
PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Welcome everyone to this call. We are two minutes over the hour, but I think we should try to go through the agenda. I don't know whether there is anyone... Can people that are on the call, and not in the Adobe Connect, please make themselves noted?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I'm logging into Adobe Connect as we speak. It's Joe.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Thank you Joe. So what I see are the ICG members, Kavouss Arasteh, Demi Getschko, Hartmut Glaser, Russ Housley, Narelle Clark, Manal Ismail, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Alissa Cooper, Daniel Karrenberg, Milton Mueller, Jari Arkko, Jandry Ferreira dos Santos, Patrik Fälström, James Bladel, Keith Davidson, Jon Nevett, Russ Mundy, Lynn St. Amour, Joseph Alhadeff, Michael Niebel.

And we have as liaisons Elise Gerich. And we have apologies from Martin Boyle, Kuo-Wei Wu. We also have Alan Barrett. And from the Secretariat, Jennifer Chung, Shirley Haristya, and Yannis Li.

And from ICANN, Mike Brennan. Did I miss anyone? I also got a side note that Mohamed is going to join us, and we might have other people that are on their way in. Lars-Johan Liman just joined, welcome.

So let's check at the end of the call that we got everyone correct. So, next item on the agenda, review our last meeting action items. So here are the action items on... So here are the outstanding action items, and

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.

I am, I think that we should really try to close as many action items as we can, because as we all know, when we start to get more data from the CCWG names, and also an increased need for synchronization with CCWG accountability, I think it's important that we have as clean table as possible.

Just like at home. So let's look at these action items and take them one by one. Action item one, from ICG call number 12, the, Alissa Cooper and the ICG Chairs to coordinate with Ismail to draft an explanatory text to be published. This is something that has been dragging on for quite some time. Lynn and Manal are still working on this, and I ask whether anyone do have any outstanding issues with the text that is posted as it is all today.

I think that every time we bring this up, someone falls a small detail that they would like to get changed. I think it's really important that we try to move this forward. And I'm very close to be prepared of actually calling consensus in this document, just because new things are popping up all of the time and we need to able to find the text is good enough to be able to move forward. So I ask if anyone have any issues with that one?

And I would like to ask the secretariat to show timeline version eight, please, while people are thinking about what to do. I can also say that Lynn and Manal have been working quite hard to be able to try to collect all the issues from people, and we Chairs together with the editors, do feel confident that this is probably something we can, or should be able to find the consensus on.

I see Daniel and Keith in the chat room say that we are, think that we do have consensus. Let's see, I don't see anyone that would like to speak. I see a lot of people are supporting. So let's, the supporting voices from Keith, Daniel, Demi, Jean-Jacques, James, Keith from ccNSO, Jandyr, Narelle, Russ.

Okay. Milton, I have an issue here. Should it be March 2014 update or March 2015 update? I presume that it should March 2015 update, or as it is now, April 2015. Good catch Milton. Okay. I hereby declare consensus on this document with a change from 2014 to, from March 2014 to April 2015.

I'll go back to the action items. Thank you. So action item number two, from ICG call number 12, ICG to discuss and pose a volunteer penholder on the internal CG mailing list to consolidate the information collected during the assessment process of the operation community's proposals in an ICG report that can be published together with the final proposal. This is something which we have not moved forward on.

No one has stepped forward on the other, and we as Chairs have not pushed anyone either, yet we don't really see any real need for that now, but it is something that we probably need to have some individuals that can help with this. Arasteh, Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, good morning. The final proposal, you mean the proposal of the three [inaudible] or the proposal [to be created], just a question of clarification. There was not [with some of your meetings]. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Thank you very much. We talk about the three proposals, with the final proposal we talk about the proposal that we are delivering together with the final proposal. That said, I think it is important speaking as one of the co-chairs, without [inaudible] with anyone else. I think it's important that we also do not miss any early comments that are coming in.

So we should actually try to find someone, where a mechanism for catching these as soon as they start to come, whenever they start to come. My suggestion is that just because we don't have to pick someone yet, that we are, that we can discuss this later on this call, or move this to the mailing list.

Number three. Jean-Jacques, please.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Patrik. This is Jean-Jacques. I had a question, Patrik. I suppose that the Secretariat would be following this, and pointing out the comments as they come along. Because I think if it's one of us, I think, individual members of the ICG, we may or may not miss it. Can you give me an answer on that?

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Yes, excuse me. Yes. When we discussed this earlier, we do know that we do have Secretariat support. The Secretariat has already, as you've seen, try to lift all different questions that we raised on the ICG list from the two first proposals. That said, I think it's important for us in the ICG,

when we are doing our work, that we do have ICG members that are token holders, that tries to make sure that the Secretariat is attaching everything.

