ALISSA COOPER: All right, why don't we get started? Welcome to call #22 of the ICG. Nice to have everyone back together. It's been a little while. As usual, we will take the roll call from the Adobe Connect room. First question is whether there's anyone who is on the call but is not in Adobe Connect? Okay, doesn't sound like we have anyone who's on audio only, so that's great. Thank you to everyone for joining.

You can see our agenda for the day. Three items. It's likely that I think we won't take the full 90 minutes, but we have 90 minutes scheduled if we need it.

The first item is a little bit of a discussion about the public comments received. I think everyone knows our public comment period closed just yesterday in my time zone, or approximately 28 hours ago. We'll talk a little bit about what the plan is for getting the public comments analyzed. If anyone has been reading the comments and has initial impressions, I thought it would be interesting to hear from folks just based on your initial review of the comments.

We'll have an update from the CCWG liaisons about what's going on in the CCWG. Then finally we'll just talk a little bit about the logistics and agenda planning for our face-to-face meeting, which is next week in Los Angeles.

Are there any other items that people would like to add to the agenda or any comments on the agenda? Okay, so seeing no hands, I think we can move on to agenda item #1, if the secretariat just wants to project our public comment archives.

I think folks know that all of the public comments are being archived on our website. We received 142 comments. There are a couple more where I think people know the process for submitting the comments was that no matter which way they were submitted, the submitters would receive an e-mail and they were asked to click on a link to confirm, essentially, the spam filtering technique. We have a handful that came in before the deadline, but have not been confirmed yet, so we may end up somewhere near 150 submissions. Right now, we're at 142 confirmed submissions.

I personally have looked through them very briefly, and done kind of a very, very cursory initial review just last night. From my perspective, I think we've received a really broad [inaudible] comments from a geographically diverse group of people and organizations. There's also I think great diversity in terms of the interests that they represent. From my cursory view, I think the majority of them are supportive of the proposal in general, but obviously we all have a lot of work to do to understand them more fully. And that's just based on an initial review. There are certainly lots of criticisms and questions of the proposal as well. That's just a summary for folks who haven't looked too closely.

In terms of the planning for this comment analysis, we have six volunteers. I sent a mail last week asking for volunteers to do a rapid analysis as a first pass before we have our face-to-face meeting, and we had six volunteers who agreed to do that. Milton, Martin, Lynn, Jean-Jacques, Wolf Ullrich, and Joe. Thank you, thank you, thank you to those volunteers.

Basically, what we've done so far is in just the six volunteers and myself and the co-chairs and the secretariat had a brief coordination call earlier today to sort out how to get this task accomplished. We have divided up the comments among the volunteers, so they each have a batch that they will be reviewing in detail and will make use of the matrix that Jennifer has circulated previously. The reviewers will be inputting their [inaudible] analysis into the matrix and Jennifer will be consolidating all of that input into a single document for the ICG to be able to review next week.

We are targeting for that document to be available to the full ICG on Tuesday of next week. There's not a lot of time between now and then, especially considering the depth of the comments. So we're really going to try to do that because we know that people are traveling and so forth to get to the face-to-face and we want you to have enough time to review what the reviewers have done.

Of course anyone is welcome to read as many of the comments as you would like, and please feel free to send your thoughts to the mailing list in the meantime if you have them.

The way that the matrix is structured I think people have seen. We tried to pull out some of the topics that we thought were likely to recur in many of the submissions and we've added some more topics to that list just based on initial review of the comments. So we're hoping to be able to glean an agenda for the face-to-face based on the organization of the topics and the issues arising from the comment analysis, but we won't really be able to know exactly which topics those are and which areas

EN

will require the most focus from the group until we have that initial task from the reviewers.

That's I think the basics of what the plan is as far as the analysis of the comments. Are there any questions or thoughts that people have to share in terms of the process between now and the face-to-face meeting?

Russ Mundy, go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you, Alissa. I've not looked at the comments, so I've looked through the list of the [inaudible]. I have not looked at what the secretariat has put together, but I was hoping that there would be as a part of the list that the secretariat assembles a way for us to enter our own views or our own materials on our copy or the copy of the list of comments or the matrix of comments. Maybe that's already there, but I just wanted to ask if it would be possible, if it's not already taken care of, for the list to have a place for us to put things in and keep and use ourselves.

