
ALISSA COOPER: Okay. This is Alissa again. Can people hear me?

LARS LIMAN: Yes. This is Lars Liman. I can hear you.

ALISSA COOPER: Great. This is a reminder to everyone to mute your line when you're not speaking. I have echo a little bit myself right now, but hopefully if everyone mutes, then we won't have to be [muted] in that will help us with some of the issues that we've had with [inaudible].

Do we have anyone on the call who is not in the Adobe Connect room? Okay, so the secretariat will take the roll call from the Adobe Connect then.

We're looking at the agenda for today. Six items today. We have a two-hour call scheduled, not that we'll use the whole time, but it's going to have a full agenda. Are there any comments on the agenda, anything that anyone would like to add?

Okay, I don't see any hands raised, so please go ahead with agenda item number one, which is minutes approval for our last call. The secretariat [inaudible]. Okay, so these are the minutes from our call on the [14th] of May. These have been out for comments for quite a while. Any objections to approving these minutes?

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.

PAUL WILSON: Alissa, while we have silence, I really need to ask if people will mute their microphones, please, because there is an echo on the call. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, I hear it, too. Okay, hearing no objections [inaudible] echo, I think since we still have the echo, if the tech will put mute everyone, essentially, that might help. We were trying to avoid doing that, but clearly it's still a problem.

We have no objection to the approval of minutes and I think we can consider them approved. Thank you. [inaudible] next set of minutes. Okay, these are the minutes from the last call that we had, have also had some revisions on the list. Any objections to the approval of these minutes? Anyone need more time?

Okay, seeing no hands, I think we can consider these minutes approved. Thank you.

Now we will move on to the update on the status of the CWG proposal, and I will turn it over to Martin.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks, Alissa. As for the last week or so, we've worked our way through. We're actually refining drafts of the CWG proposal, and a call that I wasn't on last night – I don't know whether anybody else in the room was on that call – during that, we got to a document that is now open until midnight UTC for any last, and I emphasize the word, drafting comments.

The document is pretty well final and the intention is that the chairs of the CWG will transmit the document to the chartering organizations tomorrow, i.e. the 11th of June, with a covering note. The chartering organizations will all have their own processes for accepting the report and it's expected that that will take place during ICANN. That's just about as far as I can go.

The document has got a lot more detail from the document I spoke to the group four weeks or so ago about, but it actually has the same overall structure, and it seems to have had quite a good level of acceptance. Since then we've been working with the comments that came in through the consultation period and all comments are being at least addressed and many of them are adopted in the new and final document.

I think that's about as far as I can go at this stage, but it all looks set for there to be a document in quasi final stage by sometime tomorrow or perhaps for some people they'll be seeing it on Friday. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Martin. Just one question in terms of the process. Does the CWG have a meeting planned for the end of the ICANN or shortly after the ICANN meeting to agree that they've received [inaudible] from all the SOs and ACs and send the proposal back to us or what does that last step look like in the planning?

MARTIN BOYLE: It would help if I unmuted my microphone. I'm not seeing any final arrangement for the accepting that we've received all chartering organizations' input. We are having a certain number of meetings during ICANN week. The ccNSO meets, the council meets on Wednesday, so that would be the earliest that the ccNSO would be able to adopt. The GAC I guess is around about the same timescale. I don't know about ALAC. The GNSO Council is again sometime around then.

There is a meeting on the Thursday morning overlapping with the suggested ICG meeting from whatever 12:30 is UK time, whatever that is in Argentine time, but it is for the first hour-and-a-half of the ICG meeting schedule for the 25th of June. That is actually a working session.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Got it. Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Good day or good time to everyone. Martin, thank you very much for two things. First, you speak very, very distinctly. You separate the syllabus one from another and we non-English spoken have no difficulty at all to understand what we are saying, but we have difficulty in particular when Alissa is speaking. Half of what she said I didn't understand at all. I'm not criticizing her, maybe criticizing myself, but your presentation was absolutely good and even better than good.

Second, thank you very much for all. I have one question. You said that the report or the outcome of the CWG will be submitted to the chartering organizations for accepting. Is accepting a binary, yes or no,

or accepting with some [inaudible] comments or questions? This is question one.

Question two. From the e-mail exchange of the GAC I saw some comments and to CWG and CCWG. The part of CWG I don't know whether it was considered or not whether the two GAC raise those questions and they're considered [inaudible]. Thank you very much for that.

And Alissa, I'm very sorry. Please excuse me. I apologize. I did not want to offend anybody, but I want just to understand and benefit of the discussions. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Go ahead, Martin.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thank you, Alissa. The two questions. First, the report going back to the chartering organizations. I think during the week there will be ample opportunity for participants in each of the chartering organizations to have discussions with the CWG to further understand the proposal [inaudible] as necessary.

For each chartering organization, what they will have their own processes for accepting or at least not objecting to the document. I think we are all aware of the possibility that there might be comments or questions from each of those chartering organizations. I hope the questions will have been addressed, but I will actually note that Martin for being able to amend the document at this stage without the whole

document falling over, it is quite a delicately balanced consensus document, is very, very limited. I would hope that the chartering organizations having been involved in the process will be in a position to adopt the document.

The second question – I'm sorry, I didn't actually catch the very beginning of it, Kavouss. Was it that there were some GAC member comments to the CWG or was it the input from the CCWG? Could you clarify, please?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. It was comments to the whole process, but one section of the input was addressing issues related to CWG and other sections relating to CCWG and other general issues. One part relating to CWG and my question was whether anyone has taken those comments or whether the GAC representative is in CWG or participants of GAC and CWG have raised this comment or question or not. Thank you.

MARTIN BOYLE:

Okay, thanks very much, Kavouss, for that clarification. In the case of all inputs – and the document is yet to be finalized – there is a response to all the contributions that came in during the period of the consultation. In other words, how we have taken and used those comments.

In the case of GAC membership involvement in the process, GAC members have been involved, have raised issues, have flagged them and I'm not in a very good position to be able to assure you how any individual comment has been dealt with, but the document in

preparation currently should be able to do that. So if you've got any concerns at that stage, I'd be quite happy to hear them, probably best offline rather than waiting for our next meeting. Thanks.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Any other questions or comments on this topic? Okay, I think we can move on to agenda item number three: [inaudible] discussion of the feedback we've received from the community regarding the timeframe inquiries that we sent out.

We have received responses from all three of the operational communities. We only just, at least in my time zone, received the response from the CWG and we are still awaiting a response from the ICANN board, but that should be forthcoming today is my understanding, so we'll have that for discussion at our next meeting. But perhaps we could start with the response from the IETF and maybe – what is that sound? Okay, I hope someone is not under duress. It sounded like an alarm.

