

---

ALISSA COOPER:

How about we go ahead, in any event? Folks can see we have one main agenda item here, which is to discuss the approval of the final transition proposal. And then if we have time, we'll talk a little bit about communications plans for Marrakesh.

Jennifer, if you could bring up the V10 version of the proposal, the redline, that would be helpful.

So I think everyone saw that we had communicated to the CWG, asking for confirmation about whether the CCWG proposal meets their requirements. And we got affirmative confirmation back from them that it does. And so I think – and I will admit to not being up to date on all of the e-mails that have come in, in the last few hours, as it's overnight for me. But I think our main task here, at least from my perspective, is to see if we have consensus on this V10 of the text. And I know there have been a few edits that have been suggested, which we can incorporate, editorial things to fix. But to determine whether we have consensus to approve this text as the final version that we can send to the ICANN Board at the appropriate time, and then discuss perhaps what the appropriate time is.

But I'd like to first understand if we have consensus on the text. And I think we saw edits from Manal and Joe, which were editorial in nature. So I think the question for the floor right now is there's anyone who objects to this text or has other edits to raise that haven't been raised on the mailing list so far. That's the first question.

Kavouss, go ahead.

---

*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.*

---

Kavouss, we cannot hear you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Do you hear me now, please?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, we can hear you now. Go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yeah, thank you, Alissa. Good early morning to you. I hope your daughter is very well, is good. It is about one year, and congratulations for that first. This is the first thing.

Second, think we have already approved the report. We were just waiting for the confirmation of CWG. It [inaudible], so I don't think that we have any objections to that. But the only question is that when you need to send that to ICANN to be sent to NTIA. There are two options. One is approving that and allow you to send it, or wait until the Marrakesh meeting is over, about 10<sup>th</sup> of March. This is the only question. I don't think that there is any other issue. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. That's excellent. That is my feeling as well. I just wanted to confirm. So not hearing any objections from anyone else, and everyone in the chat seems to agree that we are good to go with this text. So I think we can declare that we have consensus and communicate that on to the list, since there are some people who have not joined today.

---

And then we can move on to the question of when to send it. And again, I've got e-mail about this that I haven't read, but it's sounding to me like, at least in the best-case scenario, where we have all of the chartering organizations approve in Marrakesh or beforehand, once all of that happens, then it sounds like we have consensus for the ICG to send at that point. We can talk about alternative scenarios in a moment, but I see that I have a queue forming.

So I will stop there and turn it over to Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you, Alissa. Hello, all. It's nice to be back with you. Two points. One is when, and two is how. On the text itself, yes, as many others, I have shown a green tick, that I agreed with [inaudible]. Now, I think what was suggested, my fellow colleague is meeting Thursday, the 10<sup>th</sup>, at the beginning of the public forum session. That would probably be the moment when it would have also the most impact.

Now, the how, I think that I want to make sure, and I'd like [inaudible] that we get in writing the confirmation of all the necessary ticks of boxes. In other words, I would not be content with simply a show of hands or an acclamation of something in the forum. I think we have to have in writing that the CWG has cleared the CCWG as in conformity with its criteria.

I did see a message to you, Alissa, from the co-Chairs, Jonathan and [inaudible]. So that's one thing. Do we need any other written confirmations? And if so, which are they? Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Good points. Just a couple of responses, really quickly. The first is that I don't know if people have seen the scorecard that ICANN has produced, which basically has a checkbox for each organization and for the CWG. And so they have ticked the box for the CWG at this point, and will continue ticking the boxes for the chartering organizations as they approve. So at least there is a visual explanation out there of the status of each of the chartering organizations. I would suggest that we perhaps use that as the written record, because it's simple and that's what the rest of the community will be referring to. And we can ask ICANN for the stable reference to that visual.

I think the other thing to note is we can certainly coordinate, in terms of logistics, with the CCWG to understand when they plan to send their proposal to the Board. I know they have a meeting planned for the morning of March 10. So that might be the time. And we can attend that meeting and ensure that everything is ready to go, and send our proposal at the same time.

The one thing I will say is that if people remember the agreement that we have with the Board and the agreement that CCWG has with the Board, as far as how long they have to consider our proposals before sending them forward to NTIA is different. So the CCWG, I think, they have agreed to turn it over in 48 hours. For us, they said 14 days. I don't really expect that to be of any issue. I think the Board is well aware of what's in our proposal, and so on. But that's the only thing to realize, is that it's possible that by sending a proposal in the morning on the 10<sup>th</sup> and hoping for the Board to transmit it to NTIA in the afternoon of the

---

---

10<sup>th</sup>, that we're giving them less time to consider our proposal. So just something to think about. But from my perspective, that's not a great concern.

Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. I think the consensus is building. Everybody is, at least up to now, agreed that we wait until 10<sup>th</sup> of March. On 10<sup>th</sup> of March, we send the ICG report or proposal forward, and either we have a meeting or we don't have a meeting. If we don't a meeting or we [do not] have a meeting, we authorize you, and the other Vice Chair, the three of you sending the report. If you need to have a call, you could do that. But I think that the first thing we agree, that all of us think that, okay, we have waited about one year up to now. Let's wait another nine days. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Kavouss. Wolf-Ulrich, go ahead.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:

Yes, thanks, Alissa. I could not follow all the e-mails at the end, but I just want also to underline what Kavouss was saying. I am also of the opinion we are to wait until the very last moment, until the CCWG proposal has been approved by the chartering organizations and then deliver it. Also, I understand that from a formal point of view, maybe could do otherwise, since we are only asking the CCWG whether their criteria has been met, and they answered in a positive way already. But

---

just saying, from the call we had yesterday within the GNSO Council about our internal process, I'm not sure that the CCWG proposal is [that] ready at the time being today. And I would say that we would be ready to submit the proposal at the time being. So we should wait for the terms of that. It would also give us, in addition, from a publishing point of view, let me say, a better situation.

So I think, let me say in this way, if only the CCWG is going to be submitted on Thursday, then they will get all the applause from the public. And I think you also, and this could also some applause from that public, so that would be the best moment to do so. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. Just one note on the applause, which we had on the agenda for our next item anyway, is that the Communications Sub Group has been working with the ICANN Communications folks and ISOC, and others, to discuss the celebratory moment. And actually, what the discussion was oriented towards having it be very inclusive of all of the communities and the ICG, and to do that, to have the moment that people focus on be when both of the proposals get sent to NTIA, as opposed to when either one gets sent to the Board, since the Board will still have to consider them. And they won't still be with NTIA yet, just when they're with the Board. So that was the strategy anyway, to make sure that the celebration and the applause can be as inclusive as possible, even if we had sent the proposal today or tomorrow. But certainly having it all happen on day is a little more dramatic.

Jean-Jacques, go ahead.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: When we say it's about the how the proposal will be transmitted, I remember that as early as ICANN 50 meeting in London, I was the one who had proposed the exact mechanism by which this would be sent to the administrator of the NTIA, via the Chair of the ICANN Board. So there was a very clear reason for this. It was the formulation I have proposed. And I think that was subsequently accepted and not questioned. It would make clear right from the beginning that the ICANN Board was the conduit through which the proposal would be submitted to the NTIA, but that it would not be altered or changed in anyway. So the consequence of this is that the proposal signed by US Chair has to be addressed to the administrator of the NTIA, care of, or [kind] care of, the Chair of the ICANN Board, and not any other formulation.

As for the delay, I think that, having been, myself, on the ICANN Board, I think 24 hours will not be fair, because not all the Board members are necessarily available on short notice. I would say we don't need to specify any time. I'm sure they will do it as fast as they can, in a matter of a few days, and send it on to the NTIA administrator. I just wanted to make sure that I have your guarantee that the transmission is the way I have just [reminded us]. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. That's a good point. Thank you for reminding us. I think what I can do is share on the list the drafted message that we would intend to send forward, and then people can comment on that. I

think that the only difficulty that I envision with your proposal is that, per exactly what you just said, I would want to remind the Board of the agreement that we have with them, in terms of transmitting the proposal unmodified. And so the message is actually directed to Secretary Strickland. It's a little bit confusing to do that, because it's not really a message for him. That's a message for the Board. So we can hash that out on the mailing list and see what people's preferences are. If people have comments about that here, that would be useful. But I'm not exactly sure how to handle that.

Martin, go ahead.

MARTIN BOYLE:

Thanks very much, Alissa. Yeah, I must admit, I agree with the process for moving forward. It seems to me to be a good one. I've got a little question in that I'm still not particularly clear in my own mind when the chartering organizations are expected to have all given the Accountability Group their response to the current draft proposal. But I am assuming that that will all be done by close of play on the Wednesday night.

