

---

ISTANBUL – IANA Coordination Group Meeting  
Saturday, September 6, 2014  
Istanbul, Turkey

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Good morning. Can we please get seated?

So while people are seated, let me take a couple of practical and logistical reasons -- issues.

You can find the agenda in the Dropbox in the email but also on paper outside the room.

Coffee and lunch will be on my left, in that general direction in the next room.

We -- whenever -- when the meeting starts, we want everyone to state their name for the interpreters and the recording. This is publicly -- this is recorded. It's publicly distributed and transmitted. We will have as many silent observers in the room as we can fit, and I think given the room's size as given, I think the air volume is probably what limits people's ability to participate.

We will keep the doors open as much as we can. And I think that is approximately everything that I have as logistical issues for now.

We are using interpretation, as you know.

And with that, let me hand over the microphone to Hartmut.

HARTMUT GLASER:

Are you sure?

---

*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.*

---

[ Laughter ]

We have a selection process to see who is the senior, and I was the winner.

[ Laughter ]

[ Applause ]

My understanding is we only need to clarify the way how we will work today and how we will give up the chairman -- chairmanship.

I was surprised for this discussion. I was really -- it's not the way that I like to work, but we have the problem that Alissa cannot be with us today and we have two co-chairs and they have some meetings together and they decide to share the work today, and I think we only need to accept this proposal. I think we don't need to go in other details.

Is there any comment about this procedure? Someone likes to --

[ Applause ]

Okay. This was very easy for me. Thank you very much. They already decide. I think the morning session will be Patrik and the after- -- or the reverse? So Mohamed --

>>

(off microphone.)

[ Laughter ]

---

HARTMUT GLASER: So take over, Mohamed. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you very much, Hartmut.

Good morning, everyone. Good afternoon and good evening for the participants who are following up remotely. I would like also to welcome ICG -- new ICG members attending for the first time the face-to-face meeting. We're really delighted to have them here joining us, and hopefully today we really have a collaborative work to achieve the agenda items that we have in front and we make progress.

So we will start the meeting with the roll call and the introduction of the members.

I think we -- and this time, this is maybe the biggest ICG face-to-face meeting, so we will try to make it short and brief. So if you can just kindly state your name and the community that you're coming from. I can start with myself.

Mohamed El Bashir. I'm representing ALAC.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: My name is Lars-Johan Liman and I'm one of the two co-chairs of the Root-Server System Advisory Committee which I represent.

DANIEL KARREBERG: I'm Daniel Karrenberg. I'm also from the Root-Server System Advisory Committee.

---

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm Russ Housley. I'm here from the IAB.

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko representing IETF.

XIAODONG LEE: Xiaodong Lee from the ccTLD.

HARTMUT GLASER: Hartmut Glaser from ASO.

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Lynn St. Amour appointed by the IAB.

MILTON MUELLER: Milton Mueller appointed by the GNSO.

KUO-WEI WU: Kuo-Wei Wu from the ICANN board, liaison.

JON NEVETT: Jon Nevett from the gTLD registries.

---

MARY UDUMA: Mary Uduma, ccNSO.

KEITH DRAZEK: Keith Drazek -- sorry. Keith Drazek, gTLD registries.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Keith Davidson from ccNSO.

DEMI GETSCHKO: Demi Getschko from ISOC.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Joseph Alhadeff, ICC/BASIS.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben from GNSO.

PAUL WILSON: Paul Wilson from the NRO.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Adiel Akplogan from the NRO.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JANDYR SANTOS: I'm Jandyr Santos from the GAC.

---

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Michael Niebel from the GAC.

MANAL ISMAIL: Manal Ismail from the GAC.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Kavouss Arasteh, GAC.

NARELLE CLARK: Narelle Clark from the Internet Society.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Heather Dryden, chair of the Governmental Advisory Committee. Good morning, everyone.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Patrik Faltstrom, chair of SSAC and appointed by them.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you very much. I assume that already we started recording even with introductions, so we can start with the first agenda items.

The first agenda item is --

ELISE GERICH: Do we want to announce the --

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: -- is basically the --

ELISE GERICH: -- people on the remote participants?

Elise Gerich, liaison from ICANN.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: All right. We want to introduce the remote participants as well. Okay.  
We have Elise --

They can introduce themselves. They can hear us.

ELISE GERICH: Elise Gerich, ICANN liaison, vice president, IANA.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Seems we have only Elise. Good to have you remotely.

We can start the meeting by the first agenda items, which is a summary of ICG activities between the first meeting in London and this meeting.

As you know, in the previous period, we have managed to finalize selection of the chair and the vice chairs. Alissa has been appointed as the chair. Patrik Faltstrom and myself, Mohamed El Bashir, has been appointed as vice chairs. And we did extensive work in terms of finalizing a draft RFP that has been published two days ago, and unfortunately it seems there was a miscommunication in terms of the

---

publication but it's a draft RFP and the aim of this meeting is to finalize the RFP and publish the final RFP.

And we did extensive work, as well, in the independent secretariat work. We have an RFI -- an RFP process already there, and we put an announcement as well. We will discuss in details in the agenda items regarding the independent secretariat that we have.

Also, there was lots of exchanges of email regarding the consensus-building document.

There was also discussion regarding a time line which hopefully we're going to discuss in this meeting in a separate agenda.

So there is lots of work that has been, let's say, completed and we're making good progress and hopefully details could also be discussed in the separate agenda items which we have.

Okay. Mr. Arasteh, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Thank you, Mohamed.

You just forgot to say that we have formally adopted the agenda, one, and you have not mentioned the name of the chair, who is not with us.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Okay. I think we -- there is no objection of adopting the current agenda and we are already adopting the agenda.



---

And myself, Mohamed El Bashir, will be chairing this session, and Alissa Cooper unfortunately apologizes, and Patrik will take over the second part of the session. Yeah.

I'm just being reminded that we have Jean-Jacques Subrenat is also on the remote participation. I'll just give him the mic just to introduce himself. In can you hear us, Jean-Jacques?

Okay. So he's following up with us and will be participating remotely. So we can move on to the agenda item, the review of the status of the different ICG documents that currently we have. We're going to ask ICG members who are the focus points or the editors to provide us an update regarding the status of the documents currently.

Also, we will be discussing the different topics in a separate agenda item for discussions. So this is for the focus point editors to give us their update.

So I will start with the RFP.

PAUL WILSON:

Thank you, Mohamed.

I think you covered it fairly well, that we have a draft document that was released without exactly an agreement on -- it seems we had not agreed on releasing it.

I actually personally did expect it was going to be released before this meeting as a draft. I wasn't exactly surprised but surprised that we need to clarify these things. Clearly we do.

---

We are going to talk to the RFP document in detail in the next half the day, in the second half of the day. And I think what we need to clarify obviously is what exactly we are going to release after this meeting.

I'm hoping that we're still releasing a draft which will have a substantial time for comment because, of course, this is probably the most important document that we have. And on it hinges all of the responses and the final result that we are going to have. So I hope -- I would hope we would be releasing a document as a draft we'd be providing ample time for feedback but, of course, releasing it in something like a near-to-complete draft on which some work can start for all those who are satisfied with it.

I hope the finalization of it is not kind of necessary for people to even start thinking about it.

The other question would be how are we going to solicit feedback on the document. Are we going to ask questions about it or simply release it for feedback and I suppose that's all we need to do.

I think that's all I need to say about it until we start talking about it between -- and that will be between 12:00 and 1:00 p.m. today. Thanks.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Okay. Joseph, if it's a discussion point regarding the RFP, can we defer it to the RFP part or --

---

JOSEPH ALHADEFF:                   Actually, it goes not to the substance of the RFP but I think the confusion was in the language related to the release. Not the surprise that it was released but the lack of sufficient clarity in the language related to the release. I think that was the problem. If it was a little clearer that it was a draft, then I think everyone would have been okay with it. I think just the -- we need more clarity when we make those statements of what the purpose of the document is. That was the only comment.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:               Okay. I think I will give it to Narelle and then Jari.

NARELLE CLARK:                   I think the other thing that was missing is a time frame for when -- within which people could make comments about the draft RFP.

JARI ARKKO:                        Yes. So I think the only mistake was that we didn't say that this is a draft and the time line of sending out a correction, that that's what we do in other organizations when something like this happens and mistakes do happen, so no problem. Let's not get too worked up on it.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:               Yeah. Mr. Arasteh?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:                Yes. I have no problem that the document sent out be draft, but I heard that we are waiting for or seeking for comments. Then these comments

---

should be included in the final RFP. Where and how we do that, we have to discuss that. This is number one.

Number two, any draft which has been published should be identical to what was at least draft by us by Turkey. There is something different published. There was words that was deleted and substituted by another term. We had "including" somewhere and now is replaced by "i.e.," which is entirely different. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Arasteh. I'd just like to remind everyone just to state their names for the transcript before they speak.

I think there is a correction announcement has already been published, so it's clear now it's a draft, and I think, yes -- I mean, Paul is the person ensuring that comments already are captured with further -- in further versions.

On the Dropbox, I think we have the latest version, which is -- also has been published.

So I think we can move to the next document. We have the independent secretariat RFP, and Adiel could give us a brief.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Thank you, Mohamed.

On the secretariat process we have two steps. We have, first, the Expression of Interest -- call for Expression of Interest. And that one is

---

already published since September 2nd. And we have the RFP itself. The latest version of the RFP is in the Dropbox.

I thank you all for your contribution to that. I think it has been probably the less controversial document we have worked on the list so far. But based on the document that we agree on -- I worked with Daniel, Russ and the ICANN procurement team to finalize an RFP. That RFP is meant to be published Monday so that we can receive proposals from a company or people who want to run the secretariat for the ICG.

One thing in the RFP that we may need to look at is the timeline. It will be released on the 8th, Monday then. And it will be open until the 22nd of September. There will be between that step where potential applicant can send their question, I mean, related to the RFP. And there will be a consolidated response to those questions that will be sent back to them before the closure of the RFP.

Now, what we probably need to discuss and agree on is the final selection of the secretariat. I don't think we have another point on the agenda to discuss those details. So I will raise them right now. We need to have a selection committee, and the proposal here is to have a different selection committee, done of those who work on the RFP for the selection. And the objective will be for that committee to look at the short-list-selected applicant and make a final proposal to the ICG.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Sorry, Adiel, sorry. But there is a specific part of the agenda for the secretariat and definitely there --

---

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: I raise the question and probably we discuss it then.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you very much.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: That is roughly what I can report on that. There has been confusion as well on the release of the Expression of Interest as well. It was released as the RFP. I think that was also a mistake that I think is now corrected. So what is now published is request of the Expression of Interest. That is the process that allows the procurement team to have at least the contact detail of those who want to apply so they can more easily communicate to them during the process, if needed. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Mr. Arasteh, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, Arasteh. Yes, it mentioned between the release and the deadline there would be some question raised. Who will answer those questions? Just for clarity of the minutes. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you very much for this question. I think I will just defer it to the agenda item because this question and other questions regarding who also to evaluate and what are the process to evaluate the proposals that we need to discuss in the group can be discussed in that agenda item. Thank you for that question.

---

We can move to the timeline document with Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Good morning.

>> (off microphone).

[ Laughter ]

RUSS HOUSLEY: Good morning, Russ.

So the timeline document has had a couple of revisions since we met last and the last one we sent out earlier this week, several days ago. And the changes to it were to align with the date that was in the draft RFP that Paul Wilson already talked about. We put in that date that we want the communities to respond by the 31st of December. And the last version of the timeline had 31 January. So I moved it back that month and the dominoes that resulted from that.

That was the only change to the last version. So I'm hoping that we can get further on this timeline, and I think it's important that we share it with the community so that they know that what they send and what the review process to expect for what they send. That, I think, is the most important part.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Paul, please.

---

PAUL WILSON: I agree. The timeline is really important. I'm missing it on the Dropbox, though. Is it there?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I emailed it. I don't know that -- we can get it there.

PAUL WILSON: I will create a folder on there.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: So since we are in agreement on that agenda item, we need at least to finalize it and discuss it further. It will be good to have it in Dropbox so everyone could look at the document.

So now we have the consensus-building process document.

Wolf, please.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Good morning, everyone. Thank you. With regards to the consensus building document, we had an extensive exchange on the list over the last time. And what I did, I tried to polish as much as possible the document and send out the last version last midnight or so of that.

I would like to thank all the participants in the discussion about that because it was very useful and it is still a useful to exchange and bring to the point the main issues we have.



---

So the status, I would say, and as I have mentioned on my email, we are, more or less, so busy with all the polishing of some of the items we had in the past and we are now related to the last points to be discussed which is the question of how to find consensus, what kind of measurements we are going to take.

And this is in regards to the questions of quorum and in regards to questions of recommendations. It is still open. And I would say -- and I would expect discussion we will have later on in the day, so we really focus on these parts of the document and try to find a solution.

What I will highlight as well is that we should look at this document in the future as a living document that it might be altered and amended in the future, depending on issues that may be raised as well. So far that's the status. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Mr. Arasteh, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you all who has participated very tirelessly for this simple but complex process.

I sent the last comment 1:00 in the morning today. It's not change of substance, but it just change of some structural things. This is number one.

Number two, I have no problem to be a live document. But once we meet and we want to decide the document that we decide on which is no longer live at that meeting, so we should have something. We

---

should not be always changing everything and so on. You could have something for today to decide. If you want to change it between now and next meeting, you can do that based on exchange. But I don't believe we should get in such a very lengthy and difficult discussions. I think we are all about very, very close to agree with each other.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Thank you very much, Mr. Arasteh.

I think as Wolf also mentioned, we have three -- two major points just to finalize. And hopefully in the discussion of that agenda item, we can finalize those.

On Dropbox, I can see that there is a new version. Maybe that's your version. It is draft Version 5ka4September. This is the document you are talking about. Okay. Where -- did you send it to the mailing list or put it in Dropbox? Please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Arasteh. No, Chairman. The version that I am talking of this morning, 6 of September. I sent to all of you. It is -- the date is 6 September. And the time also is on the email. So please look at that. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:

I remember that email, but there wasn't an attachment. I couldn't find the attachment to that email in the morning. Is that what you mean?

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I will give it to Heather, and we will sort out the latest version of the document.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you very much. I just wanted to suggest that since we're discussing this later today, that that would be a good time to work through some of these issues, and we will also have an opportunity in the breaks as well to clarify any of those details that we were getting into.

I did want to ask when we were going to cover the agenda I'm summary of ICG activities since the previous meeting, if we were going to take a few minutes. A few of us had indicated an interest in summing up from the perspective of the communities we represent. So I would like to do that. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. We have already an agenda item for that. So it is going to follow. We didn't reach that point yet. We will give a chance to community members to report what's happening in their activities.

Narelle, do you want to speak? Do you want to speak?

NARELLE CLARK: There is a whistle tone going off in the background here that is going to really annoy me for the rest of the day. So I'm asking the background attendees to turn it off.

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Maybe Arasteh can resend the document, and we can discuss it later on. We can move on to the agenda item IANA functions, transition request for proposals, RFP. We are in the final stages, and hopefully we can agree on final version of the RFP, which is we can publish even as a final version. That's my personal opinion on this.

Open for discussion.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello? Trying out microphone. This is Jean-Jacques Subrenat. Can anyone hear me, hello?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah, Jean-Jacques, we can hear you. Please, you can speak.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. This is Jean-Jacques Subrenat. I was on time for this call, but there was some connectivity problem so I take this opportunity to present my excuses and to say this is Jean-Jacques Subrenat, attending the meeting. I was appointing by the ALAC to join the coordination group. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Jean-Jacques, for introducing yourself.

Any discussion commence about the RFP? Daniel, please.

---

DANIEL KARREBERG: Can we first establish what text the current draft is and where it can be found? Is it V15?

>> Seems to be, yes.

PAUL WILSON: That's the latest version that's officially on the site and shared. But I'm not sure about the suggestion that there was some edits to that latest version before it was published. I hadn't noticed that. So could someone from secretariat explain whether that's the case or what might have happened there.

If it is the case, perhaps we can take whatever was the published version and put it on to the Dropbox.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: We're happy to use the published one and just republish it on Dropbox. That's fine. The latest version.

Jari, please.

JARI ARKKO: I wanted to make a comment that we have at the IETF have been using the RFP and are reasonably happy with that. It seems to work for us. So at least from my perspective, it's ready to move forward.

One sort of minor editorial thing, it isn't really related to the RFP but how we use it. So the person who was writing our draft or the

---

proposed draft proposal was taking that RFP as a template and then inserts our explanations in it.

And I kind of felt that is making the end result a little bit hard to read. So I personally think a better approach would be to write our free-form text within the same structure that you have in the RFP rather than include everything from the RFP.

I don't know if anyone has here strong feelings about that or not. I think it is an editorial thing, but just wanted to make the point.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Milton, please.

MILTON MUELLER: Milton Mueller. I'm a bit surprised. I thought that we had gone through lengthy discussion process in which we were presenting the operational communities as the conveners of a process to develop a proposal, not as simply directly requesting the proposal from the operational communities.

I thought ALAC made that point. I thought we made that point and that everybody had agreed to that.

And maybe during the IGF I missed some discussion, but what this says now is simply we are seeking complete formal responses from the operational communities. And I did not think that that's what we agreed on or that's what we wanted.

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Paul?

PAUL WILSON: Paul Wilson here. I'm sorry. I'm not sure I get your point, Milton. The proposals are coming from the operational communities. And your point is that we'd like to suggest that they convene a process specifically. And you see those words as important, that they are convening a process rather than just producing a proposal. Is that -- do I understand you there?

MILTON MUELLER: Exactly, that the process has to be open. Other people who are not part of the operational community can participate in these processes. And, for example, in the GNSO, we have this cross-community working group which includes people from the other non-operational communities. So that might be a model as to what I have in mind.

But I think it is just somewhat dangerous to say that we are just asking for the proposal from the operational communities and that we are asking them to consult with the others because it makes it sound like the operational communities by themselves is the final deciders and if they don't get the agreement of the other groups that are actually involved, it might trigger problems down the road in terms of consensus development.

I don't think it is a very complicated wording change, but I just thought we had agreed on that. I think I brought it up during the last call.

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Paul, please. Daniel, please.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Milton, I think that language is there, if I remember this discussion correctly. If you refer to the second page of the proposal, it says communities are asked to adhere to an open and inclusive process in developing their responses, da,ta da, ta, da. Communities are also asked to actively seek out and encourage wider participation by any other parties with interest in their response. And then it goes on, the major challenge and so on.

So I think this was addressed, and it is in the draft. I don't understand your concern.

MILTON MUELLER: The first -- Milton Mueller again. The first paragraph says that we're seeking proposals from the operational communities. It doesn't say we're asking them to convene a process that includes all these other parties.

Now, yeah, you've -- we've added that paragraph later. But I just don't think it's adequate.

You know, you could have an open and inclusive process that only includes the operational communities. It's subject to different interpretations. It doesn't have to be. It is a very simple change, I think.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: We have Jean-Jacques, Joe and Paul and Daniel.



---

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Mohamed. This is Jean-Jacques speaking. I would like to underline the validity of what Milton just brought up. I remember that on behalf of the ALAC, we had reached a compromised text, a short addition, and I cannot see just now on the Adobe Connect screen because the wording -- the lettering is too small and I don't know if it is the appropriate paragraph. But I remember that I had made a proposal which was much more elaborate and then Milton had proposed some things, other people, too. We finally got a compromise.

I would like to make sure including with you, Mohamed, because you are in the hall there, that our concerns were properly addressed. Thank you.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Okay. The first thing is could we request --

Sorry. Joseph Alhadeff.

Could we request whoever is managing the right screen to actually use page width, as opposed to that size, so that we could actually read what's on the screen more easily?

The -- thank you.

The second thing is, while I agree with Daniel that I think the concern is addressed, I also agree with Milton that that was actually agreed language, and we have to make sure that our drafts are correctly reflecting conversations, and one of the things I would suggest is that we start doing many more versions, as opposed to keeping flowing

---

comments in a draft which ends up getting confusing and we don't actually capture them correctly. Because I think it was probably an inadvertent oversight that that was agreed upon and then it was never really captured because it was part of 73 comments that were in a draft.

So I think we have to find a better organizational method as we edit our documents, and it may be to get a defined "We accept all these comments" and then we circulate that to make sure everyone sees their comment in there, because I think that's what the problem is.

And while it might be already addressed, I don't think it actually harms in any way the document to add Milton's suggested language of "conveners of processes" as opposed to just "drafters of proposal."

So it seems like a -- you know, an edit that creates no dysfunction in the document and may help clarify.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Okay. Paul?

PAUL WILSON:

It was really a point about whether we were going to start editing specific -- putting the specific edits into the document here on the screen, in an effort to try and really decide here and now on those specific changes, and if we are, whether we could actually start that process.

Otherwise, we may find ourselves again in the same situation, with edits being done afterwards and not reflecting what we're talking about.

---

So is that -- Mohamed, is that the way we should be proceeding here with the document actually up on screen and being actively edited?

I think we did that last time.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: We can do that this time, and I think I'll also ask you, as the document editor, maybe, to take a leading role on that.

We can revert back and check Jean-Jacques and others for that text that they want to address.

PAUL WILSON: I'm happy to do it right here if I can be connected. Otherwise, I'll ask the secretariat --

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Just to respect the queue, we have Lars and Lynn and Jean-Jacques again.

Yeah, please.

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy, for the record.

The thing I think we all need to keep in mind is that at the halfway point in our process, or approximately the halfway point, we are going to be the ones that need to read, review, and understand the content of what we get in the proposals.

---

An important, critical issue is for us to be able to see if there are conflicts or gaps in these, and I think we've spent a great deal of time worried about some of the specific wording in terms of structure and not enough concern about content.

So I would urge all of the members to think about this from the perspective of the content and the perspective of what we will have to look at, review, and compare when we receive it.

Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Lynn, please.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Lynn St. Amour. And this is a relatively minor point but I just want everybody to note that the version that was being shown on the screen was not the last version. That was Version 15 and I believe we're all working from Version 16 which I assume is the one that Paul's putting up now, but --

And I think secondly, we need to find a way to manage this process better.

Maybe there's a cutoff which says the final revision we take on documents is 24 hours before the meeting starts or something.

I look around the room and everybody's, you know, scratching through their computer trying to make sure they've got the last version, and that's not a particularly effective way to proceed.

---

Not suggesting we comment on that now, but I think we do need to take that into account as we go forward.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Jean-Jacques and then Mr. Arasteh.

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

I had a question for you, Mohamed.

From the thing which is on the screen now, I cannot scroll it so (indiscernible).

Can you tell me whether the amendment, the friendly amendment which had been suggested by ALAC and which had been accepted, is now properly on that version?

Because there has been some uncertainty about what version we're working on, so I ask you the question directly: Has it been done? Are you satisfied as a representative of the ALAC?

I'm referring to the friendly amendment which had been proposed by our colleague from the ALAC, Alan Greenberg, and which was accepted by this gathering.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Thank you, Jean-Jacques.

---

On the versions I have seen previously, it was captured Milton Mueller's -- your proposal, and Milton's updated and accepted that and that text, I think, was captured.

We have an issue regarding document versions because looking at Dropbox, the latest version we have, it was Version 5, and -- 15. Sorry, sorry, sorry, sorry.

And so, yeah, I think we have an issue in terms of consistency. I will just get back to the document and make sure that is captured. Milton is here as well. He can confirm that.

I have Arasteh now and then Milton.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Thank you, Mohamed.

Yes. I have also Version 15. However, as I mentioned several times, we need to be coherent and consistent throughout the document.

Roman I of the part of the document talking that "act as liaison to interested parties in the IANA stewardship transition, including the three." That means others are not excluded. That is good part of that.

Then we continue, we go to the comments. Again, in comments we have some -- first line, "this is only." We have to be very clear. If we say "only," that means we totally restricted or limited to something, so perhaps we should think whether we need this "only" or not.

And then in the third line of that, it says "directly to the ICG."

---

Why not anyone who wants to comment could send a comment to the ICG and to the community as well?

Is there any problem that the community concerned -- naming or number or so on, so forth -- also receive the comments? No problem if somebody send the comments directly to the ICG, but why not asking that sending to the ICG, however, it should also be sent to the community in question.

These are the things that we have to be very careful about, the -- who is expected to reply. "Including" means that it is the operational communities plus, and we should be consistent throughout the document. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Milton?

MILTON MUELLER: Yes. This is Milton Mueller again.

So I would propose that you let me go through the doc and make -- it looks like three lines that need to be changed, I send that to you and you can see if you approve of them.

But one point I particularly want to make is I distinctly remember -- and I'm sure the ALAC representatives will recall also -- their amendment in which they -- we ended up agreeing on the line, "This RFP does not preclude any form of input from the nonoperational communities." That isn't in there. It was on the list. We all agreed with it. It never got in there.

---

So that needs to go in. We need to introduce the convening process rather than the direct proposals. We need to remove the word "only."

It's pretty simple.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Paul?

PAUL WILSON: I think as per my question before, let's decide whether we're going to do this here and now, so that we can finalize it here and now, rather than going back to -- back to edits in the background.

I mean, the document is there. I've saved it on Dropbox as Version 16. I've made one attempt at Milton's line there, but I mean I think we should just go through it systematically and capture all of these things and get it done. That's my proposal.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. If I might just put a proposal, because it seems this is the only issue currently where maybe having the --

I remember that text and that exchange of emails, and I think there was an agreement as well that this text needs to be there and we agreed that to be there.

Maybe the three of us could get together and ensure that this text is already there, or Paul, maybe you can add that text on Version 16 and put it in Dropbox.



---

PAUL WILSON: Let's -- have we got time to do it now?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yes, please.

PAUL WILSON: Okay. So here it is. So what's the first change in the document? Are we going to go through paragraph by paragraph and make sure that everything that we expect is actually in there?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I think -- it's Mohamed here -- we have -- the only issue currently being raised is the issue about the text proposed by ALAC and also commented and updated by Milton. That text was agreed in the mailing list to be in the document, so --

PAUL WILSON: Let's do it.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah. Let's focus -- let's add that.

PAUL WILSON: Where are we going? I'm in charge here, so tell me where to go.

---

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Milton, please use the microphone.

MILTON MUELLER: Just to be grammatical -- this is Milton Mueller -- "complete formal responses to this RFP through processes which are to be convened by each of the operational communities," and then I'm happy.

Then you go down and you delete the word "only."

Further down -- I think it's "Comments," yeah.

No, it's further down.

>> (off microphone.)

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah. And you could again enter "processes convened by the operational communities" between "complete formal proposals" and -- right.

And then at the end of that paragraph is where I would put the ALAC language.

And then we're done, I hope.

PAUL WILSON: Milton, what was the other change here?

---

>> (off microphone.)

PAUL WILSON: Ah, "each of."

>> (off microphone.)

PAUL WILSON: And the ALAC language, where does it go?

>> (off microphone.)

PAUL WILSON: New paragraph?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: This is Patrik Faltstrom. I just want to say that I'm talking to the AV people and they're going to try to look at the focus of the projector to the right because it's a little bit difficult to read.

So I appreciate that you're continuing to try to solve the problem, but we're also trying at the same time to make the picture better. Thank you.

PAUL WILSON: Okay. Paragraph -- the sentence says what, Milton? For ALAC?

---

>> (off microphone.)

MILTON MUELLER: It's Milton Mueller here. See, this is...

PAUL WILSON: It says up-to-date now, so --

MILTON MUELLER: Hello. Paul?

PAUL WILSON: Yes.

MILTON MUELLER: Do you want the language?

PAUL WILSON: Yes, please.

MILTON MUELLER: End of the paragraph, after the URL: "This RFP does not preclude" --

PAUL WILSON: Is that all?

---

MILTON MUELLER: No. What are you saying? It's already there?

MARY UDUMA: I'm saying it's already there. When you go up, you will see it there. It is already captured -- sorry. Mary. Mary Uduma here.

In the beginning, at the beginning immediately after the -- the sentence before zero, it is captured, yeah.

>> (off microphone.)

MARY UDUMA: Yeah. It's there already. It was captured.

MILTON MUELLER: Okay.

PAUL WILSON: Okay. Is that the right place for it?

MILTON MUELLER: Oh, oh, it's up there?

>> (off microphone.)

---

MILTON MUELLER: Great. I stand corrected.

So the only other is I don't think you need the "which are." "Through processes convened by."

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. So now it's -- we have -- yeah. We have the text now added, so I'm not sure if there is any other issues.

I have Mary and Arasteh.

