
ALISSA COOPER:

Hi everyone. This is Alissa. Thank you for joining ICG call number 24. This is our last call before you all will be together again in Dublin. The call is being recorded. Do we have anyone who is on the phone but not in the Adobe Connect room?

Okay. I don't hear anyone. So we can take the attendance from the Adobe Connect, thank you. You're looking at the agenda for today. I'm also supposed to remind people to please provide your name before speaking on the call for the transcript, as usual.

So you're looking at the agenda for today. We have added an agenda item from the original agenda, to talk about an update from the CCWG, and I see that we have both of our liaisons on the call. So we will look to you for that item, but otherwise we'll do minutes approval, have discussion of the responses from the operational communities, which we received from all three communities, some additional responses have just come in right before the call.

So some folks might not have seen that from the IAB. Then we'll go to the current status of the part zero, but we'll have the CCWG item. And then if we have time, we will move on to the summary document, which I know folks have worked hard to get their initial draft in, and so hopefully we'll have a bit of time to at least touch on that, and that will be led by Manal and Joe.

Kavouss, I've seen your hand kind of go up and down a few times. It looks like it is down right now, but did you have a comment?

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.

Go ahead.

It seems like we're having a microphone problem with Kavouss.

So hopefully we can take a minute to work that out. Any other comments on the agenda?

Okay. While we work on the audio... It sounds like both Kavouss and Manal both are having audio problems. Let's move on to the minutes approval, and then we'll come back to you if you can, when you get connected.

Jean-Jacques, I see your hand is raised. Is that to talk about the minutes or something else?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Yes. Hello Alissa, hello all. This is Jean-Jacques. Just a small point. I think it's the minutes of the two face to face meeting, in which I participated by remote participation. And in the action items towards the end, regarding PTI, [Jennifer] got in touch with me. We will have to add some, a sentence or two, about a remark which has been made a commenter. I think it was commenter number 50, about the way that the PTI Board should be refuted.

I just wanted to confirm that I had had this exchange with [Jennifer], and contributed. That was all. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay, thank you Jean-Jacques. Much appreciated. So I think, I will try to work on my audio as well, but I think the question for the first set of minutes is the two days of the face to face meeting. We've had some exchange on the list about these, and they've been updated accordingly. So any objections to approving the face to face minutes, both day one and day two?

Okay. Seeing no objections. Then I think we have one more set, which is the minutes from our last call, on call number, whatever it was, 22. Not the last call, the one before that. Again we had a discussion on the list. Any objections for approving the minutes for call number 22?

Jean-Jacques, are you back in the queue?

Okay. So hearing no objections, we can approve these minutes. Thank you.

So let's move on to the responses received from the operational communities. If we could start, I think, with the protocol parameters, since we did ask them one question. So folks have hopefully seen this on the list, but perhaps Jari, if you wanted to just take one minute to summarize, give us the one sentence summary of the response, that would be helpful.

JARI ARKKO:

Yes, the one word summary is, I guess, yes. Jari Arkko. It's a little bit more fine grain level, so we are pointing to a sentence in the proposal that says we are coordinating actually beyond the specific question, that's the ICG. [Inaudible] about coordination, and I think we have

made also some statements earlier that we believe were, ITF and ICG together have communicated that we believe in a formal way of coordination, rather than setting up any new formal structures.

So I think that's the gist of our comment. So we believe there is coordination going on that we plan to continue it.

ALISSA COOPER:

Great. Thank you. From my perspective, I think this is, you know, the complete answer. I think we can reflect it in part zero, and I think it gratified the question that had arisen from the comment with respect to the protocol parameters community, but would be interested in other people's thoughts if they have a different assessment.

And if folks are not speaking, if you could please mute. We're listening to somebody type.

Okay. So seeing no hands, I think we can, well let's talk about the action items, maybe, at the end of this segment, but I think the action is to reflect this commitment in part zero.

And I'll note, we also received, just before the call, a response from the Internet Architecture Board, which essentially says something very similar, but emphasizes the IAB's role as the body that deals with external relations for the ITF. So I think we can reflect both of those responses. Yup, there it is.

I think we can reflect both of these responses in how we characterize this in part zero.

With that, I think we can move on to the numbers community response please.

Okay. Do we have individual scroll control? I think we do. Okay. So we asked the numbers community two questions. The first one was about, a similar question about the commitment to coordination, and the other one was about the registries associated with the numbering community.

So perhaps, if I could ask Paul or Alan to maybe again provide these kind of one sentence summary for each of these.

PAUL WILSON: Yeah, I'm here and I can talk. Can you hear me? It's Paul.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, we can hear you Paul.

PAUL WILSON: Thanks. Well this was a [inaudible] decision, discussion by the CRISP team. And they response points out that yes the [inaudible] in fact the, or the protocols community, numbers community proposal does say clearly that the, I think [inaudible] coordinate with other communities, and that's part of, from the section 3A proposal.

They decided not to detail the coordination mechanisms to go further than that. But I have said that they're willing to talk with the other

community develop specific mechanisms, [inaudible] necessary. Then in the second question regarding the [inaudible]...

I have said that [inaudible]... to been participating in the [CFC] or the [IFR]. That's it.

ALISSA COOPER:

Great. Thank you Paul. And if you could get, I think, a little closer to your mic. Your audio was kind of coming in and out and it was a little bit hard to hear, but we all have the text of the response in front of us as well. So, I think again, as far as the question about coordination, I feel satisfied in terms of what we got back from the numbering community, and I think we can reflect that in the proposal, and it would address the concerns raised in the comments.