What I was going to say is perhaps we could have Jari speak for a moment about the response from the IETF on the timeframe inquiry.

JARI ARKKO: Yes. Thank you, Alissa. I think the text mostly speaks for itself, but it's basically saying that the IETF is ready essentially today to move forward

or take the next steps, and for us the next step is a new version of the SLA, which already exists in terms of what we want and [inaudible].

Of course, since we are not alone in this process in anything that happens at the ICG level or any interactions elsewhere might of course bring additional tasks, and you all know that as well as I do. It's just a reminder of two specific things. One is that we had this discussion earlier of the alignment [inaudible] RIRs at IETF on trademarks and domains.

We don't think from the IETF side that that's a prerequisite for the transition, it be a separate thing that is done. But if coordination on that could be finished, then maybe that is an ICG task. Then we could move on that again. But again, maybe that's a separate timeline and it's not a thing that we have to do before any of the transition steps.

The other thing is the discussion of our relationship to the PTI structure. So [at the time] at least we can see different outcomes. One is that our agreements and arrangements that we have today could remain in place [inaudible] PTI thing is kind of an internal – important, but internal – detail to ICANN side of things. There's no additional effort for us required, but if it was the case that we would have to be involved somehow in the final details of the PTI or have some of our people participate in that or move some of the [construct], then that might actually require more work. Possibly [inaudible], but more work. So therefore our preference is to [inaudible] whatever happens to PTI, it's within ICANN, not [inaudible].

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Jari. My reading of this is that [inaudible] have to compile a response concerning overall timeframes, get back to NTIA that the steps that need to be taken by IETF are unlikely to be the sorts of [meeting factors]. That is, if there's other communities that think they will require some amount of timeframe, then that will certainly be longer than what the IETF will need [inaudible] ready to go currently. That's a useful bit of information to have. Are there questions or comments on this [until] we receive from the IETF? Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Not question directly to what Jari said, but in a general if there is any unclarity or ambiguity relating to this PTI and other sub-[organs] of the naming, which is in the CWG which might have some legal interpretation and legal connotations, we could, if we have any such questions, raise those and ask for legal opinion of the legal advisor of CWG in a written manner. We have done it in CCWG for several cases, and in fact some other ICANN constituencies, they have [inaudible] just in case that someone has any or require any [confirmation] of understanding or clarity relating to those activities. We could discuss them and we decide if it is relevant. We could raise it formally to have a clearance on that, not to get to any difficulty confusion. This is just a way of suggestion. It's not directly related to what Jari said. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Jari, did you have a response to that?

JARI ARKKO:

Yeah. I basically agree with what Kavouss said. I was just phrasing it slightly differently. I always like to think of things as people or the community is in charge to decide what they want, and then the lawyers come as secondary. [inaudible] what direction to take in order to avoid any delays. I think that's a task which can be taken in terms of further details [inaudible] PTI side. It's not, at the time, I think, necessarily something that we need to ask the lawyers about. It's more like until the lawyers do this, then there will not be issues. More of a feedback than a question for them I think.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks, Jari. I certainly agree. I think our first stop if we have a question should be the community that sent us the proposal, but we can leverage there [inaudible] if we need to.

Any other comments or questions before we move on?

Okay, so if we could project a response from Izumi. [Let's] take a look at that. The response that we received from Izumi doesn't actually speak to the question we asked, but really says that they will provide us with the information later in the month. I was wondering, Paul or Alan, if you could maybe clarify a little bit for us because it wasn't clear to me if they're working on it and needed more time or if there's something else going on. It wasn't obvious, so we had asked for some initial input at least by today.

In theory, Patrik, Mohamed and I need to respond to NTIA by the end of the month. So if we don't receive anything from the [numbering] community until the end of the month, then that could make things a

little tricky. That's my question about this response, but open it up for Paul or Alan, if you have an answer to that or other thoughts.

PAUL WILSON:

I can comment. I think there may have been a bit of a misunderstanding about what was actually needed by this stage. I think Chris took it as a progress update, and admittedly, that's about all you got and not a substantial response about the work that's being done. It wasn't understood that Chris needed to provide a substantial update by this deadline. I think we'd better clarify that because, as Izumi said, the work is still underway. It definitely is underway. That's what Chris was doing and they've stated that in the response that you received this morning, Alissa.

From our point of view, I think the implementation is a matter of only two substantial components which are actually administered I guess rather than standard. In particular, the development of the service level agreement and the review committee, both of which are [inaudible] substantial components of the CRISP proposal. I think what will be updated substantially is the service level agreement. That is the first and the major component of the proposal. It has actually been drafted and been open for comment for quite some time now. In fact, the deadline is the 14th of June. So comments on the SLA will be received from all interested parties, including members of the numbering community and ICANN, and anyone interested. I think the NRO will take about a month to digest those comments and publish another version of the SLA by around mid-July, and whether or not that will receive another round of comments I guess is yet to be seen, or another round of review.

The second component is the review committee, which is proposed as part of the CRISP proposal. That actually is being written up at the moment and will be published. It will follow a similar process of publication of their proposal and a call from it, which will be perhaps slightly after beyond the timeline of the SLA. It's a much less substantial part of the overall structure, so it's not one that's likely to cause any delays.

Those two substantial parts of the implementation will be documented and will be provided in the responses [inaudible] CRISP. And as Izumi said, there is also [inaudible] consideration component [inaudible] any other factors that might impact on [inaudible].

That's about all I can report at the moment, Alissa. I don't know if Alan might have more to mention, but I guess what we need to do is clarify what is the deadline for a complete response from CRISP, because as I say, I think the request was taken as an interim update of progress which is what was given just this morning. Thanks.

ALAN BARRETT:

Thank you, Paul. This is Alan, if I may continue. The CRISP team has said that they expect to be able to provide more details by the end of June, so I hope the ICG can just wait for that. I would [inaudible] by the end of June the CRISP team will be able to give better estimates on how long the remainder of this process will take. I think Paul's given a good summary of what's still needed, sorting out the SLA, processing public comment, and drafting new versions of it and also figuring out how to handle the review team. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks to both of you. I guess my question from a procedural standpoint is even if we can just – I mean, obviously we have now the update from Paul. Even if we could just have that amount of [substance] I think in writing from the numbers community before our face-to-face meeting or sometime earlier in the ICANN week that would really help us. Patrik, Mohamed, and I were hoping to use at least part of the working session at the end of the ICANN week to develop our response to NTIA and our response needs to go back by the end of June, so it's a little bit difficult to write up the response by the end of June if we don't receive anything substantive from the numbers until the end of June. Do you think that's reasonable if we just write back to Izumi and ask for a substantive update by, say, a week from now, the 17th of June?