Just like you say, the Secretariat can help with the mechanical work, but we cannot delegate to the Secretariat the ultimate responsibility to have caught all of the various issues. We, as ICG members, need to have that responsibility, and we need to find a way of doing that. But of course, we are volunteers, and we should get Secretariat help from the Secretariat. That was the goal as far as I remember from the discussion. Does that answer your question? Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Patrik for the explanation. In that case, I volunteer to be one of those members of the ICG. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Thank you very much for volunteering. Narelle?

NARELLE CLARK: Yes, hello. Narelle Clark for the record. I'm a little unclear on precisely of what the task is, actually. It doesn't quite come across clearly enough for me in that action item. And I would be, I'm glad that you also got that clarification about the Secretariat support. Thank you, Jean-Jacques, for bringing that one up.

So could you please clarify the role a little bit more?

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Well, first of all, the role ends up being exactly what we designed it to be. But when we discussed, be able to catch the various questions, we saw that when we were discussing the first two proposals, that we were a little bit confused over what were just discussions among the ICG members, and what were really questions that we asked for clarification, and ultimately, how did we find out which one of these questions, or if these were the ones that we actually had to bring back to the operational communities, without having individuals being responsible that we are actually moving that forward, or people saying that they could actually help with this work.

We felt that there were, more or less, only two ways we could do this. We continue to do it ad hoc. We could rely on us chairs, able to do the work, but on the other hand, if it is the case that we have ICG members that could step forward and feel a little bit more responsible of actually trying to make sure that we're not missing any of these issues in the work that the Secretariat do, then that would be preferred.

NARELLE CLARK: Okay. So if I could just encapsulate that. It is simply an issues tracking, an actions tracking role between the three operational communities and the ICG.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Yes.

NARELLE CLARK: Got it. Thank you. I'd be happy to give Jean-Jacques some support in that then. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Thank you Narelle. Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, if I'm not mistaken, the proposal from CWG is about to receive formally in June, before ICANN 53. Has that date changed?

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: No. That date is the date, the last date we got, and that is the date we have, yeah.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Excuse me. The last they got?

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: The date, June 25, is the latest information we have from them.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: 25th of June is the date for information, so that is the first round that we see that we need to be carefully examined, right?

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: That is correct, yes. But on the other hand, the actual issues with the proposals on the ICG list, that is something that we already have some issues that we're discussing, as you see on action item number three on ICG call number 12. So we already start to have issues that we are seeing on the two proposals that we have already received.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Okay. That [inaudible] two [inaudible] that we have. Yes, okay.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Because, Kavouss, let me explain it this way. It would, of course, be much easier for us if it was the case that all proposals arrive at the same time. Now when they didn't, as the co-chair, I'm a little bit nervous that there are some issues that we are, for example, now we are discussing some issues with the two first proposals, and then we might forget to look at the same issue for the third proposal, and vice versa. That we are not doing a coherent evaluation of all three proposals just because we get them at different points in time.

So that's why I think a tracking system, or tracking issues like Narelle just explained, is something that we need to come up with a way of doing it in a way that is costing us as little overhead as possible.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: If that part has not been given to anybody, I think one of the [cultures] [inaudible]... manageably hand and [default] on the issue, not really [inaudible]. It's somewhat, this has not been taken care of.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Yeah. Thank you very much Arasteh. Yes, ultimately we, Alissa is the Chair and Mohamed and myself as co-chairs, are of course, ultimately responsible to ensure that whatever the ICG call as consensus is something that we do have a consensus for. So yes, that is absolutely true.

Milton asked that we are tracking exactly. And first of all, I would like to move forward from this action item, because it takes quite some time from the call, but we are looking at is the tracking of issues that are brought up on the ICG report. And that we need to sort of close if we take, for example, action item number three, where we have some clarification questions from, for example, the protocols side.

Alan has suggested on the community chat that, whoever raises a question, is to say whether it's a formal question or to one of the communities, or just until the discussion. I think that is absolutely correct, but it's really important that it's clarified, if needed. Because I expect that we on the ICG will have quite a lot of just plain discussion on the mailing list when the sort of proposal comes in from the third operation community.

Anyway, I think we have two individuals that have said they wanted to help. We have started an embryo of coming up with a process that does a good discussion in the chat room. I'm not closing action item number two, but we need to move forward. So action item number three, Jari to provide further information, the diagram, to then channel

ICG mailing list about the IETF current overall internal accountability and oversight system related to the IANA interaction.

Jari, do you have any comments on where you think this item is? Because there is some degree, I feel that some individuals in ICG are starting to sort of talking across each other or something. So could you please say where you think this is?

JARI ARKKO:

Yes. First, I'm sorry I haven't been able to complete this as planned. I was on my way, until the IETF meeting and recovery there of intervened. But indeed, this is further information or some illustration of the IETF mechanisms and I hope to complete that soon at the IETF meeting.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Thank you very much. Alan?

