPER: That's what you're saying? I see. Okay.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Because that will be the constituency. And then in the interim, if anyone else wants to volunteer, you know, as a chair, because we have the -- we have the five, but if -- that's not a limit, then -- and we have a hum 3 as the number that we're looking for.

ALISSA COOPER: Right.   So did you think that you needed to resend the call for volunteers?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: No. I was just going to say in case something comes in, that's -- that's not closed off as a concept.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Good. So I think that's all I have on my list. Did I -- what did I miss? Any action items?

KEITH DRAZEK: You didn't get an owner for press.

ALISSA COOPER: I'm sorry?

KEITH DRAZEK: You didn't get an owner for the press, unless Adiel was signing up to --

ALISSA COOPER: Yes. Adiel. That was a combined responsibility.

KEITH DRAZEK: Oh.

ALISSA COOPER: Secretariat and figuring out the press thing. Is that okay?

                        See, that's what happens when you wave your hand in the air.

>>   ---

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. Great. So let's stick around a couple minutes. Keith is banging away on the communique, and when he's done, we will take one more look at that and say some concluding remarks and that's it. Okay. Five-minute break.

[BREAK]

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay, everybody. I've got the updated draft ready for review, if we want to run through it.

ALISSA COOPER: I think we are ready to start again.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Let's go ahead and get started, do one more review of this.

Okay. I'll read again.

"Statement from the First Meeting of the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group (ICG).

The ICG met for the first time on 17-18 July 2014 in London United Kingdom. In this first meeting, the ICG developed a proposed charter and scope for its future work in support of the community's development of a proposal on the IANA function stewardship transition. It also discussed a draft time line for development of the transition proposal and worked on its internal organization, communication needs, and participation processes. Most members of the ICG were on-site while others connected remotely. The meeting was also streamed live to observers in seven different languages."

Milton, is that an acceptable lead-in?

>>   ---

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. So moving on to --

>>   ---

KEITH DRAZEK: Got it. Thank you.

>>   ---

KEITH DRAZEK: "To facilitate ongoing community efforts, the IANA stewardship transition coordination group" --

Actually, we can get rid of that and just leave "ICG."

"To facilitate ongoing community efforts, the ICG was established to coordinate the development of a proposal among the communities affected by the IANA functions. The group has one deliverable: a proposal to the U.S. Department of Commerce (NTIA) recommending a transition plan of NTIA's stewardship of the IANA functions to the Internet community consistent with the key principles outlined in the NTIA March 14th announcement.

The ICG will conduct itself transparently, consult with a broad" --

Yes. Mary?

MARY UDUMA: Yeah. In terms of flow, the -- go back.

KEITH DRAZEK: Sorry. We're technical updating here. I don't think I was showing it in the Adobe room.

>>   ---

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. We're back. Go ahead, Mary.

MARY UDUMA: Okay. From the beginning, don't you think that paragraph, the first paragraph, should come after this one?

                      You know, it's saying we met, but the second paragraph is saying the establishment. I don't know. Go down. The second set of --

>>   ---

MARY UDUMA: Second paragraph. Okay. "To facilitate ongoing community effort, the ICG was established to coordinate," but it had already stated that we met, so I don't know whether bringing in this one, it flows in terms of thoughts.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. I guess the original flow sort of --

MARY UDUMA: Yeah. It was this.

KEITH DRAZEK: Well, the original flow sort of established --

MARY UDUMA: Yeah.

KEITH DRAZEK: -- you know, why we're here, who we are --

MARY UDUMA: Yeah.

KEITH DRAZEK: -- and then what we did.

MARY UDUMA: Uh-huh.