MARY UDUMA: Yeah. Mary here. Arasteh mentioned the issue of the other comments going directly to the operational communities, even if they are going to send it direct to the ICG, so I don't know where he wants the language to be. Arasteh?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Mr. Arasteh, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Arasteh.

My comment is on the fourth line, starting from the third line saying they're sending directly to the ICG about the specific aspects of particular proposals, no problem, about the community process, or about the ICG's own processes. We expect to receive comment about our processes? What we do with these comments? And how will we resolve that if somebody comment?

---

>> (off microphone.)

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yeah. What we are talking about here, yeah.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Thank you, Arasteh.

>> (off microphone.)

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Just for the sake of others, let's try to focus on the discussion.

I have Joseph and Jean-Jacques. Joseph, please.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I think the concept of the comments on our processes is, we are representative of stakeholders. If stakeholders who don't happen to be part of our communities want to tell us that we should be more transparent or we should do something, we have an obligation to listen to them. We have to be open to people commenting on our processes. Otherwise, the concept of our multistakeholder representative status is fictional.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Jean-Jacques, please.

---

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

So since it's quite difficult at a distance to follow what is going on (indiscernible), I can see part of the scribing (indiscernible), so this is a reminder of the friendly amendment which I had sent to all of us on behalf of the ALAC on the 27th of August.

So, "Although full proposals are not expected from nonoperational communities, this RFP does not preclude any form of input from the nonoperational communities."

So I want to make sure that that finds its way into the text. Sorry, maybe you can see but I'm not sure I can get to the right part. Thanks.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: That language is included in the document. It's already -- it's already there with the same quote.

Milton, please.

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah. Just -- Jean-Jacques, if you remember, you proposed that full sentence but I proposed to chop off the front of it because it was actually too restrictive, and everyone agreed with that, including you.

So it's -- now it's just, "This proposal does not preclude." We lost the first part about "while we're not asking for proposals from anybody else."



---

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Right. Milton, could I request that you read the whole sentence as it is now? That is my problem. Thanks.

MILTON MUELLER: We just did but we discovered it in the -- it's already in the proposal.

>> (off microphone.)

MILTON MUELLER: "This RFP does not preclude any form of input from the nonoperational communities."

DANIEL KARREBERG: And this is Daniel. It's at the end of the introduction, before paragraph zero.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: This is Patrik Faltstrom. Yeah. The reason why we need to repeat is that Jean -- is that it's not possible to see the right screen in Adobe Connect, so Jean-Jacques doesn't see what we actually have there.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Patrik.

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:           Okay. So we are clear now that the text is already there in the document?

Yeah. Russ Housley, please.

RUSS HOUSLEY:                On the 4th of September, Alissa sent two comments, RFP feedback from the IETF community. She sent it to the list on September 4th. She made two comments. I think we should look at those two and see what, if anything else, needs to be done.

The first one was that the document uses the terms "IANA functions, services, and activities." It might not be clear if these are all words for the same thing or if they mean different things. If they are the same, then we should choose one term and use it throughout.

So that was her first comment, and I guess we want to process these the way we're doing the edits, I think, and then we'll return to her second comment after we've made sure the text resolves her first one.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:           I will defer to Paul.

PAUL WILSON:                 Would you like to go to all references to IANA here? We have a reference to IANA functions operator. It is the first paragraph in Section 0. We refer to IANA or IANA functions through the rest of that page, IANA stewardship, IANA functions, contract functions, functions. Here is

---

"distinct IANA services or activities." Should we replace this with "functions" then? "Function." Singular.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Daniel, please.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Paul, hang on one second. This is Daniel. There's actually a difference because what we said is if we say "IANA functions," we refer to the NTIA ICANN agreement.

I think in this paragraph there was an intentional distinction between IANA functions because the agreement does not mention all IANA services and activities.

So this was done -- as far as I remember, was done very consciously because the communities might consider some of the things that are not mentioned in the NTIA agreement as part of the things they would like to formalize.

PAUL WILSON: Does this wording address that, Daniel? So we're actually saying -- referring to "distinct IANA functions, services or activities?" So it is inclusive of anything that they're relying on?

DANIEL KARREBERG: That will work for me. But not having services or activities was not the intention here.

---

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm concerned that this is about the proposal that's going to go to NTIA. Do we really want to talk to services and activities that are outside the scope of the NTIA functions? I'm not sure we want to put -- while I have no concern about the existence of such things, are they a part of this proposal is the question.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: So Patrik, Russ, Daniel, Adiel.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Patrik here. Russ, I agree with you, what we are sending to NTIA should be the responses to their questions. That said, I can envision that as described by some people here that a proposal from one of the communities might cover more. The question here I think is whether we should force the communities to write something that is only explicitly what is covered by the NTIA contract or if we allow them to sort of cover whatever is IANA from their perspective.

And I do understand that some communities might have interest of writing a proposal or a process that actually covers everything, whatever they call IANA. And I think that is why we have a problem with the wording here.

To some degree I hear that we sort of agree but we really don't know how to word it so that the text is what we actually agree on.

---

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy here. Having spent a bit of time reading that contract and there are things that are outside of that contract that are really important IANA functions, also having studied carefully what the NTIA asked for, I believe that what we should push out to the community are those things that are in response to what the NTIA asked for. If one or more particular communities wants to include additional things in their responses, that's fine. I don't have any objection to that. But I don't believe we should have wording in our RFP that requires them to do more than what's currently specified in the contract.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Daniel -- sorry, Adiel.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: I want to say exactly the same thing. It is for us to be precise in our RFP what we want. And what we want is exactly what is in the NTIA contract. We don't want to allow people to -- if they do it, we will know and we will say the RFP was very precise. This is what is requested and so we are not taking it into consideration.

I think we have to be consistent in the text. We want only what is covered in the contract because there are many other functions that we don't want. Don't even want to go there.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I have Daniel, Arasteh.

---

DANIEL KARREBERG: I don't agree with what Russ and Adiel -- this is Daniel, again. I don't agree with what Russ and Adiel have just said. I think it would be -- I think some communities may view this as too limiting. And actually we have a chance here to identify those things that are not covered, and I think we should at least open the door for that.

If there is resistance to do it in the way that the language was, I think we should introduce some new language that makes what we have just discussed here very explicit in the sense of if there are any other functions that the communities consider essential and that might be not mentioned in the NTIA agreement, then that can be included as well.

Paul is actually trying to capture that right now, and I appreciate that. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Mr. Arasteh.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Arasteh. The last speaker's suggestion is good provided that we slightly amend that. We put it in a separate sentence saying in addition if a particular community wants to do that, they will do it separately. They could make it separately, not to mix it up for the people who review that. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Narelle.

---

NARELLE CLARK:

When I go through this contract, which I happen to have a copy of here if anybody else needs to look at the paper version, I find that there are a lot of things in it which I would consider to be startup-type conditions.

So if I were the subject of this contract, then it would -- it is requiring me to do a whole bunch of new things because I'm a new entity or a newish entity.

And there would be a lot of things in here that I would want to update, I being the subject of this contract.

So I would like -- I think this is a substantive discussion that we do need to have. And, unfortunately, we've sort of had to -- with the time constraints, had to move along down the path of issuing an RFP and getting people to think about these things without really having this substantive discussion as to how far should this thing go, how much should be reflecting what was an agreement a long time ago and what should be representative of future states and future actions.

So I would suggest that I think it is important that we do leave it open within the RFP responses so that people can look at the scope and extent and apply that to the document where possible. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Joe, Milton and Lynn and Russ.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF:

Thank you. Joseph Alhadeff. I understand that we necessarily focus on the response to the RFP as something that is necessary for us to assemble a proposal from the response.

---

But I also wanted to remind everybody that one of the purposes of the RFP was to elicit information for some of the non-technical communities to better understand what's going on.

So while I agree that we want the RFP's focus to make sure they're answering the questions we need to answer, the RFPs have more than one purpose. And part of that purpose is also providing information so other people can understand what those communities are doing.

And so I just want to make sure that we're understanding, you know, that perhaps Arasteh's comment of how we focus an answer to a specific part and then request additional information for other purposes, maybe that's the way, and it helps us compare the answers then for assembling what we need to use as a response but also providing that ancillary information which is necessary for other communities to review and understand what's going on.

So it could be that we have a couple of pieces, but, you know, one of the things that we had asked is people to describe at greater length than the narrow questions, some of these issues. And that's not a requirement. That's a request. And obviously if a community doesn't feel they can, then they can't. But that might impair the ability of non-technical communities to have an opinion and may create more questions down the line.

So I just wanted to remind everybody that while the primary purpose of the RFP is to help us assemble a proposal, it has other benefits as well.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Okay. Milton?



---

MILTON MUELLER: Milton Mueller. Yeah, I agree with Daniel and Narelle and Joe that we should include a broader request here. I would actually move back to IANA functions, services and activities.

I think -- I'm not sure I understand the logic of saying that the proposals for change have to mirror the existing IANA contract. The purpose of the transition exercise accountability arrangements that will make things work properly in the absence of the NTIA, it may be that other kinds of functions, services, activities are implicated or affected by these changes. So I don't see how it hurts anything to have that broader approach.

And I don't really understand how you could limit that to the IANA contract. As Narelle points out, it has got all kinds of federal government legally required stuff in it. I don't think we want to tie them that closely to it. We want to come up with a transition process in which the Internet community has its own arrangements.

So -- and it is hard for me to imagine what it hurts in the sense that if these communities agree that their proposal doesn't want to touch anything, they'll leave it out of the proposal.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Lynn, please.

---

LYNN ST. AMOUR:

It is Lynn St. Amour. I would like to echo what Adiel said earlier but also support a lot of what Milton just said. I think it's really important that we don't burden this RFP with a lot of other things.

I never saw this as an educational document that was going to help people understand more fully the IANA activities. And I think it is probably actually a poor place to do it. I'm not sure that would actually add clarity to anybody to read a bunch of very broad proposals.

I think that's a useful exercise to do, but it is probably a different exercise.

And I think we need to be sure to keep focus this is about supporting the transition of the U.S. government's oversight and really say as close to that as we can. That's why I liked Adiel's formation, but I also liked Milton's at the end that we want people to think broadly about whether or not there are other IANA functions, services and activities that are impacted when you address that transition issue. I think it always needs to come back to just the transition issue.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

In the queue now, I have Russ Mundy, Russ Housley, Joe, Adiel and Keith Davidson.

RUSS MUNDY:

I don't believe Adiel and I were 100% in agreement. I think mostly, if I understood correctly what Adiel said, is that nothing except what was in the functions should go in and be responded to.

---

I personally think it is fine if the communities decide that it's important and necessary for them to include more.

My position with respect to what we should require as far as what is sort of the "require" words in the RFP are those functions that are currently part of the NTIA contract.

I'd also like to remind folks that the NTIA contract is more than 62 pages that was held up a little bit earlier by Narelle. It is about 300 -- no, about 450 pages of text that is the ICANN response to the RFP.

That was literally incorporated as part of the contract. So as other folks take a look at what constitutes the contract, please remember it's the large ICANN response in addition that's about 60 pages that's labeled "contract."

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I have seen some name tags been put down. So just reviewing the queue, Joe and Adiel, then Keith, then Jari, then Daniel.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. Just to clarify -- Joseph Alhadeff. Sorry. Just to clarify to Lynn's comment, this wasn't meant to be an IANA tutorial. But it was meant to be a suggestion that the RFP not use code words in two sentences to say this is how we do accountability because in all honesty, the people from the non-technical communities aren't looking to micromanage the technical functions of any of these organizations. You know, as I like to say, I'm here representing the people that can't spell IANA.

---

And so the purpose, though, is what they're interested in is the accountability function and what you're doing to your accountability function to supplement the fact that NTIA is no longer there. And that's where I think we need that long-hand explanation. And that was where there was a request for explaining what you're doing.

And I think that to Narelle's point earlier, there's the difference between things that happen based on what Milton said, which is the NTIA is no longer there and what might be a wish list of improvements for the community.

From a business perspective, we think it's perfectly fine to have that wish list of things that could happen but this might not be the time for the wish list. This might be the time for the transition issues.

The wish list is perhaps the best thing to do once the transition is complete. But from a business perspective, the general business perspective, where our major concern is maintaining the stability, security and resiliency of the Internet, we would like to keep the complexity of the changes to the minimum necessary to accomplish the accountability related to the transition. Things that are overall improvements of "Gee, we could do this better," we think are wonderful to explore but let's explore those after the transition.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Adiel, please.

---

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yes. I just want to probably emphasize the fact that, yes, the community can propose anything. But we as the ICG, we have to limit the scope of what we are requesting in what we have been asked to do. I'm in line with you for that.

The second thing is we have to be very careful. The IANA functions, there are other arrangements with ICANN that are handled through IANA today. That does not mean it is part of the NTIA definition of the IANA function. Those arrangements are made outside of this scope.

So if we want a sort of accountability there, that has to go to the ICANN accountability process framework because that's where it's handled. This is very specific to the NTIA contract with IANA which has a very specific function.

I think this is critical, and I know communities out there -- from the number perspectives, we make that distinction very clear.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Keith Davidson.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thank you. I'm a little bit -- oh, Keith Davidson. I'm a little bit worried about the concept of being quite so binary in what we can do here. I think it's only as we get to examine exactly what we do with IANA in our own communities that we might actually get to see there are some things that do occur that have not been codified in the existing contract.

So I think Milton suggested a slightly broader approach and allowing some slight expansion of not confining purely to the contract but being

---

able to capture other issues that relate to U.S. government oversight and stewardship and so on is probably something you wouldn't want to limit from being included. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Jari, Daniel and Demi.

JARI ARKKO: I'm in agreement with Joe, Russ Mundy and Adiel, I think. We need to focus. That being said, this discussion -- we are putting this -- you know, the ICC in some sense decides. I think the right place to do this actually is in the communities. So we should demand or request that we get information about the NTIA-related IANA parts.

Now, there may be other things that communities feel they should put in with reasonable discussion and consideration. I think the text on the screen or something like that will work for me. I think that's the right balance. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Daniel.

DANIEL KARREBERG: This is Daniel again. Let's do text. I like the first sentence until the comma. If you can make a full stop after "here," Paul, then we can make progress.

So I think the thing we want to express afterwards is that we want the communities also to consider whether they want to include those

---

activities in this -- in the transition process because I see materially two kinds of other activities.

One of -- one class has been mentioned before which is the stuff that's under -- that's totally unrelated or only slightly related and under different arrangements between, for instance, ICANN and the communities.

But there's some other things that -- I see and I know at least two of them that are quite closely related to the functions governed by the agreement. But just by matter of oversight, I would assume haven't been mentioned explicitly in the agreement.

And I think it's the latter class that I'm concerned about. I'm not concerned about the stuff that's clearly in another realm. I'm concerned about the stuff that is not explicitly mentioned in the 300 pages, and I searched very carefully for some of that stuff, but what is still very important and done with an assumed oversight of the NTIA.

Let me just mention one example. One example is the maintenance of the registry of the service addresses of the root name servers. I think that is something that we all assume is part of this but it is never mentioned. I think we want to include things like that.

I'm not a good wordsmith in a live meeting. But there should be a sentence there that says the first sentence, if you rely on any other stuff, you may describe it. I like that.

And then the second sentence should say, if it is closely related to the functions mentioned above, please treat it as if it were a function and answer all the questions.

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Maybe just if we can sense the room direction before we go to editing the document and adding that text.

There was many support -- or at least people put forward the discussion that -- I think Adiel and Lynn and others -- that the text itself is broad enough that it enables communities. We don't need to update that text. It enables communities to -- this is what we need as it is. And now we have a new suggestion that we need to put a text to enable communities to add other --

DANIEL KARREBERG: Sorry. I have a point of order. The language that we agreed previously had services and activities there, so we're making -- we're -- what's proposed is a change. Many people spoke in favor of it, but it's a change. Just to be procedurally correct, right? Where it now says "functions," the last version, which we all agreed on, said something different.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Demi and then Russ Mundy.

DEMI GETSCHKO: This is Demi. I think that we were more or less in agreement. I agree with what Lynn said, and to try to resume my position it's something like we have to be conservative in what we are requesting and liberal in what we will be accepting from the community. Thank you.



---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Russ, please.

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy here. In response to Keith's comment earlier, I believe the -- the approach that says we take "to require things that are identified in the NTIA IANA functions contract but leave it up to the communities" will permit the answering and covering of the things that you were raising. And my sense around the table is that seems to be the general direction, and maybe Daniel wanted more specifics but I don't know that we have enough knowledge and insight in the ICG to be any more specific than to leave it up to the communities that say if the communities feel more needs to be included, then please include that.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. We have Arasteh and Jean-Jacques and Daniel. Yes.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Chairman.

First of all, I can't read this very nice screen. For me, it's difficult. Very difficult. I am very sorry. You are not my age. You are very much -- some of you much younger. You can see it well. I can't see anything at all. Put it another color. There are so many nice colors than this, I think, number one.

Number two, I think we have already covered all arguments. It is now to have a concrete proposal, Chairman. We need to go to the concrete

---

suggestions but not go into a description and argument why we suggest that. We understand why we want to make it. Let's kindly ask concrete proposals. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Yes, Paul, if you can make it more readable, visible.

>> (off microphone.)

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. So we'll continue. Jean-Jacques, Daniel, and Arasteh.

I think we need to return to Paul later, after the speakers.

>> (off microphone.)

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah. Jean-Jacques.

Please proceed, Jean-Jacques. Maybe he have issues.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Can you hear me? Hello. Can you hear me? This is Jean-Jacques.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yes.

---

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you.

To follow up on what Kavouss has just suggested, which is to make concrete proposals, I'd like to make one.

Under paragraph zero, "Complete Formal Responses," second paragraph, it starts with the sentence "Proposals are expected to enjoy a broad consensus of support from all interested parties."

So I think this is a sort of declaration but it doesn't really add anything.

If I tell you I would like to spend the new year on the Seychelles Islands, would you put that in this text? I suppose not.

So this brings a question in legal terms.

"Proposals are expected to enjoy," et cetera. Expected by whom? If only for that reason, the legal aspect of it, I would cross out the sentence altogether. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Thank you. Daniel and Keith.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Speaking to what's concrete proposals, if we -- if we want to go back to the previous issue we were dealing with, I make a concrete proposal to take the first sentence of what you put there and delete everything else and leave it. If it is too prominent for people, I could accept moving it into a footnote on the first mention of IANA functions there. Yeah. So

---

that makes it less prominent, but I'd still like it to be there. If that's acceptable to everyone, that would be really nice.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Keith and then we'll get back to Paul for his comment.

KEITH DAVIDSON: I think that the proposal to put -- oh, Keith Davidson. I apologize.

I think the proposal to add it as a footnote is quite appropriate, but could we have the words back on screen, as I think it needs a slight improvement in terms of, it says -- because we've now got a new sentence -- "However, it should be noted that those IANA transition issues which are not the subject of the IANA functions contract" --

>> (off microphone.)

KEITH DAVIDSON: "May be" -- yeah, "may be included."

Does that add some clarity and focus? Particularly if it's dropped to a footnote?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Paul, please?

---

PAUL WILSON:

What it said was that if you rely on other services or activities, you may describe them here; however, it should be noted that those which are not the subject of the IANA functions contract might not be part of the transition plan.

I mean, I think that was attempted to address this idea that for instance if someone says, "Yes, we're relying on RPKI," really the transition plan has got nothing to say about RPKI because it's not -- it's not part of the contract, so that's what I was trying to say there. Yeah.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

There was a couple of proposals that has been put, so Paul, because now we had Daniel suggesting that we delete the second paragraph. You are -- any support? You are the document editor. You think that the first paragraph is sufficient and we put a footnote?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Excuse me, Chairman.

Just, first of all, a small arrangement.

Whenever somebody propose to delete something, please do not delete it immediately. Delete it with a revision mark, so the case that you could get back, because it is not appropriate. Somebody put a lot of effort, propose something, someone just automatically says, "Delete it," no. Revision mark to come back for that now.

So what is the last proposal? Deleting the second part? Retaining the first part? And what is put in the footnote? Thank you.

---

Could you explain that? Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you very much.

Daniel, because you put the proposal, let's try to have -- to have -- finalize that.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Yeah. What I proposed was to just use the first sentence from "if your community" until here, and I'm quite happy with what Paul just did and made it "IANA functions contract." That's -- the language that's on the screen is fine.

My proposal was to keep that, delete the second sentence, and -- and -- so that's just highlighted, and move that into a footnote to make it less prominent.

If we -- since I have the floor, if we want to -- want the second sentence, I think it should not be formulated like this but it should be formulated like a question.

So please -- so if you describe that, please express whether you consider this should be part of the transition plan. Because it's a request for proposals and it's not like, you know, we'll --

The language as it is there radiates "Please describe it but we might discard it." Yeah.

So if you formulate it as a question, that would be acceptable to me.

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: So Arasteh, Manal, and Adiel and Milton.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, Chairman. Kavouss.

I'm happy with that. Retain the first sentence, not delete the second. Move the second sentence to the footnote. This is the correct explanation. We don't delete anything. We move it from the body of the text into a footnote. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes. This is Manal. Thank you, Mohamed.

Actually, I can see we are still drafting, but I'm not sure how the final text would look like. I would just -- I would just want to make one point, that maybe instead of saying what we do not want to see in the RFP, we can say what we want to -- what we would encourage to see. I don't mean "encourage." Okay. Let me try again.

[ Laughter ]

MANAL ISMAIL: So I would be a bit reluctant to say we do not want to see things that are not subject of IANA function contract. I would rather put it the

---

other way around: Anything that would help the transition thing could be included. I mean, I'm not sure if I'm able to clarify my point.

Yes. It's hard to say what we do not want to see. It's easier to say the prerequisite to what we would like to see here. Again, we are going to be focused on our requisites and then be flexible to receive things that would help the transition proposal. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: So okay. Now we have Adiel, Milton, and Michael.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: My first proposal is already covered. I pass it to Paul. It's to add "beyond the IANA function contract, the scope of the IANA contract." That's already there.

If we -- the second thing is, after Manal's comment, if we really want to take this route and open the door, then maybe instead of being very firm on the second sentence, we can use "may." So "may not be subject." Because we don't know. Because we open the door, at the end it can be taken into consideration.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Milton?

MILTON MUELLER: Yes. Let's not forget, the reason we're doing this now is that somebody from the IETF commented that we wanted to use the word "functions, services, or activities" in a consistent manner.



---

>> (off microphone.)

MILTON MUELLER: Nobody said that everything had to be tied to the IANA contract.

Of the speakers here, I've heard maybe three or four say they thought it should be closely tied. I've heard, I think, four or five say that they don't think it is. Don't think it needs to be.

My view is that I agree with Keith and Daniel's line on this, that what we're asking them for, if they're listing these other activities and they think they're relevant to the transition proposal that they're making, then by all means go ahead and describe them.

I don't think we can say a priori that no other service or activity that IANA does or might do is irrelevant to their transition plan simply because it's not in the IANA contract. I just don't think we can say that. And there's no gain by doing that.

We -- I don't think the people making the proposals are going to give us a laundry list of all kinds of things. I don't think they're going to be that sort of disorganized or stupid. I think it's pretty clear what we're doing here. We're asking for a transition proposal that's relevant to the absence of the NTIA, so let them have the flexibility. Let's not tell them what not to give us, but I think -- I can't remember if it was Keith or Daniel who said ask them, "If you think other activities or services are relevant to your proposal, tell us what they are." I think that's a very simple solution to this problem.

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah. I think --

>> (off microphone.)

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah. I think that that's also really a practical approach to go through it. I'll give the floor to the others, but I think I just -- on the -- when you talk, maybe you can consider the current approach being laid down by... I have Michael, Joe, and Russ Mundy.

MICHAEL NIEBEL: I just want to echo Michael, speaking on what Milton said. I think Daniel's proposal is exactly showing that we're serious not to say top-down what they should do but have the community also have a say on the scoping of the ideas.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Joe?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. Thinking about the fact that Milton mentioned that we were first approaching this by -- sorry. Joseph Alhadeff.

---

-- that we were first approaching this by looking at the words "services and functions," perhaps instead of trying to micromanage those words, the footnote or that last sentence could just read, "Communities may also provide other information to the ICG that may help us better understand their proposal."

Because then they can provide us what they think is the appropriate contextual information to the proposal, as opposed to trying to say, "Well, it has to be related to a service that's kind of related to this."

I think the communities are going to want to provide us things that make us believe that they are well-positioned and situated for doing what they're doing, and that phrasing may be -- we don't have to then define services and functions and make sure that they're thinking about those words in the same frame of reference that we're thinking about them, but rather saying, "If there's something we didn't ask you that you think we should know, tell us."

RUSS MUNDY:

Russ Mundy here.

I think that we are -- we're really honing in very closely on what we need, which is in that second sentence a positive statement, something of the effect of "Communities that choose to include requirements that are not currently part of the IANA functions contract should also describe why including those in the transition plan is important with respect to the elimination of the IANA functions contract," or wording roughly to that effect.

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. I think we have current wording there and the last three or four speakers were in favor of this wording, so I'd just like to urge others as well, if we can adopt this, because --

>> (off microphone.)

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Paul, maybe you can read it. The text.

>> (off microphone.)

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah. Okay. So it seems we've finalized that and that has been agreed. Sorry. Daniel?

DANIEL KARREBERG: No, no. Just -- I'm in agreement with that text. We just should be clear whether it's now part of the text, like there, or a footnote. I can live with both, but we should be clear.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I think the last amendment that -- the last proposal is to have that text, not to add as a footnote, so that will be text there. And it seems -- maybe instead of humming, maybe we can raise hands?

Okay. Seems very clear that we have everyone happy with that text.

---

So I have -- Lynn, you have -- you have a nametag. Okay. So I think, okay, we finalized that, and we have Mr. Arasteh now.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. If -- good. Good. Can I talk?

>> (off microphone.)

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yeah. Good. Thank you very much. We have just finished this one.

I wish to go back to what Jean-Jacques proposed. He proposed something and I think we go back. I support what he proposed and I request him to propose it quite clearly what are the changes he wants to make in section zero.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. And so we finished the last -- the last update that we had, so --

>> (off microphone.)

>> No. We were going through all the mentions of IANA.

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Oh, okay. Let's continue this and we can get back later on to the proposal put forward by Jean-Jacques.

Paul, if we can --

PAUL WILSON: Okay. So we've got -- we've got plenty of other references to IANA here.

We've got a reference to existing IANA-related arrangements, IANA function, we've got IANA activities, services, service or activity. So I'll take bids on edits. Just shout out.

>> (off microphone.)

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Please use the microphone.

>> Okay. Yeah. So I said first one is fine, second one is fine, third one should be functions.

PAUL WILSON: Okay. Good.

>> (off microphone.)

---

>> Sorry. That should be functions. We're on first bullet in (b). Function --

PAUL WILSON: "Functions are affected" or "function is affected"? Which?

>> Editor's choice.

[ Laughter ]

PAUL WILSON: Yeah, that's right.

>> If we use "functions are" here, on the previous one, we have to change.

>> (off microphone.)

>> No. The previous... yes.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So we have to be -- I'm sorry for interrupting here. Patrik speaking.

We need to be -- we must be very precise. Use the microphone, state our names, because this is translated and minuted and specifically when

---

we're going through the document, agreeing on the text, this is actually really important for transparency reasons. Please.

DANIEL KARREBERG:

Daniel here. We are now in (b) -- 3(b), second paragraph from the bottom, just above 4, and it says "interface between the IANA functions and existing policy arrangements" and I believe that should remain like it is.

Then we move into 4.

Third bullet, "Meet the needs and expectations of the global customers and partners of the IANA functions," it should say.

And I'm going on here just for the transcript, and if anybody disagrees, please raise their voice.

Next one, we are just above Paragraph 6, where the last sentence ends in "global interest in the IANA functions," and I think that should remain.

And then we're done.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Thank you. So we are -- we are done now on that IANA function.

Russ?

RUSS HOUSLEY:

So you may remember that we started this because Alissa had two comments. That was her first.



---

Her second one was much more specific about transition implications, we want to include an additional bullet point about how long the proposals in Section 3 are expected to take to complete and any intermediate milestones that may occur as they are completed.

PAUL WILSON: Where do you want this bullet to be put? At the end of the list? This is Paul, by the way.

RUSS HOUSLEY: She didn't say, so I would put it at the end.

PAUL WILSON: And some words then, specifically, Russ?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Okay. I will read it again. How long the proposals in Section 3 are expected to complete and any intermediate milestones that may occur before they are completed.

RUSS MUNDY: It should start with "describe" or "provide."