And I think the answer as far the CFC and the IFR are very clear, and we could reflect that as well. But any other comments? Go ahead Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you Alissa. Thank you Paul for that brief explanation. I have a question Paul, if I man. About the [inaudible] in address [inaudible] IPv6 [inaudible]. It just says here, these two things aren't excluded from the CFC IFR processes, as such the [inaudible] community doesn't see it a need to participate with the CFC and IFR.

I'm not very familiar with that. Can you tell me when you say exclude, that means they will come under a different set of rules? Is there a

legally binding arrangement for them [inaudible], and what is it?
Thanks.

PAUL WILSON:

I think the point is that those zones don't occur in the root zone, that they're under dot [R-PA]. So the provision of those services requires interaction with the dot [R-PA] registry and not the root level. So the CFC and the IFR are operating at the root level registry level, I believe, was my understanding.

And so while the interaction with the IAB as the authority for the [R-PA] registry, they wouldn't need to be interaction at the level of the CFC or the IFR. It's similar to the way, I guess, second level domain through the rest of the hierarchy may not need to have that interaction. That's my understanding, that if you want a further response from the CRISP team, I guess we can ask about it, with the subsequent deadline of another week's time. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Alan, go ahead.

ALAN BARRETT:

This is Alan Barrett. And let me try to expand on that a little. I think the dot [R-PA] domain is under the authority of the IAB. It doesn't really fit the same management or oversight through policy mechanisms as all the other domains that ICANN usually deals with. Dot [R-PA] is special, it's under the authority of the IAB, and in that regard [R-PA] IPv6 dot [R-

PA] are managed, sort of under mandate from the IAB according to the way IP addresses are delegated.

So I think from a numbers community perspective, we believe that the whole of dot [R-PA], and especially IPv6 dot [R-PA] and [inaudible] dot [R-PA] should be excluded from the oversight mechanisms that the names community is looking at. We don't see them, as I say, like the other names.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Alan.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Alissa, this is Jean-Jacques. May I put in one more question then?

ALISSA COOPER: Yup.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Alissa. This is Jean-Jacques. Thank you Alan for that explanation. I don't want to retard the whole process, but I would appreciate if someone would send me, on our list, a reply or a link to let me understand more clearly, what is it that makes the [R-PA] management, which Alan just referred to as separate.

My concern, or my vantage point, is simply that of accountability. So would separate accountability compatible with the overall tasks of compatibility to which we are held? Or would it be a separate,

something altogether different standard? I would like to have a clearer view of this.

Not now, but I would appreciate someone sending me, on this list, the correct information. Many thanks.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you Jean-Jacques. I see that Alan has posted one link into the chat, and Russ who was going to say, I'm sure Russ is at the ready with the appropriate RC reference. So hopefully that can provide more clarity for you. Any other comments on the numbers proposal? I mean, proposal, on the numbers response.

Okay. So, again, we will roll this into the action item to be reflected in part zero, both of these responses. And we can move on to names.

Okay. So here is what we received from the names community. Obviously here, we asked many more questions of the names community. So, and I know, I realize that I really didn't ask ahead of this call for anyone who was participating in the CWG to walk us through these questions, but if Milton or Martin, if you're willing to do that, we can do it that way, or I could step us through. What's your preference?

Martin points the finger at Milton to at least talk us through the [RZM] questions, so perhaps we can start that way. Milton, are you on the call?

MILTON MULLER:

I am. Can you hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes.

MILTON MUELLER: All right. I'm not in a very good environment, so I can be interrupted any minute, and I may have trouble hearing you and you may have trouble hearing me.

So we had some discussions, and I... We had a phone call with the CWG a couple of days ago, in which I think I clarified what the questions were. And I wasn't particularly happy with the answers that we were getting, not because I didn't like their substance, but because I thought, in many respects, the CWG wanted to avoid answering the questions properly.

And I wasn't able to follow through with the finalization of their response, and I see that they already in question one, they did not [inaudible] said they would do. But essentially, they believe that the VeriSign ICANN proposal is really only addressing how to implement and test the logistical elimination of NTIA approval, that the moment of transition in order to minimize some problems in root zone modification, and it doesn't address anything else.

And I think we did make a bit of a mistake in framing our question by including paragraph 1150 section 2, which is all about the NTIA and their cooperative agreement. So we shouldn't have included that in there, because I think that threw it off, because they kept wanting to assert that the proposal is not about amending the cooperative agreement.

And I'm sure that we all knew that and nobody expected to be [inaudible] ...or a place in the cooperative agreement. I think what we were all concerned about was the issue of the agreement between the post-transition ICANN or IANA, and whoever the root zone maintainer is.

So all I see in there is that they have inserted some language saying the CWG stewardship is of the view that an arrangement must be in place at the time of the transition. But they seem to be unwilling to confront what that arrangement is, and some of the people on the CWG seem to be, in suggesting that the NTIA should design that arrangement rather than the CWG itself.

In terms of question number two, they say, both [inaudible] are correct, but incomplete. One can test that, but that's what they said. They said the full answers addressed in paragraph 1155, so they think that their existing language about a substantial architectural and operational change is sufficient to say, to answer our question that there would be a review, and ICANN Board approval.

They did not answer a question about what constitutes consensus, or what consultation means. And you know, again, I wasn't able to, because of the deadline, they really were not able to carry on the discussion of that very much longer. So, that's my take on what happened in the RVM process. Does anybody have any questions or care to add anything? Martin?