KEITH DRAZEK:	And now we've turned it upside down to basically say, "Here's what we did," and then because this is our very first communication, we're providing the context about who we are and how we got here.
	So it is a little bit, I guess -- it doesn't flow the way I thought it did before, but...
	[Laughter]
KEITH DRAZEK:	But -- so I guess the question is how can we better -- do we want to move this up?
>>	---
KEITH DRAZEK:	Huh?
>>	---
JOSEPH ALHADEFF:	This is Joe. I think the problem is the language of "to facilitate" -- the fact we're talking about "was established."
	I think we can say "an essential element of the ICG is on" -- "is facilitating ongoing community efforts related to the establishment of or the development of," because I think the "was" is what's making it

sound awkward when you've already talked about what you've accomplished.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. So I'll move it back.

Shall we say "the ICG has been established"? Or "is now established"? Because I guess, you know, it was -- it was formed, in a sense. We were called together. But it's really the establishment of a charter, right? That --

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Right. But you could say "an essential element of the establishment of the IANA" -- "of the ICG" --

>> Or you could just say "to facilitate ongoing community efforts, the ICG is coordinating the development." Get rid of all that middle stuff.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Got it. Thank you. Okay. So Mary, let me back up so get back on track and then tell me if that addressed your concern.

Okay. So I'll start from the beginning.

"ICG met for the first time on 17-18 July. In this first meeting, the ICG developed a proposed charter and scope for its future work in support of the community's development of a proposal on the IANA function stewardship transition. It also discussed a draft time line for

development of the transition proposal and worked on its internal organization, communication needs, and participation processes. Most members of the ICG were on-site while others connected remotely.

The meeting was also streamed live to observers in seven languages.

To facilitate ongoing community efforts, the ICG is coordinating the development of a proposal among the communities affected by the IANA functions."

So Mary, is that okay?

MARY UDUMA: Yes.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you.

"The group has one deliverable: a proposal to the U.S. Department of Commerce (NTIA) recommending a transition plan of NTIA's stewardship of the IANA functions to the Internet community consistent with the key principles outlined in the NTIA March 14th announcement.

The ICG will conduct itself transparently, conduct -- consult with a broad range of stakeholders, and ensure that the final recommendation supports the security and stability of the IANA functions. Creation of the ICG was initiated and facilitated by ICANN, and the membership of the ICG has been defined by the Internet communities participating in it as enumerated at" -- and we will include the link to the ICANN Web site.

Then we go back to the background.

"In March of 2014, the U.S. Department of Commerce (NTIA) announced its intention to transition its stewardship role of IANA functions to the global multistakeholder community. As part of this transition, the Internet community has launched a bottom-up multistakeholder effort to develop and deliver a proposal to enable this transition and to meet the criteria set out by NTIA. Substantial efforts are already underway in the respective impacted communities, including but not limited to: For names, in ICANN and country code communities; for numbers, in the RIR community; and for protocol parameters, in the IETF."

>>   ---

KEITH DRAZEK: Sorry?

>>   ---

KEITH DRAZEK: Yes, please.

>>   ---

KEITH DRAZEK: So Paul suggested that as part of this paragraph, we remove "as part of this transition" and just say "the Internet community."

>>   ---

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. And Russ in Adobe, go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks. Thanks, Keith. I'd like to just make one suggestion.

Early up -- I don't see exactly where it's at at this point, where we said "draft time line," change it to "initial time line."

It may really be a draft, but I think it will come across better calling it an initial time line.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: But we don't even agree on it yet, Russ.

KEITH DRAZEK: How about a draft initial time line?

[Laughter]

RUSS MUNDY: I was just trying to leave a little more definitiveness --

KEITH DRAZEK: Well --

RUSS MUNDY: -- but I'm fine with "draft," if you don't want to change it.

KEITH DRAZEK: I'm actually -- this is Keith. I'm actually fine including "draft initial" because it, quite frankly, still is, so --

>>   ---

KEITH DRAZEK: Yes. And I -- Jari mentioned to me earlier, I think we need -- we do need to be cautious on this one because when you say there's a time line, even if you say it's a draft, people are going to immediately go to it and start picking it apart. And later in the document, at the very end, we say that it's available for community input and feedback and all of that, but I do think it's appropriate to be extra cautious here.