ALAN BARRETT:

Alan Barrett. I'd like to report that the CRISP team working together with the RIR staff, and have prepared a similar diagram for the numbers community. It's not quite ready. I expect they'll be able to share it within a few days.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Thank you very much for that information. Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thanks. I, for both committees, outreach [inaudible] I have two questions, or two requests. One was the diagram, showing a link between the two, between everybody before and after. And somebody says that it is not possible before, and now there are [inaudible] deeply comparative way.

And secondly, the IETF, there was a question about jurisdiction, which is now a very detailed discuss in CCWG in general term, but not for IETF in general terms, what the jurisdiction is. The jurisdiction is in place? Is this [inaudible]... And I will ask whether there has been some answers to that question.

These are the two questions that was raised. One of them raised by me, the diagram. The other raised by many people. So I would like to know whether the ICG has also present something finally. Thanks very much for the time, but it seems to me, [inaudible], it takes too long time to reply to these questions. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Jari?

JARI ARKKO: Yes. I [post] that for a long time, that has been troublesome. We, of course, has [inaudible] to run, or other things to do. From our perspective, these are illustrations that are useful for spreading information about what we are doing and how. But we also believe that the proposal, as written, is clear and complete.

And I'm sorry, I could not fully understand the second part of your comment, Kavouss. Maybe you can carry it back?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

The second part of my comment was jurisdiction, and there was no clear explanation about how the jurisdiction will continue, or have been taking care. And as I mentioned, the CCWG, the topic of jurisdiction was a very sensitive topic. And we discussed very aspects of jurisdiction, place of the jurisdiction, and the persons of the jurisdiction, and the law residing in the jurisdiction.

So these are these things that are associated. To what extent do we take some of that? But the jurisdiction question was raised, not be me, by someone else, in one of our physical meeting, and yet to really [inaudible], if you trying to go back to some of those meetings. Thank you.

JARI ARKKO:

Yes, and I believe we discussed this in our Singapore meeting. And my understanding was at the time that, they provided a proficient answer. We explained what the situation is, and the final say in any disputes, and contract or [inaudible] between IETF and ICANN. It's on the IAD according to the RC that was created.

So the MOU that was created 15 years ago.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Okay. Thank you very much. So we see that this is, we see that this is on its way. I also see that the CRISP team is also on its way, working on this. Let me then say that we have not closed action item number three from call number 12, but let me suggest that we are closing action item number two from ICG call number 13, which I see is overlapping.

So we have only action item number three on call number 12 outstanding, which has to do with diagrams for the IETF. And we also understand that we will get one from the CRISP team. So action item number four, from call number 12. So that is Alissa to confirm with the ICG members on the internal mailing list that the ICG has completed step two of the finalization process for the protocol parameters and number of proposals.

That is something that I understand, if I remember correctly, I'm sorry for not double checking this. It's a little bit early in the morning here. But that was done right?

ALISSA COOPER: So this is Alissa. Can you hear me?

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Yes.

ALISSA COOPER: Great. So I sent the mail, I guess, five or six weeks ago, about this. There was one response, I think, from Kavouss saying that he wanted more time, but many weeks have passed since then, and that was the

only response that I got. And I note that, in the mean time, there hasn't been any, I don't think, really for further discussion of the items in the finalization process.

So I have sort of assumed that it's done. But if anyone thinks it's not done, we should talk about that.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Thank you very much. That matches my recollection as well. Would anyone like to speak up or can we call this to closure?

In that case, let us call, close action item number four from ICG call number 12. So let's move over to the ICG call number 13. There is a question of approval of the February 25 conference call minutes. That was something that was pushed forward just because of some issues that were brought up.

Is there anyone that still have issues with the February 25 call minutes? I saw some discussion on the mailing list. I think it was Lynn that had some issues with that. I'm sorry to, this is early in the morning, not seeing whether the issues was related to these minutes or not. Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks Patrik. This is Alissa. I think we also have outstanding the minutes from the face to face. So I just wanted to check on that, that we need to approve the minutes, those from the last February conference call and the face to face.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Yes. We do have on the agenda for today a separate item on approval of the minutes of the previous calls.

ALISSA COOPER: Oh, okay. Sorry...

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: No, no problem. Maybe I am the one that mix things up. So I don't mind having people picking up when I might be making mistakes. Anyways, I think this is an outstanding action item because of the approval of the 25 February minutes didn't happen. So Secretariat, could you please project, or even speak up, and explain the changes or outstanding issues with the February 25 teleconference call minutes.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Hello everyone, this is Jennifer Chung, the Secretariat. The February 25 minutes, I don't recall any problems with them. They were approved, and they're just listed here as a complete set of action items for ICG call 13. There are some outstanding minutes that need to be approved, and I can project that if anyone requests that.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Sorry, I didn't really understand what you meant here. Would you say that you did not see any issues, you did not think there were any issues for the February 25 minutes? Or did you say that you did see issues?