ALISSA COOPER:

I see Russ Mundy in the queue. Go ahead Russ.

Okay. It looks like Russ, we lost Russ. So yeah, please get in the queue if you have thoughts. I have a couple of reactions. On question one, I think, you know, that we have learned a, part of it is the information that we were looking for, I think, which is that the CWG does not consider the existing document produced by VeriSign and ICANN as the, quote/unquote, agreement that needs to be in place for the transition to go forward.

So I think, in terms of what we said before in the proposal that we put out for public comment, and I think where we got to at the end of the face to face meeting, is that we're all in agreement, I mean, maybe that's not the best way to phrase it, but the CWG and the ICG are on the same page as far as the fact that there is an outstanding requirement for there to be an agreement between the RZM and the IFO.

And that there, all that text about what Milton wrote about what is required of the parallel process to produce that, we and the CWG are on the same page about all of that. Now I think some of the details that Milton brought up are important, and but they are probably not within the ICG's scope to determine.

I mean, I think that's what we're hearing from the CWG as well is that they have said what they wanted to say in their proposal, and how the rest of that gets carried out as far as, you know, what the agreement would look like, and the details of the agreement, and how it will be determined, are subject to this parallel process.

I'll just stop there for a second. That's kind of my take on the situation on question one. Do people agree with that, disagree with that?

Russ Mundy go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY: Let me try again. Can you hear me at all? Hello?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, yes, we can hear you.

RUSS MUNDY: Oh good. Yeah, the first one, I think, is the most problematic here. The second one I think, although I'm not thrilled with the answer, I think it's an okay answer, because I don't think they were particularly pointing out in their proposal, that they considered this to fall within the spectrum of what gets changed, and you know, what has to go to the review Board and the Board for approval, but I think this certainly clarifies it for answer two.

The general concern I still have about the first question is that, when we're supposed to be looking at this, overall, and of course, as the SSAC person, one of the SSAC people, overall security and stability I think is really absolutely crucial to this whole thing. Somebody needs to answer that question. And if the CWG doesn't want to ask NTIA, or point it out as it's not sufficiently addressed yet, I think that's still, that's a concern.

And I don't know exactly what or how we ought to say it. It doesn't sound like CWG is going to want to say anything also.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Russ, can you just restate what is the outstanding question?

RUSS MUNDY: The outstanding question is, as simply as I can describe it is, today, there is no written agreement concerning root zone management between the IFO and the root zone maintainer. The agreements that exist are between the IFO and root zone maintainer by way of NTIA. And NTIA is the holder of both of the agreements.

When NTIA goes away, and the contract for the IANA functions goes away, that takes away one of those written agreements. And then we are trying to operate and maintain the root zone of the DNS of the Internet, without a written agreement, unless some written agreement can be established between the root zone maintainer and the IANA functions operator.

And everybody seems to say, yeah that's important, but nobody seems to want to speak up and say exactly what ought to be done about it. Is that straightforward and simple enough?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes. It is. So my next question is, I sort of understand that, although we didn't quite say that in this question to the CWG, we took this question to the CWG and they said, yes that needs to be worked out, but not here. And everyone should feel free to disagree with me if I'm getting this wrong, but that's my understanding of one thing that they said.

And then separately, NTIA has said it was going to launch a parallel process that would deal with this aspect. And so, my question is, if

we...? My question sort of is, what is the next thing that we do? Like if the main gap here is for us to understand, is this parallel process that NTIA launches is going to cover this? And what is going on with that parallel process? And why don't we know anything about it?

Then that's the question that we should go at NTIA. Or if this is, if we look at what the proposal says and we say okay, well, we know the current root zone maintainer is VeriSign, we know the current IFO is ICANN, and in the future it will be PTI, which will be an affiliate of ICANN, do we need to go ask ICANN and VeriSign what is going on with this thing?

Or do we need to do something else? I'm trying to figure out, what do we need to do given that there is this outstanding issue. Milton, go ahead.

MILTON MUELLER:

Well, I think, Alissa you are correct in your interpretation of what the CWG is saying. Definitely. And my problem with that is that what you're saying to... If you consider this agreement, the listing agreement that Russ Mundy was talking about, if you consider that to be a gap that the NTIA fills, then I think we have created a process that doesn't really execute a full transition.

That we have said to the NTIA, you are going to still be in the position of assuring that this relationship between the IANA and the root zone maintainer is there. You're going to be in control of it. And I'm very concerned about how that will look to the rest of the world. I think there is a tendency, I think we had it at first but we overcame it, which

is to say, anything that touches RTM is out of scope for this process, and in fact, that's not true. Anything that requires modification of the cooperative, of the agreement, is out of scope.

But we have to say, not we, but the CWG names has to say, this is what the future relationship should look like between IFO and RTM, and now, NTIA, you modify the cooperative agreement to make it look like that. That is what I think should be happening. If we're just saying, we have no idea what this relationship should look like, if the multistakeholder process, that is, is saying that, then we're just going to let the NTIA solve that problem, I really have concerns about that viability in the international context, to put it delicately.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you Milton. Go ahead Russ.

RUSS MUNDY:

Thanks Alissa. Russ Mundy here. I think, as a minimum, we, as the ICG, need to say that, if we don't go and ask any more questions, and we just process forward based on what information we have at this point, I think we must point this out as a very visible and absent from completion or implementation aspect, based on the original guidance that was given to us.

