
ALISSA COOPER: All right. Hi, everyone. This is Alissa Cooper. Welcome to the ICG call. We're at about one minute after the hour, so I think we should get started. Can everyone hear me?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

ALISSA COOPER: Great. So, as usual, Alice is taking roll in the Adobe Connect room. Do we have anyone on the call who's not in the Adobe Connect room?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Elise Gerich is not in the Adobe Connect room.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, [Lauren]. Okay, great. Alice will keep taking roll, as usual. The agenda for today is we have, first, minutes approval from the last call. Just looking at the minutes on your screen, Samantha has incorporated

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.

the edits that were discussed on the mailing list up until a few hours ago.

The first question is if anyone objects to adopting the minutes from the [eighth] teleconference.

DANIEL KARREBERG:

This is Daniel. I just five minutes ago suggested a small edit to one of the things I said, if that could be made, it would be [inaudible].

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay. I see that edit. It looks fine to me. I have no problems with that. Anyone else on the minutes? Okay, great. So I think we can consider the minutes approved with the one more change from Daniel. Thank you very much, Samantha, for putting those together.

The next item on the agenda is secretariat update. Unfortunately, we don't have much of an update. There's been some personal matters that have delayed things a little bit, so we don't have any further information that we can share on this call, but hopefully very soon there will be information that can be shared. I don't know, Adiel, if you wanted to say anything else about that. I see we have a bit of a queue, so maybe we can go to the queue.

Jean-Jacques? I'm not hearing Jean-Jacques if he's speaking. I also see Daniel in the queue. Can we try Daniel?

DANIEL KARREBERG: Yeah, hello. I'm just wondering whether the secretariat selection team can give us any indication on when they expect that we have this done. I know it's kind of an unfair question, but still, I think it's on the mind of – I would assume that it's on the mind of many of us.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello, this is Jean-Jacques. Can anyone hear me now?

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, we can hear you now. Go ahead, and then we'll take Daniel's question afterwards.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, thank you. I was saying there are two things which are different. On the one hand, whatever we are ready or not to give in public; and on the other hand, preparatory work on the sub-committee on which I am a member.

Now, I can understand that there have been maybe various hindrances of a personal or professional nature which have not made it possible for some to go forward with this, but I suggest that if Adiel or anyone else has a problem with the timetable on this particular item, then he could delegate that to another member of the team to keep dealing with the staff of ICANN, especially with procurement staff, to make sure that the various steps are being followed and that we will not fall too far behind in the preparation of the choice and the contracting of an external secretariat.

So I'm very much aware that Adiel was extremely tied up with his African meeting, and I'm just saying that [inaudible], in spite of that or other hindrances, the other members of the team should pull forward and report to Adiel as we go along. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER:

So I think we now have Adiel on the call. Oh, he's waiting for his mic to be activated, so let's give him one second. I will just say that, from my perspective, none of the delays have anything to do with anyone on the ICG, so I think everyone on the ICG has done essentially everything they can to make this happen as quickly as possible, but we'll let Adiel speak to that. It looks like his mic is activated.

Patrik, did you want to jump in there?

PATRIK FALSTROM:

Sure. I can try to explain what the situation is. The situation and one of the reasons why we cannot talk about this in detail has to do with [procurement] rules, and it is simply the case that individuals that are working with the actual procurement process had personal matters which have delayed information to the various applicants on the current status, and as long as that is not finalized, it is not possible to talk about the current situation, regarding the – in detail, because. . .

For example, the parties that are number two and three in line has to be informed according to appropriate procurement rules, and before that is done and before the actual final negotiations and the contract is signed and the ink is dry, it is hard to move forward.

That said, what we have done in the leadership of ICG with the help of some ICG members is to prepare the discussions regarding, for example, who is doing what regarding the separation of tasks between ICG, ICANN, and the incoming secretariat, and as soon as the actual negotiation is ready, I think we have as short start-up phase as possible.

So to answer Daniel's question, as far as I understand, it has to do with a few days of work. The problem is that those few days of work was something that I personally expected to happen three weeks ago or two weeks ago. I still hope that that can happen this week and then we're done.

