
MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Okay. I think we can start. Good afternoon, good evening everyone. Mohamed El Bashir here. I will be chairing the call. Unfortunately, Patrik, he has another engagement, he will be with us, but he won't be able to actively participate. So, we can start the call, and the Secretariat has already started recording the call.

And we have a number of apologies already received. So I think we can start by going through the agenda, which is already displayed in front of you. We have the first agenda item, which is we need to approve the last minutes meeting of our conference call on the 25th of February. A link to the Adobe Connect, the link to the Dropbox is already there.

And we have as well, two action items that were from the face to face meeting, which is we can discuss. So we can start with the approval of the last minutes of that meeting.

So if there is no, I don't see anyone raising their hand. So we can consider the minutes of meeting on the 25th of February teleconference as approved. The second agenda item, which is reviewing the action items from our face to face meeting in Singapore. And specifically, action item number four, and action item number six, which is number is just [inaudible], and the action item is that ICG Chairs review details of the proposal finalization process, and timeline with assistance from the Secretariat.

That has been done. And Alissa has sent an email to the mailing list earlier, and we had a lengthy discussion about the timeline version eight. So I'm not sure if anyone has anything to say about this action

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.

item. We can consider, chosen no further action items to [inaudible]. Okay. The next action item, which is also related to that proposal finalization process, and [inaudible] that the chairs should work with the assistance of the Secretariat to create the new version of the finalization process, and [inaudible] the major steps into more details.

I have Mr. Arasteh raising a hand. Mr. Arasteh.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes Mohamed, I would be very much appreciate if you called me Kavouss, because when you call somebody by first name, they are a friend and are close, when you call him by last name, you have not. So I don't think that I am not so much older that you do not want to call me by my first name. In any case, my name is Kavouss. I would appreciate if you would call me, that you feel free to do that, if you still have some difficulty, go ahead with Mr. Arasteh. No problem.

Okay. I have an item, I don't know whether to associate it with the face to face, because it raises the face to face. I asked for a flowchart, or diagram, stating the maneuver and the chart, or the way, how the accountability is currently done. And I have made a small resume here. In the protocol parameters, we have IETF, we have IAD, we have Internet Society Board of Trustees, we have Internet Steering Group, then we have ICANN.

IETF has a memorandum of understanding, and we have Internet Research taskforce, and then we have IAOC, and IAD. There are many, many partners and many, many people, we don't know what will be done by whom, who is doing what. In the accountability starting from

page nine, all of these have been mentioned, and if somebody really needs to go, he will be lost at who will report to whom, who will oversight what, and there are many things. What is clear that IAD is at the top.

But there are many, many other things that is there. I asked for a diagram, indicating that. And Jari promised, and in the last email he mentioned that he is working on that. I appreciate very much, kind work. And I would like to have this diagram being made available, and similar diagram after transition, if there is any changes. So we have one diagram between the flow of work before transition, we have another diagram after that.

I don't think that that is a request for an ICG to analyze this. It is a request from the member, was made at the face to face meeting, was agreed, and was promised. I think it's a follow up action, and I thank you very much Mohamed.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Thank you very much Kavouss. I don't mind, I can put your request, wishes also be requested on the mailing list in any other business, so we can have a discussion regarding it. Would that be fine?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

But this is something that has been at the face to face meeting. Why do we discuss it again? At the previous meeting, we raised the question, and Jari mentioned that yes, it seems to be a little bit difficult for some people, and he has planned to make [inaudible]. Why we need to go

and spend time on the discussion for nothing? There are many, many other issues. This [has been] raised by everybody.

A flowchart, a diagram, a graphic indicating [inaudible] works, fits in various entities, as mentioned that, and that is that. One, before this transition and one after. Why do we need the discussions? And some people, they are very, very sometimes, not very kind, start to always do that. Start to oppose to that. This has something [inaudible]. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Okay. I will give Jari a chance to respond. Jari, if you would like to respond quickly so we can proceed.

JARI ARKKO:

Yeah, so actually kind of agree with Kavouss that we don't necessarily need discussion. I mean, I have been asked to provide a diagram, because I think it will be informative. At the same time, I think, you know, this is an existing system well documented. You know, you may have to read a few RFCs, but it's documented. It's not that complicated. I mean, the diagram will be helpful in presentations and such. And I will deliver that.