PATRIK FALTSTROM: You must state your names, please. The translators have no ability to do a proper translation if you don't speak your names in the microphone.

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Mohamed here. Any objection to the added text? By the way, we have issues in terms of Internet connection, and I'm really not sure how our remote participants are engaging. I'm not able to log in here to Adobe Connect and it keeps connected. Maybe the secretariat could alert us if Jean-Jacques or Alice, they have any opinions or they wanted to raise any issue. We have a really bad Internet connection.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Mohamed, this is Jean-Jacques. The connection is fine. The difficulty is really following exactly what part of the text because what would be useful now is that someone state exactly what part of the text we are in and then read that whole part actually so that we are certain to be on the same page. Thanks.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah, Patrik, please.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Patrik Faltstrom here. What we will try to do after the coffee break is to ensure that the people that will go through the document do have proper Internet access. I don't know really how that will work, but we will see how that works.

The individual that edits the document on the screen should use Adobe Connect, and that way the document that is edited will be visible in Adobe Connect and also people remotely and people locally.

---

But I talked to support staff. We decided to not try to sort of change things now in the middle of what Paul is doing, but we will try to do it the rest of the day. So hopefully it will be better for you and everyone else who is remote.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Maybe Paul or -- Paul, if you can just describe the change and the text to remote participants, that would be great.

PAUL WILSON: The document is Version 16 in the RFP folder on the Dropbox. So it should be possible for anyone to see that, and I will also circulate the URL by email.

It should be visible.

DANIEL KARREBERG: While Paul is doing that, we are in Section 4. We are referring to the base document as Version 15. Paul just uploaded Version 16. You can see it there. If you are working from Version 15, we are in Section IV, "Transition implications." And at the end of that section, just before Section V, there is a new bullet point added. And the text of that bullet point is: "Description of how long the proposals in Section 3 are expected to take to complete, and any intermediate milestones that may occur before they are completed," full stop.

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: So if there is no disagreement with the text, can we move forward and consider it as adopted?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello, this is Jean-Jacques. May I speak?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Jean-Jacques, please.

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

I suppose you're asking agreement on the considered part. I had a proposal to make on another part at the beginning. I have sent my proposal by chat. So it was to delete the section that started with -- under zero, under zero, "Complete formal responses." I was suggesting that we delete the first sentence of the second paragraph, which is, "Proposals are expected to enjoy a broad consensus from all Internet parties" -- "interested parties."

There was a remark of Lynn, a suggestion that we see that the ICG expects (indiscernible).

So that could be on the path to better understanding why this sentence has been proposed in the first place.

Could we rather than delete, could we have something like "When submitting proposals, communities are expected to have garnered sufficient support from the communities they represent."

---

Because for a native English speaker, which is not myself, of course, the sentence as it reads now (indiscernible) the words "expected to enjoy" seems a bit vague. That's why (indiscernible).

PAUL WILSON: Jean-Jacques, could you repeat the specific words please?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes. I will try to remember that. "In making proposals, communities are expected to have garnered sufficient support from the community they represent," end of quote.

But as I said earlier, English is not my native tongue. So I defer to you and others to put it in proper wording. But that's the idea. I'm working on the idea which was first presented by (indiscernible).

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques. We accept your amendments to have more clearer language.

I have Joe and then Arasteh.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I think one of the purposes of that sentence and the reason of the use of "affected communities" was to make sure that the community that's developing the proposal is obviously expected to have consensus of its own community in developing the proposal. But the concept was that you weren't just being asked to hear other communities, you were being asked to factor in their concerns as well.

---

I don't think Jean-Jacques' statement can be read to be only the community creating the proposal as opposed to the communities consulting.

If we take the concept and put it at the end of the sentence that starts with during the development, then the fact that you're being asked to reach out to communities in order to gain -- in order to gain their support or consensus or something like that, that then picks that up with the entirety of the comment and communities, not just the community that's creating the proposal.

Now, it would be at the end of the sentence that says "During the development of the proposals, you are requested to consult and work with other affected communities and to garner support" or "to achieve consensus with them" or something like that. It is at the end of that sentence. We just have to work on whatever the construction is that works with the rest of the sentence.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Michael? Arasteh.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: If I could just react --

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Michael speaking. I agree totally with Joe's explanation. I think that is not captured by the proposed amendment. I kind of like to have it at the beginning because it is flagging something. That's why I would not like to hide it behind.

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Arasteh?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. Arasteh speaking. I think the initial suggestion by Jean-Jacques seems to me to be more acceptable. But now it is very worded. It is quite complex.

I am much in favor of the initial sentence, but I have difficulty with "expected." I'm not in favor of expectations. I have read that book Charles Dickens, "Great Expectations", and it doesn't give me anything. We should be more clear.

The issue on the table is broad consensus of support from all interested parties. That is the essence of the paragraph.

How we should tell the people, I suggest that -- I suggested several times we replace "expected" by "should enjoy." Thank you. Simple, clarity and sufficient. Thank you. Not going to too lengthy sentence which has a lot of words.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. I think there's almost -- Daniel, quickly. We have seven minutes on this agenda item.

DANIEL KARREBERG: I'm aware of the time. This is Daniel. I'm aware of the timing. May I make a proposal in the direction that Kavouss is suggesting and it was suggested by Lynn earlier, to just replace the words "proposals" -- no,

---

go back. Please go back to the yellow sentence. And I think we are going to work on that. I'm proposing to work on that.

And delete -- remove the part "Proposals are expected to enjoy" and says "The ICG requires proposals" -- "proposals must have." That's fine. That's good, Russ.

"Proposals must have documented broad support from all interested parties." So delete the "ICG requires" again and start with "Proposals must have."

Thank you, Russ.

"Proposals must have documented broad support from all interested parties" because I don't understand "broad consensus."

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Daniel, I'm just -- also another person, intervention. Can we have it as "Proposals must have consensus"? Let's not go too deep on that.

>> Yes, yes.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I think there's lots of heads nodding. If we can keep it without the word "documented."

>> Yep.



---

>> Thank you.

[ Laughter ]

PAUL WILSON: "Must have" --

MILTON MUELLER: You can either say "consensus support" or "broad support." You can't say "consensus of support." Sorry. Get rid of the "of."

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Paul, did you capture that?

>> Not on this. On another issue.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Can we try to finish this one? Paul, if you can update it.

PAUL WILSON: It now says, "Proposal must represent a consensus of all interested parties."

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Milton?

---

MILTON MUELLER: At least for the names community, I think you are setting up an impossible requirement as part of the RFP. That's why I preferred broad support. It is not going to be consensus in the Quakers.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Just a question, in essence. We are using a requirement in proposals. It would seem that it would be appropriate to use a requirement as opposed to request to consult in the following sentence.

>> (off microphone).

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: It seems like if you are having a broad consensus -- you're telling them they have to have the broad support of interested parties. But if you don't consult with anybody, your interested parties are yourself. You should at least have a similar construction, whatever the appropriate word is.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: It becomes really confusing. We have previously almost, let's say I can say, favorable text, okay? Can we revert back to that? I have Keith Davidson, Keith Drazek, and John.

---

KEITH DAVIDSON: Keith Davidson. I think the "must consult," in our community we have ccTLDs who will not consult who do not recognize ICANN, do not recognize the U.S. government, do not recognize the NTIA's role in IANA. And this is causing us to have to consult with them, and we may not be able to always do that. So a compulsory requirement for the community to come together fully is probably not appropriate to us. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah, Keith, please.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Mohamed. Keith Drazek.

I note there are two different words used related to "parties," "interested parties" and "affected parties." I'm wondering if it ought to be made consistent or if there is a reason there is a difference or a distinction.

>> (off microphone).

KEITH DRAZEK: That's what I thought. So the question is: Do we need to discuss why they are different or explain how they're different?

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Jon? Okay.

We have coffee break. I would like to suggest that we go through the coffee break and we take about ten minutes extra from the next agenda item to try to finalize that. And maybe during the coffee break, we can make look at those issues currently being brought up. I think the last one is "affected" and "interested."

If we can take the coffee break and then continue. Mr. Arasteh.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Legally speaking, "must" and "shall" are very, very strong words.

Now, listening to Keith Davidson in some cases, first of all, we should introduce normally if you want to retain "must." If not we go back to "should." Otherwise, if we have "must," you leave no exception at all. That is a total mandatory and obligatory in the legal language similar to "shall." You have to introduce the word "normally." That might be some very minor or very exceptional case that you could not comply, and that is the case that was mentioned by Mr. Davidson. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Joe?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I think to answer Keith's problem, which I think is a legitimate problem, the concept is, you can't force anyone to consult who actually doesn't want to be consulted, number one. So that you want to avoid.

---

But, perhaps, it's the requirement to have a consultation process opened to all interested parties because the requirement is you have a process. You can't be forced to consult with people who aren't interested in talking to you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: The last intervention. Heather, please.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you. I just wanted to -- this is Heather Dryden speaking. I just wanted to really say something along the lines of what Joe is proposing because, on the one hand, if you are putting a requirement to do something active, so the language is more on the active side of going out and needing to consult, if you can simply emphasize that it has to be possible for those other parties to come and feed into those processes, should they wish to.

And I think if we find we get bogged down in language, if we can just come back to that basic point, it's going to help us actually come to agreement on some language here. Thank you.

NARELLE CLARK: Narelle Clark for the record. We had minor reference there to "interested parties" and something or other parties. It is not clear to me whether we are talking about responding parties, interested parties, or parties.

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. We need to break now. Sorry, Keith. We will get back in, let's say, 20 minutes. And we'll use the time for discussion for discussion. 20-minute break. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Point of order before you leave. Please be quiet. We are passing around a piece of paper which is really, really, really important. Write your name and at what time you need a taxi to the airport. Thank you.

[ Break ]

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: So welcome back. We can start. The last person that was in the queue was Keith Davidson. I'm not sure if you want to take your turn or --

Okay. So let's try to, in this remaining last maybe 10 to 15 minutes, try to finalize the RFP so at least we can have a final version coming out from this meeting.

I think that's doable. So let's try to aim for that before going to the next agenda item.

Paul, anything to add?

PAUL WILSON: Or maybe I do. Okay.

[ Laughter ]

---

So Paul here. What's next?

>>

(off microphone.)

[ Laughter ]

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

We need to finalize the RFP so we can have lunch.

[ Laughter ]

Yeah. So just -- I think we -- we were in the -- Jean-Jacques' proposal and the last final updates we have, and Keith Drazek raised an issue regarding consistency of the term "interested" and "affected."

Maybe I can give him the floor.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thank you, Mohamed. Keith Drazek.

Yeah, so I -- in the break, I had a couple of conversations and it helped me understand better the distinction, in that "interested parties" is anyone in the community who would be interested in the process; "affected parties" is actually the direct customers of the IANA or the IANA functions. Impacted parties, affected parties.

So I'm fine with the clarification.

My only question was whether we needed to call that out and make that more clear, so that the respondents to the RFP would understand

---

the distinction between the two terms, but I'm not hung up on that. That was just a -- just a thought. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. So Jean-Jacques, he's on line. Maybe he can look at the latest updated text, based on his proposal, so we can -- we can move ahead.

Joe, please.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah. In an attempt to try to capture what we were saying just before the break related to the process versus the maximum outreach possible, I had some language to suggest which created a parallelism and also took out the problem altogether that Keith was referring to.

So -- and sorry, Paul, I didn't have a chance to send it to you. And Joe Alhadeff. I didn't announce myself correctly.

"Proposals should be supported by the broad range of stakeholders participating in the proposal development process. Proposals should be developed through a transparent process that is open to and inclusive of all stakeholders interested in participating in the development of that proposal."

And I think that covers us in a neutral fashion, allows people to participate, indicates their views have to be taken into account, but doesn't put an objective requirement of outreach beyond the creation of an open process, which I think is sufficient for the communities, and



---

then within the communities, they can do the active outreach that is appropriate to their community.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. So what do others think?

>> (off microphone.)

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Heather, please.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Just to strongly agree. I think what Joe is proposing is very helpful to us here and gets us to where we need to be with the sentiment underpinning this particular part of the text. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. I would like just to give the chance, as well, to Jean-Jacques as the first person who put the proposal. He's on line, so if he can, as well, give his input on the latest.

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

From what I heard read out, it seems good. Thank you.

When it will be on the -- on the screen, it will be even easier to evaluate, but it sounds good. Thanks.

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:           Okay. So if there is no -- if there is no objection, I think we can move ahead.

Milton?

MILTON MUELLER:           Not really an objection, but if we're introducing a distinction between "interested" and "affected," I think we should duplicate them in all of those references. "Work with other interested and affected parties likewise" -- blah, blah, blah -- "all other interested and affected parties." Does anybody object to that? Is there some reason you're not doing that?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:           Joe. Then Mr. Arasteh.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF:           In the initial part, there is no "interested" or "affected." We actually took those adjectives out. But you're right, they occur in other places, so in other places -- the language isn't up on the screen yet, but I had tried to remove that distinction in the initial part, but they do occur -- you were right, they do occur in other parts of the document and we should treat them consistently.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:           Mr. Arasteh.

---

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I am not sure whether we refer to "affected" or refer to "interested" or we refer to both.

I suggest that if we want to be quite clear, we should say "affected and all interested, comma, as the case may be," because in some areas they are affected, in some areas they are interested. You could not just limit that to those who are affected.

So I don't know the exact area that this term first appeared in the text, and we should be quite clear that not limited to only affected.

Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Thank you.

To go back, we have an agreement on the text proposed by Joe.

Paul, if you have the text, it's going to be included.

>> (off microphone.)

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay.

>> (off microphone.)

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. And --

[ Laughter ]

And we don't have any disagreements to Milton's proposal to have consistency of "interested" with an updated "and/or affected." Okay. So can we accept that and move on?

Okay. So the two proposed changes are at least accepted, and so we can -- those would be included in the document.

I would like just to move ahead and also propose that before we close this agenda item, we all agree on the document with the changes that has been conducted on this part and move ahead, I guess, in even publishing a final RFP to the communities.

So any -- any objections to that? Paul?

PAUL WILSON:

I think -- as I said earlier, I think this is a -- this is an agreed draft and we really do need to leave a certain substantial time -- and I'd suggest four weeks -- for response. And I think if we state that we hope that this is very close and that communities can start work on this in the meantime, then we're not saying that, you know, all the work stops for four weeks. But I do think that, you know, we've just -- there's just no point in issuing something that has got any major problems. You know, we'll get answers that we don't expect and we'll get different answers in different styles from different communities and it will make our job harder.

---

So I think I would suggest a four-week comment period, but quite explicitly saying we hope it is close and that work should start, unless some -- you know, notwithstanding comments.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Mr. Arasteh and Narelle. I have seen the -- yeah.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Maybe ladies first.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Ladies first.

NARELLE CLARK: I love first. Can I suggest, too, that -- to reinforce what Paul has just said -- Narelle Clark, for the transcript. Just to reinforce what Paul has just said, we need to give a time window -- I would say four weeks or one month, whatever -- and saying that -- a small piece of words in front of it that says, "Does your community consider this form of words will adequately capture the input you need to give" or something nice and tight around that. I'm happy to wordsmith that off line with Paul, but that would be the intent.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: We have a proposal now for one month, four weeks.

Yeah, Mr. Arasteh, please.

---

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Thank you, Chairman.

First of all, I understand that we are almost agreeing to the final draft in ICG. Then you want to put it for comments and we are talking of one week or one month, but we should look into the deadline. If deadline is the 31st of December, then we need to have a workable time for that. One month from the publishing date. If it is 8th of September, bring us to the 8th of October. And 8th of October remains little time up to 31st of December.

So perhaps we should work on something that would fit in that program.

So why we need one month here whereas in the charter we just have 6 1/2 days?

So perhaps we should try to be balancing, and I suggest that maybe one week is sufficient.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Daniel?

DANIEL KARREBERG:

This is Daniel Karrenberg again.

May I suggest something different?

In some RFP processes I've worked with, the RFP has been published and requests for clarification are entertained, and I think that's much more appropriate right now, in view of the time line.

---

So my concrete suggestion is that we actually agree on this text here at this meeting and we publish it as the RFP which will not be changed. Those are the words that we are publishing. And if there are -- and we entertain -- we entertain requests for clarification until a certain date.

I think that would make it much more clear, would send a much more clear message to the communities that they should start working.

If we now publish a draft RFP and say, "Oh, please comment within the next four weeks," the chances are good that the communities will not start working. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Jari?

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko. I'm in full agreement with Daniel, so no other comments.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Adiel?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I fully agree with --

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Adiel first, then Mr. Arasteh.

---

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Yeah. I kind of have a different position on that. I think as ICG, we have to be consistent in what we commit to, which is transparency and allowing the community to comment on our document.

This is one output of our work, a very important one. I think just by passing the comment period won't be very good.

I think we can do both at the same time, meaning we publish this for comment and at the same time ask people to send clarification if they need. We can add even a sentence like, "This is very stable draft of the document, so we encourage community to start working around this while we open it for one week comment."

I think I will suggest that for all documents that we publish, as we agree that we will involve the community, we keep at least a one-week comment period always.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Thank you. Mr. Arasteh?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Kavouss. Chairman, I agree with Daniel. We should have a definitive RFP from this ICG. If you want some clarification, we call them clarifications but not comments. Requests for clarification. And we put some time, one week and so on, so forth. If you start to have comments and then there is a need to get together to implement those comments, to have another drafting or exchange of views, we never even get to publish something definitively. There will be no time to make a real proposal, Chairman.



---

Let us be firm. This meeting would have a final RFP published. If there is any need for any clarification, you provide one week for clarification, but not for comments. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah. Lynn, please.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: I'd like to support Daniel's comments. I thought that was a nice path that allowed us to stay true to our principles of transparency and engagement and inclusiveness, but also signal that we thought it was close enough that the community should get on with the work.

I think the IETF is quite close to putting some documents out themselves which would show that the community was already pretty well advanced, and maybe we just need to think through the capping paragraph we put that says that this is out, and we could put it out, I think, for a substantial number of weeks looking for clarification, comments, and just, you know, frankly manage the wording well enough that clearly if we had any strong objections, we would be inclined to review that, or if anything was pointed out that was missing that was substantial or significant, we would also take that into account.

So I mean, I -- I think amongst all of us here we can find a way to make it clear that we're looking for input and for clarification, and at the same time we think we're quite close and the community should get started, in light of the time.

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Daniel, please.

DANIEL KARREBERG: I'm sorry. I had -- I said everything I wanted.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Joe?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thanks. I'd like to -- Joe Alhadeff. I'd like to support both Daniel and Lynn's suggestion, though perhaps I think -- and I'd also like to remind us, this isn't the first time we've reached out to the communities on this document. They saw a version of this that wasn't all that far away from this, with the exception of there's been significant change in the chapeau text, not significant change in the substantive requirements.

But I think perhaps -- we're not going to be a community that offers a proposal but I could imagine that if you're creating a proposal, you might, in the process of creation of that proposal, find something that isn't working in the RFP, and so I think, you know, the concept of -- I think it would be too narrow a window to say that in one week we would want the concept of clarification or amendment.

Based on the time line, if a community is not actively working on a proposal in a serious way within the next month and they haven't fleshed out a good chunk of what they're thinking of within the next month, then they're not taking the process seriously and maybe we don't have to consider things after that.

---

But I think for one month, the -- and I wouldn't use the word "comment," but the concept would be "if there is a need for clarification or amendment," because they can request an amendment, and that request process should be clear and transparent to all.

So the request isn't made to the ICG; the request has to be publicly made to us and we have to publicly answer that, so that it's clear. Because clearly if one community has a question, maybe another community has a similar question and they just haven't gotten to it yet.

So I think that's important.

The other thing that's, I think, important is the cover note that goes with this or the context information that goes with this.

Do we associate the time line with this document so that people understand what the inflection points are in the RFP process? Because sending out an RFP without really giving people due dates and an understanding of what's going to happen to the document is much less useful.

So again, you know, the question is, have we finalized all of that information to the extent necessary to send it out with the RFP. Otherwise, we are subject to being misunderstood again.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

So if I may just put a proposal. I think there's a -- a majority -- at least there is a view that we proceed with this, with Daniel's proposal. I just want to ask Adiel if you can -- after hearing the other members, will you

---

be able to change your mind and we can proceed with the proposal from Daniel?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yes. No problem.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you very much.

So I think now we have -- we have an agreement that we're going to publish a final RFP with a period for questions and clarification to ICG from the community.

And Joe's proposal makes sense in terms of making sure that this time the messaging is clear to the community and all the information around the RFPs is really clear and times are very clear.

I have Keith and Ross Mundy.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Keith Davidson. Jean-Jacques has his hand up --

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: And my hand is up.

KEITH DAVIDSON: -- in the Adobe Connect room.

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:           Sorry, Jean-Jacques. Please.

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

Yes. May I suggest that we align ourselves on the best practices, and in this case, I think that ICANN has a good record.

There is a clear-cut duration for public comment.

Now, what we are suggesting is not public comment. I realize that. It's more a call for clarification or a request for clarification. Fine.

But as for the duration of that process, I think that if I remember correctly in ICANN, it's 15 working days, but perhaps we should ask Theresa or someone else on staff to confirm this.

So two points. One, the duration. I think we should align on ICANN or perhaps IETF. And the second thing is how do we call it. I think that a call for clarification would be much better than a comment period. Thanks.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:           Okay. So your proposal is regarding the time frame to have two weeks for a clarification period on the RFP?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:       Not two weeks because of the holidays and all that. I think the correct formula is 15 working days. But that's a detail. You can check that.

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: So, Daniel?

DANIEL KARREBERG: May I propose procedurally -- Daniel Karrenberg again.

May I propose procedurally to postpone this until we actually have dealt with the timeline because once we have the timeline in front of us and we have some idea when we will have a meeting -- because if we are going to give clarifications, we'll have to agree on them -- then we can make a more informed decision about what time frame to put there. I suggest to postpone this point until we have dealt with the next agenda point.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Arasteh, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, no problem to postpone. But we should be very clear, when we say "15 working days" means 19 days. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Russ? And then Russ Mundy.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Two queues, two Russes.

Russ Housley. We already know when our next meeting is, so if there is any clarification to this, we are going to deal with them right after the ICANN meeting or on a call before that. But I think we can settle on

---

three weeks and get -- have plenty of time to then discuss it on the mail list and then finalize it in the meeting in L.A.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Russ, please.

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy. I would like to also suggest that the text that goes on the announcement on the Web site be reviewed by at least the chairs before it actually gets put up to make sure that it aligns with the intent of the group and hopefully we don't get the same kind of confusion we had last time. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Thank you very much.

So I think it's -- the path is clear to us. We have a proposal of 15 working days. We are going to discuss it in the timeline. There is no disagreements in publishing a final RFP with that period agreed on the next agenda item.

Joe and Arasteh and Patrik.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Joe Alhadeff. If I could just suggest we specify the date. Because if you say "working days," then every region has a different number of working days based on who has got a holiday. And then we're going to say this region thinks it is three days from now. This region thinks it was

---

yesterday. Some region is going to claim it is not fair. We didn't have as much days as they did. Let's just say a date.

I think Russ Number 1's three weeks -- (laughter) -- was the appropriate -- but Number 2 might be younger -- (laughter) -- was the appropriate kind of time frame. I would really suggest we choose a date.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Mr. Arasteh.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, Arasteh. I agree that we specify the dates. Nevertheless, the duration would not be two working weeks and so on and so forth. We should say calendar dates if you want or just specifically mention the date, by X of October, November, December, September, and so on and so forth. I agree with that. Thank you. But not more than 14 calendar days, not more than that.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Patrik and Jean-Jacques want to speak.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Patrik Faltstrom. Thank you very much. I have been looking at the calendar. I'm also looking at the rest of the agenda, and the agenda point at 1600 today, we are going to talk about when we are going to have meetings and telephone conferences between now and Los Angeles.



---

Let me propose that the suggestion for the agenda point at 1600 is to have two phone conferences between now and the meeting in Los Angeles on Wednesdays, every second week.

If it is the case that I look on the calendar, that means that the phone conferences will be on the 17th of September and 1st of October.

In between we have Wednesday, September 24. Even if it is the case that we are on the agenda point at 1600 move the phone conferences around a little bit, I have a suspicion that this is approximately the schedule we will have. So let me be very, very specific because I also don't like the term "working days" because no one knows what that means. It just adds confusion.

Let me suggest that we say September 24. It is a Wednesday. 24 September, 2359 UTC.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Patrik.

Jean-Jacques, please.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Mohamed. Two points. First is the detail. When I said "15 working days" in ICANN, that means this must be taken into consideration by staff in prescribing or giving up -- proposing a date. That's for internal dates. It is not published as 15 working days. That was a minimal requirement.

---

My second point is I very much agree with Patrik's suggestion. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. I think we can wrap up now the RFP discussion. We are in agreement that we are going to publish a final RFP with September 24th as the deadline for clarifications period.

Mary?

MARY UDUMA: Mary Uduma. Are we going to do another reading of the text here before we leave as we did in London? Because the statement, do we need the final reading or not? We got final approval before we left.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: My understanding that Paul has incorporated the changes agreed here. It will be a new maybe final version in Dropbox. So you can review it. If the proposal is to review it in the meeting, that's something we can -- at least people could give their opinions about.

But my personal opinion is to review it in Dropbox and raise issues that you can raise before it's been published.

I have Mr. Arasteh and Lynn.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. Arasteh. I don't believe we should come back to that and discuss it again. We have discussed everything. Leave it to the two vice

---

chairs whether there is any editorial, and purely editorial, aspects of that to be checked. But it would not come back to us because we don't want to engage again. We have so many things to do. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Lynn, please.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Lynn St. Amour. This is a very minor comment. We are using ICG and IGC throughout the text. We should probably do a global search.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Paul, please.

PAUL WILSON: Just to -- Paul Wilson here. I've drafted the announcement here on the screen and just to check that it captures the sense of what we are asking for -- what we're announcing and asking for in terms of the responses by 24th of September.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: I don't see it on the screen.

PAUL WILSON: Sorry. It is not on the screen. It is on the Dropbox as "Announcement V1" under the RFP.

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Jari, please.

JARI ARKKO: I like this. The only thing I'm kind of missing is that we talked earlier about telling the communities that they should start their work. Maybe that should be added somehow.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: If I might suggest, Paul, I think it's we're issuing a final RFP. Within the final RFP, there is a clarifications period, not we're opening -- the text was misleading for me for maybe not English native. ICG is also opening a period of submissions of question clarification.

My understanding, that is embedded within the RFP. Within the RFP, there is a period of clarification for communities and all who are intending to submit proposals. That's my understanding of it.

PAUL WILSON: That could be done. So we take this paragraph out, the one about the request for clarifications and put it into the RFP document?

>> No.

>> No.

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Lynn and Daniel.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Lynn St. Amour. Just with respect to the sentence Paul is trying to edit now, I think -- yes, that the RFP is sufficient for or allows communities to begin their work in light of the aggressive timetable or something.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Daniel?

DANIEL KARREBERG: This is Daniel. I think I would like to be -- two points. First of all, this one should be much stronger than "we hope." It should say "we expect."

Again, sorry, Kavouss.

Or just say, "Communities should start work." I think we cannot be clear enough here.

This also -- this text also relativizes the whole firmness of the RFP.

And my second suggestion is that we add at a later stage when we have the timeline and our meetings clear under the paragraph that mentions the deadline for submissions of request for clarification an undertaking of ourselves to respond to these requests by a certain date.

Because my understanding of RFP proposals is that -- or RFP processes is that you have to publish all the questions and responses. And I think we want to do that.

---

As Russ Housley has already said, we are going to meet in Los Angeles. So my proposal, if we want to finalize this text right now would be right after Los Angeles. But there should be a sentence that says the ICG expects to respond to those requests by date.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: If I may put a proposal. The chairs could work on the announcements and send you a draft to the mailing list, taking this as a base. This is the document we have. Instead of now going through the announcement itself, we can take it and edit it and submit it to you. Maybe just for saving time.

Mr. Arasteh?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Chairman, Arasteh speaking. I thought that this portion of the document -- not document, this portion of the issue seeking clarification or establishing would not be part of the RFP. It would be part of the announcement. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Joe and Patrik.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yes. Joseph Alhadeff. Just a concept. Rather than saying we are opening a clarification period, just say, "If clarifications are required by the community submitting proposals, we request that they be submitted by X date."

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: So we have Narelle.

NARELLE CLARK: Narelle Clark. A really short one. Right up early on, there should be an "and/or," "for the communities interested and/or affected."

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I think the proposal was that we were going to submit an announcement, yeah.