So it is very short few more steps to be done, but it's unclear to me when it actually will happen, and at the moment, I'm not really holding my breath and I don't want to and I cannot promise anything.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Hi, I'm not able to raise my hand there. Just to add to – can you hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes. Go ahead, Adiel.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yes. To add to what Patrik just said, I think what is remaining is very, very low and that has nothing to do with us from our side. As you all know, from the logistical perspective, it is ICANN that is driving this and [inaudible] has been on emergency leave for family reasons for the past

two weeks or so, and unfortunately there was no one else at ICANN that was following this particular thing.

So I think from the mail and the information we have received from [Xavier], which the chair and co-chair were in copy of, they are trying to get this done as soon as possible when they got more information from the [JAG]. So they [inaudible]. The resolution of this is out of our hand and it is from ICANN perspective, which is one of the backside of having them running the legal and administrative part of this. So we just have to wait for them to finalize the contract for negotiation, the bit that is remaining, so that the work starts.

In that, there is one aspect of it that we have requested and that is still pending in that contractual negotiation is the mitigating point of the conflict of interest, the wording that will be added to the contract. That is also one piece that is still remaining right now.

So [inaudible] for ICANN to get hold of for [Vivek] or somebody else inside there to take up the file and get up to speed.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Adiel. Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Alissa. Thank you, Adiel, for the explanation. As a member of the sub-committee which was appointed to prepare this, I formally request now and would like to see that reflected in the minutes. I formally request for any of these dealings, the members of the sub-committee should be informed by e-mail.

I was not aware that there was a problem, where it was located. I thought wrongly that it was Adiel or someone else on the leadership team who had a conflict of calendar, possibilities, and I know that's not the case. But it's very embarrassing to not be able to address the question when you're supposed to be part of the team which is supposed to deal with it.

Now, Patrik, I heard your remarks, but I find this not satisfactory that I was not informed. Of course not in a public way, but at least by e-mail or perhaps by a Skype conference.

So I formally request that this method be re-established. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you. Adiel, can we give you that action for [inaudible]?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Yeah. Jean-Jacques, I take that on me. I apologize for not keeping all the group in the loop of those discussions. Frankly, there was no concrete action from that and I didn't really thought of forwarding or adding you to the loop as the chair and the co-chair were informed of this. But I'll forward you all of the communication and keep you in the loop. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you. I think we are done with that. I don't see anybody else in the queue. Okay, great. So moving on to the next topic, which is global finalization process. I'm going to attempt to share from my own desktop.

I saw that there were, at least for me, a bunch of e-mails came in over the evening. I'm having a little bit of technical difficulty. Okay, can folks see my screen?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I can see it.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, great. And I'm sorry, I have to share my whole screen because I don't have two monitors today, so you're looking at the rest of my screen as well.

This is the latest version, which is version four as edited by Wolf-Ulrich or he just inserted a couple of comments. I wanted to start at the bottom, because I think this step number five has received more substantive comments and changes over the various edits, and I know that there were also a couple of comments that just came in about it. So this is the sequence of steps at the very end that relate to proposal submission. This is how it stood a few hours ago, but perhaps if I could ask – I think Manal and Adiel both had further comments on it, and anyone else who would like to comment. We'll attempt to both run the queue and share my screen at the same time if possible. So please raise your hand if you would like to speak, and I will try to figure out how to see the queue.

Okay, go ahead, Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Alissa. Sorry for the late sending. But again, I have just agreed with the suggested proposal, but I had only two remarks on this. The first was that I'm more inclined to linking the first two bullets in one bullet, because as the bullet stands now, they give the sensation that they are sequential steps and that this may have a period of time in between, which I don't think is the case. I think we're going to post the final proposal online, and at the same time, send it all to the ICANN board.

So if my understanding is right, then I'd rather we have them both in one bullet that would read "The ICG will post the final proposal on its public website and transmit it to the ICANN board." So this was the first suggestion.

The second suggestion was regarding the bullet C. I was suggesting to add at the beginning of the sentence something like "As conveyed by the ICANN board" or "As communicated by the ICANN board" and then start the sentence "The board will send the final proposal to NTIA without making any changes," and so on.