As you well note, Alissa, it came from the fact that there will be the separate and parallel process, etc. And the only results of that seem to have appeared, or that draft agreement between VeriSign and ICANN, but that's not clear that that is the final agreement. So I think if we go

forward with what we have, we have to identify that there is a missing piece based upon the guidance that we go going in from the NTIA.

If we want to pursue it further, I would like to see us, honestly, ask NTIA the question. Because I think they're the guys that are really, if you will pardon the sports analogy, are holding the football at this point in time, regardless of what kind of football one thinks of when I say football. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you Russ. Kavouss?

We do not have audio for Kavouss still.

Well, hopefully, can we try to work on Kavouss's audio? I still can't hear him.

And while we do that, I guess, so here is a question for everyone, which is... So we already had in the proposal, and I think it was with the consensus of the ICG, that the fact that, just as Russ said. The fact that there is no written, currently no written agreement between the IFO and the RTM, is a gap that must be filled before the transition. Those aren't exactly the words that we used in the document, but that's essentially what we said.

So I think we already have that as our position, and that's in the proposal. I wonder if there is another position that we are talking about, which is that we think the CWG needs to have some sort of role in the development of that agreement, or assessment of that agreement, or something, and Keith Drazek had put this into the chat.

Can I get people's thoughts on whether that's, is that also a collective feeling of the ICG, that the CWG must be involved in the development of this agreement? Or reviewing it or something.

I'm seeing people type into the chat. Review.

Milton, go ahead.

MILTON MUELLER:

The issue for me is, it's not just an implementation issue in the sense that we need... I mean, okay [inaudible] written agreement. There are issues raised, which were sort of raised by our second question, which was okay, if this is the relationship in which ICANN is full in control, or PTI is fully in control, if it's ICANN, could ICANN then say, you know, what will the term of the contract be? Will it be for two years?

And if it's, let's say, at the end of two years, can ICANN just say, bye-bye VeriSign, we're taking over this function? Then we have to deal with the fact that there are people who commented on the proposal who said that they would oppose it as a matter of principle, if the RVM function and the ICANN function were collapsed into the single entity.

So I think you need a statement of principle as to, you know, what the nature of that relationship is going to be. I mean, I think that's part of the design of the transition. It's a critical part of the design of the transition. And I don't think NTIA can be responsible for... I think NTIA is responsible for implementing what we tell them we want to do, via the cooperative agreement, but I don't think they should be deciding what we want to do.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Kavouss.

Still no audio from Kavouss.

Let's go to Martin and try to come back to Kavouss. Working on the audio, hopefully. Martin, go ahead.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks Alissa. Can you hear me? I've got a pretty ropey line here.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes we can hear you.

MARTIN BOYLE: Okay. Thank you. Martin Boyle here. I think the CWG proposal actually did cover the expectations that there would be a separation the RZM and the PTI, or and ICANN.

ALISSA COOPER: Martin, are you still there?

Okay. Sounds like we lost Martin's audio as well. It's a little hard to have a call if nobody has audio. Martin?

No. Okay. Just since we... So I sort of thinking of these as slightly separate topics, but I'll just kind of give a take on this separation of roles question, and again, please correct me if this seems incorrect, but I was

reading this as, you know, the response that we got from the CWG essentially says, well, if the IFO and the RZM or basically, if the RZM was going to change from who it is today to somebody else....

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: ...I can hear you.

ALISSA COOPER: We've got Kavouss on audio. So if the RZM was going to change from who it is today to somebody else, that would be considered a major operational change, which would then be subject to this standing committee process that was outlined in paragraph 1155, and would include a public consultation, and so on and so forth.

So I was, it seemed to me that that was basically the answer to our question, is that it is what it is today, and if it's going to change, then it will be subject to this whole review process. But Martin seems to be saying something different. Martin, do you have audio back?

No. Kavouss, do you have audio back?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, I have audio now. I wish to repeat what I said. That we have to do the steps, the first steps are CWG, to look at the issue, if there is any problems to indicate that, and they can also consult the legal units that they have had. It can be problem that. Once it is finished, it should come to the broader community and the broader community needs to

reflect and to pronounce on that issue, which we do it in two steps.
Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you.

So do we have anybody else who is able to speak who wanted to speak?

Okay. Seems the answer to that question is no. So we have to figure out what to do here. I think, as far as this, the question of the agreement, where is it going to come from, and what would the role of the community be? This is clearly an open issue. I do not know whether, you know, we need to go ask someone about this, or we need to just take a position on it.

So, I would appreciate people's thoughts. We should probably take this to the list at this point, because we have a lot of other things to get through. But we need to figure that out. And if we need to ask somebody something, we should do it as soon as possible. So any of you who have been contributing to this discussion, or anybody of course, please make a proposal to the list of what you think we should do here.

And that could be, we just flag this with all of the red flags in the world, in the proposal. We send it to NTIA, or it could be, we need to go ask people and come up with more of a plan. But it seems we need to do something, but it's not clear exactly what, to me at least. And that's with respect to the agreement point.

I think there also seems to be disagreement about the collapsing the two roles into one, or into ICANN. I thought it was fairly clear from the response that we got, but if other people think it's not, then we should take that to the list.

That's my proposal, especially given the audio problems that we're having.

Okay. I still see hands up. If you're not wanting to be in the queue, thank you for putting your hands down. Okay, so there is an action there for the people who have opinions about this, please send them to the list so that we can get it worked out.

If we move down to ccTLDs, do we have Martin back on audio?