Yeah, but I don't think there is anything unclear per se in our arrangement, and other high level victories that we have, accountability for failures around IANA function, which we can survive, even regardless of any ICANN accountability mechanisms, although they are useful. We can deal with failures in any case. And in those failures, and in the

policy process itself. And for both of those we have processes. Anyway, I will deliver a graphic.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Are you able to provide this...? When do you expect to deliver that?

JARI ARKKO: That's been the difficult part. I'll try to get something done this week.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you very much. I think we can proceed now to the next item, which is basically, we had a discussion about, are we satisfied with the current response about the fallen numbers, response on the IANA intellectual property and domain name issues. So, I will...

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Are you asking me Mohamed? Do you ask me [inaudible] or asking someone else?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: No, I think you have your hand raised, Kavouss, if you want to...

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yeah. I am happy with that. I am happy with that. The only request is to my distinguished and dear friend Jari is that if that diagram after transition, might have some little changes, I would be very much appreciate that with some other color mentioning that, after transition

that line between A and B will no longer require however the line between C and D will be required.

Just indicate the changes after the transition. That would be very much appreciated. If he doesn't want to produce two diagrams, one diagram but with this in color, one color indicating before and one color after, that we know that has happened. That is one. And then under the next agenda item, I have another thing.

Mohamed, let me tell you something. I [inaudible], it's very sensitive. Let us also do the same thing within ICG. Very, very friendly meeting. The most complex, complicated issue will result in the most friendly manner. On the contrary, simple issue in ICG becomes controversial by some people. It is not good. It is inefficient. Thank you.

MOHAMED AL BASHIR: Thank you Mr. Arasteh. Jari?

JARI ARKKO: Yeah, I think, yeah, I will try to clarify again the graphic, but as the proposal fairly clearly states, there is really no change to the accountability mechanisms. They say the same thing going forward as well.

MOHAMED AL BASHIR: Okay. Thank you Jari. Daniel has mentioned in the chat room that the group needs to approve the minutes in Singapore. You're right. I recall that yourself and Milton had some edits on the document, which was

not agreed by other members. So, do you want to provide any comments on that? Or someone could also comment on that?

And the Secretariat has showed the redlined text already. So Daniel, please.

DANIEL KARREBERG: This is Daniel. Hello. Can you hear me?

MOHAMED AL BASHIR: Yes we can hear you.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Okay. My connectivity is a bit spotty, hence the question. I think that one redline thing on, I think that's the bottom one on the screen right now, on section six, is the one that was contentious between Milton and myself. The other stuff, I think, the other redlines I agree. I have no position to them. Now we have a little bit of a problem, because Milton isn't here, and Paul Wilson, who actually is the person speaking is not here.

So I would propose that we table this until the next call, unless people are absolutely against it, so that the people who have the concern can have a say as well. Would that be acceptable?

MOHAMED AL BASHIR: Thanks Daniel for the suggestion. [Inaudible] I think [inaudible] it's a good way forward. I have Arasteh raising a hand. Arasteh please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Hello, I have a question if you, tell Jari I just want to follow up that question.

MOHAMED AL BASHIR: Mr. Arasteh, Kavouss, I couldn't really hear what you were saying.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, I was saying I have a question. I have a question. On the page that was open, discussion, issue about the revision. I think still it is something being issued, because I have the same problem that he says that currently, the current agreement does not specify jurisdiction, and it has been raised in the discussion, as mentioned, the ICG decides to further articulate any questions.

So we would like to have some feeling why there is no jurisdiction. It is one point. And I have another point which is this, on the page of the, on page 13 of the Jari or protocol proposal, it's about talking, this ability of the Internet depends on capable provisions of not just IETF protocol parameters, but that IT parameters, very good. Again, if you talk about domain names, then talk about the other agencies, then talk about [inaudible].

So how are these things between the parameters community, numbers community and naming community, how are these coordination being done? Because this reference that all of these are required. That's the expect we have a role of the IETF and so on, so forth. So who will do this sort arrangement and coordination between the IETF, between the

[inaudible] and IETF, between IETF and names? And written all of this, because everything is mentioned in that page is in the document page 13, paragraph four, starting from this [ability].