PAUL WILSON: Yeah, I think so, Alissa, if you feel that's needed. Maybe that comment [inaudible], but I think I understood that the response was really a response from the [inaudible] community directly to NTIA, not a response that needed to go to the ICG in order to be assembled into a joint response on behalf of all the communities. Is that a misunderstanding on my part?

ALISSA COOPER: My understanding was actually that since we were the recipients of the letter that we were the ones who had to send the response, so indeed we had different understandings of it. We were planning to collect all this information and then decide [inaudible] one response.

PAUL WILSON: Yeah, apologies for that. I'm sure something in the next week or thereabouts will be possible. Yep.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. We can send the [notes] back to Izumi.

PAUL WILSON: I hope that makes sense to Alan as well.

ALAN BASSETT: Yes. I responded in the chat. I think we can get a more detailed response in a week.

ALISSA COOPER: Great, thank you. Let's move on into the response from the CWG. I don't know about everyone else, but I didn't see this until like five minutes before the call and haven't really had an opportunity to digest it, so maybe we can just give people a minute or two just to read at least the e-mail that we received from [inaudible] and then we will pick up the discussion.

Okay. Hopefully, [inaudible] had a chance to at least give this a quick read. Kavouss, go ahead. Kavouss, if you're speaking, we cannot hear you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Hello?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes. Go ahead, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I said that apart from general comments on some difficulties, there is no direct answer to the question raised. They said that they need this to be done. They need that ICANN do this, but do not answer our questions by giving any timing. One community IETF mentioned they are ready today, even they were ready yesterday. The other [inaudible] received information by end of June, I hope maybe earlier, perhaps possibly for our face-to-face meeting, if possible. But I don't see, unless I am not read properly, I don't see any reply – clear reply – to the question raised. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Kavouss. The one concrete set of timing that is noting in here is the legal counsel estimate for the PTI [set up] items could take three to four months at a minimum it sounds like. That was my interpretation of this is that the minimum implementation time period for the CWG would be three to four months. It could be potentially longer based on all of the other extenuating circumstances that they list. That was my interpretation of this, but definitely would like to hear from others. Maybe from other people who have been involved in the CWG or who are more familiar with the part of the proposal that they site in the e-mail.

I have in the queue Jean-Jacques, and then Russ Mundy, Martin, and then Joseph. Let's start with Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Alissa. [inaudible] had a suggestion. The first remark is along the lines of what Kavouss has just pointed out, which is that the response from the CWG stewardship co-chairs is rather vague as far as timeline is concerned. It appears to be rationale to explain why it's not very accurate.

My second remark is that I think it's a bit unfortunate that this response seems to underline the responsibility of the independent counsel to the CWG stewardship as if the signatures were saying that depends entirely on the lawyers and it's not really our stuff.

My recommendation flows out of these two first remarks. It would be that our ICG members who are in the CWG stewardship – I think that's Martin, Milton, and [inaudible], is it? – would get back to their co-chairs and say, "Well, if you could give an additional response, a bit more accurate if possible," and without all this putting forward the [inaudible] of the independent legal counsel, that would be good.

Lastly, I think, Alissa, that your conjecture is quite right. It looks like the response is asking for three to four months. So my question to you, Alissa, and to everyone, is that compatible with our overall timeframe? Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Just one note of response is I think, again, to me it looks like the minimum is three to four months, but could be more. And also that this is the one thing that I noted about this response is that it's primarily focused on the implementation, which means that it's not really coinciding with our ICG timeline, because theoretically, the implementations would not take place until after the proposal is sent to the NTIA and approved. But the note doesn't really speak to the proposal finalization timeframe, but I think we have an understanding of that based on our earlier discussion with Martin.

Russ Mundy?

RUSS MUNDY:

Thank you, Alissa. I'm in full agreement with Alissa's comments and Jean-Jacques concerns and Kavouss's concerns about the lack of precise answer or full answer here. But I'd like to raise one other aspect of this that I don't think is addressed in the e-mail. Having not studied it carefully, it could be and I just missed it in the read-through, but it is to me completely unclear how, who, and what will be the approving entity for the Articles of Incorporation and the other legal documentation that needs to be put in place between the current ICANN and the newly created PTI.

Is this something that ICANN will approve, the documentation and relationship? Is this something that the CWG will approve, or are there some other entities involved? For instance, does this slosh over, so to speak, into the CCWG area? I think that aspect of approval of the definition of what this new entity will be is fully undefined and could

itself require multiple months of approval activity by whomever it is that has or gets the responsibility for approving these legal documents. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Russ. Given that Martin is in the queue next, maybe he can speak to that a little bit in addition to whatever else he was planning to say. Martin, go ahead.

MARTIN BOYLE:

Thanks very much, Alissa, and thank you for that unnecessary setting me up for a fall because now I don't think I can answer in any great detail. Certainly I would agree that there are a lot of unknown elements. For example, on ICANN input into the process and the reiterations that might be needed to get to the final documents.

The reason I put up my hand is essentially once we've got this document to a point where it can sail, we are going to have, as our critical part, the process for getting us to a document – sorry, to a series of documents – that would allow implementation to go ahead.

Russ is entirely correct that that process, part of that process, will have to be an approvals process which is going to involve a certain degree of negotiation. I don't think any of us have got any idea how long that is likely to take, bearing in mind that we will now be involved with ICANN's own legal team and I don't think anybody will pretend that that process will be slow.

However, I do think that so long as everybody is feeling reasonably comfortable with what we have got as being something that is an operational solution that that legal input, the preparation of the various documents and the negotiation with ICANN on what that would look like, I think can go ahead and that can go ahead in parallel both with the ICG's own process and the consultation.

If we can do that, I think while it might be our critical part and is always certainly going to be on the critical path for the total solution, we shouldn't find ourselves stuck while everybody is waiting for it.

I'm just looking down in my notes to see whether I missed any other comments that people made. No, I think I've covered all the points that people made as best I can. The point you did make I think is an important one that we have got a certain amount of time now within the CWG when we're not focusing exclusively on preparing the proposal to start looking at what more we might need to do and that might then lead us to be able to give you a slightly more accurate information. I will have an exchange with the co-chairs and find out what we might be able to do. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Martin. That will be very helpful, I think. I have Joe. Joe, if you're speaking we can't hear you.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF:

Can you hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, we can hear you now.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I was going to say that I have a feeling that the incorporation of the new PTI is possibly the most complex thing we have in terms of what it's going to look like exactly, what its functionality is, and what its contractual relationship with ICANN is going to be.

I agree there's a frustration that the letter doesn't give a better idea of a timeframe, but I know that the letter is actually capable of giving a better idea of a timeframe for that specific element.