If there it is not a hot issue, Mr. Arasteh, can we close?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Not hot issue but only replace in case there is a need for clarification. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Patrik?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. Let me just re-emphasize what Mohamed suggested, that we take on as chairs to finalize this document so we can move forward, send it to you and then we use our normal 48-hour period before we are -- to request comments because a lot of people are traveling home. We will use our sensitivity to understand where we are.

---

We also -- let me also explicitly note that we have got comments from a few of you that have commented on the announcement that have been sent out in various cases, the text has not been careful enough, validated and checked with the text of the document that the announcement is actually referring to. And we take on that as chairs, as an explicit task to make sure if it is the case that we are quoting or using wording from the document, that we actually are using the text in the document. Let's just take that on a minute that we recognize that and will do that explicitly.

Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Thank you very much, Patrik.

I think we move on. We are already late. We need to discuss timeline and consultation process. I think we already had half an hour from that session.

So this is the current agenda item. We can have half an hour, yeah, for this one.

Okay. So let's try to accommodate the two because we have Martin on the phone and I think we need to finish the consensus by 1:00. So let's try to move on the two items.

>>

Are we swapping the order?



---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: We will proceed as it is, timeline then followed by the consensus but squeezing the time allocated for the session.

Russ, I think you can lead this one. Russ Number 1.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Thank you. So the documents were sent out several days ago and added to the Dropbox earlier today. So I think the big thing to do is just walk through the big steps, and then we'll take comments.

The first thing of the timeline is the request for proposals. Right now it says "now" which means we are trying to get this out. Originally we said we were going to get it out at the beginning of August. Here we are at the beginning of September. Fortunately, we know at least some communities have already begun the work anyway.

The RFP we just finalized that we said we need to get proposals from the community by the end of the year. Sooner is even better. Ha.

The idea is that then this group will stitch together an NTIA response, a draft NTIA response, by the end of February, making public interim drafts as we have on all of our documents.

Then we ask the communities to review that draft. We give them two months to do that.

Based on the comments we get in that two-month period, we then use one month to put together the final response. We send that out, even though it's final, for basically a check that the communities are in agreement with that.

---

As various parts of the proposals get stable, we begin testing. The idea is that by the time the final response is actually delivered to NTIA, we have been actually operating under the thing that we're proposing, which shows that it actually works, it's not just a paper study.

And we then continue to operate that way, even though we are then formally submitting the proposal to NTIA and awaiting their response. We actually don't know how long they're going to take to respond, but the idea is to give them several months because we know they are not going to have a simple process when we --

You may recall we reported in London that we asked Larry Strickling how long he needed and he said he had no idea, it depended on the number of Congressional committees he had to brief.

Okay. So open for comment and review at this point.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Mr. Arasteh and then Keith and then Paul.

PAUL WILSON: Sort of point of order, administrative order. I did create a time line folder in the Dropbox and put Russ' three sets of versions there.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Can you please identify the version title, maybe, for others as well?

PAUL WILSON: Paul here. We're up to Version 3, I think, correct?

---

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. The one we just went through was Version 3, and there was one you didn't have and I added it there. There was a Version 0 that was missing. You had 1, 2, and 3 and I put 0 in there. So they're all there.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Keith, please.

KEITH DAVIDSON: I think just putting in a comment at this stage -- it's Keith Davidson, for the record -- the 31 December date, of course, is a very, very tight deadline and when I reflect on my community and perhaps other communities within ICANN, you know, the cross-community working group to look at the IANA transition is just being formed as we speak.

There's a call out currently in my community for ccTLD representatives to join that committee and so on.

So this time frame is extraordinarily tight and I am a little bit concerned that this time line that we're now considering has very little flexibility around the 31 December deadline, and my belief is that one of the first tasks for our cross-community working group will be to work at what possible time line it can meet, but I'd be very surprised if they said they can come back with a full proposal from the names by that date.

So I think we just need to be cognizant and perhaps look at how fluid this time line can actually be. Thank you.

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. I have, yes, Jari.

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko. I of course share the feeling that this is tight. I think we from the IETF will probably be able to deal with that but I understand that it's tougher in some other cases.

But I'll make just one generic observation about the time line, that it's a quite waterfall-like process and I think we might actually have an opportunity to use more parallel mode of operation in some cases, and I'll just give you one example.

I think, if I'm not mistaken, the NTIA is tracking what we are doing and looking at the different communities, and ICG, and they will do it -- they will look at things even this year.

So if there's a chance to add some things, even to -- to the time line graphic on showing this, that might be useful.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Wolf, then Joe.

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

I'm -- on this -- about what Keith was saying here with regards to the time line the cross-community working group is going to be faced with. However, I would say, well, it's good you said you just made us cognizant about that at the time being, since this group is just under establishment, and we should really try, well, to get as soon as possible

---

any response on the -- on the time line. That must be one of the first priorities of that group, to look at this and to respond and comment on that, and therefore, what can we do at the time being.

I think we should leave the pressure on them -- it is a pressure -- rather than coming up with something, well, okay, we may move it by ourselves here in this group rather than to ask you and give us comment on that where we stand and how you see that process. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Joe?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. Joseph Alhadeff.

Looking at the time line, and especially in light of the fact that it's a very aggressive time line for the communities who are submitting proposals, I just thought that it might also be useful if somewhere between the December date of the submission and perhaps two weeks after that date, we could just provide feedback to the community if there's anything missing from the proposal that would -- that we need to review it.

So just the concept of just having kind of looked at our requirements, looked at what the proposal was saying, and if there's something missing or something that we don't think is complete enough, get that feedback to them very quickly so they can fix that before we go through a wholesale --

---

Because if it turns out that when we get to the -- February, we're starting to tell them, "Well, no, your proposal is really not as complete as we had hoped," that's not very helpful. So perhaps we can put an inflection point for ourselves that we can respond to them in a short order and just say "At least, we think you have answered all of the elements we need to move this forward," and then we take it forward from there.

But I think it's -- we owe it to the communities who have kind of done their job to let -- to let them know at least we think all the elements are there, and then it's a question of how we can put them together.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Milton, please.

MILTON MUELLER: Milton Mueller.

I just wondered if we could push the December 31st date back a week.

I mean, I know that we're not all part of the Christian world, but it seems to me a little bit flying in the face of reality to have a deadline on New Year's Eve. And knowing that many people are traveling between, you know, December 22nd and January 1st, that they will be partying, that they will be not in full productive mode, I mean, just let's push it back a week.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: And Arasteh and Xiaodong.

---

RUSS HOUSLEY: So I don't have a problem with that, but the document we just put to bed had that date in it, and that's why I -- it appeared here. It's a trickledown problem. If you want to reopen the RFP and shift that a couple days, there will be a reflection here, but the previous version of the time line had it at the end of January, but when the RFP put that date in, I shifted it.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Mr. Arasteh.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Chairman.

In fact, as Milton mentioned, that from 22nd or 23rd of September -- December, people are moving and they don't come back till 5th or 4th of January, so I think that what is the difficulty to -- I don't know whether we set it back or forward but something around 10th of January instead of 31st of December.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: And Adiel.

XIAODONG LEE: I think it's no big difference before the Christmas date or just after the New Year date. You know, I don't know, in China, they also have a holiday, you know, for the new year, so I don't think everyone can do their work before that.

---

So we can just make maybe before the Christmas date or just after one week after new year. Yeah.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Adiel?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: What about shifting this back to what it was originally, 31st of January? And not just in the RFP. I mean, the RFP is just one line. What will be the impact on this by moving everything to give people all the month of January to do this?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Jari?

JARI ARKKO: So I think the detail around the Christmastime is really just a detail. We should not spend too much time on that. I think it's fine to move one week forward or backward. I mean, to the January 7th or whatever the appropriate thing might be, and we can fix it across the documents that we have. That's fine.

But that still feels, again, like a detail.

So the bigger question, I think, that the community -- some of the communities at least have is, is this time sufficient. You know, I want to make a more concrete proposal. I raised earlier this parallel thing. Currently there's like no activity after -- in the communities after submitting the proposal, but in reality I think they'll be revising based on



---

feedback and synchronization with others so I -- you know, maybe that would help. And I would also suggest that currently the NTIA, according to the graphic, at least, will start looking at things beginning of March, and in the text it says -- what was it -- February, but I think in reality they'll be looking at it preliminarily already this year. So showing those things might actually be sensible.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Russ?

RUSS HOUSLEY: So to answer Adiel's question, if you go to the Dropbox and open Version 2 --

[ Laughter ]

-- that's the graphic that would result if we shifted it a week. I'm sorry. A month.

The bottom line is, everything is shifted a month and NTIA is left with two months to do their process, to get it done by the end of September.

We could do that. It's -- I don't see that any of the other steps in between could be shortened.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah. The queue now is Alyssa, Mary, Arasteh, and Paul.

ALISSA COOPER: Hi. This is Alissa Cooper. Is my audio okay? Are you able to hear me?

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yes.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Great.

Just a comment on the sort of flexibility of the time line.

I think, you know, the dates are listed as targets and I think that's appropriate and I just am hoping that people are looking at this with an eye towards some flexibility. For example, as some folks have mentioned, if the -- you know, the processes in the communities proceed on slightly different time lines, it still seems that in Step 2, what we have there is perhaps a sort of gating function in that, you know, we can't assemble something until we have all of the pieces, whereas I wonder if the components do get, you know, somewhat fairly out of sync, if we would want to start to have community review on the ones that have come in from the communities already and a broader community review on the ones that have come in already, if all of them are not complete.

I think that's certainly, you know, possible within the time frames outlined but I just wanted to make sure that everyone is reading it that way; that it's not that, you know, if one or the other of the communities is taking much longer, that we have to wait to ask for broad public comment before everything from the communities has come in.

Thanks.

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:           Okay. We have Mary, Arasteh.

MARY UDUMA:                   Mary Uduma. From now till the end of the year, there is a lot that will be happening. I know that the -- there are conferences and programs that will be taking -- like the plenipot is taking about three weeks, and some people might also be involved, and immediately after that, you'll be looking at people going on Christmas -- sorry, I'm thinking the Christian side -- going on holiday, so I think we should also be looking at the 31st of January. It's more positive. Those that are on holiday will have come back and be able to do their work and that's what -- I want to support Adiel's proposal. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:           Okay. Mr. Arasteh?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:           Thank you. Kavouss speaking.

30 people talking about time, maybe 30 different views. There are two dates, 31st of December or 31st of January. Why not taking the middle of that, 15th of January, and postpone the NTIA or reduce that by 15 days. Can we take that? Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:           Okay. Paul, we're skipping. Okay. Joe.

---

JOSEPH ALHADEFF:

Thanks. I have no problem with the 15th of January as a date.

Just whether it's in the RFP or in the time line, just a request that we make sure to ask communities to submit the RFP proposal as soon as it's done, because people shouldn't wait for the submission date if they've actually finished the RFP earlier.

And some communities have already gone quite a ways towards developing an RFP, and may be able to submit an RFP earlier.

The earlier we get it, the better off we are, so just somewhere along -- that could be in the cover note that Paul is drafting to the RFP.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Paul?

PAUL WILSON:

I think that's a good proposal. I think if the -- if these things are being done openly and transparently, we should actually be seeing draft proposals while they're in production. But I think we could actually make a note that the ICG will attempt to review drafts as they are under production in the time beforehand and we encourage those to be released formally for public review.

Does that make sense? I wasn't sure that I was going to be further editing the announcement, though. I thought that was then over to the chairs, so I'd like to clarify if that's the expectation.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Yeah. Jon.

---

JON NEVETT: Yeah. There's still a mistake in the announcements. I was just about to send some suggested edits and you could do whatever you want with it.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Do you mean the current published RFP announcement? Okay.

JON NEVETT: I'm talking about the announcement. The announcement still has the ICG messed up in the last sentence. It also a couple grammatical issues. I was just going to send it out for you guys.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. So now we have an agreement that -- or at least maybe I can sense the room -- 15th January as the deadline for submitting complete proposals to the ICG. Okay. That's been agreed now.

Joe proposed we do -- we have a review period after -- a initial review period, if I understand it correctly, after the 15 January and before the face-to-face meeting on ICANN Los Angeles.

So do you want to take a minute or -- to discuss that?

Maybe you can clarify your proposal.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah. No, the -- Joe Alhadeff again.

---

The proposal was just a question that with -- when the proposals come in, we just review them for completeness in very short order so that we can sign off if there's anything that the community has to add to the proposal that isn't there.

That was the only thing I was suggesting. This way, before -- you know, it could be that we don't want to do that a month into the process, we want to let them know as soon as possible if there's a gap somewhere in the proposal.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. I have Jean-Jacques remote, and then Daniel.

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

Several points.

First is to say that I think Joe has a good point there. We should point out that there is a cutoff date, but that they can send in their input at any moment when they're ready.

The second point is that we should also make known that the ICG will start processing -- in other words, reading and assessing -- that input without waiting for everything to have reached us.

So we will make sure that we treat input as it comes in.

And the third point is, if there is no disagreement now on this time line, I would request that someone or staff put this up on the screen right

---

now that we have the correct dates, because what I see on the screen just now is not updated. Thanks.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Daniel?

DANIEL KARREBERG: This is Daniel. Concrete proposals to what was just discussed.

I think Joe's concern could be taken into account by -- if I refer to the spreadsheet waterfall time line by just extending the preparation for step on Line 6, which is "Develop draft response" by 2 months to the left or 1 1/2 it is now. Or actually 2.

So basically saying we're preparing from the time that we issued the RFP and the communities are working, and to add something under Step 2 in the text along the lines that Jean-Jacques proposed by basically saying a sentence that we will -- as soon as the communities release drafts, we will -- we'll look at them and comment back.

And that would -- that would take care of that.

And the other -- my other point is a request for clarification, just to be sure that we're really agreeing what we're agreeing, is we pushed back the "Develop proposals" step to January 15th and as a consequence, none of the other steps until the NTIA review are shortened, so the NTIA review moves up for two -- by two weeks.

That's what we agreed, right? Just to be a hundred percent sure that we have complete agreement.

---

>> (off microphone.)

DANIEL KARREBERG: Yeah. That's what I heard too, but I just wanted to be sure about that.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah. Mr. Arasteh?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, chairman. Perhaps I misunderstood the process. When we agreed by consensus shifting 31st of December to 15th of January, I thought that we shift everything by 15 days but not reducing the time within that. So let's give a little bit less time to NTIA. That is the situation. Then you have to correct this editorially. And then you have to also make some correction in Step 4 because Step 4 chronologically is not correct. You are talking 31st of what? I don't know. Something of July? 31st of July?

DANIEL KARREBERG: Kavouss, this is exactly what I wanted to clarify. We are in complete agreement about this.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: There was a suggestion, I think, from Adiel or someone to put a timeline for comments. Just wanted to make sure that I didn't miss anything.

No? Okay. Mary?



---

MARY UDUMA: Thank you. Mary. Sorry. Step 4. I asked that question during the intersession, during the mailing session, and the clarification was made. Maybe we move Step 4 down after -- so the dates are -- that the 1st July, you come back to June. I think we should rearrange the dating. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: It is clear that the document needs to be -- I mean, everything aligned. So maybe, Russ, if you can take that into account and we have an updated version as well. Adiel and Arasteh.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Mine is just a clarification question. When we did the testing, can we just have -- discuss what does it mean concretely? What will be involved in the testing? How do we see it?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Russ.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So I think the idea was that whatever has been proposed, when the proposal is stable, start operating your community in the manner that you have proposed. In that way, you find out very quickly whether the

---

processes that you're planning to use are actually working for your community. I don't think it is any deeper than that.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Maybe I will ask the next question to that, which is implementing the testing will involve other parties, meaning IANA, NTIA and all of that. So kind of an agreement that we discussed with them already that this is what we are going to do?

RUSS HOUSLEY: So I think the only thing we have not gotten agreement in is that the root zone updates will still go through NTIA. And I think that we have a problem removing that step, but I think we can do whatever we are proposing in parallel. But they have to join before an actual root zone -- and I'm not sure we want to put that bit of detail in the timeline. But, yes, that's obviously a concern.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yes. So we need to look at documenting that test part very clear so we take care of this thing because it's...

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. I just wanted to add, everyone, that we are running out of time and we need to go to the next agenda item. And I think there are further discussions that need to be done as well on this document and also the document contends the different periods need to be clarified.

---

So I don't think we are ready here to move beyond what we have reached here. Maybe on the mailing list we can take this further and try to find a deadline agreed between us here.

RUSS HOUSLEY: I would like to propose that what we do is I generate one more update based on these comments. We discuss it on our next teleconference. And then if we have resolved them, then we send it out for comment to the community.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I have maybe the last people maybe commenting on this.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Just to reaffirm that the RFP must go with the timeline before I ask that question. So if we want to release the RFP, let's maybe make sure that we sync both. It is very important.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Arasteh.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. Arasteh speaking.

Chairman, if somebody asked me about testing, still I don't have any convincing reply to that. What testing means. You test what?

And then the timeline putting here 31st of July, which will be modified, it is not appropriate in the chronological order. Step 4 is before Step 6.

---

Step 6 is 26 of June today and maybe 15 days will be postponed according to what we have done. We need to have that one, and we need to clearly understand what do we mean by "testing." We are testing what? This is point one.

Point two I had during discussion, someone is asking of the completion of the information received, this data completion process.

At what stage do we do that? Do we do that as we receive any proposals and test them, not test them, verify them whether they are complete or not and where that appears in the timeline here? This is what I have. Whether we want to do some data completion process or not. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

So I think the approach now, Russ will produce a new version that will be reviewed because we have new edits already now. We have 15 of January. This document needs to be updated.

Daniel.

DANIEL KARREBERG:

I have a point of order. I think we should make the time to put this to bed, to actually finalize it. It is an important message to be sent out to the communities we expect work from. I think we can talk about consensus building later. I propose to take time from that and finish the damn timeline. Excuse moi.

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Patrik and then Michael.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: The problem we have -- Patrik speaking. The problem we have with the consensus document is that we got a very strong request from Martin to have -- to discuss the consensus document between noon and 1:00 p.m. And, unfortunately, even though some people suggested that we would move the timeline document to a different time of day to be able to accept his proposal, we continued the way we did which to some degree was correct because I must say myself that the discussion on timeline, as you say, Daniel, it seemed to be much more important to discuss than even I expected as chair, as co-chair of this.

So regarding the timeline, the only thing I wanted to point out apart from clarifying this consensus thing, Daniel, why me and Mohamed feel that we should move forward with consensus is that I would like to ask a question.

The way I understand the dependency between the timeline and the RFP -- and I must -- might have understood things wrongly, is that it's only one date that is the dependency and that is when the RFP is to be handed in.

I do think -- and I would like to propose to Mohamed as the acting chair that I think I understood that we were agreeing that would be January 15, okay? So what I think I hear is that if it is the case that we can agree on January 15 and lock that date, then we don't have any dependency, first of all, between the timeline document and the RFP, then we will

---

know that date in the timeline is fixed. And we can correct the RFP and we can move forward with the RFP and create those two sort of documents, increase the independence between the two. That's what I would like to propose. And then I hand over to Mohamed and Daniel to see -- and I will go back to read the mail from Martin to see what other times during the day he is available.

So, Mohamed, please continue.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I think just to move ahead, I don't see any objections to this approach. So we can adopt it and agree.

Daniel.

DANIEL KARREBERG: It's up to you to juggle with the agenda. My only objection was against not having an agreed timeline at the end of this meeting. So if you want to juggle the agenda and come back to the timeline later, that's fine with me.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you.

Michael.

---

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Michael speaking. I have no proposal, just a question, a strategic question. We said we squeeze the NTIA's time. To those who are more familiar with the D.C. environment, as we are moving into the summer break, does that have more than 15 days repercussions strategically on the possibility of the USG and the Hill to look at the proposals?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. I would like just to give our colleagues in remote participation a chance. They have been waiting for some time. I have Martin, Jean-Jacques, and Alissa.

Martin, please.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks, Mohamed.

Actually, I was the last one in the queue but I would like just to say that I do agree with the urgency and need to sort out the timeline with very, very indications to the outside world. For my timing, I need to leave from now in 25 minutes. I could join you again around 1500 or 1530 this afternoon depending on traffic. So if you can juggle with your agenda in that way, that would be very helpful. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Jean-Jacques.

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

---

Two points. The first is I agree with those who have underlined how important it is now to get the timeline agreed upon and published.

The second point is about the one that Adiel brought up earlier about testing, and this was also supported by Kavouss. I think it is extremely important for our communities to know what is exactly that is considered under the words "testing."

Now, there are two ways of viewing this: Either we have only the duty of informing the NTIA and we consider that NTIA has some sovereign or divine right, remains passive, and either says yes or no; or alternative, we could consider that NTIA should be a bit more proactive in this part of the game. And that's what I would suggest, that we make it known to the NTIA that just for that single part called "testing," that perhaps it should engage and see how the testing would work in the hypothesis contained in our proposal or our transition plan to see if at least the NTIA path would actually work.

Otherwise, I think our exercise remains a bit theoretical. Thanks.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thanks. Alissa, please.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. This is Alissa. I was just going to suggest -- I don't have the agenda in front of me. But if we are juggling the agenda, I would assume that if you give Russ 15 minutes, he could make the updates that have been discussed to the timeline on a break or over lunch or something. And it could be perhaps reviewed and affirmed by the



---

group before the day is out. In particular, if we are putting it out for public comment, again, it doesn't have to be, you know, completely perfect, but I don't -- based on the conversation today, it seems like not too many changes and a little piece of work that could actually be done during the day today, if given a small amount of time offline to work on it.

I would also like to second Patrik's comment about the dependency between this and the RFP. And if for some reason that process doesn't work and the timeline cannot be agreed today, that as long as the proposal target date can be agreed, then I think we should proceed with the RFP as discussed earlier and not do a separate release of the timeline for public comment. Thanks.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. As I will chair the afternoon, I have been looking at the agenda. My proposal is to do what Alissa just said. We ask you Russ to update the timeline.

We move now to the agenda item of consensus-building process. We deal with that up to lunch. Then after lunch, we -- I do believe that both the discussion on the independent secretariat and the conference call schedule, each one of those items will hopefully be shorter than 30 minutes. So I do believe that we can -- with an updated document from Russ, we can deal with that after the conference call, schedule face-to-face meeting just before any other business.

---

And if it is the case that we are not done with the consensus-building process, I'm happy to discuss how to deal with the detail of the agenda at the point in time that Martin comes back given traffic.

So regarding where we're continuing with consensus-building process, if we are not done at lunch, it is something I would like to defer to the afternoon.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thanks, Patrik.

Okay. I think now -- okay. Arasteh, if you could be short, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Arasteh. I will be short. I suggested that at least the first round of discussion on consensus building be taken place before lunch in order to allow us to have some sort of offline discussion during the lunch. And I suggest if possible, you can take that.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: This is Patrik Faltstrom again. This is exactly, was my proposal, that we end the discussion of timeline now and move into consensus so that we have had the first exchange of views on the consensus before lunch and while Martin is online. That was exactly the intention. I'm sorry for not being clear enough.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: So I think we can give it to Martin.

---

Can you please proceed, the consensus-building process. Oh, sorry. Sorry. That's my mistake.

Wolf, please proceed.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Mohamed. For the first one, so my take is -- and suggestion is to use as a basis my document which I've actually last night shared with you. And I know -- by knowing that Kavouss also had some additional comments on that. But -- so my suggestion is going that way because your edits in this document, I would say, have been not so serious with regards to the proposed major items we have to discuss with regards to quorum and voting and consensus.

So rather than -- and some other edits. I would like to come back to your edits later on and just start with most -- with the items of most priority, I would say, which is the question of about quorum and the question of how we take consensus or voting, if you agree to that. I would like to ask Kavouss whether he agrees to that.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Please, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, Kavouss Arestah. I think the version I sent you, but some of you have not received it, and I copied it again this morning or before this second part of this session, is more or less some editorial and structural arrangement. It seems that from some sort of the structural sentence,

---

it doesn't seem to be aligned. I don't mind it if you take your version. But see what I suggested to you. I would like to retain that. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. That is exactly my suggestion. Thank you. So I would like to come to that.

If you could bring up the version -- I don't think that is the version -- which I have sent out last night. I'm not --

So if you could come to that, because there were -- many of the comments already have been covered.

Well, let me just, as introductory remarks, say what is, you know, the reason why the document which came up here was in that way, not to come up with figures with regards to voting figures or levels, dedicated number levels of quorum we have.

That is the reason why it was, when we discussed the first time in London, that we would like to a process which builds on consensus. And the understanding was, in that way, that consensus is -- well, it's a consensus to find and it should not be based on figures.

That was my understanding that way.

And so I refer to a document which we have for years discussed and elaborated within the GNSO of ICANN as well, and we are using that in the working groups for ICANN to elaborate on some issues and to come up with some recommendations.

---

The recommendations themselves are covered by then the GNSO Council, who is going to vote on this.

So this is one part why it was done in this way.

Now, let me come to the two points.

So we introduced in this document the question of quorum, which means a level of participation as a precondition for taking decisions. A level of participation in the discussion. It's not regarding the discussion and the -- and the decision itself, but it's just to reach a minimum level of participation which could be in terms of numbers, but it should qualitatively more be that way that all relevant participants are present and are covered at least to start discussion about items and to find decisions. That's one point.

And then the other point is the consent -- finding consensus itself.

And the wording we were choosing was -- and that was the reason why we did not apply for -- at the beginning for figures here. We were choosing -- we were discussing it first, the question of different kinds of consensus. Well, rough consensus and full consensus and all these things. And then we came over to that opinion that we say, "Okay, let's leave it, because consensus is consensus and consensus in our environment should be a hundred percent consensus."

And then we call it, okay, "recommendation found by consensus." That is the first category we are talking about, and that is the 100% target we would like to reach.

---

Now, on the other hand, in any case, we would like to come up with con- -- with recommendations, and we call it then just "recommendations." So in that case, when we cannot reach consensus.

So that is where we are about, and we are discussing -- we have two positions on that.

The one is, let's try to define it in a -- in a more qualitative way, rather than going for votes, and also not in exceptional cases.

So -- and because -- and then it might jeopardize the -- that -- what we have in mind with consensus.

So then let's -- well, this is the first -- well, my take on that discussion, and I would like just to open the discussion at first for this part of a quorum, whether we should impose a quorum at all. That means a level of attendance which is needed to take decisions. And then how this quorum should be taken and should be measured, and then about the voting, the other thing, how to find consensus.

Well, as I said, a target would be, well, to find consensus on the consensus process, so -- and then this is really the question how we do that here in this one, and I do hope that we can come to a conclusion.

So I would like to open that discussion. Thank you, Chairman.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Thank you very much, Wolf. On the line is Alissa, then Mr. Arasteh.

---

ALISSA COOPER: Sorry, I'm not in the queue. I don't know if my hand was raised, but it's not raised.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. It now has been put down, so Mr. Arasteh, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Chairman.

Arasteh speaking.

Perhaps either I was misunderstood or I was not clear. I am not in favor of voting from the outset. We should make every possible effort to reach consensus. However, there might be cases, rare cases, complex cases, that every effort will be exhausted to reach consensus. Then we have to go some other way, and that would be voting. In order to go to the voting on that very, very rare cases, which I hope we would not be faced with -- I hope -- two elements exist.

First of all, quorum.

If the number of the people attending the meeting or remotely participating are below a figure which is two-thirds, I don't think that decisions would have sufficient validity.

And then coming to the voting itself, if the number of voting people present or remotely which was proposed first to be simple majority, in our -- in my view, it doesn't fit. If there are 30 people and 14 of them are against, that decision does not seem to reflect what we are

---

expecting. Therefore, at least we should have that simple majority by a two-thirds, if not four-fifths of majority.

These are the two main issues that we have to address. It is very, very important and I have added another one that came in -- come in from other peoples, talking of those two-thirds, saying that "and at least one member from each of the communities," which there are 13 communities.

So I combined them together. There are these two conditions that none of those people are ignored if they are not there, so they should be represented, and then the third question comes later on, which has not been replied, whether it is possible in particular for those communities who have one single representative in ICG, whether they could go ahead with the sort of the proxy or not. That is another issue.

So these three issues we have to address.

The remaining issue was editorial, grammatic, reality, so on, so forth, and I don't go through them.

Fortunately, most of them have been agreed by Martin or by others, referring to the Oxford dictionary or any other dictionary, but I refer to my own dictionary of 40 years of (indiscernible). I have been in this business for years and I have -- know that we could not say somebody can do something. I can do many things, but the important issue is that whether I should do it or I should not do it. It is not the capability; it is the obligations. Either moral, like "should," or mandatory, like "shall."