So we're now on the basis that we're overall assuming that the Accountability Group will have agreement and will be then sending its proposal to the Board. I'd actually like to try and [inaudible] our minds the process of submitting to the Board for onward transmission to the NTIA, from that stage of onward transition to NTIA. What I think we are doing, and probably need to do, is respond very, very quickly to the CWG Accountability's agreement to the document. And when it says it's

---

complete, ask them to say, “And here is the overall proposal.” I see that as being quite important in that the Board then has quite a clear picture in its own mind that everything now is in place. So it then has its processes, 48 hours for them, 14 days for us. I’m not quite sure why they need 14 days for us, but never mind. But they have actually got that picture, and everything then is mapped out.

Now, I certainly do not expect the Board, as it’s meeting on the 10<sup>th</sup> of March, to turn round and say, “Okay, now we’ve received these documents, and we’re going to agree to onward transmission,” at that stage. But I do think there is definitely very clear advantage for us to support the Accountability Group’s document by saying, “This actually meets the requirements. We have put it in to the proposal, and here is the proposal we’re going to forward to you.” Because I think we could end up with us wondering at a later stage whether we should wait until the Board has gone through its 48 hours with the Accountability proposal before we submit. And I wouldn’t like us to get there. But I think we get it onto the table as soon as the CCWG has said, “This document is ready.” Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks, Martin. I think I agree with everything you just said. Just to note that I believe the Board is, in fact, expecting to transmit the proposal to NTIA on the afternoon of the 10<sup>th</sup>, and they are prepared to do that. And they are familiar with the content of the proposals and have considered them at length, obviously, in the past. So although it may seem unusual for the Board’s process, that is, in fact, the expectation. The Board, I think, is prepared to do that, at least as far as I understand.

---

I don't want to speak for the Board. And unfortunately, Kuo could not be with us today. But that's my understanding at the moment.

Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, many suggestions or proposal was made. First, send the ICG proposal to NTIA. It goes through ICANN. ICANN would not attach that. But if they want to add some comment, they would do it in a separate way. Therefore, the report of the ICG will be intact, without any changes. However, it might have some comments from ICANN, as appropriate. This is something that should be clear. We have decided already, many meetings before.

Second, I don't think that we need to send anything to CWG, apart from thanking them. That's all. And we don't want to send them that, yes, we now decided to send to the NTIA. This is a message to everybody. If we decide to NTIA to the ICANN on 10<sup>th</sup> of March, we will announce it to everybody without writing neither to CWG, nor the CCWG. The only thing that we have to have a date, and this date must be 10<sup>th</sup> of March. And we have to have a positive message to outside world that we are waiting about a year from the last time. And now we have decided to send it on 10<sup>th</sup> of March, no doubt after considering the proposals of the charter organizations. We did not change our report at all, because we can't do anything about what they say. The only thing, that we just wait for the matter of courtesy, to [inaudible]. I don't think that any reply from any charter organization has impact on the ICG report. That goes

---

to the NTIA, and that is up to NTIA to look into the chartering organization and CCWG. But we don't take any action at all. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Kavouss. And just to clarify, I think, on Jean-Jacques's proposal, it's not that we send our proposal directly to NTIA. It's that we send it to the ICANN Board Chair. But we write our note to NTIA and we address it in care of the ICANN Board. I understand that to be the proposal. And I will say, I personally would prefer just to address it to the Board Chair, because I think that's what we are meant to do, and it's a little more straightforward.

Daniel, go ahead.

DANIEL KARREBERG:

Thank you, Alissa. To the later question, I have no opinion either way. I just wanted to reemphasize what I heard Martin say, and also what I read in Jari's proposal on how to proceed, which many people have agreed on over the mailing list. I think what we should prevent at all costs is that our proposal gets transmitted a microsecond later than the CCWG one. I would prefer, personally, to have it transmitted as soon as possible, but it should certainly not go any later than the CCWG one. So therefore, I propose that we explicitly authorize you, as the Chair, to send the proposal without the further meeting with the ICG, as soon as the CCWG has agreed on its proposal. But certainly, we should not be later than the CCWG. That would [inaudible] [justice] and it would also look very strange. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Daniel. Agreed. Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, thank you, Alissa. I just wanted to make the point again. And now this is to your remark, Alissa. That is not inconsistent with what I was maintaining. Your letter would be to the administrator of the NTIA, [kind] care of the Chair of the ICANN Board. You can [inaudible] it to the Chair of the ICANN Board, thanking him for the diligence of the Board it shows in transmitting, etc. But the result of our work should be addressed to the administrator of the NTIA, because we got our marching orders not from the Board, but from the NTIA. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Kavouss? Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. For instance, we say that, to the authority that we want to send, to [your authority] as act as a post office. Therefore, we could address that to the NTIA, whoever name would be, and then via or to ICANN Board. And that is the situation. Then when ICANN receive that to send it at the post office, if they have any comment, they would add that. I have no problem with the proposal of Jean-Jacques. The effect of both will be the same. Thank you.