JENNIFER CHUNG: As far as I can see, this is Jennifer Chung speaking for the record. I did not see any issues with the 25, 26 February teleconference call minutes. It was listed on this projected document as a full set of action items.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Okay. Thank you very much. Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER: Sorry, my hand was still up. I'll put it down.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Okay. Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. The action item, we are not on item two yet, no?

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: No. Item one.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yeah, okay. On approval of 25th February. Okay, I wait.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Okay, thank you very much. Thank you. So with that, if no one has any [inaudible] on the 25 February teleconference minutes, which was about 300,000 years ago, Internet time, let's close action item number

one. Done. Regarding action item number two, as I suggested earlier, I saw that action item number two with the clarification from Kavouss, was to be conflated with action item number three, for ICG call number 12. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, action item number two. It doesn't involve internal mailing list. ICG overall, in terms of accountability and oversight current, but in the meeting of Singapore we're talking about current, and the [inaudible] the future, after the transition, and we wanted to have a simplest possible way to have a comparison with issue, an issue, and the current, and in the transition.

But I don't see anything about the transition. First of all, [inaudible]... we have more or less a clear idea, but our problem is that, what would be the accountability after transition, and compare that, what are the issues, which item continues to have exactly the same accountability before and after, and which item would have different accountability to follow after, even if it is very simple or very trivial.

What are the differences? These are the things that were not clear from the first [inaudible], and we raised that point. All of its outcome current, and use this to convert. Because in the current we are not very much interested in the current, we are interested what will happen after transition. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Yes, Kavouss, that was, you mentioned it when we discussed action item number three. It was noted. So yes, I think we, I claim we all understand what you would like to see here, but I left Jari speak up please.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah, I also thought that we had discussed that on the previous action item. But just to clarify, the accountability mechanisms that we have are not dependent on the ICANN. I mean, of course, it's useful that ICANN is more accountable, but we are not depended on that. That's fundamental to sign before and after transition. So from my perspective, the accountability is saying.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: So, just because...

JARI ARKKO: ...any improvements for it.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Thank you Jari. So just because I would like to move forward, let me suggest that the action item number three from ICG call number 12, ends up being, Jari Arkko and Alan Barrett, to provide further information diagram to the internal ICG mailing list about the IETF and CRISP team current, current and future over all of the internal accountability oversight system related to the IANA direction.

Because that is sort of what we have been talking about. And then we closed action item number two from ICG call number 13.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, I had a further explanation. If you read the [inaudible] CCWG and we see the hybrid course of action they proposed, legal separation and finance separation, and any of these two separations between the [inaudible] and IETF is not the same. So how it has been addressed? How they could foresee that what would be the output of the CWG relating to the whole transition, [inaudible] transition, the two different methods of work, legal separation and finance separation.

There are two different models of the transition responsibility and the action items. So does anyone have a look through that to see really what we're talking about after transition? What is [cooking] by CCWG, even if it does not finally come to us? Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Kavouss, we did. Yes. I think your concerns are noted. Let me suggest that just because we do have an open action item number three, where both Jari and Alan has promised to come back with information, that we let them, we give them the ability to come back to us with the information, and then we can have a discussion on whether the information they bring up fulfills the request and the interest from us.

We do have minutes and recordings of these calls. So I think we don't have to wordsmith the action item itself, because I do envision that we will talk about their proposed, what they're bringing to us, because as

you also noted, and we also need to move forward, and we would like to have these responses. So it's actually good if they bring information to us, and then we can continue the discussion. Is that okay with you?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, if the information provided that these two communities have a look to the preliminary output of the CWG. If they will do that, that will help us, because the CWG finally comes to us about June, and then you have to know what occurred, and what is the course of action for the transition after, or post transition, the responsibility of these two communities because they are doing something else.

So with that caveat, I agree.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Yeah. Thank you. Daniel?

DANIEL KARREBERG: Yeah I object to putting an onerous on the two communities, who have actually given us a response to take into account an unfinished process of the third community. I think that is not appropriate.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Daniel, I [inaudible] to object. I never object to anybody. You are always objecting to everybody. There is no need to objection. You kindly give your point of view things that you don't believe that these two communities should even to start anything which has not been

populated. That is your idea, I respect it, but don't object to everyone, at this early morning, at least in Europe.

Please give it a bit more time please. And I don't understand your logic. You do something totally, totally in isolation from the CCWG, and the complete proposal saying something which is not anything to the CCWG, this would not be accepted by IANA. We need to have all together. Please, don't object so quickly. You're objecting any time that any one opens their minds. [Inaudible]... Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Please, everyone, I would like to get some order on the call here, because I thought that we had consensus on a path forward, that we left Jari and Alan to send the information back to the ICG, and we continue the discussion when we do have that information from them. Daniel?