So I would like to have some clarification. How these are being done or will be done? If management of coordination between the three players. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Thank you Kavouss. Before I let also someone else open it [inaudible]... There was [inaudible]...

...accepted that suggestion which would be fair, and [inaudible] minutes, because we have members who have [inaudible]...

...So I think we will be fair, and I will give a chance to Jari, who might want to respond to you Kavouss.

JARI ARKKO:

Yes, so a couple of mind. Jurisdiction, my recollection of them discussion in Singapore, was that we briefly got a jurisdiction, and we provided an answer, Russ and I, based on the existing agreements and the role of the IAB, which is kind of pass final say in any argument between ICANN and IETF.

And my understanding was that solved that particular issue, and we decided together that we would ask one question from the operational communities, which related to IPR or the domain names and trademarks, which we did. And I think solved that particular issue.

So I think the minutes may actually need some correction on that point. And then Kavouss, you asked about coordination. That's a good question. And that happens as specified in the various RCs, and when there is a situation where those do not describe what to do. So for instance, we have had cases where we have had address ranges from an area that belongs to the RIRs to an area that belongs to the IETF, and we've done this through discussions, kind of a point to point coordination of the [inaudible] communities. So likely that happened many times over the course of history.

And doesn't seem to be having any kind of difficulty actually.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Jair, would it be possible you would put that on the paper? What you said? Because I am working in the CCWG, and I want to be very, very clear. Would you put what you said that thing in the paper, that seems to be no problem, or [inaudible] problem, because the difficulty that I have with your document there, many, many times you said that everything is okay.

I'm not objecting that everything is okay, but it is not sufficient that someone say that everything is okay. The others could say everything is okay, but not the person who is writing the paper saying everything is okay. So could you put on the paper here, on the paper, what you said that we discussed that, because we would like to be very, very clear.

I'm not also convinced about [IAB] with everything. In CCWG overall accountability, we are talking and following the community. And the community is not only IAB, it's the entire community. So I don't think

that we could put everything on the hand of IAB. To judge [jurisdictions], jurisdiction is not IAB. Jurisdiction is jurisdiction should be a mean way and so on, and so forth, and that's, this is the legal issues should be properly addressed. Thank you.

JARI ARKKO: Kavouss, I agree on the process. Hello? Who should speak?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Go ahead please, Jari.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah, so Kavouss, I think we've agreed on the process. I mean, a large part of the responsibility for the transition planning is in the communities. And the communities are indeed different, and their problem areas are a little different. They're not all one-sized fits all situations, and they don't all do everything exactly the same way, and that's quite natural because you have different resources that you're talking about in TLDs, for instance, are very different beasts that some [inaudible] numbers, and deep inside [inaudible] and different communities are being served.

And our community has produced a document that explains how it does things. And the community has discussed the matter of who, where the accountability is, and what accountability mechanisms we have in place. And their opinion is very clear in the document. We can always provide some further information that is not clear, by and large. The information is in the document as well as the relevant RCs.

And I mean, if it helps, I can write an email or something that explains some practicalities around coordination, but I mean I don't want to go back and change the communities for those.

MOHAMED EL BASHIER: Thank you very much Jari. I think that we can continue this discussion on the mailing list, [inaudible] approval of the minutes, as well as [inaudible]. So we can move on that, on the first agenda items. And we're on item number two, to [dedicate] the response from the protocol and numbers community on IANA IP and IANA [inaudible].

So, any comments on the responses?

Okay. I don't see any hands or anyone wanting to discuss it. We can move ahead and go to agenda item three, which is the status of names [inaudible] progress. And what is often for ICG members involved in the CWG work, to provide an update about the current status.

Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, Mohamed. I think we have a few distinguish ICG members in the CWG, mainly ask one, or some of them, or all of them to kindly, if possible, brief us on what is going on in the, sorry, on CWG? Thank you. I can see, can we ask some or few of them to brief us? Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIER: Thank you Kavouss. I didn't want to name someone specific, but we have a few members here who can brief us. Keith is here, or Wolf is already here, and someone is already involved in the CWG could provide us an update?