---

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Kavouss. Okay, I think on that question, Chair can draft something and share it on the list. And hopefully we can hammer out the finer points that way. It shouldn't be too tricky, I think.

Any other comments on this topic we've already discussed?

Okay. Oh, Mary, go ahead. Mary, did you want to speak? It doesn't look like it.

Russ Mundy, go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY: Hi, thanks, Alissa. Just one quick comment. I've seen in the chatroom discussions of publishing on the website, which I think we absolutely want to do. But just for clarity, the plan is to also send it as an attachment to the e-mail, the report itself, attached in the e-mail that goes to the Board. Is that right? That was my understanding of what we were planning to do. Website and attached to e-mail.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, they will publish on the website for sure, and send an e-mail.

RUSS MUNDY: Great, thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Mary? Mary, we can't hear you, unfortunately.

---

Okay, it looks like Mary is having audio issues. So the one other... So we've talked a lot about the best-case scenario and getting this done in Marrakesh. If there is any other outcome, I think, other than all of the chartering organizations approve, then my suggestion would be that we, when we get to the end of the Marrakesh meeting, if that's the situation that we're in, that we schedule a follow-up conference call, perhaps for the following week, to discuss what to do. So I don't think we should make a plan or any particular commitment right now as to what to do in that case, since we don't know exactly what the nature of that would look like. So I'd like to hear comments about that.

Jari, go ahead.

JARI ARKKO:

Yeah, I think that's right. I might consider one special case though. So I don't know how feasible this is or likely, but if there's some small edits and there's some negotiation going on at the last moment, and the CWG tells us again that, "Okay, this didn't change what we told you earlier," then I think we'd still be find to go ahead.

ALISSA COOPER:

That sounds reasonable to me. And I know that, I think, in talking to the CCWG co-Chairs yesterday, that they are willing to make editorial fixes if people spot them. So would appreciate hearing from other folks about that as well. So if there's really no consensus among the chartering organizations to approve, then we will schedule a call. If the only thing that happens is editorial changes or if the nature of whatever changes may get made between now and the 10<sup>th</sup> are such that all of the

---

chartering organizations approve the proposal and the CWG does as well, then we can continue with the plan that we discussed on the call.

Go ahead, Daniel.

DANIEL KARREBERG: I think we should [inaudible] call before the 10<sup>th</sup>. And I think we should keep that slot in mind in case something really unforeseen happens. So I will at least keep it in my agenda, just as an emergency opportunity to talk to each other if something really unforeseen happens. And otherwise, I agree.

ALISSA COOPER: Good point. We actually don't have it in the agenda yet, because we are still, I think, Doodling for it. But, yes, we will keep that call. It's probably going to end up on the Wednesday. We will keep that call on the agenda, possibly until the last minute, if we decide to cancel. So apologies to folks, if your time zone is not conducive. But I think we should absolutely keep that call on the agenda until we know that we don't need it. Good point. Once we get it on the agenda, which we haven't quite done yet, but we will very soon.

Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Alissa. I just want to support Daniel's remark and his suggestion. And then remotely in Marrakesh, I would very much insist

---

on whatever meeting we had in April to [inaudible] remote participation. I really intend to be part of this final stretch. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, definitely. Thank you. Martin, go ahead.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks so much, Alissa. It's just a point of clarification for me. It just seemed to me that doing a call of the ICG on Wednesday, the 9<sup>th</sup>, it's a bit early for having all the input from all the chartering organizations. So we might have some indication by then of there being issues. But it would seem to me that we might just be having a call that's discussing rumors, rather than actual outcomes. So I was just questioning the timing, as to why we thought earlier in the week, rather than essentially Thursday morning, which is when we would have expected all the chartering organizations to have responded. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. So, to be clear, I think we've agreed. We do not need another call to agree to go forward. So that's not... Originally, that's not why we scheduled that particular call. We just wanted to have a slot during the ICANN week in case we needed it for something. But I think, on the basis of this call, we have agreed that we don't need it in order to proceed, if all the chartering organizations approve. I think what we could use that call for is if we know by that point that we're in some other scenario that warrants discussion. So if we don't know by the time we have the slot or if everything is looking good, then we can cancel the

---

call. And as for the timing, I think there might have been a Thursday slot on the Doodle as well, but mostly the times are challenge because of tech support and other ongoing meetings. It took a very long time for us to hammer out the logistics with ICANN for this call. And so there just aren't that many slots available, which is why we have the slots on the Doodle that we have. So hopefully that answers the question. Okay.