DANIEL KARREBERG:

Oh yes. I fully agree with that. I didn't agree with the ICG asking Alan and Jari to take into account an unfinished process while making those answers. I objected to that. As I don't think that we should do that.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

We should ask them to... So I stand with my suggestion as the Chair of this call, that we should let them bring back whatever they're bringing back, and we'll continue the discussion at that point in time. Is my proposal.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Please kindly note that if these two communities do not place, or will not take issues clearly managed our proposal, has not taken any action whatsoever of any incomplete work being done by CCWG. We must have [inaudible] and that's all. [Inaudible] anything, this is understand. I'm not pushing them to do anything that they don't want to do, but they should mention that their proposal does not have any element of the CCWG. That's all.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: I would like to ask, your view, Kavouss, is noted, it is minuted [sic]. I would like to ask people, including you, to please raise your hand before speaking and asking for your turn. I do understand, and I appreciate that we do have an interest, and that we will, in the issues, that we need to have a good outcome of the discussions. So I thank you everyone for speaking up, regardless of whether you agree or disagree with each other.

I'm not, I'm a person that is not worried about getting a little heated discussions, because it's better that people speak up then if they keep their mouth shut. That said, I would like to move forward on this call. So your points are noted, Kavouss, and I encourage people to please move forward. Jari.

JARI ARKKO: Yes. I mean, I don't think there is any reason to get concerned or excited. I think we have this under control. What my plan is, we will

provide additional illustrations, that's what I would call it. I don't think there is any plan from either the RIR or ITF side [inaudible], to change anything.

We have made a design, based on our community wishes. That is what we are going forward with. We look forward to working with the CWG and CCWG. But I don't believe there is a need to coordinate things with our, not something that we have to coordinate on in terms of like trying to align exactly, or anything like that.

So we are providing information, hopefully, [inaudible] I think we can move on.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Yup. Thank you very much. And regarding action item number three, phone call number 13, that is that we're going to continue to discuss the jurisdiction of the practicalities. That is something that I think that we should continue to do, and at the moment, we have both waiting for this data from Jari and we also request the Secretariat, with the help of chairs and whoever else can help, to find the actual, to try to recap what we talked about regarding the jurisdiction and sending that back to the mailing list.

So I'm not feeling that we need to discuss action item number three. It's still open. So, number, ICG call number 13, action item number four, what we do have is a, excuse me. We do have the first version of the issues that were brought up that have been created by the Secretariat. We just do have a discussion with the Secretariat on merging the

proposals and trying to come up with some other messaging or info graph.

We don't have anything to report back on, on that issue yet. Mohamed, is there anything you would like to bring up here?

Okay. I don't hear you. I didn't really prepare you on getting this spot. But I can just say that we chairs have not delivered on item number four yet. Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. If you allow me, Patrik, on item three, on jurisdiction, have we considered to have a legal view from the legal firm about this jurisdiction that we are discussing? Some people among us, not myself, maybe very, very competent. But usually, in the issue of jurisdiction, we need to have a more clear and more through jurisdiction view on the issue. Have we considered that?

Or we believe that we know everything, and we don't need any external information, and no legal view of anybody else outside the jurisdiction of the ICG? Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

We had not make a decision on that, and I think we should still wait for the information that we get back from these communities, and then we can discuss the issue further. We need to be able to discuss the timeline, so action item number three on ICG call number 13 is still open. So that is the answer to your question.

So with that, I find that we have closed a couple of action items. We have merged two of them. Can we please go back to the agenda?

So we have, as was pointed out during the call, we do have a couple of other minutes to approve, but let's start with talking about the revised timeline.

So what you see on the screen here, is that we, let's see. What we see here are the last couple of weeks, sorry. The weeks of June 2015, where we know that the actual timing is that we will have our meeting on the Thursday and Wednesday of June 18 and 19. We do know, have been notified, the last couple of days, that the accountability, CCWG accountability will have a meeting of the Friday of the 19th, which will be a collision with our working session.

We, co-chairs do have a discussion with the chairs of CCWG accountability on synchronizing the agenda for our two meetings, so that we, together with you individuals that participate in both processes, can get as much out of the meetings in plural, as possible, without ending up having any issues, or maximizing the ability to work together.

So there is something that we need to work on. Then we have the ICANN meeting itself. And on the 25th, we do know that the CCWG accountability and the CWG names will have working sessions. We do have a slot before lunch on the Thursday the 25th, where I have requested room, if it is the case that ICG members would like to sit down and talk about whatever is happening on the other, in the other rooms.

I do understand that just because there is a bunch of collision that people might want to listen in, in the other meetings that are ongoing before the actual proposal is delivered to us. But I'm not going to give up the room unless I hear that ICG members don't want to be able to talk with each other about what is going on.

So there is a room allocated, but it's not planned to be a meeting as we decide on the call, no decisions made. We decided that on the mailing list, just because so many people are travelling home. Narelle.