---

So I refer to the ICG can do this or ICG can do that or ICG is encouraging. We are not encouraging ourselves. Or ICG is expected. So that -- it has been corrected, so I've gone through that.

So the main issue is one, quorum, and second, decision-making, with the suggestion that I made -- I send it to you -- and third one, the proxy issue for those communities which have only one member and that member may not be possible neither physically attending nor remotely participating, whether or not could, by proxy, attending, or participating in the discussions, and I thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Thank you. In the queue now I have Martin, then Keith Davidson.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thank you. Martin Boyle here. If I pick up -- you can hear me, can you? If I pick up on the point of making decisions first, my concern is that if we end up with one or more of the affected parties being unable to accept it, then it doesn't matter how big our supermajority might be. If that party is not a party to the conclusion, we're just fooling ourselves if we think we've got a solution.

The second point I'd make about voting is that if we set thresholds for voting, sooner or later somebody is going to use them, and if that happens, then, again, we can end up in a position where we are -- after lots and lots of work, people just look at our answer and say it is not a viable answer.

---

So that's why I prefer, certainly at this stage, for us to be a little bit more vague about what a supermajority in a vote might look like, and to be really objective in trying to work out whether what we have got is going to be an acceptable solution. And that, I would link specifically with the importance of the issues being serious issues, serious objections, that are then clearly documented, and that we then go and try and address and respond to those objections.

Now, I recognize that that's always a difficulty but I think it's a difficulty we're going to have to get to almost on a case-by-case basis with always in front of us the -- when we present something, at the end will it be shot down because a particularly important user or a specific -- or any of the affected parties cannot live with it.

Now, turning to the quorum, I actually agree that we do need a quorum. The point I raised on the document was that I actually think that the quorum as specified is impractical, because some communities are just one person, and I don't particularly like the idea of us getting involved in identifying proxies.

Now, I wonder whether one of the things we need to do -- bearing in mind that when we come to decisions, we should be reasonably clear before we have a meeting that affects a decision, that tries to reach a decision, that we are going to be trying to make a decision in that meeting, and perhaps it is at that stage that we try to make sure that the person or the people who have got difficulties with the text are included in one way or another, even if it does mean that we have to say, "Right, okay, we need to do a conference call to finalize it when that person -- those people -- are present."

---

So, you know, I'm not going to stand in the way of getting to an agreement on the quorum part because I think it is really a practical issue and, you know, supermajorities, two-thirds, whatever it is, I think is actually less important. It's when a meeting is so called that's got one purpose -- or one community that has strong views that is not able to be there, and that, I think, gives us a problem.

Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Martin.

Keith Davidson.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thank you, Chair.

I was going to raise- -- this is Keith Davidson for the record.

I was going to raise exactly the issues Martin has over quorum, and I think, Wolf, you asked us to address quorum only at this stage, but since we're looking at it quite holistically, I think if I could continue to discuss some aspects.

I think one of the things, as we move forward to the rotating conference call times, is that there will always be one out of every three meetings that will be at a terrible time for some people in the room.

So if the chairs can be cognizant of never making a binding decision on any one call, so you have two rounds of discussion before finally binding a decision, that can help perhaps avoid the necessity to declare a

---

quorum every time, and you can appeal to people who are able to be on calls in their own time zones.

So maybe it can be more pragmatically dealt with in that way.

In terms of consensus and voting and so on, this is a thing that really does concern me quite considerably, because we've been asked by the U.S. Government to provide a proposal that is consensus based.

If we can't achieve consensus and we say we've had a supermajority agree to our proposal but there was this minority or some percentage, it means that we've voted -- however you want to explain that away, it means we've voted and we haven't achieved consensus, and that then does give the U.S. Government the right to throw out the proposal in its entirety.

So I think if our -- if our mind is focused on achieving consensus all the way through, then we should be able to do it.

Thank you, Chair.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Thank you. Maybe we can have the last round of speakers before lunch. It's Joe, Jean-Jacques, Alissa, Jari, and Jon. If we can close on that. And please try to be brief.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF:

Thank you. Joe Alhadeff.

I think two points I just wanted to make quickly.

---

One was, there might be people who can support a consensus opinion but who may have a reservation or a caution they would like to add to it.

So perhaps we can say that we have a consensus but allow people to state a reservation or opinion related to it, the community can support it, but like to highlight this point which they find to be very important, or something like that, and that might allow people to find consensus where they quibble with something on the margins but it's not something they can't live with.

It might be a caution even towards further implementation or how you look at this in the future.

The other thing is, perhaps when we're thinking about -- and I'm one of those communities that is a community of one -- when we think about those, if we just give a couple of days, you know, a week after a decision is proposed for anyone to affirm or deny the decision, that should be sufficient. I don't think we have to wait another -- a complete cycle of another phone call. A few days for comment should be sufficient for anyone who couldn't make a meeting or a phone call to take a look at a proposal and say, "Yes, I have no problem with it."

For the purposes of a quorum to have a discussion, I don't think we should create that restriction for a discussion. I think that is only a restriction applied to decision-making.

And to the extent that we want to use proxies, we would probably be able to manage that, but it would be a proxy given with a limited

---

bandwidth of discretion, so if the topic goes beyond that, we wouldn't be able to use the proxy.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Thank you. Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Chair.

This is Jean-Jacques speaking.

So two or three points.

The first is the notion of quorum. I find that Kavouss made an important point. A quorum cannot be demanded on every point. Obviously that is restricted to a certain number of cases where it is felt that that is important.

The second point I wanted to make is the link between quorum and voting. You may remember, but it seems not but a few weeks ago I did send around an email making a rather strong point about the fact that I was suggesting we should have two categories. One, decision-making without a vote, and that could be the preferred or general mode of operation of our group. And two, cases, a restricted number of cases, where voting should be allowed and contemplated.

And I did say that this would be on matters of principle, of course on personnel matters also, although I don't see where these will come up.

But that would have made things very clear.

---

For instance, I had brought it up in the nomination of the chair structure. That's over now, and fine, but I think it is still useful to have the possibility of a vote taking place when that is requested. Of course, and obviously, with all the required justifications that a vote be called for on an important subject related to some major principle.

And this is the link with the quorum. Quorum has to be achieved. Otherwise, it is the usual suspects, meaning those of us who are all within the community or (indiscernible). That's not fair, and that's certainly not something that the wider community would expect in the longer run. I think it would also cast from the credit on the ICG when the proposal for transition, it could (indiscernible) by this or that part of the community. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Alissa, please.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. This is Alissa. So a few quick points. On the issue of quorum, I think perhaps one way we can pragmatically go forward is to, as I think Joe perhaps indicated, leverage the mailing list as the means of ensuring that everyone from each community is able to comment, even if they are not able to attend a meeting or a phone call. I don't really see why we only consider the meetings and phone calls as the times when we make decisions.

In fact, for example, in the IETF, the -- every decision -- or every decision of any weight that is taken in a meeting is always confirmed on the

---

mailing list because it allows people who are not able to attend to express either their support or their concerns.

So I would say that for decisions of the weight that I think we all agree would have required a quorum, we could say we would put them out for a deadline for comment on the mailing list and that way people who are not able to attend the call or the meeting can have a chance to express their views. And maybe that gets this out of the bit of pickle of defining what the quorum and proxies, which I agree with previous speakers, are too messy for us to get into it.

I would say on the issue of consensus versus voting, the document that Wolf has put together already has two separate types of decisions outlined. One is personnel decisions. The other one is non-personnel decisions. I think in the personnel decisions section, as Jean-Jacques says, it is fine. It has to do with sort of personal preferences. I see no problem with voting for personnel.

For non-personnel decisions which is basically everything else, I'm in full agreement with Keith and Martin. I don't see any way how we could take a vote and have it be credible or legitimate. I think we must separate by consensus. And I think if we truly can't find any consensus whatsoever, that is, we can't find either what is called in the document, "recommendation by consensus" or "recommendation status," then I don't think voting will help us get out of that situation. I think we will just be at a stalemate.

So I don't think it should be viewed as a last recourse or an option at all. I think if we get to recommendation status, then I think we have a good option of allowing objectors to document their objections any way they



---

see fit and at whatever length they would like and we can put those objections forward together with whatever the opinion is that did reach the recommendation status or the rough consensus status. And that's essentially our only option going forward.

Lastly, I would just like to note given some of the edits that have happened to documents, that there's some documentation in there about polling. A poll is not a vote. A poll is a way for everyone in the group, including the consensus callers, to obtain further information in a structured way about the view of the members of the group. It is a means of informing a future consensus call. And it is not a voting mechanism. So any sort of numeric threshold on that either I think is not workable. Thanks.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Thank you. Jari, Jon, Keith and Russ Mundy just to be brief. We are already ten minutes -- we need to close for lunch. So maybe you can be very brief, please.

JARI ARKKO:

Jari Arkko. I wanted to agree first with Alissa on the quorum question. I think we actually do need a quorum, but it needs to be more defined and be more inclusive on definition including the email discussion. And the meeting will probably solve that issue.

I'm like Keith and Alissa, I'm concerned about the voting for the substantive decisions like sending the proposal forward. Indeed, if we send something that doesn't have broad consensus, then we are doomed anyway.

---

I do want to point out, however, that we can't really ask for full consensus. So the recommendation with a small minority is something we probably have to live with because there's a likelihood that there will be someone who for various reasons is still opposed. That should not block the rest of the world from going forward.

We could, of course -- and you've asked about how do we measure that. The problem with doing that in sort of a voting sense is people get very focused on the actual voting process as opposed to trying to solve the substantive discussion.

There's really no good numbers to use. Like, 2/3, frankly, it is far too little for a believable proposal for the world, right? But if you increase it to, say, 4/5, then we get worried about how did this group, for instance, get set up and how many people are coming from particular groups and you start thinking maybe there is a chance for capture by one group which would be bad.

So like it or not, we have to make a decision -- informed decision by the group at some point. Is this small enough to ignore or not?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Jon.

JON NEVETT: Thanks. Jon Nevett. I'm not going to go through what I agree with what everyone else said on the quorum issue. The one concern I do want to raise is this per-group quorum requirement risks the capture and hostage situation that Jari just talked about. If any one group decides

---

that they don't like something and don't participate and therefore, we don't have quorum, we can't move forward. We should take that requirement very seriously and think about either changing it or getting rid of it.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Keith and Russ just quickly. Half a minute.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Keith Davidson.

Just going back to Joe's comments about just a few days grace to make decisions on the mail list and so on, if it is an issue of substance, and some will be, then the necessity for some of us to consult back to our community and gain comments will take time.

So could I go back to my earlier comment and suggest that by tackling things over two weeks for the next call does give us the grace to do that. Thank you, Chair.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Russ, please.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Mohamed.

I would like to say -- first, I would like to say I'm very much in agreement with the points Alissa made earlier. I think it is really important, in particular the substantive issue, the substantive point issue. I would like

---

to recommend that all of us go back and read the 14 March announcement by the NTIA which launched this whole thing. In particular paragraph 4 talks about the places and the groups that need to be coordinated in there. Nowhere in there is the ICG even mentioned or the quantity of people made any reference to. There is a very particular set of people and then "affected parties."

I believe that if we voting on any substantive issue, we will have failed the directive we got from NTIA. And whatever we send them will likely be rejected anyway. We must reach consensus.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. It is time now to break for lunch. Be back at 2:30. Final announcement, ICG group photo will be taken before lunch. Wolf, yes?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: I really have a question here. Do we really need 90 minutes?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: You need to speak into the microphone, please. You have to speak into straight into it. Otherwise, it is not possible to hear.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: I have really the question --

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Straight into the microphone.

---

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Oh, hi. Wolf-Ulrich Knobén speaking. Do we really have 90 minutes for lunch since we already have problems with our timeline here? That's my question.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: It depends on how quick you are with the group photo and how fast you are with coming back. And we also need to check with the interpreters. I will talk with the staff. And it might be the case that we can start earlier. But I need to come back on that. There are some logistics that might prohibit the ability to start earlier. I'm sorry.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: For the group photo, it will be upstairs through the room to the left to the outside terrace.

Enjoy your lunch.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: No, we cannot take a group photo because we need to have lunch and the meeting. The group photo will not happen if it is far away from this room. So no group photo. Please have lunch.

[ Lunch break ]

---

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Welcome back, everyone. I am Patrik Faltstrom. I'm hereby starting this afternoon's meeting. I would like to -- there are two things I would like to do to start with.

First of all, I would like to mention that you have in the Dropbox, again, the ICG meeting, the Istanbul Version 5, which is what I intend to use during the afternoon.

I also would like us to thank Mohamed for chairing the meeting up until lunch in such a constructive way.

Thank you, Mohamed.

[ Applause ]

So for this afternoon, we start by talking a little bit about the ICANN enhanced accountability. It was a request that was -- on adding that after we posted the first version of the agenda, and the reason for this is that the ICANN enhanced accountability process is -- according to our charter, we acknowledge that process being in parallel but related to what we are doing, and we are saying in our charter that the two processes are interrelated and independent and should appropriately coordinate their work.

In the proposed process for the ICANN enhanced accountability that is now or shortly up for a 21-day open consultation period, there is proposed a liaison between the ICG and the group that I forgot the name of for the ICANN enhanced accountability, and I would like to have a discussion here and see what people in the ICG do believe -- do think about that liaison.

---

Further, whether people have any ideas on how we are going to either use that liaison or otherwise ensure that we are living up to the text that we have in our charter. That, of course, is still up for -- which is up for public comment still, so we are still receiving comments on our own charter, but we have so far -- as I said, that -- it's also part of our responsibility to make sure that we are coordinating with the other group, without being more specific.

So I open up the floor to the people to come with some suggestions and ideas on what our views should be.

I don't think this discussion item will terminate in some kind of concrete actions or anything yet. It might be, if we are lucky. Instead, I'm going to let this discussion going on for a maximum of 30 minutes and we'll see where we end up.

I see Arasteh and Keith and Milton.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Thank you. Kavouss speaking.

Yes, we are grateful for ICANN thinking of some sort of the interface with ICG but at this stage we still do not know what is this ICANN accountability process, it's progressing, and from what aspects they want to consult us.

If the consultation of the ICANN accountability enhancement is in relation of the general ICANN accountability enhancement, it is outside the activity of ICG.

---

If it relates to the issue of accountability within the transition of the IANA stewardship function, I don't see that is a issue that ICANN should take to us.

So I don't see at this stage that we could comment that we participate or we do not participate because we don't know how it is -- how it will be developed, so perhaps we should hold off this issue, saying at this stage we are not in a position to reply to that, and we may reply once we see a further development of the matter, but if it is relating to the accountability of ICANN, perhaps it is not in the mandate of ICG because ICG established for the IANA function stewardship transition only. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Patrik. Keith Drazek.

So there have been some developments this past week on this topic of particularly the ICANN accountability track.

Going back to the IGF meeting that took place here in Istanbul this past week, there was a town hall meeting with Larry Strickling and Fadi Chehade, Steve Crocker, and some others in the community that have been engaging in this effort, and they had posted -- ICANN had posted the proposed plan, the process plan for the ICANN accountability track the week before, and since, ICANN has said that there will be a 21-day public comment period on the process itself.



---

So as it stands today, as of today, there will be a 21-day public comment period to discuss the process around the ICANN accountability discussions.

A component of that process is the idea that there would be a liaison function or a liaison person between this group and that group, whenever it's formed, okay?

So I would agree with Kavouss that it's premature at this point to make any decisions, probably, about who would be the liaison to that group because that group isn't finalized yet. It's still in the process of being evaluated by the community.

But importantly -- and this is really an important consideration -- is that at that town hall meeting, Larry Strickling said that these two processes were very much, I guess, interdependent or inextricably connected, and that they needed to complete at the same time.

In other words, the accountability portion needs to be completed in order for our process to complete as well.

Not the -- not that they have to be -- our processes have to be merged, but they both have to complete in parallel at the same time, for the transition to be able to take place.

So I think it's -- it will be very important that our two processes in parallel, and the groups in parallel, communicate. So it's more of an information-sharing function, as opposed to maybe a contributing function that I perceive. But again, it's too early to know, because the process hasn't been finalized on the accountability piece.

---

So I'll stop there. Thanks.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Milton?

MILTON MUELLER: Thank you, Patrik. Milton Mueller, Syracuse.

Yes, I think Keith and I have similar perspectives on this, but I'm going to emphasize a different perspective.

I agree with him that it's probably too early to appoint a liaison or multiple liaisons. However, it seems clear to me that whoever it is should probably be somebody from the names community.

I would like to just float an idea that I haven't thought out thoroughly but I think it's worth floating out this idea and I think it's a good idea in terms of one way we could contribute to the process more substantially than simply liaising and information sharing, and I would say that in that period after we receive the periods -- let's say it's January 15th -- and particularly the names proposal, and sometime in mid-March or something, that this group should prepare an analysis of the accountability implications of the proposal for ICANN's enhanced accountability process.

In other words, we would say "What's being done here for the IANA accountability, how if at all does it affect the IANA -- the ICANN policymaking process accountability? Does it have any implications for that? Are there things that could be taken into account?"

---

And it would also be kind of a shot across the bow of that other group at the time, saying, "We've got a bead on our work. Maybe you should do a counterpart report in which you report back to us and say, 'Here's how we think the accountability issues should be handled,' before we make the transition, knowing what we now know about what's being proposed for IANA."

One of the concerns I have about the bundling -- too closely bundling these things together is of course that the ICANN side of the bundle could be so large that they will have difficulty reaching consensus, but on the other hand, there are things that have to be done on that side before the transition can take place.

So I think that kind of a reporting function would be a useful contribution to how these -- how we coordinate and liaise.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you. Michael?

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Thank you. Michael speaking. Three points.

Agree on it's premature to nominate.

Second point on process, I totally agree with what Keith said. Whilst at the very beginning of those processes there was not a linkage, still at Singapore Larry said on day zero, "Well, that's not on our plate," but after the Congressional hearing, he has been very impressed by the necessity to get this right, before anything happens on IANA.

---

That does not mean, as Keith said, that we have to wait, but it needs -- if the music is going to play, there has to be the accountability track of ICANN in some way established.

I like the proposal of Milton to have something more substantive, and I want to -- want to add. I mean, it is not like these are totally separate ships. I mean, at least in some areas -- maybe not in all -- there is accountability, and when -- if you look at the discussions we had at the many workshops in the IGF, accountability was used everywhere. Flavor of the month, but very often used for different things. It was not very clear what was meant.

So I think we need -- there is a discussion needed on what is meant and where there could be an overlap or something could be feeding even into -- from here into the ICANN accountability discussion.

So I like the process proposal by Milton. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, and I think pretty much of what I was going to say was already covered by Michael, but despite the fact that we are very early to have some concrete ideas on this, but again I thought we need to have a common thinking or align our thinking about how both processes are related, and I think we should come up with two things.

---

One has to do with the process itself, how are we going to align our cooperation, and the other thing has to do with the substance and the final proposal.

I understand that we are going to submit a complete proposal that would cover all aspects that is needed for the transition.

Would this be dependent on some input from the accountability team or are we going to be feeding into their process or they are going to feed into our process? I mean, it's -- there is -- and if -- if this exists, then we probably need to align also time line of both processes, where there is overlap that has to do with the transition.

Finally, a personal view.

I think of course not everything that has to do with the accountability overall of ICANN has to do with the transition itself, but I was at the hall town and I heard what Larry said and I think that you cannot really define the part that is overlapping without seeing the whole picture, so it's maybe appropriate that we see the whole picture, we know all the components, we identify components that are overlapping, and then work out a process that would help us come up with the overall proposals.

Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Thank you very much. So I have four people on the line and it seems that we are converging. I'm actually stopping there.

So I have -- sorry. Three more people.

---

Xiaodong, Keith, and Joseph, and I think that's all. Yes. Xiaodong?

XIAODONG LEE:

This is Xiaodong Lee. From my point of view, I think there's definitely no doubt that there is a relationship between the ICG work with the ICANN accountability, but from my understanding, you know -- you know, we are -- the IANA function transition is our main job, but in our country, the IANA function is something like a department of ICANN itself.

So even when we transfer the function to -- to -- maybe some people think that it is ICANN. So -- but now, just like I have apple. I'm going to give this apple to Patrik, but how I make sure that it is an apple and a good apple, and then Patrik is the right person to be the person accept the apple.

So I do believe that we need to consider the relationship between ICG vis-a-vis ICANN community very carefully, but I agree with Milton that we need to -- we have time, some time to know what be happening for the ICANN accountability and then to decide if we need to (indiscernible) to the ICANN accountability. So we have some time, three weeks left, and maybe before that, we can have a conference call and have a decision.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Thank you. Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK:

Okay. Thank you, Patrik.

---

So I think to respond to the two questions that Manal posed, one about scope, I think, and the other about the relationship between our two groups.

So I think Larry Strickling said that there is -- you know, that the processes are intertwined. You know, sort of the -- it's -- we have to look at this holistically, but that the -- my understanding is that the operation of our two groups, this group and then the ICANN accountability group that's been proposed, are very separate.

In other words, that it's not that we are necessarily feeding into that group and that that group is necessarily feeding into us.

I think the -- the expectation -- my understanding today is that these are two separate parallel processes that are dealing with some similar or, you know, related issues, but that it's not the expectation that we're supposed to contribute to them and they're supposed to contribute to us.

More of information sharing and the liaison function is really more to make sure that if there are any common areas of concern or questions, that we're at least aware of what the other is doing.

But I think that still is -- maybe needs to be defined better. But that's my understanding.

The issue of scope. The comment earlier that there's a concern that if there's too much on the plate of the ICANN accountability group, that they might not get done in time I think is a significant concern, and at the town hall meeting, Larry Strickling said -- he called out, really for the first time, that there was a narrowing -- or a narrow scope that needed

---

to be focused on in the accountability group; that it couldn't be everything. It couldn't be things that would normally be addressed through existing processes like the ATRT or other existing structures; that it's more focused on the accountability issues that result from NTIA disengaging from its contractual relationship for the IANA functions but with ICANN, and what the implications are there.

So I -- he acknowledged that it needs to be a more narrow focus, to make sure that the work can be done on time and in parallel with this process.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Joseph?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. Joseph Alhadeff.

I think perhaps I see a little more linkage than Keith does on this, in the sense that both groups are essentially, to one extent or another, dealing with what happens when NTIA steps out of the room, and therefore, we are talking about an ecosystem of accountability that NTIA impacts for both groups.

It impacts it differently for each group but that's more of a linkage than perhaps just keep each other informed.

It might be that we collectively need to look at where the hooks are in the process for how some of these linkages occur.



---

That's very different than saying we are a subject matter expert in their accountability or they are a subject matter expert in our accountability. Neither one of those is true. But I think we will likely need to do a little more, and I think we also need to make sure that people are clarifying in their mind. I think a statement of our work related to accountability may be useful because I think there is substantial confusion related to who's doing what in this process by the people who are not involved in the process directly.

On more than one occasion, I heard, "Yes, the division is ICANN will be working on the accountability issues related to the transition and other things while they will be working on the technical issues."

And the answer is, we have some work to do on the accountability side of the equation as well.

So I think, one, some clarification in some form of information on our Web site would be useful.

Two, I agree with everybody that it's premature to figure out how we do any linkage because we don't know what we're linking to.

But I do just want to just put into the concept that the ecosystem of accountability engages both transition and ICANN, and there will probably be a little more linkage than just an exchange of information related to those concepts.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Thank you very much.

---

I see that Kavouss and Manal has asked for comments after I closed the queue.

It is -- let me first summarize and then see whether you still have something to add.

What I hear is that it is pointed out that there are different kinds of accountability. We have the accountability as a result of what we are doing with ICANN and might be other things as well. What is specific to what we are doing that is the result of the IANA thing might be closer to us.

Both our charter and description of the ICANN enhanced accountability process, both of them are up for open comments which mean we don't really know what we are talking about yet so a lot of people are asking for more information before we can actually go into more formal discussion of what kind of relationship we need.

I do hear that just information sharing is probably not enough because the linkage might be stronger than what we think. And one strawman proposal is that we should add to our timeline or work items and analysis of whatever we are receiving on our request for proposal. And maybe the other group is going to do similar work, so we can do a mapping exercise between those needs and requirements which is a more formal -- well, maybe not formal, but more structured way of seeing where -- what kind of relationship we have with each other.

What I will propose is that after letting you comment, if you still want to comment on this, that we are tabling this as a very important issue for

---

us to discuss, but that we are continuing the discussion when we have more information.

With that, I would like to ask Kavouss, if you still would like to comment on what's just been said, including -- yeah, thank you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, Kavouss Arestah speaking. Yes, I agree with you, but I would like to add one element. And that element is that no matter when we establish that, I have some difficulty or I'm not comfortable with the liaison. I don't want the ICG to delegate its authority to one single person for such a very important issue. If there is any discussion, discussion comes to the ICG and we should embark on the matter, exchange of views collectively, and so on and so forth but not having the delegation of responsibility to one person to discuss on behalf of us as a liaison, number one.

Number two, in the process of enhanced accountability of ICANN, there is accountability related to the transition. That should be seen once we have overall picture of accountability. Then you will see what are the elements related to our work. Without having that, it is difficult for us to comment on anything.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Thank you very much. Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL:

I apologize. I didn't know the queue was closed. Just to raise the question very quickly -- and I understand we will be continuing this

---

online. We are going to receive from the operational communities full proposals that would have already some part of accountability that has to do with the specific functions.

Assembling all this together, are we still going to find that there are some gaps in the overall accountability thing that we will need to coordinate on with accountability track? I mean, this was the thing -- I didn't mean to couple both processes. But thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Thank you very much. And thank you for the clarification. It made -- what you just said together with what Milton said regarding actually doing some kind of mapping exercise with an evaluation of what we are doing and what the other group is doing, I also -- I also hear no one in here -- well, I don't really see anyone here really asking for an individual person that would just do information flow, as you point out, Kavouss. It might very well be the case that we are talking about something that's a little bit more strict, like a mapping exercise between the various groups, but we don't really know yet. I think that's where we are.

So thank you very much for that discussion. And I see, hooray, that we actually gained five minutes on our schedule which we definitely -- which we probably need when we open up the next issue, when we go back to consensus and timeline.

Let's move into the slot of community updates. I have added here in the order which I read the email. It might be the case that they were sent in a different order. I didn't really check the time. It is sort of random or something in my mailbox.

---

I would like to have these updates quick, not more than five minutes. And I will start to wave a little bit if it ends up being a little bit too long.

GAC, GNSO, NRO, IETF and SSAC. Is there anyone else that I missed that would like to say something? Keith?

KEITH DAVIDSON: I could provide a very brief update from the ccNSO if that's okay.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: That is noted. Let's go down the path and see whether someone else wants to -- I hope that people can be...

Paul?

PAUL WILSON: Should we ask the ICANN observers to give us any update from ICANN's point of view, or do we not want to go there? It is an opportunity.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: At this point in time, I think my suggestion is that we don't do that explicitly because it also puts them on the spot and I don't feel comfortable doing that without giving the ability for them to prepare.

Let's hope we have a break at the end of the day when we chairs are going to try to summarize the actual action points from the meeting. And those that actually would like to know that feel you don't know what's happening in ICANN, you might have the ability to talk to the ICANN people. That also gives them the ability to prepare a little bit.

---

With that, Heather, please.

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Thank you. This is Heather Dryden speaking. So I wanted to talk a little bit about how we as GAC participants are operating and give you a sense of some of the things we have started to do or started to discuss in relation to the IANA stewardship issue.

So, first of all, you might be interested to know that the proposal for five seats to participate in this group is a first for the GAC and, therefore, somewhat experimental.

While the GAC has always sought to respect regional diversity in its leadership positions, it is not structured to develop advice along regional lines. And other organizations that perhaps do do this would be the At-Large Advisory Committee at ICANN.

There is also a long history in the GAC of ensuring full engagement of all GAC members through regular reporting back and engaging online with the full membership to share information and updates and to get members' perspectives. And there are examples of this also at ICANN where we have engaged the full GAC in a process, for example, with the board-GAC recommendation implementation working group.

So as chair, I have sent several messages to the entire GAC list and apprise them of all new developments and timelines and deadlines, et cetera. And my colleagues as well have been sharing information with their colleagues as well to try and keep the information flowing.

---

We have also created a separate email list for those members of the GAC, ICG list, and the vice chairs which we are calling a contact group for this purpose. It is to coordinate the work of the five GAC representatives here and to subsequently coordinate information messages to the full GAC list.