Apparently not, okay. So, the ccTLD questions are fairly straightforward, so we can hopefully just tick through them. The first question was about updating, well really both of them are about updating the text and the references regarding the documents related to ccTLDs. And the CWG has either agreed with our proposal for amending the text, or suggested their own amendment. So I think we can just incorporate these verbatim. Does anyone disagree?

Okay. Hearing no disagreement, then I think for three and four we... Oh, that was for three and four. Then we have five. So five was the one where we had thought a good suggestion came in from one of the public commenters concerning making the non-ccNSO ccTLD seat on the IFRT optional rather than mandatory. I think we've got a fairly thorough explanation from the CWG as to why it is a mandatory seat.

And you know, it is their prerogative. I think we made the suggestion because we thought it was a good one, they have a different view, and I think their community consensus certainly needs to rule. Does anybody disagree with that?

Okay. Seeing agreement from our CC folks, so that's good. So that involves no change. Moving on to PTI. So this same question that we had sent to the other two communities about commitment to cooperation in the future. We've got an unequivocal statement. The CWG willingness to coordinate in the future.

So I think again here, we can reflect that into the proposal. Any comments on that?

Okay. So that's what we will do. For question number seven, we had asked about whether the decisions or recommendations made by IFR or special IFR would be mandatory. And you can see an answer that we got from the CWG, essentially that the expectation is that those recommendations would be implemented, and in the event of some sort of divergence, that's where the reliance on the accountability mechanisms would be.

So does anyone still have questions about this? This was, again, just I think a clarification question. I'm not sure that there is anything actionable for us here, but if you think there is, please speak up.

Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, just one small comment. In the last part of the CWG, it is mentioned that the community will be able to rely on the candidate that the CWG accountability is currently developing. Just it's important that we have no clear consensus on how these things are doing. We are discussing that. So it is a question mark, and we have to wait until the working party, two of the CWG completes its work, and CWG considers the matter and comes to the conclusion, what would be the output in the report to the ICANN 54 that will be meeting.

So there is one qualified thing that we need to wait. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you. Good to know.

Okay. Seeing no further hands, I think we take number seven as just a clarification for ourselves. Moving on to number eight. So number eight is where we had suggested this minor word change to make it clear that the language apply, the language that seems like it's applying to the PTI actually applies to the PTI Board, in terms of limiting the powers.

And the CWG agrees with us. So for this, I think, we just make the change in the text. Any objections?

Okay. So that's what we will do for number eight. For number nine, was the question where we, that had arisen from the comments about the relationship between the PTI Board and the ICANN Board, and who ultimately would be held accountable, and how we avoid ending up in

the sort of same [inaudible] scenario. And I think the answer that we got back is that the ICANN Board is the ultimate backstop here.

And the CWG has suggested adding one sentence to the paragraph that currently talks about this to make that clear, and that's the sentence that you can see in yellow.

So I think we would add this text verbatim from the CWG. Any objections?

Okay. People are onboard with that, so we will do that for number nine. Then for 10, 11, and 12, these were the questions for clarification about the application of the term IFO, and also the CFC and the IFR to just to the names community. And the CWG has confirmed that all of those, within the context of the CWG proposal apply only to the naming functions.

So, here is a question, I mean, I think that this concept should probably be reflected in part zero to make that clearer for people, but otherwise, I don't think there are changes to be made to the names proposal itself. Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Nothing on number 10, but on number nine, I have a question. Want to finish, if you first could kindly allow me to come back to nine. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Sure. Yeah, let's do 10, 11, and 12, and then we'll come back to nine.

So the proposal for 10, 11, and 12 is that we make it clear in part zero, the scope of the application of the CFC and the IFR, and the use of the term IFO in the names proposal. Objections to that?

Okay. Looks good. Okay, so that's what we will do. And let's come on back to number nine. Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. In the last part of the CWG, there is a highlighted part. I don't really understand what is the purpose of that. It is highlighting the, drawing our attention to something, or this is something that we need to reflect on that. It is highlighted in yellow. Could you clarify the meaning of this highlighting? Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

So the suggestion is that we would take the highlighted text and append it to paragraph 11 13 in the proposal, so that this question came up from the public comments could be clarified for everybody. So that's what happened to that highlighted sentence.

Okay. So then the last one, number 13, again, was about dot [ARPA]. And the clarification that we got here was, essentially that, within the structure of the CFC, there is a slot that has been held open should an additional TLD representative outside of the ccTLD or gTLD registry operator community want to participate. And so that could be the IAB for dot [ARPA]. And then further that if there is such a person sitting on the CFC, the IFR has a slot for a CFC liaison to it.

And so it's possible that same dot [ARPA] representative could serve as a liaison to the IFRT. So essentially here it's like, it's all optional. And that's how the situation is for dot [ARPA].

I think, I don't know that we actually need to clarify anything in the proposal here, since this is just what they've told us is already written in the proposal, but would appreciate other people's thoughts.

I see people typing, so I'm waiting for a response from someone, okay. It seems fair enough, need changes, okay, that's what I thought as well. Okay, that's good. So here is my suggestion, where we are... We have actions for all of those except for the RZM ones. I think we should move on to do the updates about the CCWG process. We'll see how long that takes us, and maybe at the end, come back to the RZM question if people think that they have maybe a proposal or something to put forward while we're still all on the call, that might be good to do if we have a little bit of time.