No one is volunteering. I know that there is a meeting that is going to be held in Istanbul in the coming few days, and there is also, I think it's one of the news that legal from, identify to provide the legal advice on the options, currently in front of CWG, legal options.

That, to my knowledge. It seems that we have many, many apologies for this call, so maybe we don't have members here who don't have an update on the names proposal. So, if that's the case, we can move on to the status of the accountability track process, in the CCWG. And we have also full of members there. Maybe Kavouss, give us an update, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes Mohamed. I am [inaudible] together with [inaudible] in the CCWG, and they have since two weeks, have this two main groups working part one, dealing with review and address, and working party two, dealing with the [inaudible] community or vice versa. So one group dealing with [empowering] community, to take action to revert to the decisions of the Board, or to call for the Board members, or to also lead us [inaudible] the Board, and similar issue like that.

And one other [inaudible] the view and the address, having different communities, the view upon it, review panel, and now they start to go various constituencies. Currently they are concentrating the GAC, the

operating principle of GAC, how the GAC decision is made by consensus or by majority, which way is more acceptable. They're discussing the legal part of all of these issues, and still at the working level, it has not come up to the main CCWG, but it is expected that something will be prepared with the view to be published for public comment [inaudible].

So maybe in Istanbul meeting, which is the 23rd and 24th of March, this issue will be more structured, and we will have a better idea about the outcome of these two. But the work is going very, very well, and there are many, many groups that have started. A lot of people who are working in a most certainly and constructive manner, and a lot of issues. And it is the hope that we would have something by April for the public comments, with the month period.

But that is a brief [inaudible] on CCWG. But if someone else want to add something, I'll be very happy to also listen to that. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIER: Thank you Kavouss. And Mary is already raised her hand, and she can provide us an update with the CWG progress. Mary please.

MARY: Can you hear me? Hello? Can you all hear me? Can you hear me?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, yes, we can hear you.

MARY:

Hello, good afternoon all. I just want to give you a little bit of what has been happening in CWG. I've been following the work of the CWG, and there has been two calls, of two hours every week, since [inaudible], after the Singapore. And then there was a re-work of the process, and to now change the mode of working to [inaudible], and [inaudible] or number from A to I think J.

And that three [inaudible] priority drafting team, that will be A led by Paul [Cain], and B, another one, that one is only SLA, will be working on SLA, and that [inaudible] will be working on CSC, and there are other drafting teams that are being named, [inaudible] and colleagues we make for volunteers [inaudible] that meeting. So that at the end of the day, there is a structure, there is a template for the response for the CWG [inaudible].

And there will be a face to face meeting in Istanbul, just like the accountability [inaudible] accountability group will be meeting. And one of the things that have happened is that there is a high [level] proposal, that was, that brought together the opponents of a [inaudible] oversight and Internet oversight, that team is being led by Avri that made a presentation to us. And we thought that that team is trying to come up with a proposal that would take into consideration the protocol parameters, the RIRs, and then the DNS, or the naming community.

So that at the end of the day, there will be a nominating board, [inaudible]... It has not been called, the contract co, or a trust, but it will be that each of the communities will nominate members to that forum or group that will be overseeing the IANA function. Then the proposal

also said that, IANA function should be separated from ICANN itself, and they can get subsidiary [inaudible] or whatever finally come up with, but not just be other external or internal. There is something together that way.

The other thing is that the label [committee] has been able to select a legal [advisor], so the advisor was at the last call in, is legal advice well, so according to independent, that there is an independent legal advisory, and they have a formable group of professionals among them. So those are the things that are happening. [Inaudible] drafting group or being formed, and [inaudible] the ones that have select, the ones that are priority for [inaudible], and we will continue from there.

I don't know what any other person that follows the meeting in the call can raise some of the things that I missed. I hope you heard me clearly.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you Mary. [Inaudible]

MARY: I think one other thing... [Inaudible] is that the principle is being [inaudible], and it's being led by the principle of outreach, the decisions will be made. It's being led by Matt and Paul, so [inaudible]... I think by the time we finish [the set of these items], in Istanbul come up with something that will work for the group. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: [Inaudible]

MARY: I can't hear you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: [Inaudible]

MARY: Please, you can type if you didn't get me clear, if there is any questions.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you Mary. Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes Mohamed, I wish to add two more things on the CCWG. They have started to merge the affirmation of commitment into the bylaw, and provide an updated version of the bylaws which includes affirmation of commitment. As it is, plus some other elements that might need to be added. This is one point they are doing.