Any other comments about the proposal and the process at the end here? Daniel?

DANIEL KARREBERG:

Yeah, I think it's important that you ask the question whether there are any objections against you actually transmitting this final report, once the Accountability stuff is dealt with. Let's put it that way. Because I think that's important that everybody agrees that that's what's going to happen, unless something unforeseen happens, just for clarity.

ALISSA COOPER:

Sure, yeah. So happy to do that. So would like to know now if there are any objections to the ICG transmitting the proposal, assuming there is approval of the CCWG proposal by all the chartering organizations by March 10<sup>th</sup>.

Jari, go ahead.

JARI ARKKO:

Yes, I have no objection. I wanted to ask for further clarification if the rule exactly all chartering organizations, or no one will check. I don't

---

know what the rule is exactly, but we should use the exact rule. Otherwise, I agree. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

So maybe other folks can speak to this better than I can, since I was really only waiting for the confirmation from the CWG. But I believe all of them are expected to say something, one way or the other.

Kavouss, go ahead.

Kavouss, you are muted. We can't hear you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

ICG and CWG. If any chartering organization opposed to the process of CWG, saying that is not adequate or sufficient, then we should react. Otherwise, if any chartering organization oppose totally with one recommendation or agree with the recommendation with some comment, there is nothing to do with the ICG. That is something between the CCWG and the NTIA and ICANN. So we don't think. The only area that we need to react if chartering organizations put the CWG outcome in question as a result of the CCWG. That we don't know. Other things, I don't think that we should rely on the reply of the chartering organizations. No doubt, some chartering organization may have some comments on the particular recommendation. That should not affect or impact the work of ICG. We should go ahead, once again, on just the CWG proposal is put in question in chartering organization. In other cases, we don't need to react. Thank you.

---

ALISSA COOPER:                      Okay, so maybe we should rephrase the call for objections. Russ Mundy, go ahead first before I do that.

RUSS MUNDY:                        All right, thanks, Alissa. It does seem to me that the only focus of our concern has to do with the seven key points the CWG output and that if any changes, editorial or whatever, occur to the CCWG, a proposal that impacts that, then the CWG needs to tell us. And I think that's the only hang-up, if you will, that the chartering organizations or editorial changes might have in achieving the final approval is, for us, the seven key points. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:                      Thank you. Daniel, go ahead.

DANIEL KARRENBERG:                Thank you. Exactly what –

ALISSA COOPER:                      Someone is typing very loudly. Please mute.

DANIEL KARRENBERG:                Exactly what Russ said, it's basically if CWG calls halt, that should be the only criteria that would stop us. They have said go ahead, as far as I'm concerned. But if CWG tells us they changed it in a way that's no longer acceptable to us, then we should stop. Anything else should be not our concern. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. So rephrasing the call for objection, I'd like to know if anyone objects to the ICG transmitting our proposal, assuming that the CWG approval that we've received still stands, after CCWG has concluded its process by March 10<sup>th</sup>.

Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, I agree with your multipart proposal. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Anyone else? Any objections?

Okay. Hearing none, I think we have consensus to move forward with that plan. I see a lot of people typing. Hopefully those aren't typing objections. If you object, you have to get in the queue.

Okay, I don't think we have any objections. So I think we have consensus to go forward with the plan. And obviously, the Secretariat will [minute] that. So unless we have any other comments on this, I'd like to just take one moment to talk a little bit about the communications plan.

I see no hands. I think we can move on to that. I had sent a message to the list after the Communications Sub Group met last week to update people about our plans, and wanted to just provide a little bit more detail, as we had another call with the sub group yesterday.

So as I said, if everything works out in Marrakesh and both of the proposals end up being transmitted to the ICANN Board on the 10<sup>th</sup>, and if the Board feels confident that they will be submitting those to NTIA in the public Board meeting on the 10<sup>th</sup>, then ICANN is also arranging for a press conference to occur right after that Board meeting and to have involvement from the whole community, actually, to have essentially occur in the ballroom, where the Board meeting will be, but to have specific involvement from the ICG and us, as Chairs. So I wanted to just flag that for people. That's still in the works. There will be further coordination with ICANN and with the CCWG, and we can share some of those key messages. I don't think they will be surprising to anyone. Obviously, there's the same messages about our approval of the proposal and how it meets the criteria, and so forth, that we've documented in the past and that we've documented in the proposal itself. So I just wanted people to be aware that that is going on, and there will likely be some further media outreach that happens. And we will follow the same process we've used before, which is essentially triaging it in the Communications Sub Group.