So let us move on to the update on the CCWG, and for that, I would turn it over to our liaisons, if you want to just give a brief update. I know there is a lot of work going on, many, many calls and so forth. But if you can give us kind of a status report, I think that would help. So I'll turn it over to Kavouss and Keith.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes Alissa, thank you very much. CCWG is working very hard. Since we have had four calls, very, very busy. And heavy on our agenda. Up to the second proposal of the CCWG, we had only one mechanism, which is called sole membership. And then based on the comments on that,

they raised several questions. One question would be that, was that, again, is the potential risk that there would be some consequences of the new structures, and which would counterbalance the situation between different stakeholders, or multi-stakeholders.

And the second part of the proposal of ICANN, it mentioned that there is a risk that the balance of the power, or the different situations between government and private sector would be changed. And lastly, they mentioned that there are difficulties to implement that sole membership. And they propose another mechanism, which is called multi-stakeholder enforcement mechanism, and that was discussed in LA.

There were actions against as well as the actions in favor, and the issue was further discussed. At this moment, there is no consensus which model we will use. The important issue for ICG is that the CWG requirement is one important element of transition, and any model that will be used will need to satisfy that requirement that at this stage, it is not [inaudible] these requirements will be satisfied or not. There are problems with the method proposed.

ICANN made 81 page of the comment, and in many of them, they are not in favor of the proposal. So it's the level of the individual directors by the designating [inaudible] live with that, the problem with the access and cost for the [inaudible], they are not favor in that, and the problem of [inaudible] the bodies or [inaudible] the bodies, they are not in favor of that.

So the issue is under discussion, and now the CCWG is considering perhaps another method, which is called plan B recently proposed. And we have to discuss it after your meeting tonight with the legal advisor of the CCWG to see whether that will go forward.

And this model is based on to save the transition, and to shift any difficulty that we have to the later stage, because ICANN Board mentioned that the current structure of SO and AC are not representing the entire community. So implicitly it means that there might be a need to review the structure of the ICANN, and that is something that we cannot do now.

The proposal made by Johnathon [inaudible] to the anchor, and amended by myself, is we try to put something in the bylaw that the membership would study the restructuring, but try to put all the powers required for transition in the method that we proposed, and try to facilitate the transition and to not have any difficulty.

NTIA made it quite clear that they do not expect to have two proposals on the table. One from the CCWG community and another from [inaudible]. There should be consensus on that. So that is the big problem today. And there are many other areas that they are discussing. So the situation at this [inaudible] is not clear, but we are working on that.

And then perhaps in Dublin, or by Dublin, we might have a together position. However, the CCWG co-chairs, they now considering to have perhaps another public comment, consideration of another public comment, and that might have some impact on the delay of the

situation. But that delay must be minimized for the transition, and transition should take place at the time that was already proceed.

So we need to reflect on that and we need to weigh that in Dublin. So I don't know whether you want to have some common meeting with the CCWG in Dublin in order to have broader discussions with the full member of the ICG and full member of the CCWG, or you just want that [inaudible] of the ICG report you back in the ICG meeting in Dublin, in order to enable ICG to reflect of the difficulties, and try to minimize the risk of the postponement or delay in the transition.

So I don't want to take your time. There is a lot of discussions. And that would be more [inaudible] to all of the [inaudible], but all information are well documented, and on the mailing list, and on the ICANN website. So people can consult that. But for the time being, the situation is unclear, in other ways, there are more questions than answers. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you very much Kavouss. Keith, go ahead.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you Alissa. This is Keith Drazek for the transcript. Thank you Kavouss, very detailed and comprehensive summary. Maybe I could just take a minute to boil it down a little bit, in terms of, you know, sort of what's happened since we met last face to face in Los Angeles, and what we're doing now in the CCWG, and what the plan is ahead.

I think as everybody knows, there was a public comment period open on the second reference model. The public comment period closed on September 12. The ICANN Board submitted written comments the day before, September 11.

And then there was a face to face meeting of the CCWG in Los Angeles on September 25 and 26. It was scheduled to take place around the same time as the ICANN Board meetings that were taking place around Los Angeles and the Board retreat. So there was a two day, pretty lively discussion, among the CCWG and the ICANN Board.

I think as Kavouss noted, the ICANN Board made it clear that it did not agree, or did not support, the recommended implementation model that had come out of the public comments, sorry, that had been posted for public comment, and that it had some serious reservations about the proposed implementation structure.

Just as aside, I just forwarded it to our list, the ICG list, sort of a personal summary, or distillation of what I think the Board, what we heard from the Board and the public comments in the face to face meetings, and in a couple of subsequent teleconferences. And so you don't have to look at that now, but just for your review following the call perhaps.

But I think the gist of it is that there is a fairly significant difference of opinion, between the CCWG, which is not entirely united behind any one proposal, but the Board has made it very clear that it does not agree, does not support the implementation plan that has been put out for public comment.

So the CCWG right now, is going through its process of assessing all of the public comments, including the Board's. The current timeline for sort of wrapping up the first phase of that analysis is October 12, so early next week. And then the CCWG will do its analysis, do its assessments, and start working on the necessary adjustment to the proposal that has been put out.

I think there is, as Kavouss said, an open question as to the extent of the necessary adjustments. It is unclear at this time because the public comment summary has not been completed, how much of an adjustment will be required. And I think... So there is a very good possibility, as I noted on our previous meeting, that there may be another public comment period required coming out of Dublin.

And I think the current timeline is, if things go as sort of expected, is that there is a target now of delivering something to NTIA by the end of the year. I think there is an expectation coming out of the public comment period that substantial more work needs to be done on the community's proposed reference model, and the CCWG is hard at work in analyzing the public comments.

So let me pause there and see if there are any questions.