That being said, I just also wonder the PTI in its relationship with ICANN is not necessarily determinative of our assembly of a proposal. I think this is one of those elements that's a little bit outside of our control but doesn't necessarily prevent us from continuing to do further work, although there might need to be some amendments to that at the end if the hooks are necessary to be in place.

I think there's a lot of community socializing that has to be done for PTI before it's a given. I know there was socializing within the inquiry that just happened, but I think there's a broader community that's going to weigh in on this and I don't think ICANN is going to be completely silent about its form or function.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Joe. I think folks are agreeing with you. Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, I agree almost with what everyone said before me. On the one hand, if CWG may not be in a position to give a better reply, but it is different from what we expect.

However, Alissa and distinguished colleagues, if you remember in two calls before this, I raised the questions of the meaning of implementation. The plan for transition is different or should be distinct from each implementation. ICG may not be in a position to provide any precise information for implementation. What we have to do to see whether the plan for transition works, with respect to the implementation, that is to be treated separately.

However, what I have in CCWG from the legal advisors, two legal advisors, that we have, they are thinking that they need time to implement all of these. That means all activities required to be in place or committed before transition takes place. They said that they, together with others – they never mentioned who is others – try to implement that.

I think this is now a question we could consider that raising to the CCWG and CWG, and also to the ICANN board members with us, getting some feedback with respect to implementation. However, I suggest that when we prepare our final proposal, we should distinguish between the plan for transition and its implementations. Even maybe the legal advisors to the CCWG, they are not aware of the time that they need to do all of these things and perhaps we may not know the implementation time, so we have to distinguish these two from each other.

But I fully agree in particular to what Joe and Russ Mundy mentioned.
Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Kavouss. That's a good point. We're having this conversation because we were asked specifically by NTIA to provide some input about implementation timeframes, but in terms of our work on the proposal itself, we ask a question about implementation timeframes in the proposal, but what we need to deliver is the [substance] of the proposal and we don't actually have [inaudible] delivered the implementation itself. The implementation will be up to the communities and ICANN to [sign on]. That's a good distinction to keep in mind.

I thought I had seen Jean-Jacques' hand still up. I know we're still having hands go up and down. Jean-Jacques, did you want to get back in the queue or did you take yourself out of the queue?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thanks, Alissa. I took myself out of the queue because I put my remark in writing on the chat. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay, thank you. Joe, I saw your hand go up and down as well. Do you have a further remark?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: No, I'm fine. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Daniel as well.

DANIEL KARREBERG: No, go on.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. I think this is good information that we received. Martin has taken an action to follow up with the chairs. In particular, I think [inaudible] point about paralyzing the implementation steps and the rest of the work that we have to do in the ICG, but also, Martin, if you can take any further clarification in terms of the overall timeframe as well, that would be great. But I think we're all in agreement that it might not be possible to obtain much more concrete information.

Just to reiterate something that we discussed before, the point of this discussion is to get some information back to NTIA, so they can consider their contract extension and what they intend to do with that.

In some ways, what matters is not having something that's precise, but getting them ballpark information and also for them to understand the cumulative effect of all of the things that need to be done, including on the CCWG side. Whichever one of these components is going to take the longest, that's the one that is of most interest, I would imagine, to NTIA because that's what they need to plan for. We don't have to

necessarily give a very [inaudible] response. We just need to give them the best that we can provide by the end of June.

Russ Mundy, did you have a comment?

RUSS MUNDY:

I did have one quick comment, and that is as the PTI as it is currently defined becomes more real, is this something that the ICG thinks we need to ask the RIRs, IETF, if they see an impact on either their operations or implementation with the creation of this different legal entity or are we just – do we think we have enough information that unless those communities actually raise something themselves, we will just let it sit, so to speak, and think they would raise something if there was a problem or should we take an active role and ask?

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks, Russ. I think that question will likely come into play when we do our assessment of the combined proposals once we have the official final version of the names proposal. I know that both of those communities provided input to the CWG during their public comment period, and at least from my reading of those comments, that it all seems workable at first [inaudible]. That's certainly something that we within this group should raise and the representatives from the various communities that are affected should raise when we do our combined proposal assessment if they think there are issues there.

Okay. Seeing no more hands going up and down, I think we can move on to our next topic. We have some administrative items, I think. No, we're talking about the combined IETF and RIR proposals.

The chairs had asked the secretariat in order to get as much ready for our public comment as possible while we waited for the names proposal, the secretariat has put together the combined proposal containing the IETF and the RIR components that we previously received. We've had some discussion on the mailing list about the structure of this.

The way that it's structured is that the two components that we received remain intact, but they have just been appended to each other so that they [inaudible] in the two parts of this document. I would expect that when we receive the names proposal that we would likely insert it as the first part and then have the other two parts follow.

We had some discussion about whether individual responses of the RFP responses should rather be [inter-weaved] instead of having the separate communities in separate parts.

I think we have come around or folks have come around to the idea that letting them sit in separate parts is preferable. That's certainly my preference as I said on the mailing list. We can continue to talk about that, but I thought everyone had agreed on the structure of the document. Maybe we should pause there. If anyone wants to have a further discussion about the structure, let's do that now. Then we can talk a little bit about what I have been calling the preface, but which might end up being called something else.

Any comments or discussion on the structure of the combined proposal?

Okay. Seeing none, then I think we should all just spend a moment to talk about the language that will appear at the beginning of this document in some format. It might be an executive summary, or an introduction, or a preface. We might have more than one of those, but I think it's quite obvious to me that we will need some words at the beginning of the proposal to explain what it is and provide some other context setting.

We've had a lively discussion about this on the mailing list and I think we are at the point where we have a list of the components that should exist in this section. I do think I have just gone back myself to the most recent message that Martin sent on this topic that I think provides a few good points and a good summary.

First of all, maybe we should call this section the executive summary of the document. It probably makes a little more sense than calling it the preface. In that sense, it could be a little bit lengthier and have a number of different components.

I think we've talked about having a summary of the proposal in there. I think we've gone back and forth about how much we should leverage our own charter and how much we should talk about the process that the ICG and the communities used.

I think for both of those there's probably just few sentences of context setting for the reader to understand where the proposal came from,

though there's probably language in the charter we can use for that and just a very brief discussion of how it was developed.

We also talked about having perhaps a brief explanation of IANA, what it actually is and does. Again, from my perspective, I wouldn't want that to become too long, but it might make sense as the context setting. Before we have a proposal about how we transition the stewardship, it would be good to explain what the thing is that we are talking about.

Then are the components that relate to our assessment and how the proposal meets the NTIA criteria, how it meets the other assessment criteria that we have set out for ourselves, the compatibility and workability and accountability of the three components together.