NARELLE CLARK:

Thank you for all of that organization, Patrik. It's Narelle Clark for the record. You just said that the dates of our meeting is the Wednesday and the Thursday. That would be the 17th and 18th?

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Sorry, yes, I misspoke. The meeting is on the 18th and 19th. Thank you very much. Yes.

Yes, Milton that is a relief, otherwise many of us would come late. So we are meeting on the 18th and 19th, Thursday and Friday. No change there. Alissa.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks Patrik. This is Alissa. So just to be clear. We are currently not planning to meet on the 25th. Is that correct?

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: That is absolutely correct. We are not having a meeting on the 25th. I do, though, have a room booked, if it is the case that people, ICG members onsite, need a room to be able to talk or discuss or something. But I am prepared to cancel that request for a room. And I do hear, over time, less and less interest by ICG members to have actually have any kind of meeting on the Thursday, whatsoever.

But if we give it up, we will not be able to get a room again, if we need to.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. And we have not yet started branding our meeting time after people return from Buenos Aries, because obviously you look at this and you see the delivery of the proposal on June 25th. And the immediate question is, okay, well, that's when we have a lot of work to do, right after that, but we haven't sorted out any of those dates yet.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: That is correct. And that is something that I hope that now when we have summarized the Buenos Aries meetings, where we are meeting on the Thursday and Friday before, then we have a long week. We do get the proposal on the 25th, and the question is then, what are we doing next? That is correct. Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Patrik, do you have, or do you have plans to discuss the [inaudible] ideas from CWG, which is available as I remember, the number from the very last exchange of email sometime before 25th of June? We discussed

that? Is the answer yes, do we need to get some clarification from CWG when they are replaced, or not? Two questions. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Yes. To answer your first question, no we have not scheduled any formal interaction between the ICG and any of the two groups that have working sessions. In the discussions that we have had with the other chairs, we have been, we have not decided on having such a meeting, partly because to some degree, it could confuse the processes that we have just because we do have, for example, the liaisons in the formal view, and Keith with the CCWG accountability.

And it's also the case that we should be very careful on the ICG, from my perspective, to conflate information that we as ICG members might get in sessions, together with the CWG names and CCWG accountability with the information that they are passing to us more formally, for example, in the formal CWG names, as the response to the RFP.

Daniel suggests that we should make a plan based on relative dates, just because of course, the date, June 25, might actually move forward. That is something that is, of course, a good idea. On the other hand, if it is the case, for example, we think that we need to meet face to face between the two ICANN meetings, that is something that we need to be able to try to find a date for.

And now we have 10 minutes more on the call. Milton please.

MILTON MUELLER:

Yes. There is a couple of points. And Keith just made one of them somewhat for me, which is that the process that the CWG will follow, requires them to get the approval of their chartering organizations. So well before they hand the proposals, this proposal will be, being reviewed by the supporting organizations and advisory committees in the names community.

So we will have some idea what is in it before it is firmly approved by them. Not that we can do anything with that. And the same question kind of relates to this potential collision between the CWG meetings and our face to face meeting in Buenos Aries, particularly on the 18th. I'm not sure what the CWG is going to be doing, if it has actually succeeded in delivering the names proposal to the SOs and the ACs. Principle is just supposed to be sitting around and waiting for them to approve it or not.

So I doubt if they will be having serious meetings during that period. That's all.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Thank you very much. So first of all, maybe I said the wrong thing. What I do know is that the CCWG accountability do have a meeting on the Friday the 19th in Buenos Aries. So that is the real collision that I know about. Regarding the call that we see on the agenda for CCWG IANA on the 18th, and also, of course, on the rest of the calls between the 9th and 18th, but the question is what will they discuss.

Maybe some feedback from their [inaudible]. I don't know, I sort of agree with you. But the collision I talked about was the 19th for the accountability work. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Patirk, can you confirm that there will be no action on the words declared by CWG IANA with ICG? We wait until the chartering organization look at that, and feedback that, and then after the [inaudible] to discuss that. I think there will be no chance in Buenos Aries to discuss anything relating to the CWG IANA, right or wrong?

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: What I hear from Keith, sorry. What I hear from Milton, and also from Keith, if an ability for us, just like the other SOs and ACs, as it is laid out in the calendar, to take, to see the proposal that they have created of June 8th. And that gives an ability for us to read and discuss that, and also of course, the feedback that potentially have come back from the SOs and ACs, which means that we can look at the proposal on the 18th and 19th.

That is what I hear the proposal, the proposal list from other members. I would like to hear more feedback from other ICG members on the ability for us to work on the 18th and 19th, based on the proposal that is delivered to the chartering organizations, or CWG name. Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks Patrik. This is Alissa. That makes sense to me. I mean, I think it is in line with what we all said before, which is that we want to try to

engage with the names proposal as much as we can, even if it's not quite complete. And so, I think we should observe where it is, on the 18th and 19th, and if it has gone to the SOs and ACs, we should try to have as much discussion as we can.