ALISSA COOPER: Sure. I think that is certainly possible. The matrix, maybe Jennifer, if she wants to show the last version of the matrix that you sent around to the ICG just so we can speak to it for a second. The matrix as it stands has an initial… The very first tab in the spreadsheet is essentially a list of all of the comments and the name of the person who submitted it, the organization, and so forth. That is actually the page where we were

asking the reviewers to input essentially their recommendation as far as the ICG action, like what the ICG should do based on the comments that were received. But that's also the place where we have the fullest of all the comments. That is certainly a [table] that you would be able to use for your own purposes. We're still kind of in the process of updating the matrix a little bit, but Jennifer can circulate the most up-to-date version when it's ready. That's one way to do it.

The matrix itself has a whole bunch of more detail because we have the answers to each of the questions that we asked broken out on a separate tab. Then we have some topical tabs as well. Jennifer, if it's really hard to project – I know it's a huge spreadsheet, so don't worry about it too much if it's hard to project. People have it in their inboxes.

That's what I would recommendation, either using that very first tab which is blank and you can write whatever you want, and then there's some other structure in the other tabs of the matrix if you wanted to keep track of your own thoughts along the structure of the matrix. Does that seem reasonable, Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Yes, it does, because what this process in a way reminds me of is some of the work on the NomCom, and that is when you have a large number of things and some of them are similar, it's really challenging to keep the thoughts that you had associated with a particular comment on that comment. I think using the spreadsheet would be a good approach. Yeah, thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Great. One other item to note that came up when the volunteers were having our call this morning is that I do think the main thing that we all need to figure out together in looking at each comment is what the action item is for the ICG, if any. And there's a bunch of different possibilities there. So for some of the comments, some of them are very short statements of support of the proposal. So for those, I think we can kind of put them in the bucket that says, okay, here's a bunch of comments that just said, "Please progress this proposal and send it off to NTIA. We think it meets the criteria." The action item there is that helps us figure out how we characterize the support for the proposal, but it doesn't really require any more detailed response.

There's another comment that might inspire us to clarify something in part zero of the proposal or to add text to part zero. I can certainly imagine just having briefly looked at all the comments that we will want to add maybe a subsection or multiple new subsections to our part of the proposal that basically describes the feedback we received. I can also imagine that some of the questions that we received will inspire us to make clarifications in the text that we wrote. There definitely seemed to be questions there that we may want to answer. But that's another potential response.

I think a third one is we might want to send a question back to one or more of the communities or a request that the communities address a comment. That's another possibility.

As people are reading through and thinking about the substance of the comments, I think it would be really good to maintain that focus in terms of, okay, this is what the comment says. What does it mean as far

EN

as what the ICG needs to do? That's just a recommendation from the chair in terms of how do we actually get our work done?

Any other comments or questions on the process and what we're doing next with the comments? Daniel, go ahead.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Just a minor technical thing. It appears that there's about 15 submissions that were received before the deadline but are still in the [inaudible] confirmation phase. I suggest that the secretariat looks at them and does some pretty [inaudible] on them and includes them, because then we have the whole [inaudible] immediately that was submitted before the deadline. So the confirmation process was only really a [inaudible] measure. I think we could do that manually would be my suggestion.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, we could do that. Jennifer, correct me if I'm wrong. The majority of those have actually been sitting in unconfirmed state for a long time, and I think are therefore presumed [inaudible]. Is that correct, Jennifer? I thought we have six that are unconfirmed from the last couple of days, but most of them are from a month ago.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Hi, this is Jennifer. Can you all hear me?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Male.

JENNIFER CHUNG: Okay. So of the 15, we have six that were received within the last two days, and the others were kind of languishing since the beginning of August, middle of August, and they have received many reminders. So depending on what the ICG decides, I can go through and do a [inaudible] filtering if that is what the ICG would like done.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: The intention of my suggestion was that we do not fall into the trap of not seeing a valid submission that was made before the deadline and get criticized for that afterwards. I'd rather see [inaudible] than miss a submission that somebody complains about later.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Any objection to that? Okay, people seem to be supportive of that, so let's go ahead and do that. The one thing I will say in terms of people who are looking to understand is this the complete list, we did get – what is it, Jennifer? – six or seven submissions that were in languages other than English and the translations of those will likely not be available until the middle of next week at the earliest. So the set that we are looking at right now, even once the unconfirmed ones are posted, will not be the complete set until next week. And those are flagged in the matrix, so that people know which ones they are. But just in case you're keeping track at home.