We have a bunch of ideas on the list about structuring that and the various components. I think we should continue that on the call. I see that we have a queue, so let's start with Daniel.

DANIEL KARREBERG:

Hello, everyone. I've been following the discussion about what content we should add in the sidelines and I have a more high-level strategic remark to make rather than a nitty-gritty remark. High-level strategic remark is that we should try to avoid generating new language that describes the context of this all.

Why? Because I think it's not necessary and because it can take quite a lot of time and it will be [inaudible] every comma and full stop, and it will be scrutinized again by the [spin doctors].

What I advise very strongly is to have [inaudible]. That's fine. Just say we will chart it like this da-da-da-, and maybe we go to, for the description of IANA and the arrangement refer to the SSAC document or anything else, but not ripe, new language, please.

I think it's important to – I agree that we should describe our process based on our charter. The process by which this content that we are describing there was created. That's fine. But it should be very factual and short. And of course we should add our assessment.

But creating language about context and all like that, I really strongly advise against doing that. It takes a lot of work, it takes a lot of time, and it doesn't add anything substantial. I don't think we need to watch a tutorial here. That's my point.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Daniel. I agree and they're agreeing in the chat room as well. Good point. Paul?

PAUL WILSON:

Thanks, Alissa. I just want to raise an idea that I raised on the chat in the last meeting and received a bit of support, and that is about – it's also question of the value-add, if you want to put it that way, that the ICG can provide to this process.

Now, we've been asked and the charter of the ICG is to produce a plan, a single plan, but there aren't too many plans that don't involve stages and steps and I think the plan that we produce can involve multiple stages of this transition. The fact is that we've got two communities out

of three who appear to be ready now, or at least who will be ready by September. In a two-step or a three-step process, we could advocate for a transition but that releases one or two communities from the NTIA contractual arrangements in the first or the first two steps, followed by a third.

I'm not suggesting – I agree that the proposals from each of the three communities should [stay] or should be included as they are, but one of the things that the ICG could do is to propose that the three plans be undertaken not as a single step, but in sequence.

I think there are some advantages to looking at this possibility. That is that rather than seeing the transition as a single unitary model [inaudible]. It's something that can happen in stages and those stages can help to provide some of the stress testing or some risk mitigation that is otherwise heightened by a single-step transition.

There's also the fact that if we do not have any transitional steps at all happening in September, then it may be seen as some form of failure of this process that we've had a long and involved multi-stakeholder process that has failed to meet the goal that was set for it, which is that the transition was supposed to happen in September, as an alternative to that failure to be able to show one or two out of three components of IANA being actually in transition at that time is probably or arguably better than having nothing to show at that time.

I'm just suggesting again. As I said, I mentioned this on the chat at the last meeting and received a few positive remarks that we might

consider a plan which involves some contingencies, as in a multi-step process. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Paul. Because I know that people have strong opinions about that proposal, what I would ask is if we could run the queue as follows. If people have other items they were going to raise about the combined proposal not in response to Paul's suggestion but to anything else, if we could put yourself in the queue and have the discussion of those and then let's see where we are and we can come back after we've cleared the queue of those comments, possibly to Paul's suggestion. Perhaps we might reserve some time for it at the face-to-face depending on how long the rest of the discussion goes. I don't want to wander off into that conversation too much, just knowing that we have a few other items on the agenda for today. So thank you, Paul. Let's hold responses to Paul for a little bit later in the call and if folks have other comments on the combined proposal, then please put yourself in the queue.

Who I have in the queue right now is I have Jean-Jacques, Kavouss, Alan, and then Joe. If you fell out of the queue and you want to be in it, please write in the chat, but let's go with those four for right now. Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you, Alissa. I think that I owe an explanation, because in the long exchange of e-mails in the past two weeks, [inaudible] added value as the real contribution of the ICG. I was not suggesting that we should invent out of nothing some language or some ideas – of course not. But

it is our duty I think to make the most of the contributions which we receive and to order them, to lay them out in such a way that organization efforts, and effort like clarification is in itself a contribution. In other words, added value. That's the first remark.

The second remark is in all these suggestions I saw, I think there is some confusion or lack of distinction between essential and what can be considered as interesting, but which could be put in attachment to the main draft.

This is something I feel very strongly about and I would advise that we put in the text itself, in the plan itself, some of the things mentioned, Alissa, which is first a summary of the proposals and then something about process, briefing based on our own charter. Here I agree with who it was that we propose that we don't put in new language but use which is already – oh, it was Daniel.

Then an explanation of IANA. That I think should go into the attachments in the same way as more detailed information about the process followed, that should be also in the attachments.

Finally, the ICG assessment according to, one, the NTIA criteria; and two, other requirements we may have found necessary on our own. That would constitute really that the draft itself – sorry, the plan itself. So [inaudible], the plan should contain a summary of proposals, a brief word about process, but it would be a relevant, more detailed document as attachments.

Three, what is IANA? There again, a very brief reminder with brief wording and with attachments as necessary.

Four, the ICG assessment. There again, we can be more detailed, but as necessary put things in attachments. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Jean-Jacques. I fully agree and I like the direction that you're going with the appendixes or the attachments. That's good for us to consider as well. The structure of the whole document will likely be executive summary, part one, part two, part three, and then we will have our own perhaps appendixes at the end to further explain the process and IANA and so forth. I really like that structure.

Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. I fully understand the frustrations of the numbering and protocol parameters. To me, it is that their proposal [inaudible] and has gone to some checks and examinations and so on and so forth, but it relates connected to the other proposals. But we have to act in accordance to our charters. We agreed that this combined proposal of two communities [inaudible] be put out for the ICG. Very good.

First of all, we have to mention in the introductory part or summary why the third proposal is not there. We should explain that and we should explain our logic that it was understood that it would be beneficial that at least these two proposals which are almost ready put into the public comment, if I understood correctly, for the people.

We have to explain because not everybody attending the ICG and not everybody reading the output of the ICG [inaudible] people expect that the [inaudible]. This is the [model] it is now.

On the [inaudible], I do not agree with Paul saying that these two could be implemented from transition [inaudible]. The transition will take place after the proposal is sent to the NTIA and the proposal is sent to the NTIA, according to the charter, should be a complete proposal so there is no transition. I don't understand why [they] said the transition could take place [from] September and I don't understand [they] said that people will be frustrated. Never [inaudible] September was the deadline. [inaudible].

ALISSA COOPER:

Kavouss, I'm sorry. Just two points here really quickly. First of all, just to be clear, there's no intention of us putting the combined proposal out for public comment before we have the names proposal. What we're looking at now is the current draft because we don't have the names piece, but the idea is that we will insert the names piece and then put the draft out for public comment. There will be no need to have introductory text explaining why the names piece is missing because it won't be missing. It's just that we have started creating the draft ahead of time so that we would be ready when the names piece is also ready, and also so that we can get it off to the translator to get it translated in the meantime.