I think this would accurately describe the current situation without having to go through verbs like the GAC expect or understands or even speak on behalf of the board and say the ICANN board will. I thought it's better that at the beginning of the sentence we got to know this from the board themselves. So, thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Manal. I am trying to live edit a little bit and we'll see if others approve these changes. I think they're fine and un-objectionable.

Patrik, can I ask you to run the queue? Because I'm a little tight on screen space and I think it would be better if you can keep an eye on the queue and the chatroom, and run the queue and I'll do the editing. Is that okay?

PATRIK FALSTROM: No problem at all. Jean-Jacques? Jean-Jacques, we don't hear you.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, this is Jean-Jacques. Can you hear me now?

PATRIK FALSTROM: Yes, I can.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello, thank you. Going on Manal's suggestions, I think when she says that we could [inaudible] that has now been done. Also, I had a problem with the fact that we were saying ICANN board shall or will do this or that. We cannot stipulate for third parties.

But I think that the formula which has just been included by Alissa is fine, as [inaudible] the ICANN board. The board will, etc., etc. And if that problem occurs anywhere else in the text, I haven't had time to check, we should also correct it. In other words, we cannot stipulate for other parties. The ICG can only encourage or expect or do things like that, but we cannot say the ICANN board will. Thanks.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Thank you very much. Daniel?

DANNIEL KARREBERG: I agree with Manal's comment in B that's already there. I suggested the language and I agree with it. Alissa just added to what [inaudible] as conveyed by the ICANN board. I think it needs a little bit more wordsmithing because the second sentence there is also stated by the ICANN board that they'll post any accompanying communication, and I would make communication [inaudible] because it could be multiple and that needs to [be] one sentence, because that's also what the ICANN board [conveys].

On C, I think we could be a bit more presumptive in the sense that we could say something like the ICG expects that the ICANN board will participate in the available [inaudible] together with the other parts of the community. And I would even suggest to add "in order to prevent any last-minute contention." So, to make it very, very clear that we expect the discussion to happen before the final transmission and that we would be surprised – and pleasantly surprised – if issues were raised at the last minute. I think it's important to express that. And I put that in an e-mail that I sent [inaudible].

PATRIK FALSTROM: Thank you, Daniel. And as Alissa doesn't see what people write in the chat, let me just step in and say what I can see people saying here.

I see that Daniel wrote, "Agree with Manal to combine A and B," and we heard his comments.

I saw Milton. Okay, now you're looking at yourself. Okay, good. There is also question whether you could zoom in the document from 125% to maybe a little bit wider. Milton? Milton, we don't hear you. Yeah, I understand that you're talking, but we don't hear anything and I don't see any indication on the microphone in Adobe Connect that there is any sound coming. Yes, it worked earlier. I also heard your voice, so this is a little bit strange.

One note to people, given that I'm using the voice system as chair of SSAC quite a lot, it is possible to dial in using Skype, an 800 number from everywhere where you have an Internet access, which means that if you have Adobe Connect...

MILTON MUELLER: Hello?

PATRIK FALSTROM: Now I hear you, Milton. Please go on.

MILTON MUELLER: Okay. I don't understand what you're trying to do with B. This "As conveyed by the ICANN board." I just don't understand that. Literally, in English, what is being conveyed. You mean as conveyed by the ICG to the board?

ALISSA COOPER: I think the idea here is – and I was going to suggest a little bit more clarity on this as well. It’s as the ICANN board as explained to us.

MILTON MUELLER: Oh, okay.

ALISSA COOPER: All these bullets came directly [inaudible] but the next two, were direct quotes from the explanation that we received from Kuo-Wei the last time we met as to what the board’s process will be. So all of this is just restating that, using his exact words, which is why...

MILTON MUELLER: Yes, yes. I understand that. So the way you just proposed to rephrase it would be fine with me.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, I was going to suggest “as the ICANN board has conveyed to the ICG.”

MILTON MUELLER: Or “explained” I think is much clearer.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Thank you very much, Kuo-Wei? Kuo-Wei, please? We don't hear you. We don't hear you and I don't see any indication on Adobe Connect that you actually do talk. Can you check that you're not muted on your computer please?