EN

And yes, for people who are concerned about the numbers, the submission IDs do not get assigned until essentially after the confirmation steps. So the fact that the unconfirmed ones will get numbers that are higher than all of the existing submission IDs.

Anyone else? Daniel, your hand is still up. I assume that's from before.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: It just came down.

ALISSA COOPER: Great. I did want to open the floor for initial discussion of the comments if people have looked at them in any depth and wanted to share any thoughts. Now is the time to do it. I know there is not a lot of time that has passed.

Okay, I'm sure we will have plenty to talk about next week. I will say I gave the broad brushes at the top of the call. I'm quite pleased in terms of as far as what I can tell so far what we received. A lot of people who thought long and hard about the proposal and gave us some very detailed feedback. A lot of people who thought long and hard about the NTIA criteria and how the proposal compares to those. So I'm very appreciative of the time that the public spent to wrestle with what was a very long and complicated document. I think we have a lot to work on, but also a solid foundation in terms of establishing the public record.

With that, I think we can move on to our next agenda item. Do we have Keith Drazek?

KEITH DRAZEK: Yes, Alissa. This is Keith. How are you?

ALISSA COOPER: Go ahead, Keith.

KETH DRAZEK: All right, thanks very much. Hello, everybody. Good morning, good evening, good afternoon wherever it may be. Before we get started, just a quick note. In case you haven't seen it, I sent an e-mail to the list earlier today my time with a written update from the CCWG Accountability. This was just my summary update, a bit of an overview as to where things are right now. I'll bet happy to run through that with us today right now. Then I'll open it up for any questions. I don't believe Kavouss is on the call today. I think he was not going to be in an area where he had Internet connectivity. He may have some further follow up to add after the call. Anyway, let's just run through.

The CCWG Accountability has an ongoing public comment period. It was a 40-day public comment period that opened on the third of August and it closes this coming Saturday at 23:59 UTC. I think there's approximately between 15 and 20 comments that have been submitted already, but in typical ICANN fashion, we certainly expect more comments to be flooding in right at the very end of the public comment period.

The CCWG Accountability had held three webinars as outreach efforts on August 4th, August 7th, and August 25th and I've included in the e-mail

that's on the screen right now and the e-mail I sent out a link to the slide presentation that was used by the co-chairs during the webinars. So if anybody wants to go and read up and get caught up if you haven't already, the link is there.

More recently, on August 31st, the CCWG gave a briefing to the ICANN board. It was really an educational session, an informational session, for the board members, included a Q&A session. But it didn't really have a whole lot of dialogue. It was more of I think a one-way communication with a few questions here and there.

Then on September 2nd, just a couple of days later, the CCWG and the ICANN board had a follow-up meeting where the board provided some preliminary feedback to the CCWG. While the board on that call said they agreed with some of the recommendations on community empowerment and enforceability, it also provided notice that the board plans to submit public comments raising concerns about the proposed sole member model as a means to implement and enforce the community powers.

You'll see in my notes the September 2nd call was a little bit contentious. And a little bit of background there. The ICANN board has had board members participating in the CCWG Accountability discussions from the beginning, and the Paris face-to-face meeting that took place in January had six or seven ICANN board members in attendance, either in the room or on the phone. Most of them in the room. And I think the CCWG group felt pretty good about the proposal that it had put out for public comment back in early August, and including [inaudible] that the board was largely supportive of the proposal.

EN

So on the call on September 2nd when the CCWG heard pushback or a signal that there was going to be some concern about the sole member model that had been proposed, I think it created a bit of a negative reaction. I think there was a sense, well, wait a minute, why wasn't this discussed before with the CCWG? Why didn't you raise these concerns before?

You may have seen some of the press reports or the blog reports about that call on the 2nd. I know there was one in Kevin Murphy and Domain Insights and [Karen McKarthy] and the register, maybe some other reports as well. It was a fairly contentious three-hour call.

But the CCWG has taken the position that we are going to wait and see. And I say we, meaning I should say they. But I'm participating in the group as well. The CCWG is going to take a "wait and see" attitude and keep an open mind because the board has not provided any real detail or substance about its concerns or specific recommendations for adjusting what the com working group has proposed. It says it intends to that. The board intends to do that as part of its public comment, and the CCWG has basically decided to just wait and see what those detailed comments represent and to then decide how to proceed from there.