But the other note that I wanted to make is that we are definitely, again assuming that everything works out, keen to amplify the message within all of your communities. And to do that, we want to make sure that we have an understanding of where you might be doing outreach or speaking about the proposal, or why we approved it and why we think it meets the criteria, and so on. So to the extent that people start to plan activities where you are speaking publicly about the proposal or the process or anything like that, please send those to the list or send them to me, and I can share them with the Communications Sub Group,

---

---

just so we can keep track of all the opportunities to amplify the message.

That was all that I had. Any other comments on that, or anything else? Kavouss?

Kavouss, we're not hearing you. We seem to have lost your audio, Kavouss.

Let's go to Russ while we work on Kavouss's audio.

RUSS MUNDY:

Thanks, Alissa. Quick question. Does the communications group plan to have anything publishing on Twitter or our website or anything prior to the Marrakesh meeting? If it is, then we can keep an eye on when it comes out and retweet or things like that. Or should we just wait for the meeting itself?

ALISSA COOPER:

So I think from an ICG perspective, we do not have plans to be tweeting or otherwise communicating before we send the proposal on. That's kind of the event that we will be promoting, from an ICG perspective. There's other people in the broader communications group that we're working with. Obviously, ICANN is doing a bunch of promotional activity in advance of the meeting. The publication of the scorecard was the first one of those, and they have ongoing updates that Samantha Dickinson writes, and so on. So to the extent that you want to amplify something, there's messaging coming from ICANN, and probably also from other places, perhaps from other parts of the community. But the ICG

---

specifically is not, because we don't have something to say at this time.  
We're going to wait until we have an event to report on.

Kavouss, let's try it again.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Do you hear me, please?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I said that are you on any other business or not yet?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, we are now on any other business.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I don't know if this is the last call of last meeting of ICG or not. If that is the last meeting and last formal call, I would like to say something. If it is not, I'll keep it for the next meeting. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Well, this is, I think, the nature of our work. We never know when our last call is, because it depends on what happens going forward. So this may be our last call. This may not be our last call. We'll have to wait to find out, at least until Marrakesh. We have another call on the schedule.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: In any case, I wish to make the following statement, if you allow me.

ALISSA COOPER: Sure, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Assuming that it will be our last formal call, we remember from the very beginning that we had started to have this ICG. There was a very, very long journey, and there was a lot of activities of many people, starting from Chair to Vice Chair, and some of the colleagues dealing with drafting groups I don't want to name, like Manal, Joe, and others. And we have spent considerable amount of time. We have sometimes dispute with each other. We have sometimes disagree with other. Sometimes we were hard and stern with each other. Nevertheless, as a group, we have managed to do our role in an acceptable and satisfactory manner.

So I would like, as a participant or member of ICG, express my sincere gratitude to you, Alissa, and to your two Vice Chairs, and to entire 30 members of the ICG, and in particular those people who have spent considerable amount of time preparing some drafts, some resume of the public comments. And also, we would like to take the opportunity and sincerely thank the ICANN staff who made all assistance to us before. We have a devoted and Secretariat. And since we have the Secretariat of ICG, Jennifer Chung, who would like to also express our thanks to her activities. She was, and still is, a very open and kind

---

persons, provide every assistance to us. And I think we, members of the ICG, should be proud that we have done, to the best of our ability, what we could have done. And I think there is nothing that we will be criticized, and I think we should be happy that, under the leadership of yourself and the two Vice Chairs, and collaborations of others and all participants, we have accomplished our job. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Kavouss, for the kind words. And I think everyone is probably in agreement and still carrying forward the warm feelings from our last face-to-face meeting. So thank you for that.

Any other business to discuss? We're three minutes to the hour, so right on time.

Okay, well, seeing no hands, I will say my own personal thanks to all of you, and the Secretariat and tech team and interpretation, for your support today and since July of 2014. And hopefully we will be communicating on the list only, going forward, and will conclude our work on the 10<sup>th</sup>. But we will certainly keep in touch, and the Chairs will be circulating a draft message cover letter for the transmission of our proposal. So look out for that. And for those who will be in Marrakesh, we will see you shortly. Thanks, everyone.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**