To illustrate how this would work in practice, those of us on the GAC contact group here in Istanbul will coordinate, report to the GAC as to the results of this meeting. So I do appreciate this opportunity to engage with the ICG in person here in Istanbul. And would note that as chair of the GAC, I am committed to ensuring that the other members of the ICG benefit from the views of the GAC as a whole.

With regard to the participation of the GAC in the subsidiary processes related to the IANA transition, well, one piece of that, of course, is on the domain names side and here there is an effort to come up with an approach framed around a cross-community working group structure. And so the GAC is working out precisely how to participate in that but has a clear interest in contributing on that particular piece of the proposal in that manner.

And regarding the other two main pieces that have been identified, the protocol parameters and the numbering side, though, the GAC as GAC would not be commenting as part of those processes, I do think there is an opportunity here for governments to be advised about the ways in which governments can participate through those processes, should they wish by communicating with GAC colleagues.

And this is really the suggestion that I was making with regard to having the ICG come and meet with the GAC in Los Angeles. I think it is a really

---

good opportunity for colleagues here to use that opportunity for outreach and to do a bit of diplomacy with our government colleagues in the GAC.

So there's my update, and I hope that this has helped clarify for you the ways in which the GAC will be participating. And if you are unclear about a view, whether it is a personal view, a GAC view, and so on and so forth, I would suggest that you ask and get that clarity. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. GNSO, Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Keith, I'm not sure I'm the best person to do this. Let me just invite you to jump in whenever you feel like it. So this is Milton Mueller.

What we know is that the GNSO has created a cross-community working group. The exact current status of that group is not entirely clear to me. That's why I'm invoking Keith.

I think it's chartered. It may be that the charter is still being modified slightly or is for out for comments. No? It is out. Okay, the charter is done.

The charter basically has -- I think it accepts input from anybody, but there are only certain members that have been designated by the constituencies and stakeholder groups who can be in it. This is something that spans the ccNSO and the GNSO. So the CC people should feel free to jump in if they know more about this than I do.



---

So I think the foundations have been played for a process. I'm not exactly sure when they actually begin. Maybe they are waiting for our RFP. Maybe they're engaged in other kinds of ratification with some of the other different groups. So that's all I have to say. I really do hope that Keith can supplement it.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Milton. I think both Keiths can supplement this.

Yeah, so shortly after the Singapore ICANN meeting, going back to the spring, the various components of the ICANN naming community started working together on developing a charter for a cross-community working group. So the GNSO, the ccNSO, ALAC, I mean, there was a broad engagement to form a cross-community working group.

And I think Milton got the details right. It's been chartered. I think the various groups are now going back and going through the ratification process. And I think there's strong interest in the community starting to get to work. And I know that Keith probably has more to add at this point.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Please, Keith Number 2.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

This is Keith Number 1. I claim by being older to be Number 1.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Alphabetical, too.

---

KEITH DAVIDSON: This was actually going to be what I did report on. But from our perspective in the ccNSO, we have a call out now for volunteers for the cross-community working group. We have agreed to the charter. And there may be a point or two in there that may need to be revisited before the working group starts to head its straps.

But I would imagine that we will have our members within the next week. And I believe that the cross-community working group will need to start meeting prior to Los Angeles and have some real progress in terms of how they'll meet and how they'll progress their goals, if we are to have any chance of meeting 15 January deadline.

Thank you, Chair.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. Let me, as the chair of SSAC say, we are also involved in this. It seems to be the case. The other groups forgot that we also exist. No, I'm sorry.

I have questions from Jari. And let me ask, are there clarification questions? Okay, quickly, please. Jari first.

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko. Quick question. You said it's open for input for anyone, but there is a set of people who are part of it. Is this an open forum where anyone who's interested about the names process can participate and be part of the opinion of informing? Or is it not --

---

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Keith Number 1.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Keith Davidson. I will try and respond from at least the ccNSO perspective. I think, you know, there are formal members of the ccNSO who will go forward, which will exclude the four of the ccNSO who are appointed to this group.

There's an assumption that the four on this group will be observers to the cross-community working group. And it appears that the meetings will be open and will seek to take input from everybody where they can. But it is those who are appointed to the group that will have first right of discussion. And I imagine that the concept of that is that a discussion should be corralled and pointed towards those who are officially on that working group.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Wolf-Ulrich? Thank you.

Alissa, do you have a clarification question?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes. I mean, maybe just a little bit of follow-up on that one, which is if there are to this notion of us going around telling everyone that all of the work is to be done in the operational communities, if there are people who are not part of one of the natural ICANN constituencies, I'm a little unclear on whether they will be able to participate or what the

---

difference is between the responsibilities of the appointed people and everyone else who might want to provide input into the transition proposal for names.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. Let me take this question and make it a little bit more general and let me suggest that at our next meeting when we are going through the groups, that each one of the groups as part of what we are reporting, we are informing each other on the participation process. Otherwise, we can continue to discuss this forever.

I also got the request from Jean-Jacques to give an update from ALAC which I also add to the end.

So at the moment, I will want to go -- move forward to NRO and Adiel.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Should I speak now?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Wait for your turn, please.

Adiel, NRO.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Okay. Thank you very much, Patrik. For the NRO, we have also started our consultation process. We are doing this on the original WSIS using the different RIR original scope for the consultation mechanism. So each RIR will have their own consultation process.

---

What is good is that we are using the NRO Web site to consolidate all the process. So from the NRO Web site, you can access the different RIR consultation process. Each RIR has a mailing list where you can describe. They are open mailing lists. They will be open.

And we are also publishing on a specific session of our Web site the outcome of the different, I would say, face-to-face consultation, where they are, and report on the mailing list.

We have also published on the NRO Web site our timeline for the process completely. This timeline will have to be updated, of course, with the final timeline proposed by the ICG.

We want, of course, to make this as open as possible so that everything is going to come from our mailing list. At the end, there will be at each stage of the process a way to go back to the community to validate what is being done.

We intend to involve at the end, completely at the end of the process, a representative from the community to validate that everything that is being submitted to the ICG is in line with what happened concurrently on the different mailing lists.

One aspect of our process is also our own accountability. We have embedded into this self-assessment of the RIR accountability. And it is a process. And the first phase of the process just ended with a survey among the five RIRs on our accountability framework. That's also published right now. That's what I can say.

Anyone can join the mailing list and participate. Thanks.

---

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. Hartmut, please.

HARTMUT GLASER: I only like to join that -- Hartmut speaking -- that Paul, Adiel, myself, we agree to do it today, NRO and ASO, so the ASO is part of all this contact with the community.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you for that clarification.  
And let me then move to IETF and Jari.

JARI ARKKO: Thank you. Jari Arkko. And I wanted to give a brief update.  
  
So we've been discussing this topic actually for quite a while so we had two meetings in March and now in end of July, and that one was actually quite well-attended and focused on the question of, you know, what is the ICG and what are the expectations for IETF and what can we do at the IETF side.  
  
Based on that meeting and subsequent discussion on the various mailing lists, we've decided to create a new working group called "IANA Plan."  
  
If you Google for that, then the first link gets you to the mailing list. The group was created 90 minutes ago. I pressed the button. And the plan is for this to be the open forum for discussing the IETF's part of the

---

transition, and it's completely open so anyone can join and you will -- we will be making calls for governments and others who are interested to come in and join the party.

And there's also some discussion already going on that's one individual from the IAB who has taken on the task of writing a proposal. There's no IETF proposal yet at any stage, but there's one draft proposal from an individual who has been gathering some comments, about 50 emails on that -- right? -- so far.

So work is going ahead but we are at an early stage because it's not really the creation of this forum, it's the building of the consensus that matters and that will still take a long time -- months -- and getting everyone involved, that's the key thing.

So we will be sending mail about this and asking some of you also to distribute it to your groups. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much.

Next, SSAC. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Patrik. As most of you know, SSAC has published one report related directly to our work here and it's the overview and history of the IANA functions and it's intended to be an educational and reference kind of document, and if you haven't had a chance to look at it, I'd urge everybody to at least look through it lightly and if you're so inclined,

---

read it carefully. It's about 25 to 30 pages and has lot of information about the history of IANA in there.

We're also working on a couple of additional documents which we expect to publish in the future. Can't say when, because we operate very much on consensus also.

There's one that's, we're hoping, close to finished, and then another one to come later. But as we're all volunteers there, we work as hard as we can but there's only so much time that can be put into them, but we're -- these are very high priority for the SSAC work plan.

>>

(off microphone.)

RUSS MUNDY:

Actually, the titles of the other two are still under discussion, so no. Sorry.

[ Laughter ]

The general subject matter, I will comment on.

The general subject matter of the next one is more specifically related to the NTIA IANA functions contract and some more specifics about that. That's the intent at this point.

And the other one will -- is expected to be more along the line of an SSAC view and commentary on the general topic area.



---

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Joseph?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Joseph Alhadeff. Just a question to all, actually, the speakers is: As we're developing these community processes, are we cross-linking them to our central page so that people can find them easily? Because that would be tremendously useful, perhaps also with a short description of how to participate in the process, if there's a way you'd like people to feed into that process.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: The links are there, as many as we have found, but we are, over time, together with our support staff, trying to make that better.

This is one of the things that will be better as soon as we have a secretariat up and running and the Web site that I actually want to have, but it's a good idea to also have the description, not only the links, where we can maybe even, if we have time, describe the various processes in the same kind of language so it's possible for people to understand how the processes work.

But on the other hand, I also think that it's important that we get the result needed and we should not spend more time on those kind of things more than we actually need, but that is probably more than what we are doing today. So thank you for the input.

Next, ccNSO. Keith, do you have -- Keith Davidson, do you have anything more to add, please?

---

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Just one thought did occur to me. Keith Davidson, for the record.

I think within a week or so, it might be appropriate to inform this group via the mailing list of both the members of the cross-community working group and the charter of that working group, so that -- you know, it may be of some interest to some of you so I'll undertake to do that as soon as things are finalized.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Thank you. And ALAC. Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you, Patrik. This is Jean-Jacques.

There's three things for the ALAC.

First, we have a dedicated working group which was set up more than a month ago and we meet on line once a week, so it's well-attended and it's very detailed in its workings, so the impression I have is that actually we get quite deep feedback from our community.

The second thing is that we also now have members of our group, of that working group, who are engaged in interacting with other communities, including the operational communities, through their proposal development process and in following on line what these various communities are doing.

The third thing is that the ALAC has tasked its future challenges working group, which is a permanent working group, with taking up the whole

---

notion of accountability but more specifically in the framework or in the context of the transition we're talking about.

Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much.

Lynn?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: It's Lynn St. Amour. I just wondered if Jean-Jacques could just expand a little bit more on his last statement about ALAC taking up a work group that was going to focus on accountability within the transition.

I mean, presumably they would be working within the communities to address the accountability issues within each one of those communities and not have a -- you know, a hierarchical position on it.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes. Thank you. This is Jean-Jacques here.

In answer to Lynn's question, this is a work which is just starting now in the ALAC future challenges working group. It is not directly subordinated to our work on the transition. We have felt for some time already that this question needs -- needed to be addressed from the

---

wider point of view of the user perspective, the Internet user globally, and it happened that we took up the subject just now.

So of course there will be the transition aspect to it, but it will probably not be limited to that.

You may remember that the first large work which had been done by this future challenges working group was a document which was voted into a white paper, the first white paper of the ALAC, which was called "R3" or "Making ICANN Responsive" -- the second "R" I don't remember -- "and Respected." "Responsive" -- something -- and "Respected."

And they were -- there was an analysis or conclusions or recommendations to the ICANN board and to others, and it had a fairly wide circulation.

So it was in the same spirit of a very open platform without any strict guideline as to what we must achieve that we are embarking on this work on mainly accountability.

Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Thank you very much. And the -- I think the conclusion I draw is that it was very useful to have this and I think it -- this kind of exchange of -- and description to each other on how our respective processes work will probably, I hope, make the discussion in the future easier to manage.

Alissa, I'm sorry, I didn't see you had your hand up.

---

Alissa, please.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Patrik. This is Alissa.

I just wanted to provide for people an idea that someone brought to me which I thought was a good idea, which is that whilst the cross-community working group is fully formed and the folks are appointed and the charter is complete and so forth, the suggestion was that I or a group of us in the ICG write a blog post for CircleID that explains how anyone can participate in all of the operational community processes, and that being kind of a forum where lots and lots of interested parties already read it and where we could have sort of a further exposition about how to get involved, as opposed to our portal which I think we're not trying to clutter with too many words, so that sounded like a good idea to me and I'll write a note for the mailing list too, but just wanted to flag that for people. If anyone thinks it's not a bad idea, we should discuss that on the mailing list, but I will take that as an action item to start thinking about in the next few weeks.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Thank you very much, Alissa, and I think that is in line with what we were talking about here, and for example, the suggestion of Joseph to summarize the various processes on our Web page in a blog post or otherwise help people to participate.

So that you take the -- take the pen and have the time to start there, I think we all thank you for taking the initiative. So thank you.

---

With that, I would like to move to the next item on the agenda, the ICG independent secretariat.

So Adiel, over to you, please.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Okay. So as I mentioned this morning, the last version of the RFP is now ready for publication on Monday, as soon as we agree to move on that.

It will be projected. We haven't put it on Dropbox because -- to ensure that we have everybody see this at the same time because it will be published.

So this RFP is not -- the content of the requirements are the same as what the document we have originally worked on. What was done here is to just put it in -- put it in the form of a proper RFP, following ICANN internal procurement processes. Well, no, that is not the last version.

So that document is what is going to be released.

One of the things that I would like us to agree on is the time line. It will be released on Monday, the 8th, and will be closed on the 22nd. In between, there is -- there are a few things that will happen. Especially the question -- the clarification and additional question period, where questions can be asked by potential applicants.

Those questions will come to the mailing list that's set up for that.

If the questions are logistic-related, procurement process-related, legal, and stuff, ICANN staff will be -- are going to provide us answers to that

---

question, the ICG will review them, and will send back to the potential applicant.

We may be also requested to answer some specific questions related to the job itself of secretariat and all the independence part of it, so that process is going to happen and it is described in the time line.

There are a few documents attached -- that will be attached to this RFP, like a nondisclosure agreement, the form for conflicts of interest, and all of that.

The RFP will be released as well with the general terms and conditions for a contract with ICANN.

So the contract will be signed with ICANN but the work will be done for the ICG.

So roughly that is it.

Now, the second aspect of this is the selection process. As soon as we have closed the RFP period, we have to go through a process to select the final company or person to do the job, and for that process, right now we have a subcommittee of the ICG that has consulted to work on the -- on this -- the RFP and ICANN, et cetera.

So the question is: Will that same group do the selection? Do we want to set up another group for the selection process? That is open for discussion.

And if there is any very fundamental comment on the RFP document itself.

---

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Joseph?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Joseph Alhadeff.

I'm not a hundred percent sure this is a fundamental question because I've never responded to one of these RFPs, but I just wonder if we've given a person who's responding to this proposal enough detail about what they're expected to do.

Because when you say things like "manage the documents" without giving an idea of what workload that entails in terms of the frequency of the documents, the nature of the documents, I'm not exactly sure whether that's something that can easily be responded to or if that's meant to be part of the negotiation of the contract where that elaboration would go into it.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Jean-Jacques?

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

Yes. Unfortunately I cannot scroll the text on my computer so I can't see if what I'm going to talk about is already in the text, but I want to make sure that we have in that text, or we shall have, a mention that the call for proposals should be really wide.



---

In other words, not limited to a set of countries which have traditionally provided a lot of consultant companies, some of them very good. There's no -- that's not the problem. But in order to make this more representative of the worldwide community, it should be advertised far and wide.

And in the selection process, which is my second point, I think that we should also be attentive to the fact that if everything else is equal, then maybe we should consider giving a slight preference to a company from outside the usual providers of consultancy firms.

My third point is that I would be willing to participate in both the RFP part of it and for the selection process as a representative of the at-large community. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Thank you. Kavouss Arasteh speaking.

Thanks for the brief. I don't think that we need to establish a new group. The group which is in place is sufficient, have sufficient experience and background, so they continue to work.

If they -- if there are questions raised in the nature of the secretariat nature, they will consult ICANN. If it is other question, you will deal with the group. Should you find there is something you should consult the entire ICG, you will do that, so I don't think that we need any particular arrangements. Thank you.

---

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much.

Russ Housley?

RUSS HOUSLEY: In terms of the point that Joe made, I'd like to say when the ICANN procurement folks reviewed this, they had similar details throughout and they proposed a solution, which we accepted, which is that we give a guess of how many man-hours we're looking for. That way we don't have to detail every one and it gives them the rough scope they need to give a bid.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Daniel?

DANIEL KARREBERG: Just a point of order. Which particular version of the RFP -- oh. No. Excuse me. Daniel again. Start over.

Is what is before us a question to agree to a specific text for an RFP?  
And if "yes," have we seen -- have we all seen it?

Or is the question before us to say "Adiel has done good work, we've watched it from the sidelines, and we're happy with it"?

And I think -- I think, first of all, we need to have an answer to that, and then if the answer is we need to agree on a specific text, I object to not having seen it.

---

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Adiel, do you want to comment on that?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Well, the original text was posted on Dropbox. I have integrated all of the comments that come to the text. The final version is a version that the procurement team from ICANN has put together based on the normal procurement process of ICANN adding some of the information related -- basically related to the process of submission and fielding like that.

On Dropbox, you will see globally they main text of the RFP. As I mentioned, we haven't put the final version of the RFP on Dropbox because our Dropbox is public so everybody can see.

>> The mail list is public too.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: The mailing list of the ICG are circulated of the mailing only of the ICG.

>> The archive is public.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Of ICG, yes. But the last RFP has not been circulated on the list of the ICG.

---

RUSS HOUSLEY: I'm sorry. My point was that's not why we distribute it on the mail list.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Exactly, exactly. Perfect.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Let me try to repeat what Daniel's question was because I think you talk a little bit beside each other. I think it is understood that the complete RFC is a package of multiple documents, to which some of them are legal documents and otherwise from ICANN that for various reasons cannot be shared before the RFP is published.

I think Daniel's question was the part of this package which is created by the ICG, is that what is going to be included in the package? Is that something that ICG has seen? And that's exactly the same document, right?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: So the path of the ICG, what ICG should agree on is on Dropbox. If people have looked at it in Dropbox and agree with it, that's fine. Nothing more than that is in the overall package. That's the thing.

So there hasn't been any discussion really on this, on the mailing list. I don't know if that is good or bad.

[ Laughter ]

That's it.

---

PATRIK FALTSTROM: This was the clarification I had wanted to know. So let me go back to Daniel. So the situation is a little bit complicated here where the actual document which is part of ICG has been visible. So, please.

DANIEL KARREBERG: My question is: What specific version of what specific document is the thing that went into this process? That's all I want to know. And I want to have it minuted that we didn't see the whole proposal. That's the whole point.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So, Adiel, can you please name the document in the Dropbox that will be part of the package?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Okay. There is a document in the secretariat -- let me see if I can find it now. In Dropbox, you have secretariat and you have a document called RFP-ICG-secretary-Version 1.

So that is the document that the ICANN procurement group used to have the final RFP that will be released.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Okay.

---

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:                    Okay? That document RFP-ICG is based on the ICG secretariat document that we all worked on.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:                That's the answer to the first question. Let us then minute that the panel consists also of other material, and that other material created by ICANN will be made public for the world and also for the ICG at the point in time when the RFC is made public.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:                    Yes, correct. And I can list the documents which we are talking about.

DANIEL KARREBERG:                For me, that's not necessary. For me all the questions I had were answered.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:                    Anyone else want to know or not?

PATRIK FALTSTROM:                Let's go -- I have Lynn, Jean-Jacques and Kavouss. Let's take those three speakers.

Yes, that's true, you as well, Wolf-Ulrich. My apologies. And we will see if we go back to you again.

Lynn?

---

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Wolf-Ulrich was first. I'm happy to cede to him.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Please, Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Patrik. Just to the selection process, I also want to keep it as simple as possible and to keep the group as possible. But I would like to say that it should be clear that the people in this group, in this selection committee, do not have any interest in any of the bidders, let me say. For example, if VeriSign is coming and bidding for that, which I don't expect, I wouldn't expect Keith taking part in that. Thanks.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Lynn.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: It is Lynn St. Amour. I put my card up for a couple of the other points. But just to answer, to add to your summary of where you thought we were a moment ago, Patrik, did the subcommittee actually review the full package, including the ICANN documents? If so, I think we should just note that. If not, it is probably a good extra step to ask them to just do that on the ICG's behalf.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yes, the subgroup has received all the (indiscernible).

---

LYNN ST. AMOUR:

I wanted it minuted as part of the summary.

When I put my card up again, what I wanted to comment on is I think we want to hold ourselves to the highest possible practices. And in that case, it is probably appropriate that a team that wasn't responsible for writing the RFP actually evaluate the bids that come in against it. I think we should also think about whether or not those operating communities perhaps that are directly tied to the output of this work not be a part of that subcommittee, if you can follow that, if I was clear enough.

And then, second, I think we should also think about whether or not there is any other criteria we want to put out in the world at the same time as we release the RFP. Again, if we are holding ourselves to best practices, then there are probably a couple which say that any entity that actually has a contractual relationship with ICANN, you know, is not appropriate to apply for this or something.

And maybe it is even the same thing for -- I guess my other point, if any of the other operating committees that are actually going to be impacted by the operations of this particular proposal should not be part of that subcommittee.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Thank you. Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you, Patrik. This is Jean-Jacques. First, I would like to agree with all the points just made by Lynn.



---

And then I would like to take up three points. First, under the form of a question directly to Adiel, which is -- I'm sorry, I don't have all the text in front of me because of scrolling problems. But have you included or mentioned in the criteria a mention of geographic diversity?

In other words, we want to make sure we take into sufficient account proposals which may come from outside, let's say, North America, western Europe, and Australia, New Zealand just to make sure there is sufficient outreach and communication about this to create a level playing field.

My second point is about the selection committee. I'd like to know who is currently a member of that committee and how they were appointed or nominated.

My third point is I wish to participate in that committee. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Adiel, do you want to respond to that?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

To the first part of the question, there is no very explicit session on the RFP that talks about diversity because we thought it is an open consultation, an open RFP. Anyone can participate. It is not how we communicate or reach out to people about the openness of this, which will ensure the diversity. But there is no very specific paragraph on diversity of proposal here.

The second, the subcommittee has worked on this, myself, Russ and Daniel. And Patrik.

---

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: How were they appointed? Hello? This is Jean-Jacques. Can you tell me how the group was appointed?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Well, there was a call for volunteers on the ICG mailing list, and those are people who volunteered to join the group. Thanks.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Kavouss.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Can I just -- before Kavouss, just come in on the previous point, Adiel. In that case, I would suggest that you put in a line in the draft saying that the committee or the RFP actually reaches out for the purposes of geographic and global diversity. Thank you.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Okay, yeah. In fact, I've discussed -- we've discussed this a little bit. And one thing that was suggested is that we count on the ICG member to help -- to spread the word about this RFP as much as possible so that we can reach out to as much as possible and diverse groups as possible. If needed, we can add that to the announcement to ensure that we broaden the scope of the proposal as much as possible. Thank you.

---

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Adiel. Yes, I specifically request that that be added. Thank you very much.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I just want to -- it sounds a little bit like if we have had some communication problems in ICG on how this has been handled, which is something I as co-chair feel that we in leadership need to listen to. This process in the secretariat includes two steps. First, we have a request for interest that was announced. Together with that announcement -- I can't find my email now, but that announcement was also known to the ICG mailing on trying to reach out to as many as possible and inform they as organizations are interested in responding to the RFP.

And then the second step is the release of the actual RFP including explicit sending of the RFP to the ones that actually have responded to the RFI.

So to some degree, the train is on its way to leaving the station. Your comments are well-appreciated, Jean-Jacques. But also please understand that -- which I hear you do, that Adiel is at the moment sort of working with a train that is already moving.

So, Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. Kavouss Arestah speaking. Patrik, distinguished colleagues, we are dealing with the specific issue of expertise and so on and so forth. This geographical distribution, geographical diversity is not the main element of that.

---

If you want to include that, we should that with some sort of qualifications to the extent practicable, preferably, something like this. But we should concentrate and focus on the expertise. That is important for us.

If I want to make a building, I don't think ask geographical distribution for the best architect. I go to the best architect, economically, also viable. But I don't do it for the geographical distribution. So let's just leave that one now.

Coming to the main issue, Chairman, I think we should not say that we not seen this document. It is not good for ICG to say that. We should say that this secretariat consists of a package, has two elements. One element relating to the fall within the purview of the ICG. We have seen that. It was posted on the mailing list, commented, and comments are included, taking into account what was said today to put something about the geographical inequality.

The second relate to ICANN activities and procurement, even if we want, it is outside our expertise to talk about that. So we should it in a positive way but not saying that we have not seen this document. I would not be favor of saying that I have agreed to some document that I have not seen.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Thank you very much.

Mohamed.

---

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I would like to expand on the point Lynn mentioned about conflict of interest and evaluation.

I think first the group has to have criteria for evaluation. That is important. That criteria will be good if that will be circulated among us so we know exactly the evaluation criteria.

I just want to go further than that by requesting that the operational communities, just for the sake of transparency, there is lots of stakeholders currently observing this process carefully.

For the sake of transparency, I think we can add a text and say that operational communities, they will be affected by the outcome of this operation should not apply or participate in this process.

Selecting an operational community and listed as independent secretariat will be harmful to our process and really sends a negative message. I think that's even a clear conflict of interest. So if we can clarify that from the beginning so we don't have ambiguity, that would be great.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. So what I have now is Keith Davidson and Keith Drazek as well or is it -- Daniel, do you still want to speak? Yep. Okay. And Joseph.

We have Keith, Joseph and Daniel and then I would like to -- Adiel to try to bring this topic together.

Keith Davidson.

---

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thank you, chair. Just echoing Lynn's comments and Mohamed's on the conflict of interests and the requirements for the highest possible standards for this group, I think -- and having seen in the past some issues arising within ICANN where contracted parties are bidding for other contracts within ICANN, ICANN does have quite a strict conflict of interest policy. And I'm not sure whether in the process of getting the documentation from ICANN, whether, firstly, it has taken account of their full conflict of interest policy. And I would like to ask if that's been checked and also has it been through the ICANN legal team.

And my reason for asking this is I think as well as best practice, I think it is common courtesy, that we eliminate anyone who ICANN would hold to be conflicted right at the start rather than have them go through the trouble of compiling (indiscernible). I wonder if Adiel could clarify that for us.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Okay. You can clarify that now.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yes, okay. The first thing -- the ICANN conflict of interest policy is going to be applied because in the set of documents that are going to be published, there is a conflict of interest disclosure form there. The RFP has been -- and it is, in fact, currently being reviewed by the ICANN legal team. So the ICANN legal team is part of the loop.

---

In fact, we are not reinventing the process, the procurement process of ICANN. We are not touching that at all. We are leaving the ICANN procurement team to handle this as per their internal policy because at the end of the day, the ICANN will be the contracting party and ICANN will be liable for that. So ICANN is doing that and giving us hints and information on how to do this the way it should be done. That's -- that will be there.

Now, how much the conflict of interest is going to be play in the evaluation at the end is something that will be discussed because we may have more strong and strict robust saying this is how we want for the ICG side the conflict of interest to play in the selection. That can even be on what ICANN has. (indiscernible).

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Keith.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Could I have ask perhaps if ICANN could circulate their conflict of interest policy to the list? There has been some curiosity around the table. Those of us who perhaps want to review that and make further comment, we might have the opportunity. Is that a reasonable request on ICANN? Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I hear from ICANN in the back that it is. They believe it is a reasonable request.

Daniel.

---

DANIEL KARREBERG: Let me make a proposal to wrap this up. We have Adiel. And I thank you. We have a proposal according to the ICANN procurement policy that's ready to go out. It is based on a document that has been before us for quite some time which, in turn, is based on some documents that we've discussed thoroughly.

So I propose that we ask Adiel to ask ICANN to go ahead with this. That's number one.

Number two, I don't think that we should put additional constraints that are not part of this draft into an announcement because that's unclear. We can put some very general stuff in an announcement in that we would welcome submissions from, you know, anywhere, along with what Jean-Jacques wants, but I'd be -- I'd caution very much against extending the criteria in the RFP through an announcement. That's not -- just not the way you do things.

And it may -- it may bite us later on. Because if we refer back to those things, then we'll get excuse -- we'll get accused of arbitrary behavior.