Anyone have questions? I see no hands Alissa, so I'll hand it back to you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, thank you to both of you for that very helpful summary and your personal insights as to the process. So I will be honest that I have

been spending a lot of brain cycles trying to think about, is there any way for us, as a group, to be helpful here? And I fully understand and agree with the approach that we have taken thus far, which has been to say that, you know, we have a process that we initiated with the operational communities, and the CCWG has a parallel process.

And there is clearly the linkage between the processes via the CWG proposal, but otherwise we have, you know, largely stayed out of the accountability discussion. And I think we are in very strong agreement in our group that that was the right approach. With that being said, we are the coordinating body for delivering a transition proposal.

And acknowledging the linkage, if the CCWG process is, you know, goes along the trajectory that we, as the ICG, cannot support, or you know, doesn't actually produce something as an end result, that can be sent to NTIA, then our proposal will be in a very questionable state.

So I think the question for us is whether, as the ICG, there is anything we can do to try and help make the process a success. And one aspect that has particularly struck me is that there seems to be a bit of a breakdown in terms of the level of seats in the conversation, within the CCWG and between the CCWG and the Board.

And I think, you know, part of the value of this group is that we have all been sent here to the ICG from our own communities, in part because of our, because of the trust the community has put in us to be able to coordinate the transition, and also because of our experience in, with consensus based processes. We've all been in this situation many times.

Not this specific situation, but we've been all been involved in these processes for many years, we've all been involved in them when they go well, and when they don't go well. And so we have a lot of collective brain power, I think, when it comes to perhaps being able to suggest, you know, some mechanisms to kind of lower that [inaudible] level.

That's kind of what I've been thinking about. And also the fact that our group is very, you know, it's much broader than just the names interest, and just focusing on the DNS, but we really are here to represent the full gamut, [inaudible] and you know, lots of interests who care very much about the transition and who have spent a lot of time on the transition.

And part of the results of our RFP that we put out, but who have not been engaged in the CCWG process. So I've just sort of been wondering if there is a message that we need to send, that just says, you know, maybe it's time to cool off a little bit. Maybe it's time to try to bring the heat down. I think that [inaudible]...

As Kavouss and others have stated, the participants in the group are avidly working through their process, and trying to process their public comments, trying to find common ground. But I feel like the level of sort of argumentation and accusation and this kind of intervention with broad statements, or you know, mischaracterizing each other's positions, and all of those things that start to happen when people really dig in, is not helping the process reach a productive conclusion.

So, I'll kind of leave it open to people, if you think there is anything for the ICG to do in this area, or if you'd rather if us, as a group, stay away

with a 10 foot pole. I would be very interested in people's thoughts. I've been wondering if the ICG could sort of, you know, say something to the effect of, it's really important for people to cool off and focus on the work, even in just the next 10 days, that's really important, if people think that would be helpful.

So I see there is a queue forming. Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes Alissa. The question whether the ICG should take any position. I think you declare yourself that no, we are the coordinating group. We don't get involved in the detailed discussions, [inaudible]. However, we need to reiterate that the requirement of CWG needs to be met in order to facilitate the transition and meet the transition [take place?]. That's all. So we did not get [inaudible] speak in the CCWG. We have two hats, one hat is ICG and the other is, we stick to that, and we don't get into the detailed discussion, other than restating the position of the ICG.

However, in the other half that we have as the participants, we make our comment on [inaudible] basis and without quoting the ICG requirements. So I don't think that we need to take any position, but if you agree and other ICG people agree, we need to reiterate once again that, we want that requirement as the CWG, as mentioned in the second proposal of the CCWG to be truly met. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you Kavouss. Paul, go ahead.

PAUL WILSON:

I'm in favor of doing whatever we can. I think our mission is threatened by what's going on there. We're in a potential position of having this entire work effort essentially wasted because a delay for another several years takes us into a completely different environment where this effort that we've done may just need to be restarted completely.

I don't think we can really make a statement that has implications about behaviors or motivations. I think we need to be very, very objective and maybe provide a reminder of what's at stake. And maybe some suggested guidance. It seems to me, one of the major sort of failings here is that the distinction between work stream one and work stream two, has sort of seemingly been lost.

Work stream one was supposed to cover, and includes a set of changes that would be achieved within the transition timeline, and what has actually come out seems to me out of work stream one are a set of changes that can't be achieved in the transition timeline, for whatever reason. And again, we don't need to go into deeply into all of our reasons for that.

The fact is that what's being proposed is possibly not achievable. I think, as work stream one, and I think the distinction between work stream one and work stream two, needs to be maintained and maybe the point to be made about work stream one is that all that actually needs, all we actually need and agree and achieve, before the transition is an understood, robust enforcement mechanism that ensures the evolution of ICANN be trusted afterwards?

That's pretty consistent approach of affairs. That's my style, but I just, I would break it down to simple requirement or a mechanism to be put in place before the transition that will give trust and [inaudible] the enforcement of ongoing evolution. That's about all I have to say at this point, thanks.

Again, sorry if you can't hear me. I am quite close to the microphone. I'm not sure what's happening.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Paul. Jari?

JARI ARKKO: Yes, Jari Arkko for the record. I think I have had basically the same thought process as Paul, but like a different place. I had a couple of comments to make. One is that, I think the situation of course, just to emphasize that we need to be very clear of where the [inaudible]... I think we're doing that with our neighbors and our proposal going forward.

So that's good. We did that correctly. The other thing is that I don't think it's our process and our role to say something about the details of how do you solve this? What's the solution? Or [inaudible] split between part one or two? While I agree, at a person level with Paul what should be done there, but I don't think that's our role.