We can't make decisions, but our process, you know, requires a good deal of analysis, and isn't going to get done in two days anyway. So, I think we should, you know, use our time wisely, evaluate it to the extent possible. Not make any kind of final decisions or anything, but we should certainly, I think, start the analysis as soon as the proposal itself appears to be stable, even if it hasn't been approved by the SOs and ACs yet.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Yes. We have a few people that have raised their hands. Let me remind people of the short time we have. We have five minutes to go. We have some minutes to approve. Let me remind people that, quite a lot of work that we did in the early part of the review of the other two proposals, responses from the operational communities, consisted of fewer mechanical, where we divided the documents, divided the issues, assigned token holders to do the review.

And so there are a lot of mechanical work that we can do, just by looking at the layout of the various proposals from the community. Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, Patrik, I see no difficulty if we have some preliminary idea about the activities of CWG IANA during the Buenos Aries meeting, why they are there to have some preliminary activities and reviews. But if everybody rejects that, say that we should do absolutely nothing. I'm waiting for the chartering organization, after the ICANN 53, and then sometimes between the [inaudible] we get together, what is possible, which is the ICG IANA people, or without.

So I don't come back with an efficient day. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Thank you very much. I hear that the concerns of this, that we should take part of the proposals as delivered on June 8, or whenever it's delivered to the SOs and ACs, but we should, of course, take into account that is not what is formally is delivered to us. And we should schedule and make actions to coordinate. Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks Patrik. I fully agree to that. My only question is that, if I understood correctly, there will be no change during the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aries, during the CWG and the ICG. That's what I understood. The question is whether we could have some because if, on the 18th and 19th, you have on [inaudible] this proposal, they may arise some questions according to our criteria we have.

And I wonder whether we shouldn't forward to those questions, to the CWG, or have an exchange, at least, before they are delivered the official report. That's my question.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Thank you very much. I think it depends very much on what the actual questions are. I think that we all would like to have a still round trip as possible, between us and the CWG names, just to decrease the amount of time, and if nothing else, calendar time. On the other end, I think it's very, we should be very careful of asking questions based on preliminary data.

So I would say that you raised some really good questions. That is something that we need to take into account when we are looking at the preliminary data. There might be some things that we can bring up to them really quickly, and there might be some things that is wrong for us to bring up, just because the data that we got is preliminary. So we need to be very careful there. Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, Patrik, [inaudible] or somebody that has listened to me. I am not asking, I am not raising the issue should we ask the question, I said that we understand what the [argument is?]. That specifically, the understand these offer very, very complex text of the applicant. I don't know whether you have read it or not, but it is very, very complex. It is called clarification, not question.

We don't raise questions. Some seeking clarification, impossible. If everybody says impossible, we don't want to do that, then we raise the question, and it [inaudible], and [inaudible]. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Yes, Kavouss, thank you very much. Yes, you point out the, something that we're coming back to over and over again when we ask clarification. And I think, given how we have, I think the way we've been working with things, with the responses we have got so far, is that a well working method, where we do something that could be viewed as an escalation, where we first discussed things internally in the ICG. Then we asked ICG members to clarify, and then we might ask for clarification from the operational community, and then we might ask questions.

So I think the mechanisms we have is working really, really well. I think it's unfortunate that we are, including myself, are using the wrong terminology, but I think we, I think it's actually, I feel confident that we do know how to handle this in practice, and we just need to make sure they are describing what we're doing and how we are doing things in a good way.

And that's also one of the reasons why I asked the co-chair, really like the ability to, for example, have Narelle and Jean-Jacques step up and try to help with the issue tracking. Kavouss please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. I see very instance by the people that we don't do anything, but I still believe that is quite useful. [Inaudible] the two communities, these two communities are working very well, and they work entirely different from CWG. It's for the [stakes] forward. We didn't have many questions. Questions were just some sort of a little adjustment, or on [inaudible] by CWG.

It's entirely a new course, entirely a new course that will with considerable clarification and [inaudible]. But if we want to postpone that, don't make any changes, but please on our record that Kavouss Arasteh, a member of the GAC, mentioned that this could be beneficial, that we use this opportunity and [inaudible], use even in an informal way. Put that in the record that I made, and the vice-chairs or co-chairs objected to that. Put that formally. And I don't want to disagree with everybody.

Everybody is right. Thank you. Put my point in the record that I said it is absolutely beneficial to have some preliminary [inaudible] view, it is very, very difficult process that CWG IANA preparing. And it was rejected by the co-chair. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Kavouss, you misunderstood me. It was not rejected by me as a co-chair and the chair of this call. It was the other way around. I said, yes, your proposal is something that I feel everyone shares. That we should do as much work as we can on the preliminary... I see consensus on this call, that we should do as much work as we [inaudible] can with the preliminary data that is delivered, for example, that is delivered from the CWG names to the chartering organizations.