So my proposal is to -- that we all agree to send out this thing on Monday as planned, with a very generally worded announcement.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So Adiel, do you want to try to close -- I give you the ability to also give some comments and then I will summarize with a question to us in the room to make a decision.

Please, Adiel.



---

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Well, if you're going to summarize, I think I will leave it to you to give us one summary for all. Thanks.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yeah. I feel that as the chair for this meeting, I should actually summarize and call for -- even though as you will hear, it will be very much similar to what Daniel actually proposed.

So thank you, Daniel, for helping me in understanding the word -- what words I should use.

So there are three things to what I would like us to agree on.

The first one is that we allow Adiel to move ahead and announce the RFP as proposed; to work with ICANN and do whatever is needed to make sure that this actually goes out on Monday.

The second one, that we ask Adiel to add some words but the word -- regarding diversity, but as we heard several people in this room say -- and I think you, Kavouss, expressed it very, very carefully, very well -- that the geographical diversity, et cetera, should not be added as any kind of criteria that we are using. It's an interest that we might have because it's good to see proposals from all over and from new parties and whatever, but it should not be an evaluation criteria. If nothing else, that would, from my perspective as chair, turn all of this upside down and we'd need to go back again and revisit what our evaluation criteria is, and I don't want to do it now. We need our secretariat.

---

The third thing is that we have an explicit request from Jean-Jacques to be added to the group that we, at the moment, are using to work with the RFP, and I suggest that we accept that request from Jean-Jacques to be added.

It will be noted, of course, that -- by others that we are using the ICANN process of conflicts of interest, et cetera, which means that when we know what RFPs we get -- actually get a response, it might be the case that we get a case of rotation of people or whatever.

Those three are my suggestions. I'll ask Adiel to go ahead; we do accept adding some language but no requirement; and we accept adding Jean-Jacques to this group.

Now I'm open for -- I see requests for comments from -- from at least three people, so let's start at the end of the table. Keith Drazek.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thank you, Patrik. I support everything you said, but I just want to make sure that I understood correctly that Jean-Jacques was requesting to be part of the group but I thought -- I thought, and I may be mistaken, that he was asking to be part of the evaluation group, not this group, if there's going to be two separate groups. I just want to make sure we're clear.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Yes. That is true. He was asking to be added as the evaluation group.

---

At the moment, we only have one group, which means that the people on the group, the people on the -- the persons on the group is currently the ones that Adiel mentioned.

We will add Jean-Jacques to that for now. I don't feel we have consensus, really, on how to do the evaluation and who should be in the actual evaluation group.

We have a suggestion that the evaluation group should be the same people. I also hear some people saying, "No. The people should absolutely be different people than what is in this group." So I hear both views.

Given that we don't know what RFPs are coming in, I would like to table this because we need -- for the evaluation group at the moment, but I'm happy to hear comments on that.

Keith first -- Keith -- Adiel?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Yeah. I would just say for the evaluation group and the group that is working on that, I think for now we continue with this group, and if we have a problem of conflict of interest, we come back and say -- and we modify that.

Because I think everybody agreed that the group that worked on this can continue with the evaluation.

KEITH DRAZEK:

So this is Keith Drazek.

---

So I wasn't sure that there was agreement on that, and so I just want to make sure that if Jean-Jacques is really interested in participating in the next group, that he's not conflicted out by being appointed to the current group, if that's still an open question. I just want to make sure that we're being sensitive to what he really wants.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Now I understand your comment.

Let's move around and listen to more comments and try to do it quickly so we can close, because I do think that we do have sort of the same view here. Mary.

MARY UDUMA:

Thank you. Mary Uduma.

I think my understanding is that a different group would evaluate the applications when they come in, and if that agreement -- if there's an agreement in the room that the current group does the evaluation with Jean-Jacques joining them is what -- I think I need clarification on that.

Because the -- the general consensus in the morning when we were talking was that we have a new group that will do the evaluation, different from the group that is doing the process.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Thank you. Kuo-Wei?

---

KUO-WEI WU: Yeah. I'm the liaison so I'm not going to participate in this, but I would like to clarify from the ICG member.

When you are talking about, you know, the -- the outsourcing for the secretary, I think that ICANN is fine, but I just want to make sure when you're talking about, you know, the -- looking for the independent secretary, what about also equipment? You look at equipment. If you are asking ICANN to pay for another company to buy this equipment for this secretary, I think we'd like to clarify, you know.

Let us know what is the independent secretary function is. We don't want to over-expend in those --

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yeah. That is actually listed in the RFP and AV is not included so that is clarified.

Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. Kavouss Arasteh Speaking. Chairman, I think returning around the subject, I don't know what is existing group, current group, future group. There is a group dealing with the RFP for the secretariat. Up to now it has done the job for preparation of that. Later on, continue for the evaluation. That's the same group. If any new member wanted to be added to that group, we have no problem, but please do not create a new group. Thank you.

---

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

I just got a note from Keith Number 1 --

[ Laughter ]

-- and his apologies for having to leave the meeting, so I would like to add here to the minutes that at 3:42 Keith Davidson leaves the room. Thank you very much for your participation.

Joseph?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF:

Yeah. Perhaps building on what Kavouss has just said, perhaps that's the best suggestion is -- because I think there's a utility to having those who created the proposal be in the room when the proposal is being applied, because they can explain some of the thought that went into some aspects of the proposal.

But if we want to make sure that they are applying it in as neutral a fashion as possible, let's ask a couple of other people to join that process because a couple of fresh eyes may also have a new way of looking at it.

So that would then solve the problem. We are just making an addition to the group when it's necessary for the purpose of evaluation. We're not changing the group. That group continues, so that the core is maintained. And I think that addresses those people who are concerned that they want some fresh eyes on the process at the time of evaluation.

---

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Jean-Jacques?

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

So following on what I think Keith Drazek just said, I am completely available, whether to join the existing group or to enter a new and different group.

My purpose is to contribute to this work. Whether it's with this or that group doesn't make any difference to me. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Okay. Let's move forward and let me repeat and maybe be a little bit more clear on the wording.

One, we do ask Adiel to go ahead with the release of the RFP, working together with ICANN according to what is needed to be done; two, to add some wording but not additional requirements regarding diversity; and three, that we are adding Jean-Jacques to this group and at the same time, of course, ask anyone else that would like to have more work to do to join the group that we have.

Is there anyone opposing? Clarification, Mary?

MARY UDUMA: Clarification. Mary. Mary Uduma, please.

Since we are following ICANN process, will ICANN be part of the evaluation or will the evaluation be done purely by the ICG? Thank you.

---

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Adiel, will you please explain this.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: No. The evaluation will be done by the ICG, through the group.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: There are -- let me just add that as the actual RFP package consists of various other legal documents and other things as well, there are some objective criteria. Because ICANN is one of the contracted parties in the final contract, they will of course do, to some degree, some of the evaluation, but the evaluation on substantial matters that have to do with what we in ICG provide in this package, it's ICG and no one else that is doing that evaluation.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: And in fact, ICANN has been clear that they are not going to take a decision even on those criteria. They are just going to let us know, "These are our valuation on this -- this thing." The decision is on the ICG, will be on the ICG.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Heather and then Kavouss.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you. Just in your summing up, just to confirm that there will be a copy of the conflict of interest rules circulated that ICANN has? I, in



---

particular, would like to see that, and I suspect other colleagues would because we did seem to have good agreement around the need to address those conflict of interest issues related to operational communities or support to those communities and those sorts of issues. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Kavouss, then Lynn, and then Alissa, and then I actually would like to hear if anyone is objecting.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. Kavouss Arasteh speaking.

Chairman, we could mention that the evaluating or evaluation group that is called with Jean-Jacques and if any other wants to work but any manageable manner. We don't want to be extended.

"In performing the tasks and activities" -- the exact wording, "In performing the tasks and activities, the evaluation group will consult ICANN where relevant and appropriate."

We leave it to the group to say that if it is relevant, they consult them and it is appropriate. As such, leave it to the ICG group evaluation. No doubt they will consult ICANN when relevant and appropriate. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Lynn and then Alissa.

---

LYNN ST. AMOUR: So to answer your question first, I think I'm not objecting and at the same time I'm not entirely comfortable because I think we're -- some of the statements you're putting out, we don't need to be as specific as you seem to be about them.

I think we need to see the conflict policy. I'm a little uncomfortable about putting the RFP out and not saying anything about criteria. And maybe we simply say, "This will be evaluated using the ICANN conflict of interest policy" or something as a criteria, because putting criteria in place after you get the bids in never looks right from the outside, and, you know, we don't -- if we don't have time to do that now, and we probably don't, then I think something that simply says it will be -- we will be using some guideline or general guideline or something which is already established and known by the community is actually fairly important to me.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Adiel, do you have any comment on that regarding what is in the package from ICANN's side?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: No. I think -- I think it will -- it's worth adding that. There are some criteria in the document, but the conflict of interest is not there specifically, so maybe that is a thing to look at.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Alissa?

---

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks. This is Alissa.

So just one follow-up on Lynn's last point. I guess looking at the RFP text that we have, I sort of thought that's what the criteria for evaluation -- which is I think what Lynn was talking about -- is what Section 2 is about. Like these are -- these are the requirements that we're looking for. So I was sort of assuming that that's what would be used to evaluate the proposals. But Adiel and others should speak to that.

I got in the queue just because I wanted one point of clarification on the issue of diversity.

I guess I'm wondering if what we need is a plan for how, on Monday and early next week, how the ICG, together with the -- with the ICANN secretariat, will make sure that the RFP goes out to a diversity of potential interested parties, as opposed to words in the announcement that say that the RFP should go out to a diversity of interested parties, which to me the former makes a lot more sense than the latter, so that's -- that's just a question about how it is that we're addressing this diversity question. Thanks.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Thank you. Heather?

HEATHER DRYDEN:

Thank you. So just following up the last couple of points, I agree with Lynn, and now that we've got better clarity about what exactly is in the RFP in terms of conflict of interest, it -- I think we do need to

---

understand what ICANN's policy is and what that will achieve for us in this particular context before we -- before we go ahead and issue this. I think that's an important matter to handle. And I understand we may need to address it quickly because we're wanting to get the RFP out early, so that we have that support in place for our work, but I wouldn't want us to go too fast on this point.

I do think it's important enough to warrant a slight pause. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Adiel, can you...

Russ?

RUSS HOUSLEY:

Maybe we should circulate one document from the package, which is ICANN's contractor conflicts of interest policy. It's in the package, it says what the policy is, and then it asks you to disclose any conflicts you have and asks for the person who's signing it at the end to explain that situation.

It's two pages. I think it will resolve this issue.

If we could get ICANN's permission to share that one document with this room, I think -- I think you would all have your concerns put aside.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Adiel.

---

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Yes. And I think that is one of the action items that we agree on.

So that will be circulated and that -- that will be -- we will know everything about it and that is part of the -- what will be released.

The criteria for evaluation is in the RFP. Point 12 of the RFC [sic] have all of the criteria that will be used. There is -- the conflict of interest will be managed through the conflict of interest policy that will be circulated.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Mohamed?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Yeah. Thank you, Adiel, for pointing to the high-level selection criteria. I think that's fine for me. I withdraw my request earlier for an evaluation criteria.

But I think it's important that we see the document and have no issues than that we can release the RFP in the time frame that's already associated with it, 8 September. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Thank you very much for that very good discussion.

So the action point, as part of the actions we ask Adiel, is to verify with ICANN that we can circulate -- and you seem to think that is possible -- to circulate the document with --

>>

(off microphone.)

---

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Yeah. So Adiel will circulate that document. He will -- when you have circulated that, do we still believe that if we circulate that today, that we will release -- can release the RFP on Monday? Does that give ICG members enough time to say "Stop" if it is the case they are -- they are concerned? It is over a weekend and several people are traveling, but I would like to hear whether -- whether people -- whether anyone objects to still use the time line of Adiel sharing that document today, our ICG members look at this, and if no one objects on the mailing list immediately, Adiel can still continue and have the RFP released on Monday.

If anyone objects to that very -- like that time line that sort of violates what we agreed to when we started to do in the ICG, because we said we would not, unless we had very extreme cases, request ICG members to review documents during weekends -- and I'm using that in a very broad term; Friday, Saturday, and Sunday -- and so I'm very sensitive here if it is the case that someone would like to extend the ability to object.

Step Number 2 and 3, we are -- we are still keeping as I proposed before.

Is anyone not comfortable with these three items that I propose?

Joseph.

---

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I'm fine with the items but just a point of clarification for the benefit perhaps of ICANN.

Because that still is a contracting document of theirs, is that -- you know, if they don't feel comfortable with putting it on the list, we could just send it to our individual emails also and that would accomplish the same purpose.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Theresa, can you comment on this on the fly?

THERESA SWINEHART: I don't know the answer and I'd like to have the chance to confirm. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Please.

NARELLE CLARK: Surely ICANN has a well-established practice by now of what I would call a public procurement policy. Sorry. This is Narelle Clark for the translators' benefit. Surely by now ICANN has a well-established public procurement policy. Are there not a standard set of documents that sit on a Web site somewhere that are readily available, that are already in the public domain, so it doesn't matter if it goes into our mailing list or it goes into the nearest trash can?

This should be a well-established set of systems. If ICANN is a proper organization in any sense of the word at all, which it ought to be

---

because it runs the IANA function, then it should have a proper procurement policy. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yeah. I think there are two things here. And I think we agree on the situation. I think the only thing -- the actual procurement policy is, of course, one thing. The actual document that (indiscernible) are going to be different.

The only thing we are saying here is that we don't have anyone in ICANN that can say that it's actually the same thing.

Now, we all hope that that document can be made public. We just need to ask someone first.

Adiel?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Is that changing? I think we heard before that we can circulate just the conflict of interest policy documents to the mailing list. Are we holding that as well because I was almost about to hit "send."

[ Laughter ]

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Theresa?

THERESA SWINEHART: Sorry. Just for a point of clarification, ICANN's conflict of interest policy for the board is all up on the Web site and happy to circulate -- no, just a



---

second -- for the board and related parties, okay? So there's that aspect. And I will circulate that to the list. That's public.

The ICANN contracting and disbursement policy is also on the Web site.

Just for a point of clarity for this group, I don't know which document Adiel is talking about because I have not been involved in these discussions. And so that is why I don't have the answer to the specific question that was raised in the context of the documents. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you, Theresa.

Adiel and then Kavouss.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Well, the document that we have in the package is called "ICANN contractor conflict of interest policy." That was the document I was about to send.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Chairman. Kavouss Arestah. Chairman, you put an element of doubt and now we generated this discussion waiting for the comments. We should be quite clear.

I suggest we put the document, should be released preferably on 8 but not later than either 9 or 10. Make it quite clear that we have a

---

deadline and we should not wait for comments and comment to the comments and comments to the comments. Preferably on 8th of September but not later than either 9 or 10. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

I have tried. Maybe I -- thank you for that.

What I tried to say was not to ask for comments. It was the ability for ICG members to say stop, which for me is a different thing. Maybe that is similar to comment. But I just want it people to say -- the ability to say "stop."

So Adiel.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Yes. I think we also have to agree on few limitations we have in this process. We all agreed that the secretariat must be in place before L.A. If that's what we still want, we have to be very, very firm on some of the deadlines because, for instance, according to ICANN procurement process, we cannot make a request for proposal for less than two weeks.

So if we remove the ALAC constraints, then we have time. We can work on this and come back as much as we can.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Russ.

---

RUSS MUNDY:

I understand the need for urgency. And I also understand the people that are concerned about seeing what was actually going to be written and sent out for conflict of interest. But we have had many urges amongst the members of the ICG to say we must have our secretariat in place.

I would suggest that we proceed using whatever the standard ICANN conflict of interest is because even if we see something or remember the ICG sees something they don't like or care for in the conflict of interest, what are we going to do about it? Are we going to right a wrong? Are we going to overrule ICANN?

I say we proceed and just put the confidence in the organization doing procurement for us.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Okay. I will stop the discussion here. What I want people -- members of the ICG to know is that we decided to have the process to appoint this subgroup of ICG with ICG members that is going to work with this proposal. We who are part of this group have seen the whole package, okay?

We are happy to move forward. What I now hear is that ICG members that have not been part of this group still want to see this package, which is to some degree a little bit weird. We need to trust the various subgroups we are creating.

At the same time, I am, of course, careful of making that statement as one of the persons that's part of that group. So I'm telling you to trust me, okay?

---

No, my point is to add a little bit on what Adiel is talking about here, we should be careful in what we are asking for here. It might create some secondary affects in how we are making decisions and how we ensure that we get things done.

Lynn and then Mohamed. Mohamed first, sorry.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Thank you. I think the objection from my side wasn't about the whole package. It was just about the specific part about the conflict of interest. I haven't seen that two-page document, so I'm not really -- I don't know what exactly is there.

So either the members -- ICG members who have seen those documents could give us an explanation what is there actually. It is a two-page document, what text is there regarding conflict of interest so we also have an understanding of that issue, how it is going to be handled before the RFP is published.

But there is no -- there is no objection of the whole package at all. We need to move ahead, yes, and publish it on the date.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Lynn?

LYNN ST. AMOUR:

Yes. Lynn St. Amour. I want to second what Mohamed said. My comments were not about seeing the full package. I fully trust the subcommittee. My question was specific to the criteria and being clear

---

on what were some criteria that we would just not accept a proposal from.

I'm also happy to do one or two things, I guess. Have those individuals who have actually seen that two-page document to just say we believe it meets the concerns that were expressed here and covers the case. And I will trust that. I'm fine.

I'm also fine with taking a quick look at the document if there was a way to do that hard copy or something.

Again, it was not for the full package. It was really focused on addressing the criteria of the conflict of interest question.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So I have Russ, Kavouss and Heather.

Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, Chairman. It is not to have criteria to judge. It is to allow ICG members to be comfortable having seen the document. They are traveling on the weekend. Why not instead of 8, we establish 10th of September. Allow that these two days, Monday and Tuesday, the people will have ample time to look at the document provided. It will be put on the mailing list. And try to finish and finalize editing, and 10th of September that would be released. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Heather.

---

HEATHER DRYDEN: Yes. Thank you. Again, I think Lynn has articulated things very clearly. As far as the concerns I had, it was really around once you have the conflict of interest form filled out in accordance with ICANN's policy around that, then what happens with that? If you don't have criteria, then the group that's evaluating the proposals that come in, are they, in fact, able -- are they expected to review those responses in light of criteria that we've discussed here but not put in an RFP?

That's kind of the disconnect that I'm seeing and why I'm continuing to raise this.

But I agree with Lynn's approach. So either way. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Daniel.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Okay. I will go out on a limb and read from the ICANN contractor conflicts of interest disclosure, version December 2013, .doc. It says under paragraph G, "The company," and that's ICANN in this case, "resorts to determine that other relationships not specifically covered by the policy represent actual or potential conflicts of interest and may take actions that it deems appropriate in its sole discretion up to and including termination of the contract."

I think this is as broad as it gets and gives us all the handles that we need.

---

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Joseph.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: And I think --

>> (off microphone).

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Joseph Alhadeff. Daniel, thank you for reading that because it actually highlights a concern. It is boilerplate written to apply to conflicts with ICANN. It is not written to apply to conflicts to us.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Joe, we discussed this at the last meeting. I was adamant if we wanted real independence, we need to be independent. We decided as a group to have ICANN be the contractor. So if we don't trust ICANN to take the action, if we say this is unacceptable, to not take the appropriate action, then we are back at square one.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: If I could. This is Joseph Alhadeff. If you send someone a template form, the template form is going to ask you to disclose your conflicts with ICANN. The template form has to ask you to disclose your conflicts with the ICG, not just with ICANN. So what I'm saying is we have to make sure the wording is correct to associate the correct conflicts both

---

in the form and in the evaluation process. That is a tweak of three words. I am more than happy to let the ICANN attorney make the tweak. I just think we have to say, hey look, the form was created for another purpose. Can you please make sure you apply it to our purpose? With that sentence, we are done with the entire topic.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Daniel, do you have a comment on that?

DANIEL KARREBERG: I don't agree with Joe. I think this is sufficient. If someone -- no, I'm not going to go further in this. I think this is getting ridiculous.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: I think, Joe, the exact paragraph that Daniel just read answered your question because it extends the policy beyond the ICANN conflict of interest and say, if ICANN found that there is a big relation with any other entity or anything in specific, they can call it conflict of interest. So we can use that in our case.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: I think I am in strong agreement with Adiel here and disagreement with you, Joe. Sorry. I really would object if we try to put ICG into a conflict of interest statement from ICANN. I think that would be a terrible mistake because we would have to define what the conflicts were from



---

our perspective. And when we start to look at that, that becomes incredibly more difficult.

I think we are much better off with this language that is stated specifically in extremely broad manner. So ICANN can terminate based on the ICG's direction regardless of whether or not it would be a normal conflict for ICANN. If we, the ICG, see it, I believe those words allow termination or non-selection.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Alissa.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks, Patrik. This is Alissa. I have two suggestions that might help us here. I think we have discovered a hot button and that means that we need to deal with it. One suggestion is send the conflict of interest policy to the people who raised their hand and say "I'm interested and I would like to see it right now." And that might not be everyone. That might be a small set of people. Surely if it was not so confidential that it could be shared with Daniel and Adiel and Russ already, then it can be shared with a few more people. They can look at it as they sit there in the meeting, as they fly on the plane tomorrow, and decide if they have concerns with.

I'm a little bit concerned about reading two lines from it and asking people to judge based on that. If I had this concern, which I don't, I'm not sure that would make me comfortable.

---

My other suggestion is if people don't like that, that we await word from Theresa about whether it can be shared either with every email address individually or on a public mailing list. And once that is done, give people 24 hours to object going forward with the RFP which is basically what we were going to give them if we were able to publish it right now anyway.

So one or the other. Just some suggestions to try to move this forward.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Heather and then Kavouss.

Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, Chairman. I think it is incumbent to us to foster the atmosphere of trust but not to create the environment of mistrust. The only concern was expressed that people have not seen the whole package. Give them time. They look at the whole package and release it on 10th of December. You can't go to the detail of these conflicts of interest, criteria how to do that, who will make that criteria, and turn the ICG as a sort of (indiscernible) jungle for these things. Too much complex.

This is not so important as respect to the other very, very complex issues we have before us, Chairman. Please kindly find a quick solution for that and we do not get -- as more and more we go into detail, the more and more difficulty we will have.

---

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Mary and then Daniel.

MARY UDUMA: Mary Uduma. Thank you. I think we have enough comfort in what Daniel read out for us to continue. Legally we cannot sue. The contracting party is ICANN, not ICG. On what basis do we bring in ICG?

I think, Joseph, you know as a legal person the contract is between ICANN and the independent secretariat and it is only ICANN that can sue. We don't have a legal backing to take anybody to court or to sue. I don't know.

So I think what my suggestion is that we go ahead with what we have, is enough for us to proceed. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Daniel.

DANIEL KARREBERG: I agree with Mary, of course. Let me just be very clear for the record. I did not actively participate in this work. This was mainly done by Adiel. And Russ helped a little.

I found myself on this group, I think, because I originally was the rapporteur in the first meeting on the secretariat.

So I have no -- the point I'm making is I have no interest in defending my own work here. I still think it is excellent work.

---

And I think there is a question before us that's essentially binary. Either we have enough comfort with this and decide today that we authorize Adiel to go ahead like Patrik proposed, or we will not have a secretariat before L.A. And I think this is the time where we take a vote.

Quite frankly, I mean, it is a binary -- it is kind of a binary thing. Either we have enough trust, and we'll have the secretariat, or we don't have enough trust and we accept the fact that we will not have the secretariat before L.A. That's the two things. We cannot simply like Kavouss suggests go and extend this another couple days because of the minimum of two weeks that we have for the whole process to run, which is already for submission of proposals. Then we have to make an evaluation and so on. It is already, I think, very optimistic.

So it is either/or. I have no preference. But we should make a decision in these terms and not discuss the two things independent of each other.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

So let me just say that time-wise, we have already for this meeting made it completely impossible for us to reach consensus on the documents I thought was more important for the ICG than this RFC. For example, the consensus document and the timeline, we don't have time to discuss that just because we have not reached consensus on this.

This delay and in the discussion that we, it is, of course, very important that everyone can say and have the ability to stay what they want. Obviously, we would have needed more than one day of meetings

---

which is -- so I just want to announce that I don't see an ability to actually be done at 5:30 today.

So let me now repeat the questions that I have not gotten any responses to sort of yet. Does anyone object to allowing Adiel to move forward, work with ICANN according to the ICANN procedures? People, individuals that would like to see the conflict of interest document can get that by letting Adiel know and you will get the documents sent to you. But he will move forward and he will make sure -- and he will -- we will still post the RFC on the 8th as planned.

Okay. So obviously there are more comments. I asked for anyone -- are you objecting to this?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF:

No. I just wanted to clarify one thing. Sorry. Joseph Alhadeff.

What I requested was as Adiel works through this with the ICANN people, to just ask the ICANN legal team, "Is this sufficiently suited to address the ICG questions?" If the answer is yes, I don't need to see the conflicts policy.

DANIEL KARREBERG:

That means no secretariat by LA because that answer will not be there by Monday.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Yep. We will not have the answer. So obviously we have an objection.

---

DANIEL KARREBERG: May I make a point of order? This is Daniel. Point of order?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I would withdraw the concept of an objection just because the danger is sufficiently minimal, but as the process moves on, I really think those are questions that need to be asked but I won't stand in the way of this going forward because we need to finish the secretariat.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Adiel?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yeah. Joe, I sent you the document, and Lynn, Joe, Mohamed, Heather, I sent you already the document that we have.

You have it on your mailbox.

So to wrap this up, I think the consent [sic] here is the conflict of interest is within the ICG. That is the main thing, if that is covered there.

I think I would like to take it on us, the subgroup that is working on the secretariat, to look into that aspect and when we reach the evaluation level, we report back to the ICG in how we deal with that. That allows us to move forward.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. I hereby declare that we ask Adiel to move forward according to what we -- what we have -- what we asked him to

---

do. We have the explicit question from ICG members regarding the sort of variant of conflict of interest just because we are dealing with ICG issues although we do recognize that ICANN, of course, is the contracted party. We add Jean-Jacques to the group, and of course if other people want to be part of the group, sure. Just let us know. And the -- and we also had this -- this request from Jean-Jacques to look into diversity of -- regarding letting people know about the RFP which, of course, is some kind of requirement on us as individuals and ICG to reach out to our respective communities, but not to change the -- the criteria regarding diversity.

So I -- I hereby say that we have consensus for moving forward accordingly.

Thank you very much, everyone.

So with that, one thing that we absolutely need to talk about, which I hope is quick, has to do with the conference call schedule and next face-to-face meeting arrangements.

I would like to let all of you ICG members know that in the division of labor between the chair and the -- and me and Mohamed -- Alissa, me and Mohamed, I have taken on the task of being the one that is working on the actual sort of logistical issues and dates and other kind of things.

So even though we of course should not address sort of one of us individually, I still want to disclose that I'm the one that is trying to work on these issues.

So the next meetings we will have I propose is the Los Angeles meeting, first of all, that we already decided. We have those dates. Everything is

---

ready. We are working on the -- on the floor plan and the scheduling. The request is to have the ability to have ICG on the -- on the stage in the open session. It looks like -- I sent the floor plans to all of you, it looks like, if that is possible.

Regarding our -- our meeting on the Saturday, our work meeting, that is a room that do -- that can handle I think it was -- sorry, Friday, Friday, Friday. Friday. Thank you very much. And it's much better to have two days of meetings than one long meeting, okay?

So Friday meeting, the working meeting that we have in Los Angeles, according to what we think the room layout is, will have space for maybe 60 silent participants and not only the few chairs that we have in this room.

When looking at the time line that we are --

Yeah. Russ, please.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

So Patrik, when we met in London, we said sometimes they end early on Thursday and if they do, we should -- whenever the board stops, we should start. If -- is -- have -- do we not yet know when the board is going to wrap up on Thursday?

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

The last thing that -- yes, I remember we had discussed that on the mailing list.

If I -- after that, it has been -- we don't really --



---

To answer your question, no, we don't really know when the board will end.

It was late -- it was late enough so that we didn't really think it would be possible to have any real meeting on the Thursday evening, so among us chairs, we do not think that we can have a working meeting on the Thursday, so we start on Friday morning.

You will get a -- a more complete proposal from us. I'm really sorry for not having sent that out yet. But as it looks now, it will be -- will be on the Friday.

Is there a clarifying question?