Okay. Alissa, in that case, there seems to be difficulty getting sound from Kuo-Wei, but there are no more people in the queue.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Well, hopefully we can get him back, because I did want to hear his thoughts. I thought there was one additional suggestion perhaps coming from Adiel on this on the second sentence [inaudible], but perhaps not.

PATRIK FALSTROM: I have a hand up from Martin. So Martin Boyle, please.

MARTIN BOYLE: Yes. As I've just said in the chat room, I'm not sure that the ICANN board has explained. I think actually we should be a little bit firmer, the ICANN board confirms to the ICG that it will send the final proposal to NTIA without making any changes.

I think "confirms" actually does carry a rather stronger meaning in that it has made a formal commitment, that is the process as it will follow. So I would just prefer the word "confirm" to "explain." Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

I have no problem with that. Adiel?

PATRIK FALSTROM:

No more hands up. And people are confirming. Jari thinks that the idea from Martin was good. Lynn also agrees with that.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay, great. So I will take an action to try to also incorporate the two suggestions from Daniel. I was kind of curious about the second suggestion from Daniel and wanted to hear from Kuo-Wei, because letter C, again, is exactly what we received, the words we received from the board. I'm fine with further articulating it, because this is our document and it's about our expectations, but let's get that edit in and we'll give a few more days on the list to make sure everyone is comfortable with it.

PATRIK FALSTROM:

Daniel has his hand up, and it seems to be the case that there is some problem with audio in Adobe Connect for people that are not dialed in. So we have to take a very careful step forward because it might be the case that people are silent because they have not heard or cannot speak.

Daniel, please?

DANIEL KARREBERG: Just one more sentence to explain what I mean, what my proposal was. To say in C to just express our expectation that the board, like anyone, conveys – participates in the discussion early on, and that is something I think we can say that’s an expectation of us. It’s not a direction to them.

And also to make absolutely clear that this is in order to prevent any last-minute contention. The way I phrased it very carefully is not to presume actions by others, but on the other hand, to make clear what our – the ICG’s – expectations are and why we’re saying that.

I’m not married to the specific words, but more to the intention of expressing that stuff. I think it’s independent of any statement of the ICANN board at this time. It just explains – it just states our expectation and motivates it.

PATRIK FALSTROM: So Kuo-Wei has written in the chat room “Board will participate in a timely manner.”

Then there is a question from Jean-Jacques whether “Kuo-Wei’s line is satisfactory? It seems to be a bit weak.”

Milton suggests [addition] “to avoid any last-minute contention.”

And Kuo-Wei says yes.

I think the proposal is actually “Board will participate in a timely manner to avoid any last-minute contention.”

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Why don't we go with that? I still would like to look at – it sounded like there was one more sentence proposed by Daniel or something. But we can just finalize it on the list. It doesn't sound like this needs a lot more real-time interaction.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Daniel Just wrote in the chat "This wording works for me totally. Let's move on." That's what Daniel said.

ALISSA COOPER: Great, okay. So I will just make the edit to be that [inaudible] suggested as well and we are good to go on this section.

So I think from now we can start from the top. I thought that one would take us a little bit longer, but perhaps the others will not. I think we can probably just go here section by section. The more recent edits have been called out, so if anyone has comments, I guess [inaudible] section one.

If anyone has comments on step one, let's say, let's talk about step one right now.

PATRIK FALSTROM: There is no hand up.

JARI ARKKO: I had a comment. This is Jari.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Sorry, I misunderstood what you wrote in chat. Jari, please.

JARI ARKKO: So in section one, you mention obtain consensus. I just wanted to point out that various communities actually have a more fine-grained concept relating to their decision processes. The obvious example is IETF's rough consensus model. I'm basically wondering if we should change the text just a little bit. Say, instead of obtained consensus, say obtained consensus (as defined in that community's process). And I might actually include [inaudible] actual consensus, but we at the IETF have some process steps that you go through when you make a decision [inaudible] and such. Those are important, too.