So we can't be the ones who say, you know, let's do this instead. However, one thing, I don't know, if that would be useful, but it might, perhaps, be more in our role, at least. Sort of like [inaudible] the

current situation, and perhaps remind people of the principles, how we should be operating. And, you know, one of those reminders perhaps could be that who much is riding on this? In what sense, the proposal going forward, the transition but also trust of community on the existing [inaudible] basically.

So it's important. But I'm also sure that the CCWG and the Board knows this. But the other thing that perhaps could be said is that, I agree with the comments said earlier that there is some amount of communications breakdown. The discussion is not as healthy perhaps. It's a little bit on one track and focused on one party's opinions, and the CCWG would be, it might be a good idea for them to give it back to what they were, what they are doing actually, whether they're feeling distracted with this analysis of the feedback, and then dealing with the feedback somehow.

And ultimately, it's not that you have a proposal that satisfies a party, ICANN Board or NTIA, or any of the sort of [inaudible] remarks, important parties, but you have the support of the broad community behind the proposal. So anything you wouldn't do to remind people of that, I think might actually be helpful. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you Jari. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. I didn't want to talk about work stream one and two, but from the definition of work stream one, is the mechanism to be in place, or

committed to be in place, regards in transition. And that is all that ICG should be worried about. Focusing too is overall, long term accountability of the ICANN, and in fact, the Board is not in favor of the community the work stream two, the [inaudible] and formal arrangement, but believe that it could be done to the normal transitional day to day activities of the ICANN.

But as far as the ICG is concerned, I don't think that we need to be worried about work stream two, because it does not, it should not have any impact on the transition as the transition is included in work stream one, unless CCWG has forgotten something for transition, that we are taking care of. So I don't think that we need to discuss work stream. It's an issue between ICANN and CCWG. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Keith Drazek, go ahead.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you Alissa. Just coming off of mute. Keith Drazek for the transcript. Yeah, I was just going to add also in the chat that I think it's important to note that the CCWG, you know, in my observation, is not unified behind, you know, promoting the sole member reference model at all costs.

And I think there is a strong commitment among most in the CCWG to, you know, take the public comments that were submitted, to analyze them, and to adjust and refine, and to compromise, to find a consensus position. And I think that you know the Board's comments have to be

taken into consideration. There were other comments, submitted by other groups, that you know, raised other questions or similar questions, all of those need to be addressed going into the next phase, and I think there is a strong commitment among most, if not all, in the CCWG to do that.

So I want to make it clear that it's not that there are two camps that are not finding a way forward. I think there is a willingness to do so. It's just going to take a little bit longer. Yeah, I'm getting some typing in the background, could you please mute? Thank you.

I think it's just important to note that we're not in a situation where there are two parties unwilling to budge. I think there is a willingness to try to find the compromise path forward, and that has to be guided by the public comments, because the reference model that was put out was the result of at least rough consensus in the CCWG, that it was good enough for putting out, you know, for the public comments.

Now it's a matter of adjustment and refining, and if there needs to be some compromise and shifting off of something like the sole membership model, I think there is a willingness to try to find the right implementation model that still delivers on the community's goals. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you. Paul, is your hand up again or is that from before?

It's from before. Okay. Well I think this was a useful conversation. It does not sound like we really have consensus to do anything as the ICG

necessarily. We have, okay, Russ Mundy, and then we have to wrap up, because we need to end on time today for the interpreters. Go ahead Russ Mundy.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks Alissa. Russ Mundy here for the transcript. I agree, I think, what you were just summarizing, I think there is no active thing that the ICG, per se, can do, if anything needs to be published, I think what the most that we can say is, you know, the relationship of the pieces, and we are waiting for the pieces to complete.

And if individuals are participating in both activities, that is perfectly fine, but there is not a direct ICG involvement, but people may be participating in multiples of these groups, as a way to help get to closure.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Russ. Narelle, we have two minutes left, and I would like to take one of those, so one minute.

NARELLE CLARK: Narelle Clark for the record. Hoping you can hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes.

NARELLE CLARK:

Hello? Thank you for that confirmation. Look, this is where, I think, I don't think we can really try and bail in at this stage. I think we need to work through the public comments a little bit more, as others have said. But perhaps this is where the extra proposal that I've flagged on the mailing list last night, or earlier today, whatever it is for your time, that perhaps where we can give some confidence to folk that if we were to say on, to do a bit more in the implementation side, but perhaps that could help people get some confidence that the transition could be a little more smooth.

That's just what I would do, is to flag that extra proposal to everybody that I've put on the table there. I'm not wed to it either at this stage, but it is something I think we need to at least discuss with some confidence. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks Narelle. We definitely have that on the radar for discussion in Dublin. So much appreciated. So I think we will certainly come back to this other topic in Dublin as well. We'll figure out when it makes sense to get an update from the CCWG folks during one of our working sessions in Dublin.

So the key takeaway from this meeting, we will work through the action items with the secretariat as far as part zero. I think most of them are very straightforward, but the main thing is, if you have a proposal for how we are going to wrap on the RVM related issues, please send it to the mailing list like today, or tomorrow, if possible, because we really need to figure out what to do if we intend to essentially wrap up our

substantive work in Dublin, and if we need to get in contact with anyone else in the meantime.

We need to know that right away. So please do that if that's of interest to you, and otherwise we will all be together a week from Saturday is our first working session. Thanks everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]