RUSS MUNDY: I like your suggestion.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. All right. Thank you. Thank you for yours.

                      Okay. Let's get back to -- so is this where we left off?

"ICG will conduct itself transparently, consult with a broad range of stakeholders, and ensure that the final recommendation supports the security and stability of the IANA functions. Creation of the ICG was initiated and facilitated by ICANN and the membership of the ICG has been defined by the Internet communities participating in it as enumerated at," and we'll include the link.

And then we ran through this already.

Okay.

Next: "Substantial efforts are already underway in the respective impacted communities, included, but not limited to: for names, in ICANN and country code communities; for numbers, in the RIR community; and for protocol parameters, in the IETF.

The ICG meeting minutes and recordings will be available at. The draft charter and a preliminary proposed time line" -- and we can actually use the same language that we used before, "the initial draft" --

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm worried that we're not ready to even post that. I think we need another round and we said two weeks of comments. I mean, the reaction here when we first saw it was pretty brutal so without the text we asked for being put on the front, I'm reluctant to post the versions or --

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Jari?

JARI ARKKO: Is the draft charter now available or is that what you're talking about, Russ?

>> No. The draft charter, I just sent Theresa the final version that I guess will be posted when we post --

JARI ARKKO: It will be. Great, okay.

>> But I actually support Russ' idea. That would also solve (indiscernible) that the people will react negatively and start picking apart our first result.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. We can still say we discussed it in draft -- in initial form.

>> We can say we discussed it and it will be posted in the coming days, or whatever, and then that email will be having, you know, all of those fussy words about, you know, very draft, the early -- please don't consider this final.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. So updating that sentence or that paragraph, "The ICG meeting minutes and recordings will be available at. The draft charter is now available for community review and input at. In the coming days and weeks, the ICG will continue its dialogue with Internet communities. We encourage all interested parties to engage early and often in the community discussions now underway."

Any comments? Any questions?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Do we expect them to want to get in touch with the ICG and do we want to say how they do that?

KEITH DRAZEK: Linn, what's your cell phone number?

[Laughter]

LYNN ST. AMOUR: We're encouraging all interested persons to engage early and often. It does say "community discussions," but I think we just need to think about that for a moment.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay.

ELISE GERICH: So -- oops. May I speak? Elise.

EN

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. Please, Elise, go ahead.

ELISE GERICH: I don't know if we still want to use the Web site that ICANN put up, but there is a link there for community input, so we could just point people to that link, at least in the interim, and collect the input there.

ALISSA COOPER: Where does -- sorry. It's a Web form?

ELISE GERICH: It's on the Web site, the IANA transition Web site or -- I don't know what it's called. I'll put you the link. Just a second. I'll find it.

ALISSA COOPER: Because if it's either the mailing list or the forum, I think we do want to use those just because of what has gone on the last couple weeks.

ELISE GERICH: Okay. I just wanted to mention that --

ALISSA COOPER: But I don't know if that's what you're talking about. That's why I was asking about.

ELISE GERICH: It's the microsite and there's a community input. Let me just -- I'll look it up right now and tell you what the link is. I'll send it to the group, and you can say yes or no.

ALISSA COOPER: Do we want to set up an alias that just goes to our list? Or if we say we will -- we're thinking about setting up an alias or we'll contemplate or whatever.

JARI ARKKO: I think ultimately actually we do need a public list where anyone can post and then our own list which anyone can still look at but they probably can't post on it. So that would be one approach. The other approach is for now send email to the IANA transition list.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Minor wordsmithing. "It also conducted an initial discussion of a draft timeline for development of the transition proposal," et cetera, et cetera.

Okay. Unless there are any other final comments here, I will circulate this Version 5 to the list. Please take another look at it if you feel up to it and send any comments back to the list. I'll consolidate and we will finalize.