PATRIK FALSTROM: I see in the chat that Milton suggests obtain sufficient support, but I would like to give the microphone to Manal, please.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Patrik. It's on a different [inaudible] that one, so if you want to resolve this first, I can wait.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Okay. Wolf-Ulrich, is it about this or something else in one?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: I was just commenting on the question of the completeness of the proposals. It [inaudible] could be our criteria to judge on that. An example – so if it's, for example, [inaudible] the proposal from the various communities, if for example, as you know, the naming community is very hard working on the proposal, but the question is then on what it would say with regard to that, what could be complete towards sending that towards the NTIA.

So, for example, if a new so-called [contract] company is proposed for that, to what extent the proposal should be complete, its regard to that. [inaudible] the timeline. That is the question which [inaudible]. Do we have any criteria [inaudible] that?

PATRIK FALSTROM: Thank you very much. Jari?

ALISSA COOPER: I would like to get in the queue as well. Thanks, Patrik.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Okay. Jari, you first, and then Alissa.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah. Milton made the suggestion of saying obtain sufficient support. I think that text and some other possible variations are really just variations of the same thing. What I tried to do is recognize the fact that there are those community processes and that we should not take the

two or three words in this document as the definition of what they need to do, but rather that they take their definition and do what they normally do, as we did in the IETF.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah. So I was going to respond to both of the last two points. I think it's helpful if we tried to reflect what we put in the RFP as much as possible, and in the RFP, we [inaudible] reports on the steps that they took to obtain consensus and the level of consensus.

So I think obtaining consensus is useful for it to [inaudible] as well. I'm fine with Jari's edit, but I think we should just be consistent in the terminology and say what we said in the RFP.

As far as completeness, to my mind, I was literally thinking of this as a much more mechanical check. If it seems that there's a bullet in the RFP that asks for some meaty subject to be explained by the community and the explanation was given, but only half of it is there or something, more of like an editing error or something along these lines. That's what I was really thinking about completeness. I don't know that there's much else that we would be judging in terms of completeness of every bullet that we put in the RFP.

I think in the later step, in step two, we have that question about sufficiency of the whole proposal and so forth and that might be where

we address some of the questions that Wolf-Ulrich raised, but this I was thinking of as more of a mechanical check.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Milton?

MILTON MUELLER: Yes. I don't think it's as big a deal. I was trying to make it into a minor verbal check. I'm not sure I would call it mechanical like Alissa, but basically the scenario that I'm envisioning is a substantial part of the community coming out of a process saying this is being represented to you as consensus or sufficient [inaudible], even according to their processes. But we think that in true we were railroaded, whatever. I think we should, in that case, be making a determination as to whether they've actually met that criteria of the RFP.

Again, I don't see this happening in any existing process, but it just seemed to me that a mechanical check as to what they did is useless. What we want to...

ALISSA COOPER: Sorry. When I was talking about the mechanical check, I was referring not to the consensus piece but to the piece that Wolf-Ulrich – the first bullet in B, completeness check. Sorry.

MILTON MUELLER: Oh, okay. Yeah, I'm sorry.

ALISSA COOPER: I agree. [inaudible] is not mechanical. You sort of need to have [inaudible] evaluation [inaudible] actually come to pass.

MILTON MUELLER: I'm happy with what Alissa suggested in the comments which is whether and how. The only problem I have with what Jari suggested is if the community sort of redefines consensus on the fly, it's as saying it means whatever we say. We don't want to encourage that. But I understand what he's getting at.

Certainly I have seen the IETF process and they have followed their normal process. I would be a bit weary of some ambiguities if we just used this current wording, but I don't think it would be a problem. I could accept it.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Thank you. Over to Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Patrik. Just to explain what I already sent over e-mail. Again, I'm flexible for both, whether we use whether only or whether and how. I just felt that we don't have a concrete set of criteria that we can evaluation how on its basis, so we cannot really go into the details of the steps and evaluation whether this is a good or bad.

I felt that the ICG should be more concerned about the end result, whether this achieved or obtained the necessary consensus. But again, after this discussion and if “how” is going to encounter other concerns, again, I’m flexible.

On the completeness thing, I share the concern that incomplete might not be, again, easy to check or to evaluate. I read it first as Alissa mentioned, which is just the mechanical check. But if it’s going to confuse the public, then I think we’d rather delete this. And again, if something is incomplete, then it’s missing. If one part is not complete, then maybe this section is missing.