What I did say was that, was also something that I hear you saying, which is another reason why we are agreeing, I hear that we're agreeing, that when we are deciding on what we need to have clarified, what we need to potentially ask question, what we are raising as issues to discuss, then we need to take into account the fact that we have

preliminary data and not the final response to the RFP, which is something I heard you say earlier.

So I do not see that I am objecting. So I'm not going to add that to the minutes. Instead, I declare consensus on this call that we have consensus on the ICG, that we should work with the preliminary data from the other two groups that are still working extremely hard. We should use as much as that data as possible, specifically what the CWG names can deliver on early June, hopefully, June 8th, according to the current timeline.

Is that something that you can agree with Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. You're referring to the two communities, I'm referring to the CWG IANA only. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Thank you very much. So there are two more items I would like to discuss on this. First of all, I would like to ask whether people would like to have conference calls starting immediately the week after Buenos Aries, or we should wait two weeks?

Narelle is suggesting two days. Alissa, please.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks Patrik. This is Alissa. I think we definitely need a call the week after Buenos Aries, perhaps a long call. We might want to book a multi-

hour call, and then if we need to, we can reschedule it. But it might be a good idea to reserve a large chunk of time in people's calendars. I would also say, we're running over time on this call, we can probably figure out some of these details on the list or over on the next call as well.

I know it's early slash late, for me it's late here.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Yeah. Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Do we need to decide now or after the Buenos Aries meeting? Maybe some of the last session that we have. This is very good, one week or two week. It depends on the discussion, and it depends on the [inaudible] of the issue, and it depends on the priority. So should we decide now or should make some very provisional, but then subject to modification at Buenos Aries. This is just an offer to you. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Yes. Thank you very much Kavouss. We do not have to decide now, but as the co-chair and also the co-chair among the three that is dealing with the logistics, I needed to get some indication of what I should work with the Secretariat. And I will come back to the mailing list with a proposal of conference calls.

I would work together with the co-chairs and secretariat to try to come up with a proposal of meetings after Buenos Aires. So, with that, let's, yeah, Alissa please.

ALISSA COOPER:

Sorry, my hand was up from before.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

So with that, we are running over time. I appreciate that all of you that are still on the call, are still on the call. We, as you see, we have some minutes for approval. I see that there are links. We have the February 6th minutes, version four. We have the 7th February minutes, version two, and we have the 11th of March minutes, version three. All of the minutes are in the Dropbox. We have had some discussion on some of the minutes and created new versions the last couple of days.

I have a question to you, if you need more time, or if we can approve all of these three. If someone would like to have more time on all three, or one of them, please speak up now.

I see Jean-Jacques thinking that we can approve them. Thank you very much.

So as no one is speaking up, let me, and Hartmut is also approving, and I'm getting an indication from maybe a few others. So anyways, so with that, let me call these minutes to be approved. Any other...? Okay. Jennifer has pointed out that there are red line sections in the minutes. Can you please clarify? That was something actually that I missed myself. I'm sorry for that. Jennifer, please speak up.

JENNIFER CHUNG: This is Jennifer Chung for the record. There are red line sections on the 6th February minutes, version four. Those are edits from Nelson, and also Daniel, that haven't been resolved. There are also red line sections in the 11th March minutes, version three. Those are the edits from Mary that I have also added.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Okay. I hear what you are saying. Given that there are red line sections, I think that was something that I should have caught, because that is something that we, in that case, could not really bring up these minutes for approval. Then the red line sections should have been brought up for discussion. So I'm sorry for this.

As the Chair, I obviously have made a mistake in the creation and discussion of the agenda for this call. So I see that we cannot approve these minutes yet, or rather, you say Jennifer, to repeat, there were red line sections on the 7th of February and 11th of March, is that correct?

JENNIFER CHUNG: This is Jennifer Chung. No, it's not correct. Red line sections on the 6th of February, version four, and also 11th March, version three.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Okay. So let me then suggest that we are approving from February 7th minutes version two, and we leave the others, two and four, for approval later.

So that's how we do it. So can you believe, to the ICG mailing list, send the information about these red line sections. And hopefully we can resolve these red line sections on the mailing list, and approve them on the next call.

With that, let me ask if there is any other issues that people would like to have discussed?

If there are no more issues, I would like to the minutes, from ICG, from me as the Chair, and to congratulate Alissa for coming back. We have, of course, missed you. At the same time, we have sort of been able to take care of ourselves. As you see, only slight issues, but if we didn't have any issues, you would not be as needed as you are. Congratulations to your daughter. And I hope that we will see you, continue to see you active at the ICG.

So thank you and congratulations for your daughter.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. Happy to be back.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Okay, with that, let me call this call to closure. Thank you very much everyone and see you in two weeks. Thank you, bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]