What else? The legal teams from ICANN – that's ICANN Legal and Jones Day, ICANN's outside counsel, and the legal advisors to the CCWG, which is Sidley and Adler are the two firms that are advising the CCWG – did meet last week once to discuss the board's concerns and they intend to meet again sometime this week I believe once the board has submitted its formal comments.

CCWG is continuing its work in planning for the assessment of all public comments. It currently intends to consider the ICANN board's input as part of the public comment period. A face-to-face meeting of the CCWG Accountability has been proposed for late September, and if it takes place, it will likely occur in LA, Los Angeles, around the time of the ICANN board retreat to hopefully facilitate any follow-on conversations.

I think this is important certainly for all of us who want to see the transition included in a timely fashion. It remains to be seen whether the board's concerns are sufficiently fundamental or substantial that a third public comment period might be necessary for the CWG to accept and incorporate the board's input. I think the key point here is that there is some uncertainty at this time as to the extent and significance – or the extent that the board's comments substantially change what the community has proposed and what the community has out for public comment right now. If something else is going to be needed, then there may be a need for a further public comment period which could and likely would put the Dublin target for delivery at risk.

This is all very much sort of a moving target at this point, and the CCWG is I think patiently waiting for the board to submit its detailed comments but not taking its eye off the ball. The CCWG is working, preparing itself to assess the public comments that have been submitted and that will be submitted by the 12th of September and is still targeting Dublin for delivery to the community and ideally approval by the community in Dublin.

Let me pause there and see if there are any questions or comments. Okay, Russ, go ahead.

EN

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you, Keith. Based on what obviously support comments are potentially and significant and disruptive to the timeline. And from your report, it sounds like it's very conceivable that some of several of the comments could affect I think it's the seven specific items that are supposed to be addressed in CCWG by the CCWG to make the CWG proposal stand as is, or might require revision. So that's clearly a potential. Are there other comments that have been heard around the community or are already filed that might have a similar effect?

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Russ. Great question. I would say not to my knowledge, but I have not read all of the comments that have been submitted already, and there are likely to be a substantial number more comments submitted between now and the 12th. My sense is that, in conversations with others in the community and taking the temperature of the various groups, I think there's general support for what the CCWG has put out as its second reference model, the proposal that's out for public comment right now. I think there's general support for the concepts and for the approach. I think there are probably many comments that will recommend adjustments, but I think there's a difference between adjustments and substantial change. And I think that's maybe where there's a bit of a difference as we look ahead. I hope that was clear enough. I don't sense that there's been any comments to date and I'm not sure that any other comments will come in that basically say that the sole member model construct is unacceptable.

EN

It may be that – I believe that's what the board is intending to communicate. The board said that they support the community empowerment and they support the concept of enforceability, but they believe that the sole member construct introduces too much risk or instability or uncertainty and that it's untested and they think they have identified a better way. A better way to achieve the same goals. I think that's really what the CCWG is waiting to better understand. The CCWG has gone through several iterations and many months of discussion around this exact issue. And based on legal advice from its counsel came up with the recommendation that it did.

Now it sounds as if ICANN and board and staff have identified an alternate solution to deliver the same goals. The CCWG is keeping an open mind around that until we see the details and hoping that the details support everybody's interest.

But I have not heard of anybody else, Russ. To answer your question more directly, I have not heard of anyone else raising the same level of fundamental concern.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Keith. Yeah, it was [inaudible] ICANN DC on 26th August I think. It was, I think, the Business Constituency focused. It was looking at discussing both the CCWG and the ICG proposal. There was clearly in that community substantially more interest and concern, if you will, in the accountability and the CCWG area than there was in the ICG area. I could not really tell from that meeting what some of those people were going to say. I just didn't know if other things had come out. Honestly, it

EN

wouldn't surprise me if some other concerns about the adequacy of the accountability showed up. And that was the only thing I really could draw out from that meeting on the 26th.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. All right. Thanks, Russ. I've got a queue building and I also note that there's been some comments in chat. I see that Paul has typed in that there's a strong impression that comments will be substantial, and that it's likely that there will be an alternative proposal from ICANN. Yeah, Paul, I think you're right. I think even though the CCWG members on the call said, okay, you're not supporting the community proposal ICANN, you are in fact proposing something else. I think there were some from ICANN who said, well, no, we really do support what you're doing here. We just have a different way of accomplishing it. But I think your assessment is accurate.