So I think it’s already included in the word [inaudible], but if it’s going to confuse the community, I’d rather have it removed. Thank you.

PATRIK FALSTROM:

I have a time check. We have 17 more minutes of this call. Wolf-Ulrich?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:

Thanks, Patrik. Briefly, thanks, Manal. I would agree to that. Thank you. Second bullet point I had on the B is timeliness. I refer to that again. It is too late if we check that at the end of [inaudible] proposal coming in. So all time questions should be solved as early as possible. And you know there will be the proposal from the naming community is scheduled to be sent to us by the end of January, not the beginning of January.

So I really would like to ask the chairmanship of the ICG to contact the other chairs and ask what to do, what it is. If [you] can [co-present], then it’s okay. That would be one problem I would see here. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Patrik, is it okay if I respond to that?

PATRIK FALSTROM: Yes. There are no more hands up.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So I removed the word “incomplete”. To me, that seems like a reasonable solution there, I think. It sounds like whether and how is a little bit controversial, so I think if we stick with “whether” in that third bullet under section A.

On the timeliness issue, I agree with Wolf-Ulrich. I feel that we have put out a timeline, which is our statement about timeliness and what we expect. As we discussed on the call last time, the names community process has a target for the initial phase, which is a couple of weeks after what we had been hoping for. From my perspective, it’s within the bounds that we can certainly accommodate it without a problem.

Assuming that we have two other proposals sitting on the table by January 15, I think by taking the time to do this first step for those two can certainly occupy a couple of weeks for a group of this size. So by that time, we can be all done with step one for those two and we’ll receive the names proposal if that all happens on time.

So for the specific case, I’m not particularly concerned assuming things continue to progress as they had been progressing. I know [I] said last time very impressed with everyone’s dedication and all the operational

communities in meeting the deadlines or roughly meeting the deadlines that we set out.

I know Adiel has sent [further] mail on this timeliness question and documenting what do we do if we get much further off track than that. I guess my only issue is that, because there are an infinite array of possibilities of how late things could get or when they might come in or what else we will have already done at different phases of the process if things are late, I just don't know exactly what we can say that isn't extremely generic, like "we will do the best that we can, given whatever we get at whatever time we receive it." I assume that's our general approach. I don't know what other approach we can take. I don't think we can say, "No, you're too late. Sorry."

I'm just a little bit at a loss in terms of how to make the timeliness check in this process actionable, because I think we said what we want the community to do. People seem to be roughly trying to follow that. If it's some community or some part of this process goes very much off that timeline, we will have to adjust. I don't know what else we can do really.

PATRIK FALSTROM:

Adiel, please.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Alissa, I understand that this is a little bit [inaudible], but my concern is that we are now publishing a document that will let the community know how we will handle a proposal that will come in, and that is an issue that will come up. We clearly know that it will.

It will be good if we don't have a precise process. At least we can say that application that will come after the timeline will be – the ICG will assess the acceptance and by consensus agree, or something at least so that people know what exactly will happen because it will be a little bit, I will say, not formal if we do this on fly and the community doesn't know in advance what will happen.

And this in RFP and [that section B] is all about if the proposal [inaudible] requirement. That's just one of the requirements [inaudible]. So that's my point.

PATRIK FALSTROM:

Thank you, and there are no more hands in the queue.

ALISSA COOPER:

Maybe this is really more of a general – I don't think it's actually specific to step 1b. I think we can say at the top of this document someplace, we can find some place to say the general statement that we have published the timeline, our expectation is we receive things on time within reason; if we don't, we will continue to follow this process as faithfully as we can and the timeline reflected in this document as faithfully as we can. That's what you're looking for, something like that?

PATRIK FALSTROM:

Anyone that would like to [inaudible]?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yes, I'll be fine if it is said [inaudible]. If we can state it on the top that will be fine. If we are not going to use it as an evaluation criteria, we put it at least on the top and clarify how we of ICG deal with late-coming application. [That would be fine].

PATRIK FALSTROM: Manal?