In addition, they have now have 25 stress tests, some of them have been discussed. Some of them have been read, some others under the discussion, and the third point is that for all legal assets, they are going to involve a law firm, and they are discussing whether they use the same law firm that has been used for CWG, because of commonality, or have a different law firm, it has not yet been come up.

And one of the vice chairs dealing with these issues. And so these are the three other things in addition to the review and address, and in addition to the [empowering] the community, which all five [inaudible] in the CCWG. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Thank you Kavouss for that piece on the [inaudible]... Mary, also your update on the CWG work. If there is no other comment about this progress of [inaudible], we can go to the next agenda item which is ICG future awareness, and any [inaudible] and media messages.

I have sent an email to the mailing list earlier, and basically in a summary, the chairs, we had a meeting with ICANN's communication team back in Los Angeles. And the main objective of that meeting was to plan an outreach and awareness of in-depth, in the proposal submission phase, but we couldn't do that at that time. And then we follow-up with another meeting with the communications team of ICANN in Singapore.

And the main objective is try to see how we can help in terms of the future reach out and awareness and media messaging. ICG would like to do one way of progressing in terms of [inaudible] refine proposal. On the discussion on the mailing list, some members supported [inaudible]. Milton has raised concerns about the work and why we need that. And I recall Joe, he accepted that portion [inaudible] awareness, but he thinks it needs to be independent of ICANN, and to be labeled an ICG work and ICG outcome.

And also, Russ had a different view on the mailing list about that. I would like us to stress that any outcome of info-graph or media messaging, or any material would be produced, it will be done, it will be developed let's say by and approved by ICG, and we will be driving that. And ICG will determine the channels to disseminate messages.

So this is the discussion on the mailing list. And I think I have here, Mary has already raised her hand on this topic. Mary please.

MARY:

This is Mary. Okay. Can you hear me? I hope I'm not [inaudible]. Can you hear me? Okay, if you can hear me, I want us to ask whether we'd be considering the timeline. Going by what I'm saying, accountability track, CWG track, the CWG IANA track. It seems to me that it might be difficult to meet the timeline that have been proposed.

So I wanted to ask from Kavouss whether who thinks they make their own timeline in the way that there [inaudible] aspects of the accountability [inaudible] with the, would be able to make input [inaudible] so that the CWG can make use of [inaudible] line. I hope you heard me. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Thank you Mary. We already, we're currently discussing agenda item number five, but if Kavouss could just briefly can answer to Mary's question. Can you do that briefly? Kavouss?

I think we lost Kavouss, he has been disconnected.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, I'm here. [CROSSTALK]

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Mary is asking about the timeframe on the CCWG work and what options the CCWG is considering in terms of their ability to achieve the target deadline. Please briefly.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Who, CCWG? Or ICG, that target deadline?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: No, no. CCWG's accountability.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: CCWG accountability does not deal directly with the ICG issues. They are dealing with the accountability beyond the transition, however, if there is something for the accountability of transition, it is different, CWG and CCWG is not between ICG and CWG. It's the CWG and CCWG. These two, they are talking about the accountability relating to the transition. Accountability outside the transition, the CCWG dealing with that, and [inaudible] depth of the matter, but there is no direct demand currently, according to what I have heard between ICG and CCWG.

Any related to the accountability of the naming, comment on CCWG to CWG. Between these two, but not ICG. ICG is not involved unless we in ICG, raising the matter that as far as the protocol and numbers are

concerned, there might be some accountability, that's also required to be taken into account before transition and after transition. Unfortunately, they have not raised that yet, so it is up to us to raise the issue.

MOHAMED EL BASHIER: Thank you Kavouss. And Mary, we can maybe you can [inaudible]...

MARY: All right. Kavouss, I was not talking about the accountability relationship, CCWG to ICG. I'm talking about the accountability aspect of CWG, CWG. Okay so...