Let me go to Wolf Ulrich, and then Daniel, and then Paul.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks, Keith, for the report. I have a question for understanding the board concerns. Are they [inaudible] related to or mainly to the sole member model as it is or to the PTI model, basically, as well? That means, in other words, the question is would there be necessary as well a change in the PTI model that the CWG has developed and the CWG should change their model and [inaudible] following the board concerns?

EN

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. That's a good question. There was no discussion of board opposition or pushback to PTI or anything that came out of the naming community's proposal to the ICG. That's not to say they may not have concerns, but I don't know. I can't speak for them. But that was not discussed on the CCWG conference call that took place last Wednesday, the three-hour call that was the board CCWG interaction.

The ICANN staff and board did acknowledge that there is a need in approving the CCWG's work, whatever the proposal turns out to be, to address the key dependencies between the CCWG and the CWG. That was clearly acknowledged and the statement, if I recall correctly, was the new solution or the new proposal from ICANN will ensure that those are addressed. I think that's certainly one of the open questions for both the CCWG, the CWG, and the ICG. It's something that we'll need to circle back on once we see the detailed proposal from ICANN.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay, thank you. Daniel, over to you. Then to Paul, then to Alissa.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Thank you. Just the one thing I'd like to do is reinforce what I said in the chat already. The question really is how does this affect our work? I see personally no direct impact on the work, in our work, as the ICG. I see a [inaudible] for us to communicate and prevent any confusion about the question that Wolf-Ulrich raised which a lot of people will raise and will

EN

probably confuse the PTI and the sole member thing, so we should probably, as the ICG, when we meet next week discuss on whether we should communicate on this and basically say these two things are totally different animals.

I think we should also strive to be on one mind, of one mind on whether this affects anything we do as the ICG. Personally I don't see any effect on our schedule and our work at this point.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Daniel. I agree with you completely on everything that you said. I think there's a clear distinction between the PTI structure and the sole member model structure that's been proposed by the CCWG. They're two entirely different things. I agree that whatever is going on right now in the CCWG with the board does not impact our work as the ICG in terms of the public comment summarization and keeping our eye on the ball and moving forward.

I think the one area where there could be a concern or could be a question is about the key dependencies between the CWG naming proposal and the CCWG accountability proposal. The accountability group is going to have to ensure that those key dependencies are met with whatever comes out of the process, whether it's the CCWG reference model or it gets a new board proposal that we haven't seen yet or some compromise or variation of the two.

The key there is to make sure that the CWG key dependencies are resolved and addressed, and I think that's the one question that I think could at some point down the road impact the ICG's work.

Okay, Alissa, back over to you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Keith, and thank you very much for the very comprehensive and helpful update. It's been very beneficial for us in the ICG to hear everything that you had to say. I just wanted to… Keith, I think your response to Daniel was spot on. I just wanted to amplify that a little bit to say that I think this topic is going to [twirl] around us as long as the CCWG comment period is open, which I guess from where I sit seems like a long time because it's three more days and I am starting to get questions from various folks in the community about the potential impact on the overall timeline and the ICG's work and so on and so forth. That's why I wanted to have this conversation now, because I didn't want people to be surprised if they hadn't been following along.

But also I think by the time that we all meet face-to-face there will be I don't think complete clarity, but a lot more clarity in terms of the assessment from the CCWG of whether they will be more likely to be making small changes to their proposal and reviewing the public comments and making adjustments as necessary or whether they think that further face-to-face meetings and public comments periods and what have you will be required, in which case their timeline will extend potentially.

I don't think we need to make any decisions as far as changing anything about what we plan to do. Even at our face-to-face meeting, it would be certainly premature for us to do that. But we do need to have this in mind and we need to have some thought as to what do we tell people

when they come asking about the impact of the one process on the other.