MANAL INMAIL: Thank you, Patrik. Yes, I would agree to having it also somewhere on the top rather than evaluation criteria. I would also say that maybe we can put it in a positive way urging early submissions and meeting the deadline rather than a threatening tone or maybe saying what we will do if we receive late submissions.

I can see that the community is working very hard to meet the very tight timeframe, and I don't want to give a negative message about it. I just want, to the extent possible, that this be drafted in a positive way urging meeting the deadline and early submission. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. I will take the action to draft something up and add it there, and hopefully we can close on that in the mailing list. Thank you.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Jari wants to speak.

JARI ARKKO: Yes. I'm sorry, did I raise my hand? I have something on section two.

ALISSA COOPER: Great, that's exactly where we were going.

JARI ARKKO: In section two, you say do they [inaudible] any arrangements that are not compatible with each other, and I would just make the suggestion that we should change "not compatible with each other" to "not compatible with each other (but need to be)."

The rationale for this is that not everything of course has to be exactly aligned. Quite naturally like the TLDs and [port] numbers or [inaudible] attributes are allocated in very different ways and that's fine, but there are interactions. As an example, special purpose names. We need to on both sides agree what's going to happen with them. But other stuff doesn't necessarily have to be fully aligned.

ALISSA COOPER: That seems pretty straightforward to me. I made an edit.

PATRIK FALSTROM: And there are no more hands. Milton says that he liked the change you just made.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay.

PATRIK FALSTROM: And now I see Wolf-Ulrich and Manal. Wolf-Ulrich, please?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks. [inaudible] to the point of 2b, accountability. It really defers to a timeline as well. Here we say we check again the question of accountability to the [inaudible] include appropriate measures and so on. As you may know, yesterday evening was the first meeting of this cross-community working group for accountability, and the so-called [inaudible] refers to that what is in 2b.

And if you look to the timeline on that, if work stream 1 is supposed to be finished, finalized, in June and the proposal shall be sent to the ICANN board by this group, I'm wondering how this matches together.

So the question for me is really with regard to the timeline, because we could expect that there may be nothing in the proposal, how we can find out ways to [solve] that or to get more explanation from that group. I would like to ask how this group, the ICG, could get in contact to the other group and to [inaudible].

I can [inaudible] community working group with regards to the timeline, but it may be supported also by others from this group. Thank you.

PATRIK FALSTROM: I just want to mention where we are, because we are now on a five-minute check. James has suggested changing overlap to

interdependencies, and then I have Manal and Elise that has their hands up.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay. I think and then we probably need to close the queue.

MANAL INMAIL:

Thank you Patrik and Alissa. First, I had a suggestion on the very first paragraph that says “according to the ICG charter.” I think maybe we can say according to the ICG charter. Its role is to assemble a single transition proposal from component proposals, not to draft its own.” So it’s just a matter of switching the order of the sentence.

I think it’s more clear to state what the role is, not what the role is not. It also is a bit misleading at the beginning and it doesn’t become clear until you finish the sentence. But again, I’m flexible.

Also, another suggestion in 2a for the possibly conflicting overlap. I think maybe instead of saying all possibly conflicting overlaps, we can say any conflicting overlaps, because again, it gives the sensation that we are expecting conflicting overlaps, but I think it may be better to say any possibly conflicting overlaps.

I have a question on 2b regarding the accountability and whether we will be returning back if we identify any gaps. Are we going to be returning back only to the operational communities, the relevant operational communities, or are we going also to go back to the Accountability Working Group itself? This was also a question I have. That’s it for two. Thank you.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Elise?

ELISE GERICH: I also have a question about number 2b, the accountability. The text says “supporting independent accountability mechanisms.” Does that presuppose an outcome of the accountability process? Because it could very well be that it would be you’d have accountability mechanisms that might cover the overlapping pieces, which would not necessarily be independent accountability mechanisms. So are we presupposing if we use the word “independent”?

PATRIK FALSTROM: And there are no hands up. But Milton Mueller also thinks that interdependencies and/or conflict is clear [then] overlaps, as James suggested earlier. Over to you, Alissa.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So I will attempt some very quick responses and then we will wrap up and try to figure out the way forward for this.