ALISSA COOPER: So, sorry, just to close on Lynn's point. We don't -- if we have some way of soliciting input from people, we don't want it to be included in the

statement. I thought you were asking if it should be included in the statement. You were. Okay.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: It was just more a matter of when I read it, it kind of left it hanging. I didn't know if we wanted to close that in some manner. I hadn't actually formed a concrete proposal.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. It is a good question. I think -- I'm struggling with the fact that currently we're relying on the ICANN Web site which is fine as an interim step. We're talking about having our own stand-alone Web site. And I'm a little concerned about putting out a point of communication that could potentially change. I think if we rely on the ICANN Web site for the next week or so and simply post it there, then there's other communication mechanisms associated with that.

JARI ARKKO: Why not the mailing list that people are already using? The IANA transition mailing list?

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah?

JARI ARKKO: Because if we point them to the Web site, even for a week, then we run the risk of getting the same reaction we got earlier.

ALISSA COOPER: So my only question about that is that apparently some people prefer the forum. So if we point to the mailing list, are we angering the people who want to use the forum? I don't know. I have not been involved in any of these discussions. But I have seen that mentioned a few times.

KEITH DRAZEK: I haven't been involved in it either, so I don't have strong feelings one way or the other. I would like for, I guess, specific recommendations as to what we ought to conclude.

ELISE GERICH: We could always include both. That way people who like the forum could do it there. People who like the mailing list could do it there. We will eventually have a secretariat that collates this stuff for us, right? Just put in both. If you like mail lists, you can use it. If you like the forum, you can use it.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: The other question which the last sentence begs is we mentioned there are community discussions now underway. But if you're not part of the community, you have no idea where this discussion is if you would like to join it. I mean, I think perhaps we can put a paragraph saying formal channels of communication are being set up related to these issues and will be posted as soon as they're available so then we can also put a list of the community consultations so we will have a centralized list.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: I like that. I was going to suggest something similar. We're trying to be really timely with respect to getting the communications out which is a really good practice. And I think we are just ahead of some of the other components.

KEITH DRAZEK: What do you think? "So formal communication channels are currently under development and will be posted or communicated as soon as available." Okay.

ALISSA COOPER: I know you said, Keith, you would accept more comments. I thought the idea was that we were actually going to close on this right now.

KEITH DRAZEK: I wasn't looking for substantive comments, just if there were any knits. But I'm hope to close on it now, too.

ALISSA COOPER: I say let's be done.

KEITH DRAZEK: All right. Thanks, everybody.

ALISSA COOPER: Does anybody object to being done?

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, everybody.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes. Thank you very much, Keith. So the ICANN folks are going to -- you can communicate that to them. They will work on getting it posted and the charter. Yes. Thank you very much.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yep.

ALISSA COOPER: So just have one little item of administrivia which is Sam is going to communicate her minutes to us over the next couple of days. Thank you very much for all of your work here the last couple days. We really appreciate it.

So we will have those two sets of minutes, and we also have a report that Alice put together from the call that we did earlier last week. So my proposal would be that we, depending -- on when we get the minutes from Sam, and there's no hurry on those, that we give ourselves a week or a little more than that from the day that we get them, the second set of them or all of the minutes as the deadline for comments on all three of those documents, you know, edits.

And then we can -- Sam will take that back and do the editing and then we can publish those when they are complete. Does that sound okay to everyone? Yeah. Okay.

Great. So with that, I think our business is done. I would personally like to say a huge thank you to everyone from ICANN, for all of the logistical and streaming and the venue and the meal support and the transcription. And huge thank you to the translators for making this accessible to everyone.

[Applause]

And that's it. We have dinner.

NANCY LUPIANO: Yes, we have dinner this evening up on the 23rd floor of the tower elevator. It is in Minako which is the name of the restaurant, and they are ready for you about 7:00.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks.

NANCY LUPIANO: Welcome.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]