And then just a second point. I really do want to put off this discussion of the point that Paul raised until a later time, and possibly a later date,

because it could be a longer conversation and we talked about it before. If you have other points to raise about the proposal, then please make them. Otherwise, I'd like to move on.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I wish you'd allow me to complete my sentence and to not interrupt me. It is not appropriate.

ALISSA COOPER: Well, I am trying to run the queue here and I asked for [inaudible].

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Let us not [inaudible] you. Allow me to complete and then you [inaudible]. You have listened to everybody. You need to listen to me as well. So what is the purpose of putting these two proposals together? It is internal. It is not external. You said external. What does it mean, external? If it is not going outside, it is internal.

ALISSA COOPER: Once we have the names proposal, it will go into this document and then we will put it out for public comment.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: But if it goes to public comment, it doesn't go to public comment.

ALISSA COOPER: Once we have the names proposal, it will be inserted into this document and it will go for public comment. That's the idea.

KAVOUS ARASTEH: The two proposals go to public comment, right?

ALISSA COOPER: With the names proposal as well.

KAVOUS ARASTEH: [inaudible] proposal. I said that if you want to put it to public comment, you have to [inaudible] why you do not have the third proposal. You have to mention that. What is the reasons?

ALISSA COOPER: The intention is that the third proposal will added to this document and then it will go for public comment.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: But now it doesn't go to public comment, right?

ALISSA COOPER: Correct. Yes, it goes to public comment July or August after we've completed our assessment.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: What is the purpose of providing these two if it doesn't go to public comment, to do what? To be happy that, okay, you put these two proposals [inaudible]? What is the objective of putting these two when it doesn't go to public comments? What is the objective of that?

ALISSA COOPER: The objective was to get agreement about the formatting, make sure everyone is comfortable with that. We had the discussion about the structure of the document and I wanted to make sure that everyone is in agreement with that before we send this version of it to the translators so that it can be translated, and also to stimulate the discussion about what other components there will be in this document as we've just been discussing the executive summary, and the appendixes and so forth.

It's a process in development. The fact that we do everything in public in this group doesn't mean that we have to have our intermediate stages be public, but we're not putting this document out for public comment until it's ready and all the components are there, including the executive summary, the names proposal, and it sounds like some appendixes.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: When I asked you if it is going to outside, you said yes it's going to outside.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes. When it's done, I'm . . . Perhaps that wasn't clear. But when it's complete, it will be out for the public, but it's not complete yet.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: But I said this document going out, you said yes. No, this document does not go out because it is not complete.

ALISSA COOPER: I think we had a misunderstanding in the chat room.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I'm sorry. Now I have to comment on Paul Wilson mentioned that even if the third party is not ready, the transition could take place. My answer is no transition could take place at all, number one. And number two, this September was not a deadline. It was an objective. That's all. Transition cannot take place until the whole proposal is [ready] going to public comment and two public comments. I insist we should have two public comments, but not one. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Kavouss. I have Alan, Joe, and I had Xiaodong in the queue. I'm not sure if Xiaodong is still in the queue or not. Let's go Alan.

ALAN BASSETT: I think the ICG also has a coordinating role. It's not just a matter of pasting these three documents together. They might be items which need more coordination.

For example, what comes to mind is the trademark issue. We have a proposal from the numbers community that says they would like the trademark to be handled in a particular way. We have a response from the protocols community which says they have no objection to that. And we have something, at least in the draft, that I saw up in the names community which might be inconsistent with that. I think the [inaudible] the three documents. We have to figure out what to do to resolve any points of discord.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks, Alan. That certainly, again, is the plan when we do the combined proposal assessment steps. Those kinds of things need to be resolved when we actually take a look at the three proposals in conjunction with each other.

I would also say to the extent that if we do discover inconsistencies and so forth, those need to be resolved through the process we established by going back to the communities and working with them to obtain a resolution. It should be the case, I hope, that we end up with this proposal where we have some covering letter that explains the inconsistencies. We want to get those worked out in the communities such that the constituent parts of this combined proposal are consistent with each other. That's what I think what we're all driving towards.

Joe is next.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF:

Thank you. Can you hear me okay?

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: What I just wanted to raise was when we have the final assembled proposal, and I completely agree with Daniel – we can use existing language. The more we craft new language, the more we'll have to get that language vetted to see how consistent it is with previous language, etc.

I may take issue with the need to be as brief as possible, because part of our mandate is one of the reasons that we have a period of time for comment after the proposal is issued is because that is meant to be the period of time during which consensus is established, especially across those communities which may not have directly commented into the operational communities.

In a consensus-building document, we need to make sure that we have laid out things in a way that's accessible to people. If we end up having a document that has 17 annexes because that's where the completeness of the information is, that's not a document that yields itself to being a consensus-building instrument.

I do think that we have to understand that the proposal that gets issued first may have a slightly different need for context than the proposal that is delivered to NTIA. Not that the meat of the combined element will be different. That will be the same for both. But the preparatory elements may actually have a different purpose and we just need to

consider that part of this document's function is outreach and consensus-building. I just want to make sure we keep that in mind and we don't presume that everyone who's going to read this document has been involved in the process to date.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Joe. Very good points. Also we should reiterate something that was said on the list. I think we're focused here on the proposal that we put out for public comment. It's quite possible, and I think likely, that the rounding material will change between that date and when we send the document to NTIA, and obviously NTIA needs less of the context than perhaps the public does, so we should be mindful of that.

Just one note for folks. Unfortunately, Arabic and Portuguese translation, the interpreters could only stay on the call for 90 minutes, so those services are no longer available for the last 30 minutes of the call and we apologize for that. It's hard to schedule these two-hour calls and have all the interpreters available for the entire time. Apologies for that.

I have in the queue next Xiaodong.

XIAODONG LEE:

I just did a question in the chat room. I'm curious if we put the proposal together and [inaudible] comment, and then [inaudible] public comment. In the first round, the people have commented [straight proposals]. Then the [inaudible] community has modified their proposals.

We test [inaudible] – we never do any evaluation to check if there's some kind of conflict or not. We just put the three proposals together [inaudible] no big difference. [inaudible] confused. If we just ask the people to comment our ICG process.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks, Xiaodong. That's actually a topic that we have on the agenda for the face-to-face, which is that in addition to whatever material we have in the proposal, I think we will also need some sort of prompting or questions that we put out to the public when we ask for public comment to direct people as to what it is that we're seeking comment about. I have in mind some questions that we I think will certainly want to ask about whether people feel that the NTIA criteria have been met and so forth. So I think that your point is well taken in that we need to decide at what level of granularity we're asking people to comment.