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Mohamed, the [inaudible] of CWG will finish with transition. Once CWG provides, it's the force relating to the accountability or the transition, that mission is finished. All accountability relating to everything, beyond transition for being dealt with in CCWG.

MOHAMED EL BASHIER: Thank you Kavouss. And the two groups are representing their work in terms of stream one, or the transition accountability. So, we're back to agenda item number five, ICG [inaudible]. So, many of you disconnected and are reconnected now, I will say again that the chair had a meeting with ICANN communication's team in Los Angeles, tried to plan future working for future activities for ICG.

And we had another meeting [inaudible]...

Can we have your mic mute please, there is some echo. Which requires more awareness and outreach. So in Los Angeles, we have a discussion about this [inaudible]...

The discussion was around, should ICG, should this product be an ICG or this outcome here, driven ICG initiative, or should we let ICANN to do that? So, I would like to just open the floor for any discussion about this point.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Mohamed, can you repeat that? I didn't quite understand your question. Could you repeat your question please?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Okay Kavouss. On the mailing list, Joe and other members agreed that we proceed and plan ahead from now, for info graph, media [inaudible] towards proposal assembly phase. [Inaudible]... Joe suggested that this should be an ICG product, driven by ICG, and then we have other members as well who suggested that ICANN should be doing this as an ICANN, let's say, initiative.

So what's your advice on that? I see Daniel, Russ, and [inaudible]. Daniel please.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Russ raised his hand earlier, but I'll be very short. This is Daniel. I think we should do our own messaging. We have a Secretariat now that can help us with that. We at the ICG should explain our process and our work. If ICANN decides to do whatever ICANN decides, that is to them, but I think it's important that we put out the message, what our process is, and what our future plans are for getting this work done.

It doesn't need to be very tutorial like, but we should definitely communicate actively about this.

MOHAMED EL BASHIER: Russ please.

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you Mohamed. I have expressed the view on the mailing list that I thought overall it was most appropriate for ICANN to do the messaging and communicating for the entire, full set, of activities, so that all of them can be included and addressed, because that's where NTIA has sent the notification originally, that's where the official response has to come from, ICANN back to NTIA.

But on the other hand, if in fact, the ICG, as a separate entity, wants to develop some type of communications, and graphics, and media, whatever, I would strongly support doing it by way of our Secretariat, rather than using the ICANN method, unless it is going to, you know, the ICANN is going to, overarch everything. So if it's just us, I support what Daniel said, Secretariat effort.

MOHAMED EL BASHIER: Leslie.

LESLIE: Thank you Mohamed. I fully support you and the other Chair's notion that more communication is good. And as Martin Boyle said on the list as well, we should really pay attention to the comments we get from folks that say that this isn't clear enough, or simple enough. That being said, when I have to say, I have reservations about the work being done anywhere other than from directly within IEG for ICG, this is a very nuanced area.

The messages are critically important. And we wouldn't want to find ourselves with, I guess, too much influence from ICANN or communications term, or any other entity with respect to these messages. And that in a sense, comes to the crux to my problem because I worry that our volunteer efforts here in the ICG will be outstripped by a well-funded communications effort, or a large communications team and resource.

So it's a bit of a catch-22, but I guess my main point is that a lot of these communications are very nuanced. The ICG process was put together by the community. In fact, significantly different than one that was proposed initially by ICANN, and I think that some of that understanding frankly is still rolling through in some corners of our community here. So just to try to sum it up, I think the communication efforts are valuable and would be helpful.

I mean, even Jari's conversation about the graphic would be extremely helpful at the table. I think it needs to be done from within the ICG, and

I don't know if that means we look for some team, you know, working group within our own effort to try and imagine what we might do and how, and identify the resources that we think are required to do that. In which case, I certainly would hope that there would be funding available if there were other communication resources needed. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you.

KAVOUSSS ARASTEH: Mohamed, do you hear me? I raised my hand. [CROSSTALK] ...wait until you give me the floor.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Now also in the queue, I have [Manal] and then Kavouss please. Manal please.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you Mohamed. Thanks to everyone who speak before me. Actually, I agree that ICG should be in charge of any message that comes out. I would just like to see clarification because my initial understanding was that ICG would be in charge of this [inaudible], or at least would be viewing the substance of the messages that would come out.