I think Keith makes a good point which is that we should remember that we have committed to seeking confirmation from the CWG that their requirements are met in the output of CCWG Work Stream 1, and we were scheduled to do that when the CCWG Work Stream 1 proposal goes to the chartering organizations for approval, which was supposed to be about a month from now. So that's something that we said we would do. I think it's very clear that the CWG component of our proposal is dependent on the CCWG output as it stands. So we just need to keep in mind what we said we would do, and I think that is the area where they could have an impact on our timeline, as Keith said. Thanks. I'll turn it back to you, Keith.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thanks, Alissa. Yeah, I completely agree with everything you just said. I saw Paul's hand go up earlier and I see Daniel's hand up now. Paul, did you want to jump in? I saw your hand up a couple times. If not, or while you're thinking, Daniel back over to you.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Thank you, Keith. Just very shortly, I think the main message that we should be giving when we're asked about the impact [inaudible] at this point is just that we're moving along with our work as scheduled irrespective of this. We understand that there might be a bigger impact, but for us there's no consequence. Is that correct? Is that the thing that we should be saying?

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Daniel. I'll defer to the co-chairs on determining messaging, but I think that sounds right. I think the ICG can continue with our work, and should continue with our work, on schedule and acknowledge that once the board and the CCWG have their detailed exchange based on facts and detailed analysis, we'll have a better sense as to the timing of the CWG Accountability track, which I think will be a [gating] factor for the final resolution of ensuring that the key dependencies that we talked about are resolved. But I think you're absolutely right that our work should continue and our schedule and timeline should not be changed at this point.

ALISSA COOPER: Keith, if I could just add to that. I certainly agree with that. The only modification I would make is that, at some point, we will come to a place where, depending what happens with the CCWG, we will have missed the mark in terms of what we had said we would do. I think saying we're on schedule and we're plugging away will work fine for the next few weeks. It will become clear possibly at some point whether we are or are not on track to do exactly what we said we would do. And at that point, we will have to say something else if we're not on track anymore or if the CCWG is not on track anymore. That's the only thing that… I want people to be prepared for this because we have a face-to-face meeting. We have one more call in September. But as a group, we're going to have to… If things do change from what we said we were doing and what the CCWG said that they were doing, at some point we will have to give an updated message. I just want people to be prepared

for that. But I agree that, at this point, the steady as she goes is essentially the message.

KETH DRAZEK: Great. Thank you, Alissa. Daniel, your hand. Then I see Russ, and I should probably hand it back to Alissa. I would suggest also that we could continue discussions on the e-mail list if necessary on this topic, particularly for those who were not part of the call today, if they have any questions coming out of the written summary that I supplied. So Daniel, and then Russ.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Hello, thank you. My question is to Alissa and what she said just before. While I understand what's going on in the CCWG will impact when NTIA receives the full package, I don't understand how what happens over there might impact what we are doing. Maybe I'm just dense right now, but could you amplify a little bit on how you see that impacting the document that we're putting together?

ALISSA COOPER: Sure. Sorry, Keith, if you don't mind me responding to that directly. So this gets back to the dependencies between the CWG proposal and the CCWG Accountability work. The CWG proposal does outline the seven items that it was expecting to receive or have created by the CCWG in order for its proposal to be considered complete, and we said that we would check with them to make sure that those requirements are met once the CCWG Work Stream 1 work is completed.

EN

So if the CCWG Work Stream work doesn't get completed or isn't in a shape wherein it would make sense for us to go ask the CWG if the requirements have been met, then we as the ICG will have to figure out what do we do, because that was the process that we said we would follow.

I think certainly based on our whole model of deferring to the communities, it would be inappropriate for us to just plug on without at least talking to the CWG about what their community feels in terms of the combined proposal. So that's where the linkage is and that's why this affects us. If there weren't those dependencies between our proposal and [inaudible] proposal, we would be in a different boat, but there are those dependencies. Yes, and it is the CWG's work, but the CWG's work is one of the components that we have in the proposal.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks, Alissa. Russ, over to you, and then we'll draw a line under this, and I'll hand it back to Alissa for the remainder of the call. Russ?

RUSS MUNDY: Ah, thank you, Keith. Very much in line with what's been in the chat room and a related question. I think the idea of having a [inaudible] edition that gives a description of this relationship is an excellent one, but the question I wanted to ask is if we have in our timeline a designated planned time for when we will hear from the CWG whether or not the CCWG proposal meets their seven key dependencies. And if we don't, it seems like we might want to consider including that date in our timeline.

EN

ALISSA COOPER: Keith, do you mind if I jump in again there?

KEITH DRAZEK: Please. Thank you, Alissa.