Again, being mindful that all the separate components of this proposal will have been out for public comment previously, some of them multiple times. That's definitely something that we all should consider and we'll have a further discussion of that at the face-to-face meeting. Thanks.

Daniel?

DANIEL KARRENBERG:

Thank you, Alissa. On the point that was raised in [inaudible] mailing list that there may be different versions of the document for different audiences. From experience, I would warn very much doing something

like this. I think we should produce the document that we are chartered to produce for the audience that we're also chartered to produce it for, which is the NTIA, if I'm not totally mistaken.

Or maybe even not that, but say could use the most substantive document that is or definite output according to our charter. Let's put it that way. If we have concerns, like Joe raised that audiences that need to buy into it or at least not oppose it and who haven't been paying much attention may be confused. I think we should not cater for them in our output that we're chartered to produce, but we should take the route that, according to the CCWG is taking an many other groups like this are taking, producing additional documentation – Slideware, infographics, tutorials, what have you – that explain the context and explain the essence of our product in a more accessible way.

I caution very, very much against producing different formal document. That will add a lot of confusion and will again cause a lot of [inaudible].

ALISSA COOPER:

We have a two-alarm call going on here so far. Thanks, Daniel. Just one point of clarification because now I'm getting a little confused, I think. At least the point that I understood about having different versions is that it's possible that the explanatory material at the beginning of the document may change between the version that we put out for public comment and the version that we send to NTIA.

It's not the case that we would have two concurrent different documents, but that this text that we're discussing right now that will go at the front of the document is what we want to put out when we

put the document out for public comment, and that we may edit it later before we send it to NTIA. I think we should reserve the right to do that, but I agree that having multiple different versions of the document is not a good idea.

Did I capture that properly or is there some other point that has been made that I missed? It's a question for Daniel, if you don't mind responding.

DANIEL KARREBERG:

My concern is about what are real products. What are things that we [merely] are chartered to produce and that we will discuss in depth and we will have to agree as a group, according to the process that we agreed to consensus that this is our output.

I'm advocating to keep that as minimal as possible so that we have a minimum number of words that we have to agree that, that we have to craft and that we have to agree on. If we want to address a concern by Joseph, which I agree with, absolutely, other communities or part of the community that we want to understand this so that they don't oppose it or buy into it, whatever meaning, that we can produce additional material for them that we can actually have produced maybe even that we don't have to work with in this group. We have maybe agreed to it in this group, but it doesn't need the amount of scrutiny and the amount of work, and in the end, the consensus.

My caution is against producing any word that is not necessarily – is not necessitated by the job that we have, by the charter that we have, by the thing that we need to do. That was my concern.

I would have a concern by saying we'll put one preface here, put it out for public comment, and then we [need] that preface and send it to NTIA. There's going to be hundreds of spin doctors that are going to say, "Oh, they changed it." It's not necessary.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay. Thank you, Daniel. At least I feel like I understand well and I can tell people in the chat are agreeing with you. Understood. Next I have Joe and then I think we will close the queue.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF:

Alissa, I just wanted to highlight another reason why I think Daniel's approach makes even more sense because at some level we want to make sure that the public comment has also gone on on the spin we're providing to NTIA. It's useful for there to be the exact commentary in the document that will be the document for public comment. We can then have an according document to that that will be the document of this is a little more information for those people who haven't been in the process who may more some context for this document, and then we can lay that out in that document. Again, using source material where possible.

But I think that bifurcation that allows people to comment on every aspect of the document, we are proposing to transmit to NTIA. If we create new language after the public comment process, it's a little unclear that that is consensus commentary if we haven't had comment on it before.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, agreed. Thanks, Joe. That's a good summary. Okay. Daniel, I see your hand still up, but is that from before or is that something new?

DANIEL KARREBERG: Apologies.

ALISSA COOPER: I think this was a good discussion. I think we understand the pieces that need to go in here. What I would suggest is that although there will certainly be gaps that we cannot write yet because we don't have the names proposal just yet and we haven't done our assessment of it, I will endeavor to circulate at least an outline or perhaps a draft that has some pieces missing to the folks who agreed to volunteer on the drafting team before the face-to-face meeting so that we have at least something we can work on when we're all together in Buenos Aires. We'll see how far we can get. There's a lot of pieces that will still be missing, but at least I think I understand the structure and we can start taking that around in a small group.

I think we should move on to our next agenda item. We obviously had the discussion raised by Paul and I would say that we, given the limited time that we have left on this call, the chairs will endeavor to get that onto our face-to-face agenda so that we can pick that back up. But I don't want to do that today because I can already envision the queue that we'll have and we'll overrun our call time for today. The secretariat

can give the chairs an action item to figure out where that fits into the face-to-face agenda. That would be good.

Speaking of which, our next agenda item is to look at the face-to-face agenda. This has been circulated to the list just yesterday. We have two days of meetings planned for this agenda. We have sessions pretty well defined on the first day and then we have a lot of time at the end of the first day and on the second day to pick up whichever topics seem like they need the most attention. We'll be doing some real-time agenda editing.

From my perspective, it's not exactly clear which of these topics will require more time, so that's why we wanted to leave it open, so we can have a little bit of flexibility in terms of the planning.

Just a couple of things to call out on this agenda. The first substantive item that we have on day one is for the CWG names proposal pre-assessment. We've already talked about this and Wolf-Ulrich did his pre-assessment. I put this on the agenda because I thought it might be the case that there are others who intend to do some pre-assessment of the names proposal and I was curious if that's actually the case. If we have anyone who is planning to give the names proposal a read within the next week, and if you think that you will have items to bring up to the full ICG based on your review of the names proposal, if you could put yourself in the queue and let us know that you plan to do that, that would be great right now. I see that Joe is in the queue. Go ahead, Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thanks. When I was reading the 18th and 19th agenda, I was thinking about the fact that our topic appears a number of different times during the ICANN meeting. I was wondering if you wanted to have a specific time to prep any concepts for the actual meeting in Buenos Aires during the course of those two days or do you think that will be done beforehand or organically in the process?

ALISSA COOPER: When you say prep any concepts, what do you mean exactly?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Well, I think we've got – there are I think a couple of times in the agenda where the transition and ICG's work is coming up. I don't know if we're going to have speakers on those panels, so I was just trying to figure out is there a time you need to coordinate any activities during the ICANN week itself and would part of the two-day meeting be useful to do that in a half hour or something? Because I haven't been able to see the agenda in detail, but I know there are a couple of topics and just was wondering how we were dealing with that.