So Manal first. I put in your edits as you were talking. I think those are fairly unobjectionable. Well come back to the point about accountability. So as far as overlaps, again these are words from the RFP. I think there’s even a section heading in the RFP that overlaps.

I do think it's important to stay consistent so that when we say this is what we are going to do, this is what we're going to evaluate, it's the same thing that we ask the communities to write about in their proposals.

So I think if people can live with trying to reuse those words, I think that would be preferable from my perspective, just so the community understands that we're not evaluating something different from what we asked them to put in their proposals and that's where the word "overlaps" came from.

So, on the questions about accountability, first Elise. Again, these words include appropriate and properly supported independent accountability mechanisms came directly from our charter. I definitely understand your point, which is that the word independent is ambiguous enough. It doesn't really specify what is independent of what. You interpret it as maybe there's a mechanism which covers multiple functions, and therefore they're not independent from each other, which is one interpretation of it and it could be interpreted other ways.

So I'm not exactly sure what to do with that one. Again, this is just what we committed to in the charter language. I don't know how we could further elaborate it necessarily, so that one is a little bit hanging. If anyone has a suggestion, maybe it could be made on the mailing list for how to handle that one.

As to the larger questions around accountability mechanisms, from my perspective, I think the copywriting and IANA seems to be the body that is producing a names proposal and working towards the timeline that

we have set out. And as we discussed before, it's certainly possible I think in any of the communities to elaborate a proposal that they can get to us roughly by the January deadline, which points to the items that need to be in place or that they expect to be in place or that they hope to have in place that are possibly the work of other external bodies but that are important components of their proposals being complete.

It's certainly possible that the names community can point to work that's expected from the CCWG accountability and say, "These are the things that we expect from them and here's how we're incorporating them into the proposal."

So I think we can view the operational community for names as being the CWG IANA. As long as the community of people who has developed that proposal feels confident in what they have there, then we shouldn't necessarily second guess it or what have you.

Obviously we have identified the liaisons to the CCWG accountability, Kavouss and Keith Drazek, and they will be keeping us informed about how the group is progressing. But in general, I think we should stick to this task of having the operational community be our point of contact if we have any questions about what we receive or what is contained in the proposal is positioned and properly supported, or appropriate and properly supported.

That's also to your point, Manal. I think that community should be our point of contact. They obviously have a relationship with the Accountability Working Group as well so they can leverage that and we can go through them. That would be my suggested approach.

I guess we are running a little bit over. Maybe let's just take two more minutes if anyone has responses to that and then we will wrap up.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Alissa, let me just say that people have said that they understand what Elise said but it also has to do with how much it relates to our charter. Also, unfortunately, I need to hang up myself, so I need to hand over – I cannot watch the queue anymore. So thank you, everyone.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Patrik. I stopped sharing and I'm back in the room here. I see Jari in the queue.

JARI ARKKO: Sorry, I didn't realize I was in the queue.

ALISSA COOPER: Sorry, it might be leftover. I haven't been in the window. And I see Manal in the queue.

MANAL INMAIL: Thank you, Alissa. I just have a small clarification on section three. I read the sentence because we don't have the document in front of us anymore. "The ICG will coordinate with the operational communities to have public comments addressed within their components before assembling an interim final proposal." I was not very clear what we mean by addressed within their components.

I have already also submitted this over e-mail, so if you'd rather we take it online, we can do this.

ALISSA COOPER:

Yeah, let's do that one, because I think that one's an easy one to work out. I know we're over and people need to drop. We made a lot of progress today, though, and I think actually if there weren't any – there's one or two more comments in the later section, but I think we can actually resolve all of these on the mailing list. I think this is a useful call.

I will incorporate the further edits from today, call out the remaining items of discussion. If people have suggestions, further text suggestions, based on things said on the call, please send them to the list today if you can. I would love to get this essentially wrapped up and do a consensus call for publication in a few days, if possible.

Thank you, everyone, and we will also follow up on the mailing list. Patrik will follow up concerning planning for calls next year and ICANN 52 and further meetings next year. We don't have our next call on the schedule yet, but I expect that we will have it actually shortly before January 15 my hope. So we have one more call before we start to receive proposals and engage in this process that we've all been just discussing.

Thank you, everyone, for joining.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]