ALISSA COOPER: Russ, the way that we had framed this was actually that we were going to put the question to the CWG at the point at which it seemed logical. Essentially once the CCWG work was completed. I can't remember exactly how we phrased it, but I think the assumption was the CCWG I think was targeting something around October 8th for sending their proposal to the chartering organizations for approval, very similar to how the CWG did that two weeks ahead of the last ICANN meeting. And it was at that point that we were planning on asking the CWG to confirm that their requirements had been met.

I don't think we ever said how much time we expected them to take to make that determination. I know they're following the CCWG process very closely. It wasn't really that we had specified kind of a deadline for the CWG. It was more that we were going to ask them at some point, and we were I think expecting a response in a timely fashion, but we didn't say when. Certainly by the time of the ICANN meeting I think had been the expectation, but there's some fluidity there in terms of…

We can talk to the CWG any time we want. We've asked them questions before. We can ask them questions again. We have open lines of communication if we have anything that we want to discuss with them.

KEITH DRAZEK: Yeah. And Alissa, just one other comment from me before we conclude this. It's important that everybody understands that the target for the CCWG Accountability delivering its proposal to the chartering organizations prior to Dublin was very much similar to the reason the CWG did it prior to Buenos Aires, and that is because certain chartering organizations need to have a face-to-face meeting to be able to make those kinds of decisions, at least historically. The GAC is certainly one of them. I think the ccNSO has a tradition of making those decisions in face-to-face sessions. And if there are any ccNSO folks on the call who, if I've got that wrong, feel free to correct me.

But certainly the GAC makes those kinds of decisions during face-to-face meetings rather than on conference calls. So there's a need to get this done in Dublin or we risk it slipping to Marrakech, which is in March which causes problems for the entire timeline if we're looking to do this before September 2016.

The alternative might be to schedule a special intercessional meeting between Dublin and Marrakech, but that raises all sorts of logistical concerns and issues and a lot of uncertainty I think. So the target was for the CCWG to deliver prior to Dublin, so that ideally, if all went well, the chartering organizations could approve in Dublin in the third week of October.

That's all I've got. Back to you, Alissa.

EN

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Keith. Good points, and thanks again for the update. I think that was very helpful. The only other note that I wanted to make is that myself and Mohamed and Patrik have a call scheduled with the CCWG chairs just a couple days before our face-to-face and after their public comment period closes. So we should have fairly… And obviously we have the liaisons as well, but we're hoping to get updated information as to the general direction the CCWG thinks it's going to go so we can bring that to our face-to-face meeting and I expect us to spend a little more time on this when we have a little more information. So that's just a head's up.

With that, I think we can move on to the next agenda item, and that is logistics for the face-to-face meeting. Jennifer, did you have the… Yeah, there we go.

I think folks are pretty clear on this, but I'm not sure if we had circulated all of this information. If not, we will send it to the list, see what we have here. Right.

Our next face-to-face meeting is taking place end of next week. There will be a reception on Thursday evening in the hotel in the lobby bar. I'm not sure. There was some discussion of other folks going to visit IANA. I'm not sure if that's planned or not for that Thursday afternoon. But in any event, folks can meet up on Thursday in the evening. Then we have the two days of meetings 9:00-5:00 in the [San Gabriel] room in the hotel.

We will be producing an agenda for those two days shortly before the meeting, probably with a little bit less lead time than usual just because

we want it to really reflect the public comment analysis and that won't be available until Tuesday at the earliest. That's just [inaudible] for people. If you're looking for the agenda, it might be a little bit later than usual. But at least you'll have the start and end times at this point. Any questions or comments on the face-to-face?

Okay. Just one other note, another thing to noodle on in your mind between now and when we see each other. There's another topic that I think is starting to percolate around a little bit which is the question of the ICG role during the implementation phase. As we're near the end of the proposal phase and switch over to implementation is something that has been discussed in I think various venues. I know folks have been talking to me about it. So if you have thoughts about that, I suspect it would be an agenda item for us to discuss that. I think it would be good for us to come to some kind of conclusion or at least start the discussion about what we think our role is, if any, during implementation phase and after we have sent the proposal off to NTIA. So just a preview that we'll be on the agenda, and if you have thoughts, please gather them for that meeting.

Any other comments, questions? Great. Then I think we can wrap this one up, and secretariat will circulate all of the post-meeting items as usual. Thank you, everyone. Good discussion today. And we will see each other in a little over one week in Los Angeles. Safe travels.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]