ALISSA COOPER: That's a good point. It might make sense for us to spend a few minutes. We did this last time, too. Discussion of talking points or some such. I think to some extent there's less attention I think on us at this meeting perhaps than on the CWG and the CCWG, but that's a good idea. I think we can work that in.

I don't know at this point of any specific sessions at the ICANN meeting where an ICG perspective will be requested, but I accept that that might happen organically, so that would be good to have us all on the same page. We can add that to the agenda. Thanks, Joe.

Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, there is a conflict of meeting between CCWG and ICG. Is it not possible to avoid that conflict when they're overlapping each other?

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, that's a conflict we have known about for a while, and I think just based on all the Doodle polling and everything, we couldn't avoid having some conflicts. We have multiple of those conflicts during the week. So folks who are participating in multiple groups will just have to make their own decisions about where their time is best spent. We couldn't avoid it. There are so many meetings happening, into the weekend as well. We tried to slot time to meet on a Saturday, and that was not good for a lot of people either, so we can't really avoid the conflicts, unfortunately.

Lynn?

LYNN ST AMOUR: Yes, hello, Alissa. I don't have a concrete suggestion, but I just wondered if it might be worthwhile reviewing the CCWG accountability work in a bit more detail rather than – I'm not sure if the agenda item

literally is just meant to talk about how [inaudible] that work or if we think it might be useful to do an equivalent assessment of the accountability work to see if there might be any impact [inaudible], but really just to understand and feel that we've done a thorough job in terms of assessing any potential implications. Again, I didn't know what was meant by the coordination, the accountability work, if it was literally just a high level coordination item or if it was something a bit more . . .

ALISSA COOPER:

Right. Thanks, Lynn. I think the idea was for that item to be fairly high level, really looking more to make sure that in so far as we are progressing on our work we are not anticipating any barriers related to the CCWG work and also that we are – the current plan is for us to finish our two work streams around the same time. I wanted to get an update from the folks participating in the CCWG and make sure it's still on track to the extent that there are contingencies between our two pieces of work that we are all aware of those and know what they are. That was really the idea behind that session.

Because we're not really in a position to – we won't be doing any kind of formal assessment of the CCWG's output, I would hesitate to have us go too deep into the weeds in terms of the substance of their work. But if people think that they want to take a deeper dive, then it would probably take more than 30 minutes I would imagine.

I was thinking of, because it's a little bit of outside of our remit, that we should probably not do that. But if people want to, then we should talk about that.

Anyone personate to my earlier question about the names proposal pre-assessment? Do folks have plans to spend some time with the names proposal with their ICG hat on before we meet next week?

Okay, seeing no hands – Oh, Patrik, go ahead.

PATRIK FALSTROM:

Yes, sorry. I'm sitting in a little bit of an awkward place. Regarding the names proposal, we are in SSAC going through the names proposal, evaluating it quite carefully compared to the document with the recommendations that we had on what we believe from an SSAC perspective the operational communities would look at.

This is of course something that – a comparison that we might do for all of the proposals from the operation communities, given our charter. But as a chartering organization for the CWG names, we at SSAC need to make the decision whether we support the proposal or not. We have [inaudible] formal review of the document of comparison with our review.

I hope that kind of review that we doing is something that will help also ICG when myself or Russ that with the two of us representing SSAC will [inaudible] to the ICG. How far we will come next week, I don't really know, but we have at least started and it will be possible for me and Russ to at least give some input on the evaluation.

Let me put it this way. We are from SSAC absolutely doing a pre-assessment and we have already started and it has come quite far. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Great. Thank you, Patrik. To the extent that you and perhaps Russ will be able to share some of that next week, I think that would be really helpful for the rest of the group. That's great.

Just a couple other notes on the agenda here. The item at 10:00 on the 18th, planning for the combined proposal assessment, you'll recall that once we had the numbers and protocol parameters proposals, we had a few people who worked together on the combined assessment looking at the overlaps and so forth and we will want to have that volunteer pool ready again once we receive the names proposal, so we'll be asking volunteers to do the combined assessment and we will need people to do that on short order as soon as we receive the names proposal perhaps at the end of the month.

If you think that you might be interested or willing to do that, please give that some thought before we meet next week and we'll be asking for volunteers for that.

Also, I just wanted to call out that later in the day the items that Xiaodong spoke to before where we need to do some planning for our public comment period, think about what questions we want to be asking to the public once we have a combined proposal. I'll be sending some more info to the list about that before we meet, but that's what that session is reserved for.

Then we also have a session planned for on Friday which is about public outreach. This might get a little bit to some of what Daniel was talking about earlier in terms of if we need to do some other outreach around the public comment period, but also possibly afterwards or before, to educate people about the proposal, to put it in a context that's more understandable for a wider audience, we have a session planned to talk about that.

I see Kavouss with a hand raised. Go ahead, Kavouss, and then we will wrap up.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. I see good reasons to go to the separate or [inaudible] assessment, but combined assessment of two may change when we receive the third proposal and we should have the combined assessment of all three. I don't see too much reason to go to the combined assessment. Individual assessment, yes, but combined assessment would be possible or useful, but for that, if we do that, then the three proposals are [on the table]. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Yes, Kavouss, thank you. That is the intent. We're just lining up volunteers to do it, but they won't be able to do it until we have all three. That's the idea.

Are there any other comments or questions about the face-to-face agenda? Okay. Our final item, which is the planning for calls and meetings after Buenos Aires, we won't go into a lot of detail on this one,

but I did want to flag first of all that we have a Doodle poll open for the times for our calls from July until October. Please, if you haven't filled out the Doodle poll yet, please do that. It's closing today. We're hoping to nail down some times for these calls today.

If you look at the calendar, you can see we have higher intensity period in July. We have three calls planned. This is hopefully when we expect to be doing the combined proposal assessment and preparing it for public comment.

Moving into August, we might have a slightly less intense period assuming that we're in the public comment period, but we might have ongoing analysis of public comment and so forth happening in August, so we have [two] calls scheduled in August.

Then in September, as mentioned on the list, we're hoping to have a face-to-face meeting in the middle of September still waiting on secretariat and others to get a final confirmation on location. Hopefully we'll have that information very soon. They've been working on it for a long time. It's hard to find a place that can accommodate our specific needs with interpretation and so forth, but people should definitely have those dates reserved in their calendar. Then we have a couple of calls planned as well.

I just wanted to flag all of that for everyone planning. People had asked to have all of the dates and times in their calendar, so you should have the times for the calls and the location for the face-to-face nailed down hopefully before we see each other next week.

Any comments or questions?

Okay, great. Thank you, all, for a productive call. We'll see each other next week in Buenos Aires. Safe travels, everyone.

PARTICIPANTS: Thank you, bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]