MARY UDUMA:

Mary Uduma. It looks like our work at LA is now going to be extended. I don't think it's now going to only be on the Friday, going by what -- the mailing list from Lynn and so on. I think we should also add that the meeting with all the communities, how do we factor them in? Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Yes. I'm coming to that. Yeah. So thank you.

Regarding potential outreach to other groups during the LA meeting, let me come back to that part. I want to do the overall scheduling first because I think that can lead to quite a long discussion that we need to move to the mailing list.

---

The following meeting, when looking at the time line that we are not yet approved but it will probably not change so much, I suggest that the next meeting we will have is adjacent to the meeting -- the ICANN meeting in Marrakech, and that is on -- let's see --

>> (off microphone.)

PATRIK FALTSTROM: That meeting is from Sunday, the 8th, to Thursday, the 12th of February.

When talking to various individuals, ICG members that have been reaching out to me, I have heard a preference either before or after or -- for me personally, for example -- either/or doesn't matter as long as I get to know which one -- if it's before or after, and I suggest that I will issue a Doodle poll for two days before and after that we -- or one day before or after the Marrakech meeting and we simply see what the outcome of that is.

The -- yes, Hartmut.

HARTMUT GLASER: Only to mention that after Marrakech, already ISOC plans to have other meetings, so we need to avoid to have a conflict. Some of our members are ISOC members, NTIA board members. They already planned and fixed and decided.

---

PATRIK FALTSTROM: As I said, these are things that can be taken care of when we issue a Doodle poll and people say whatever they -- whatever their preference is.

Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Chairman, yes. I agree with the poll but please kindly consider that for the third meeting I made a lot of effort and I missed one of the main important meeting. You may not be -- believe to that meeting but I am very much associated and that is the plenipotentiary conference of the (indiscernible). I have to cancel one of the important meetings of that in order to be in Los Angeles with you for the third meeting, so I cannot do the same thing for the fourth meeting because I'm the vice chairman of another group that would be -- so I suggest that if possible -- this -- I'm kindly appealing to you to consider before the start of the ICANN but not after. I would have serious difficulty and I don't want for the fourth time I plan to have some difficulty like what I have in the third meeting. Believe me, at third meeting, I missed that important meeting but that is that. So I don't want to be again a victim of that. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Daniel?

DANIEL KARREBERG: I have a very important day job meeting before, so, you know, my point is, let's have a Doodle poll and not discuss this here.

---

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much, Daniel. That is what I -- what I requested, so -- Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER: Sorry. I put my hand up before when we were talking about the ICANN scheduling, but you had the details, so I'm out of the queue.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Martin?

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks, Patrik. Martin Boyle, for the record.

Bearing in mind quite how we have failed to get through all our work at this meeting, and bearing in mind that we will be having to do quite a lot of work on looking at the proposals at next meeting, does it make sense to consider having two days' worth of meetings? Then you might be able to do one before and one after the ICANN meeting. Thanks.

>> (off microphone.)

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So the reaction in the room without -- with people not using the microphones say that they object to have meet- -- that if it is the case that we are doing things over multiple days, they should be together.

So we need to -- I mean, we need to move forward because -- because I'm sorry, this is just getting out of hand.

---

So the Doodle poll will be issued.

Next thing. Phone conferences. We got a request to rotate, and that is what we -- what we suggest. We suggest to rotate over the times you see on the agenda: 0400, 1200, and 2000 UTC. We have so far used 1200 UTC.

We chairs do believe that we need one call every second week and we have -- so far it has been Wednesdays have been the preferred time, and we have been Doodle polling until -- so Doodle is probably very happy with us being one of their most frequent users.

So we suggest that instead of doing a Doodle poll, we start a call every second Wednesday starting on September the 17th and we start at 2000 UTC, and after that, 400 UTC, 1200, and rotate over that.

That is the proposal from us.

Daniel?

DANIEL KARREBERG:

While I -- Daniel speaking. While I appreciate the idea behind rotating to not always inconvenience a few people, I still feel that the price is high for this, and I suggest strongly to have a Doodle poll about the times.

Because I think our objective is to get maximum attendance and not to inconvenience the fewest possible people.

So my point is, we should poll to find out when we can get the maximum attendance.

---

I think that's more important.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Please.

NARELLE CLARK: The problem with that -- Narelle Clark for the translators.

The problem with that is that you reinforce the systemic bias that we have. We have a clustering around the UTC time zone and so therefore you will, by a systemic bias, exclude those folks of us who are plus 10, plus 12 away from UTC.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Mohamed?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. I'm fine with the Doodle for selecting a time frame which is convenient for -- at least for the majority, yes.

One of the time slots is almost impossible for me, whatever -- 7:00 a.m., which that means taking my kids to school, so -- but -- and I would request also after identifying those time frames, we need to have an invitation in our calendars for the rest of the coming maybe six months or so.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Paul?

---

PAUL WILSON: I strongly support rotation. I don't think -- I think the point of majority rules here is exactly as Narelle said, that some of us are, at every meeting, up at a time of night where our performance is at 50% or less, and it's just not -- it's just not acceptable.

So sorry. Let's rotate, and if -- we just have to work around and not attend when we can't attend. So strongly support that.

But also strongly support the use of some technology, a shared calendar, so that we actually have these dates properly set up with time zones and not only -- not only the meeting dates, the teleconference dates, but actually a whole bunch of other dates. We've been talking about a lot of them this time. So I hope a iCalendar or a Google Calendar or something could be done by the secretariat or by a volunteer until we get a permanent one. Thanks.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yes. When we have a secretariat. Yes. Xiaodong?

PAUL WILSON: No. I actually mean do it as soon as possible by our current secretariat or by a volunteer or by this -- you know, for the secretariat to take over.

I think we should have this sooner, not later. Thanks.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Noted, noted. Xiaodong?

---

XIAODONG LEE: Yeah. This is Xiaodong Lee. I have a similar concern with Paul. I prefer we can have rotating schedule for the meetings, and I think the Doodle poll is acceptable but I prefer because, you know, for every meeting there's a lot of observers who are in the in the audience. I think it's necessary for them to join the meeting, to know what happened. So that's my opinion.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. This is Alissa. One comment and one question on the rotation.

I think I was the person who suggested the 4, 12, 20 UTC rotation and I actually spent a little bit of time looking at the globe map with the time zones because I do know that we have a cluster of folks in Europe and in the Middle East who, you know, if we -- if we show the time that was 3:00 in the morning for -- you know, or between 2:00 and 4:00 in the morning for that group of people, that we would lose a substantial participation in this group, but I actually think the 4, 12, 20 rotation avoids that. It doesn't avoid it for everyone. You know, poor Xiaodong will end up with a 3:00 in the morning time sometimes, but that was actually taken into consideration.

So the 4, 12, 20, or, you know, the 5, 13, 21, there's only a few of them that can achieve that, but it was taken into consideration.



---

The question I had was about the duration of the calls, Patrik. What is your -- what is your suggestion?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I don't have an answer on that yet. I would like to go through the -- the list of speakers while I think about that.

Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you, Patrik. Keith Drazek. I think the 2 -- I certainly support rotation and I very much support predictability.

The ability to know far enough in advance that a meeting is scheduled, that I can schedule around it and not have to move things around, I think is critical, probably, for all of us. Thanks.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Let's see. Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes. I also support rotation. I was going to ask about the duration and for the sake of increasing maximum participation, maybe -- I'm not sure how the Doodle could be tailored, but if we can poll an hour before and after, if this would secure more participation.

I mean, we can poll around those three times but plus and -- plus or minus one hour. Thank you.

---

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

That is noted.

So so far, we have had one-hour calls with very specific items for the agenda, so if we only have one item, having a one-hour call, but I don't think we can have multiple items during one hour.

So the suggestion is one-hour calls.

Daniel and then Demi and then Adiel.

DANIEL KARREBERG:

This is Daniel again. I did not intend to rule out rotation at all. My suggestion was to make polls because at least in my case, my work life and my other obligations are changing a lot and I suspect that's the case with other people. And if there's enough time in advance, I can do what Keith proposes. I can -- I can schedule around. But some things are unavoidable.

And then if there's a possibility to express that somehow, then we could maximize attendance.

That's what I suggested.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Thank you very much. So you suggest approximately the same as Manal is, and personally, I think that sounds sound.

Demi?

---

DEMI GETSCHKO: This is Demi. I, of course, support the rotation. My suggestion is try to make it simpler. Maybe we can choose just two options, not three. Maybe 4:00 and -- 4:00 p.m. 4:00 and 4:00. Because I suppose 20 is too late for all the people in the west and the -- both the 4:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. in UTC, maybe it's acceptable. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Okay. So I refer that back to -- I heard what all of you have said. I hear people in favor of rotation. I also hear that -- and of course my own personal life is like that as well, that moving an hour or two back or forth might make it possible. That might be a difference between being able to participate and not being able to participate.

So what I will do is I will issue a number of Doodle polls for at least the two phone calls that I -- that I propose that we have, October 17 and then two weeks later.

>> (off microphone.)

PATRIK FALTSTROM: September, yeah.

>> (off microphone.)

---

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Let's see. So September 17 and October 1. And then, of course, UTC which means for certain people it might sort of go back and forth in the adjacent days as well. So with that, we are now at the point of any other business but there are two items which we have not finalized.

Mary? Yes, you brought up one issue more which has to do with meetings during -- sorry, let me go back to that. Thank you very much for reminding me.

We have started to get requests from other ICANN groups that we should meet with them. We have got the requests from GAC and from ALAC. And there is some discussion whether we will get request from others, whether we should reach out to others.

This starts to become a little bit of a logistical issue for the ICANN meeting itself regarding travel support and budget support for ICG members, if it is the case that all of us are supposed to meet with these separate groups, if it is the case that a subset of us can meet with these separate groups. I also would like to ask whether we understand what should be discussed at these private meetings that will not be discussed at our public meeting, what will be discussed in these meetings that we as representatives from these various groups can bring back, et cetera, given how overloaded we are and how hard it is to have these separate meetings.

I would like to ask whether people in this room have any suggestions on how to handle the situation. My suggestion is that we respond and try to accomplish meetings between ICG. And let me not define what I mean by "ICG" at the moment, that we accept and try to schedule

---

meetings between the ICG and whatever group is requesting a meeting from us.

My first question is -- Sorry. I would like to know explicitly if you believe we should reach out to a group and have a meeting with them. I would like to know that explicitly at the moment, including ICANN board. I don't really --

Oh, boy. This is a lot of people.

[ Laughter ]

So, Lars-Johan Liman, let's start with you, and then I will try to go around the table.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:

I think we are representatives here from our respective constituencies. So if there are meetings required from one of the constituencies of which there are representatives on this group, something is broken.

[ Applause ]

And so I would -- I'm actually a bit open to meeting with constituencies that are not represented here. So that's something I would like to put a very high priority on, and I would really like to understand what the underlying reason is for meetings with constituencies that have representatives here. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

So my apologies for not being able to write down your names in the order you flagged. So I will go around the table in that order.

---

Sorry. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. Kavouss Arestah. I think you mentioned one element which is dominating, and that is that those people who ask for the travel support, they will be allowed for one day or -- I don't know. If the meeting with other constituencies or other groups is outside that, it means that they should stay there and the problem will exist.

So if -- first of all, what is the need of that meeting? And, second, if there isn't a need, the meeting could be with all of them in one shot at one time but not to have separate meeting with separate groups. It would be extremely difficult for ICG it would be repetitive and, second, we may need whole four days or five days of ICANN to meet with different groups. If there is a need for several groups, we will organize. We will have a meeting together at the same time, if really we need to have the meeting.

So I come to the question raised by Daniel, which is a very important question. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Paul.

PAUL WILSON:

I question whether the meeting is needed and whether, in fact, it is better to have a clearer and more consistent interface because I point out that RIR communities do not assemble at ICANN, nor does the IETF community. So if you are actually expecting to have a community

---

meeting with some significant bandwidth and real discussions, then you are either going to be favoring the ICANN community of DNS very, very heavily or there is another challenge in getting people around.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Wolf?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Some observations. The issue is not new because it circulates to all kind of such groups as we are, for example, the ATRT NomCom or others within ICANN, for example. I refer to that. Because the request was coming here from ICANN subgroups, there are different ICANN subgroups who may have interest in meeting with us. So the issue is not new.

I would make a difference in between what is the reason why meetings should be done. If it is just a request for exchanging information, I would say no because that is -- I would say that is up to the representatives of the different groups. They are to inform the groups behind them about what's going on here.

But if it's a concern from -- coming from a stakeholder group coming up with regards to the overall process where many indications should be given, I would agree that separate meetings should be done.

From now on, at the time being, I don't see that. Not yet. I would see that coming up more and more, this interest, as long as the RFPs are going to be provided and ideas coming up, how it works.

---

So I wouldn't see directly for L.A. a reason why we should already meet with some groups, but later on I would agree.

And then it's logistical problem you have, as also the other groups have, the ATRT has with meeting with the different groups and so on.

And then we should think about what you have mentioned already, Patrik, how the ICG should look like this group to meet with others in. If it should be all or if it should be a subset or if it could be as much as possible or how to deal with that from the organization point of view. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Adiel, are you flagging? We have Jari and Daniel -- that was not the answer I wanted, but nevermind.

[ Laughter ]

Jari, Daniel, Alissa, Keith, Heather. Daniel. Kavouss, are you in the line as well? Let me say that this will probably be the last thing we are discussing -- and Paul -- that we're discussing today because then we have to close the meeting because people need to start to leave for the airport, including myself.

What I hear is at the moment, I hear resistance against ICG to meet with others but that it is possible, if it is the case, that the ICG has demonstrated that the meetings do have a specific meeting and this is not limited to ICANN but also should be something that, of course, is the ability for other communities as well. That's where I think we are at the moment.



---

With that -- and I want you to keep that in mind when you give your comments.

Jari?

JARI ARKKO:

Jari Arkko. So when I was agreeing on the list that some of these meetings would be good, I was mostly thinking not necessarily directly that the ICG, at least not as a whole, meets. I'm not quite sure what that would even mean. We have other means of communication, like the members that are represented here.

But I think it is still the case that in-person communication and high bandwidth environment is going to be more helpful in getting to the same page than sending emails or liaison statements or even persons from one place to another.

So I do see that there are cases where it will be useful. I talked to certain persons this week at the IGF, and we started from situations where they were, like, this IETF process is really weird and we can't effect it in any possible way. And we ended up with a very good understanding of how can we work together and what are our requirements and so forth.

We might actually consider doing this but in a little bit more targeted basis that if we -- some set of people agree with Heather that this would be good for GAC, we could do that.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Thank you. Daniel?

---

DANIEL KARREBERG: I have a point of order. I would like to ask the chair to close this point and move forward to the timeline because I think it's very important if we can at all to get agreement on the timeline to get at least the draft timeline published at the same time the RFP goes out. This issue can wait for a phone call.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. Let me then ask Paul, Alissa, Adiel, and Keith if there is anyone that really wants to speak, can you please raise your flag again? Paul.

PAUL WILSON: Let's consider having an open session -- an open part of the meeting in L.A. so that we simply have an open session if there's going to be questions asked of people with interest, it can be done openly, part of that meeting. And that addresses many of the things that I think we have spoken about here.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Can you clarify because we do have an open meeting in L.A.? Can you clarify what you mean?

PAUL WILSON: We have said listen only, haven't we? I mean, a consultation session.

---

PATRIK FALTSTROM:                   Okay. Alissa.

ALISSA COOPER:                   This is Alissa. I have a point to raise that has not been raised yet, and I will do it on the mailing list. There is a reason why I think face-to-face engagement will be very important and has to do with making sure everyone knows how to participate in the community processes and avoiding coming to December, January and lots of people saying we didn't know how to participate so it wasn't fair. That was my main motivation for wanting to do this. I will send a longer email to the mailing list and we can continue discussion there. Thanks.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:                   Thank you very much.

So with that, let's move back to the timeline. Just give me 15 seconds to talk with my co-chair here.

So what we decided to do is that Mohamed will work with Sam to try to summarize what we agreed to today because that means that we don't have to take a break to have us chairs trying to summarize that. Instead, we can use the time to discuss the timeline.

So I just gave Mohamed something to do.

[ Laughter ]

>>                                       Something more to do.

---

PATRIK FALTSTROM: As if he didn't have important things to do already.

So back to the timeline. Over to you, Russ. And thank you very much, Daniel, for this proposal.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So I had a whole bunch of email that came to me in addition to the discussion. I tried to accommodate the email as well as the discussion. And then I did my own review. I discovered that Step 7 was left off the graphic all together. Ha, ha, none of you caught it.

[ Laughter ]

So I added that.

And that resulted in two months for NTIA instead of the two and a half because I gave us a whole two weeks to confirm consensus. That is required in Step 7.

And that should be reading the proposals and saying what those groups already did to get consensus and us believing that it was correct and the other thing we review there is that the testing hasn't uncovered that one of the proposals actually doesn't work. So that's what those two weeks would be used for.

Other than that, I tried to capture the discussion I heard. And the other thing I did was change the -- in Step 0 now, I put the date of Monday in there since we have agreed that the RFP is going on out Monday.

Oh, and I left red lining in so everyone could quickly see the changes.

---

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Anyone any questions or any issues with this timeline?

KEITH DRAZEK: Alissa just typed in the chat asking if this was in Dropbox?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Yes, it is.

DANIEL KARREBERG: It is Timeline Discussion-v4. And the graphic is v4-1.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Jari?

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko. So I think it's ready, particularly keeping in mind this is something that we will be sending for the communities to review, not like you have to follow this but it is almost more like a negotiation. Of course, there may not be much room for negotiation but nevertheless. We will get some comments, and I think it will be a good idea to get it out there and be done with it.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I think myself -- Patrik Faltstrom here. I think there are two things with this timeline or a few different kind of things. First of all, I think it is important that we do announce the timeline because we do know that

---

we are under pressure and not many constituencies that I have been working with issues, including the IETF producing RFCs, SSAC producing documents, we are not used to having deadlines. So this is something we really should announce to the community so they are aware of that there are some deadlines.

Secondly, I think it's important that we disclose what kind of timeline we believe that we have. And that is something, of course -- and I think personally, it is very important that we just try to publish this as soon as we can and say this is the timeline that we're using.

That said, because of feedback, because of external events, because of whatever, I do envision that certain parts of this timeline will actually be modified. I think it is important that what we are publishing now is not the timeline as of this date and then we are sort of diverging from it.

I think this document, we need to also -- we need to ensure that we always have published the timeline that we at every point in time is following so people can see what kind of timeline we are using, for example, if we are delaying an RFP, if we are delayed or whatever is happening.

RUSS HOUSLEY:

I would like to make two comments in response to that. Sorry. Russ Housley. The first is we had a Version 2, I think it was, that had some decision points in it and people thought that was not a good way to share what we were trying to do with the community.

But I do believe that we will have to -- this will be a living document, which I think is what Patrik was trying to say.

---

The second point is -- the first paragraph says we are distributing this for comment. So the whole point is to put it out there for people to give us their feedback on whether this is going to work in their environment.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you. Any more comments? Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK: Yes, thank you, Patrik. Just quickly, I agree with what Russ just said and your comments how important it is to publish this, not just the one date but the backup and sort of the rationale for how we came up with that date. And the fact that it is a living document and will be a living document, we could call it a draft or an anticipated timeline and post it and get comments. And I think it is critical that we do that.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Alissa has a suggestion in the chat that the document could include the URL and email address to which comments can be sent.

Russ said that it will be added. That's what I heard.

What did you say?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Russ Housley said if I knew what URL and address that would be, I would put it in.

---

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I'm sorry. I thought you were using Adobe Connect as well. I will mail it to you.

It has to go to Sweden and then back to Turk again.

With those comments, Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Chair. Kavouss Arestah. The question I raised has not been replied. Why is Step 4 talking of 17th of July where Step 5 we are talking of 19 of June? Why is Step 4 before Step 5? What we test? The sequence of action, it seems not coherent.

RUSS HOUSLEY: You asked that question earlier. I believe I answered it earlier. As soon as things become stable, we start testing them. And that's the earliest point I could think that things were going to become stable. But the end date is what we've listed in the targets, which is why in this case the graphic provides more information.

And so the end date is the date which we submit the proposal.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Paul?

PAUL WILSON: It might be easy for us to just add a period -- add dates to describe a period in those headings.



---

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Okay. Please use the microphone, and we need to try to be done with this. So Narelle?

NARELLE CLARK: Narelle, for the translators.

Russ, that's why I put "completion date" in the copy that I sent to you, and I apologize but the English pen in me lived with the secretariat at RFP but with this RFP, can I please correct the English spelling? I'm going to cope with Zs and Ss. That's okay. It's loosing time. If you loose time, you know --

>> (off microphone.)

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Daniel?

DANIEL KARREBERG: Just to maybe help Kavouss a little, what exactly is tested is subject of the proposals being developed, so our RFP says "describe the procedures" and it also says at some footnote, I believe, that, you know, "test it if possible."

So I think there's nothing strange or sinister about the testing. Some communities may require it. Some communities may not. Some communities may think it will add substance to their proposals.

---

So it's entirely optional. But it's -- it should be in the time line for those who want to use it so that they -- that they're clear when this can happen.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So Russ, do you feel that we are done with the document now, with those comments?

Mary, sorry. Let me ask Russ, first. I started to ask him.

MARY UDUMA: Okay.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So Russ, sorry for interrupting.

RUSS HOUSLEY: So I need to add a couple things based on this discussion. The URL, the pointer, a couple grammatical things that have been pointed out, a spelling error.

I can put another version out, you know, in a few minutes but not before the meeting ends.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I find the -- the suggestion -- the changes suggested, I find them being editorial which can be done after we approve the document.

Mary?

---

MARY UDUMA: Mary Uduma. Please pardon my -- my low knowledge of the sequencing.

You know, if I in the ICG can't follow it, I wonder what the community will say when we Step 4 and Step 5, Step 6.

I mean, the testing. It's the testing that I'm worried about.

>> (off microphone.)

MARY UDUMA: Okay. I'm sorry. I think I'm...

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So can we be able to agree on two things the same day? Do we find this document being approved by the ICG?

Is anyone opposing?

I find the document being approved.

[ Applause ]

So with that, I would like to ask if there is any other business that we should deal with while Mohamed is summarize -- is writing the summary.

---

>> (off microphone.)

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Any urgent issues they would like to bring up?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello. Hello. This is Jean-Jacques. I had my hand up.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Chairman. You're on any other business, right?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello. Hello.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Any other business, right?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: This is any other business and, yes, Jean-Jacques has hand up.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: When you deal with --

---

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Wait, wait. Let's wait just a second. I heard that, Jean-Jacques, that I missed that you had your hand up, you started to speak, so in this room, we started speaking over each other. Kavouss first and then Jean-Jacques, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Could you kindly clarify when you deal with the consensus building document, and how?

If you want to put it for the exchange of email, there is another 300 email exchange. It is not very efficient way.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: That is absolutely correct and I completely understand and I agree with you that it's both inefficient and I find it being sad that we couldn't agree on the consensus document as well today, but this is where we are. This meeting is to an end. Several of you individuals will still be here in Istanbul and some of you might even have dinner or coffee afterwards, and I encourage everyone to use as much face-to-face time as possible outside of the meetings to try to resolve as many issues as possible.

The next -- the mechanism we have from now on is, first of all, email. Then we have a phone conference on the 17th. And I don't dare to say the name of the month.

[ Laughter ]

The current -- the 17th of the current month.

---

So I suggest that the phone conference on the 17th will be used for the consensus document, and it is my hope, my sincere hope, that face-to-face discussions here between you individuals, email exchange that unfortunately to some degree in this final endgame of a document is more inefficient than at the beginning of the process, that those two together will be enough for us to finally reach consensus on the 17th. That is the process.

Anything else?

Mohamed, are you ready to --

>>

(off microphone.)

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Oh, Jean-Jacques. I'm sorry. Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you, Patrik. This is Jean-Jacques. I have three points.

The first is that on the draft I see on the screen just now, Step 4 has a date which is later than the date on Step 5. Testing is currently targeted as 17th of July 2015, whereas Step 5, "ICG develops final response," target is 19th of June, 2015. That's just a small point for cleaning up.

My other two points regard the testing.

This morning, I put a question clearly to have a written response on what "testing" would really imply. So that can be sent by email, et

---

cetera. I understand. I just want to make sure that that will be the case and we will be getting a clearer explanation on what "testing" implies.

And my third point I also mentioned this morning, which was the suggestion that for once perhaps we could ask NTIA to do something. In other words, during the testing period, not to remain passive and just to look at us doing our stuff, but actually to test whether it -- on its side, the proposal we put forward is workable in technical terms on their side.

Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Russ?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Jean-Jacques, please take a look at the testing section within the RFP that we approved this morning. It talks about what aspects of the proposals we will test.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So Mohamed, do you -- can -- over to you to summarize the day.

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

I will go through the agreed action items that we agreed. And please correct me if I made a mistake or I missed anything.

Okay. Community RFP.

---

We agreed to publish the final RFP with a period of clarification until 24th September 23:59 UTC, and we agreed that an RFP proposal, completed proposal, is to be submitted by 15 January, 2015. Time line -  
- I think I will skip that.

We agreed on the time line document to be published, yeah.

IANA. The coordination or at least the relationship between ICG and IANA accountability. We decided to delay our decision about either to have a liaison or the type of relationship between us and that accountability working group until we have further information about the intersection and relationship between ICG and that group.

ICG independent secretariat, there's a couple of action items. Adiel was requested to add text about the diversity of the RFP.

Adiel -- it was agreed that we're going to publish the RFP and Adiel to coordinate with staff and chairs to have the announcement and publication done.

We added Jean-Jacques Subrenat to the secretariat RFP evaluation subgroup.

And there was another action item that Adiel to send to the group ICANN contractor conflict of interest policy. He did, and I think Lynn and myself responded to that. We didn't have an issue for the RFP to be submitted.

The next meetings, we agreed to share and set up a calendar for the -- for the planned teleconferences and meetings for the coming six months period. It could be done by the secretariat or a volunteer.



---

We agreed that the teleconferences will be rotated according to the agreed three time frames: 4, 12, and 20 UTC. And we agreed, finally, in Los Angeles meeting we're going to have an open mic session within our meeting for Q&A from the community.

So that's what I have currently on record. You can correct me.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy.

In the LA meeting, we did discuss the possible need for it being two days. Did we make a decision that it be one day or two days?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: We talked about -- specifically, we talked about future meetings. I think LA we -- it's already fixed for one meeting, so I heard it as a general request that we should have two-day meetings.

LA is not possible to -- to change.

One day in Los Angeles.

Kavouss?

Okay. Paul?

---

PAUL WILSON: I sent an email, but Adiel pointed out to me that we have our open session in LA anyway, so there's not really a point, it seems, to have an open mic session within the -- within the ICG meeting in this same week.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Daniel?

DANIEL KARREBERG: Yeah. Just a couple of clarifications. I am -- I think the -- what Adiel was asked in terms of language was to write an announcement that mentions diversity but doesn't make it a hard criteria.

So just to make the -- to have that correct.

And I think about the teleconferences, we agreed to rotate them but have a Doodle poll about the exact hour.

And we also agreed to do that as much in advance as we possibly can for the -- if possible for the next six months, so that we can -- that's what Keith said.

I mean, predictability, yeah.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yeah. I was a little bit slower with the flag than you, Daniel, so I was on my way to say the same thing, that we agreed to Doodle both the meetings around Marrakech and also around the rotated times for the -  
- for the time schedule and also hear the requests to issue these as early as possible for the spring.

---

Given that we now have the time line, that kind of -- doing that scheduling will be much easier, so thank you very much for agreeing to that.

Was there anyone else?

Kavouss?

I suggest that we are sending out these -- this summary and so people can also comment on that.

Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. Just if you're finished with the agenda, I wanted to take this opportunity and thank you two vice chairmen for chairing this meeting very effectively, very efficiently.

[ Applause ]

Thank you very much. And thank you for all those people working with you for the preparation. Expression of appreciation for those who actively participated in the emailing links and encourage all others who have not said anything, or very few, to participate in the future. Last, but not least, thanks ICANN for the arrangement of the meeting and for all facilities provided to us. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Okay. So, yeah, I would like also to extend our thanks to the interpreters, really, for the hard work and long hours with us.

---

[ Applause ]

And we would like to also thank our remote participants, our friends, ICANN staff in the back here, who were really working hard to make our meeting very effective and productive.

[ Applause ]

And safe travels to everyone. Hope to see you soon, maybe. A couple of -- in a month's time. In a couple of weeks.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yeah. And with that, I hereby declare this meeting adjourned.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**