But ICANN [inaudible] their sources in terms of whoever [inaudible]... this thing. So, are we capable at ICG, or is ICG [inaudible] of doing this task ourselves? I'm just brainstorming because I'm not sure if we take this task as ICG, are we going to restarting the cycle, like trying to outsource this and finding the right people with the media or info graphic caliber, or whatever?

Or are we going to rely on the current [inaudible]? Because if we're in charge of the messages anyway, I don't see the harm in using ICANN resources. But again, I'm just trying to be clear about how things would work before taking the following position on this. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Thank you Manal. And just, I'm getting concerned that the messaging, the content, is driven by ICG. And that the implementation of is done by ICANN in terms of producing those info graphs, but it's, ICG is driving the work really. And as well, ICG should decide on how to use this graphs. I think we would definitely use it for our website, or other channels we can identify.

So the intention is to have ICANN provide that [inaudible] but ICG to drive that with the support of ICANN. Regarding the Secretariat conducting that and doing that, I'm not sure that was part of our initial [inaudible] Secretariat, that's why we had concerns about the Secretariat taking this function. Kavouss please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Mohamed, I think everyone should do his own work according to the accountability, the mandate. We would not get involved in any messages that ICANN wants to communicate the various work, this could do it, it's their responsibility. And if there is anything that we should use, we should do. If you go to our consensus building document, there is a paragraph relating to the communications from ICG to the public, and the Chair has been given the authority in consultation with the ICG members [inaudible] make communication that they wish.

So we have to ask in accordance with that document, and they should not get involved with what ICANN agree, and we should not allow that ICANN say something on behalf of ICG, which may not reflect what we are suggest. Everyone do its own job. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you Kavouss. Mary please.

MARY: Thank you. I just wonder, it's a [inaudible] question. Probably I did not get it right. The material info graph and future awareness, is it that ICANN is going to use it, produce it for us? So if it's going to be produced for us, for our own use. I don't think we need it for this and that. I mean, somebody can correct me if I'm wrong.

But can we actually detach ourselves completely from ICANN? I don't know this whole thing, everything we do? Can we say we actually say we're independent of ICANN? Why this, I don't know we are trying to

[inaudible] our own independence, and we have our own. So if there is any [inaudible] ICANN is given to the ICG, I think the communication, the info graph, if they agree. I don't think we should readjust it. That's my position. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you Mary. [Inaudible] give you your [inaudible] as well before we [inaudible]. Please.

Please go ahead Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Mohamed. This is Jean-Jacques speaking. I'd like to try to answer Mary's comment or inquiry. As a former member of the ICANN Board, I would say that, of course, there is historic reasons, we are supported and will be supported by ICANN. Although, [inaudible] now have an independent Secretariat.

I think Mary, we have to distinguish between, one is regarding material held, which is the case, and on the other hand, principles and processes. So I think that our expectation of the material held from ICANN is because it facilitates things, and its avoidance from the ICG from having to look for a set budget.

However, on the [inaudible] of principles, I think that it's clear from the initial steps of the ICG, but also from our own charter, that we are expected, by our communities, to act independently. So I think there is no contradiction between the two elements. On the one hand we have a realistic, we except the fact that we have accepted and we continue

accepting practical help. But on the other hand, when it is about expressing positions, and reflecting the opinions we get from our community, then I think we must make a point and be seen to be independent. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIER: Thank you very much Jean-Jacques. As we're already close to the time [inaudible]... that the Chair that [inaudible]... And see the [inaudible] of our Secretariat pursuing this work, that the messaging and the info graphs, and it will be [inaudible] on the preference wise by many, and see you back on the results.

I see Lynn [inaudible]. Okay. That's good. I think Manal as well is supporting that. So for the sake of time, if there is any other business you would like to raise?

Mary, you have the floor please.

MARY: Sorry, it's an old hand.

MOHAMED EL BASHIER: If there is no any other business or points, I would like to thank you all for attending this conference call. And the minutes will be circulated when it is finished by the Secretariat. Thank you very much. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]