ALISSA COOPER: Go ahead and get started. We have [inaudible]… So I'm now going to bring ICG call number 25 [inaudible]…. Nice holidays.

We'll start as usual by asking if we have anyone who is on the call [inaudible] audio who is not [connected?] in the Adobe Connect room?

Okay. Sounds like that's a no. [Inaudible]

So, you can see the agenda for the call on the screen. In December, myself and Patrik and Mohamed, had a discussion about whether we should schedule a call for January [inaudible]… waiting for the conclusion of [inaudible]… has been just the last published by the CCWG, have been wrapping up at the end of this month, the end of January.

And we had noticed that [inaudible]…

So we wanted to get the ICG back further and have a status update about the work of the CCWG and just have a bit of discussion in the event that anyone who thinks anything that's going on in the CCWG may have a spark current plan, waiting for the conclusion of their work.

So that's the discussion that we will have in item number one. We have [inaudible] who will preside, you know, in a not detailed substantive update in terms of the content of the CCWG proposal, but more of a [status?] updated about what is happening [inaudible] plans are going forward.

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.

EN

And then we also have some conversation between chairs and ICANN staff about meeting planning for Marrakesh. And so actually, have this discussion about the [inaudible]… discussion about [inaudible] at ICANN 55.

But that's what we had planned for this call. And so anyone who wants to [inaudible] agenda, or have any other agenda items, please raise your hand in the Adobe Connect. We'll use the Adobe Connect [inaudible] function [inaudible].

Okay. [Inaudible] I think we can get started with the update on the CCWG work. And I will turn it over to Keith and Kavouss to provide us with an update. Take it away, whichever who wants to start first.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you Alissa. This is Keith Drazek. And maybe I'll take the opportunity to give a brief overview, and then Kavouss can weigh in with any views that were corrections to what I said. And then we can take questions.

I'm getting a bit of an echo, and I'm not sure if you can hear me. So I'll just pause and confirm that you all can hear me okay.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, we can hear you. And if everyone else could mute their line, that would be appreciated, thank you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you Alissa. So yes, please everybody mute your lines, your computers, your phones if you're not speaking. Thank you. Okay. So just to give an update on the work of the CCWG accountability, just brief context, the CCWG version three proposal was out for public comment at the end of last year.

The public comment period closed on December 21st, over 90 comments were received, both from chartering organizations and also from general, public and individual commenters. The CCWG has been working hard over the last several weeks in the beginning of this year, to engage and to try to analyze [inaudible] and assimilate the public comments that were submitted.

This includes public comments, or comments that were submitted by the ICANN Board. So similar to the previous comment period, the ICANN Board took the opportunity appropriately to comment on the version three proposal, the CCWG has been engaging internally amongst the CCWG members, but also with ICANN Board members, to ensure a common understanding of the questions, and concerns, and any possible obstacles that remain.

As Alissa noted at the top of the call, the original timeline that came out of the Dublin meeting, had a target date of January 22nd for a finalization, approval, and delivery of the CCWG proposal to the Board and to NTIA. Based on the public comments that were received during the period that closed on December 21st, it is clear now that that date is not reachable.

EN

There is very likely, at this point, going to be either a supplementary report that shows how the various comments were addressed, or possibly a version four. It's unclear, at this point, how the CCWG will move forward and what the timeline will need to be. And much of that will be determined or dictated by the responses from the chartering organizations themselves.

So I know that the GNSO is meeting tomorrow, the GNSO Council meeting has a meeting tomorrow to finalize its feedback to the CCWG. And that feedback will simply be a consolidation of the various comments that were submitted by the various stakeholder groups and constituencies of the GNSO.

But the goal is to identify that the GNSO as a chartering organization, either has preliminary support for the 12 recommendations, or that there are ongoing or persistent concerns. So that [work is?] ongoing, I know that the other chartering organizations have either submitted or are about to submit their comments, and I think once that is received this week by the CCWG, the timeline for the next phase will be more clear.

So, let me pause there. Ask if there are any questions, or if Kavouss would like to add anything to the overview that I've provided. Thank you.

Kavouss, would you like to add anything? If you're speaking, we can't hear you.

Okay. Kavouss may be having technical problems, so maybe we come back to him. Can I answer any questions? Joseph, go right ahead.

Joe, if you're speaking, we can't hear you.

Let me pause and ask to make sure I'm connected.

ALISSA COOPER: This is Alissa, I can hear you Keith. But I've not heard from Joe or Kavouss.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. It looks like Kavouss is asking for a call out, so Brenda if you could… Yes, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, do you hear me?

KEITH DRAZEK: Yes we can hear you now Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Okay. Thank you very much Keith. It's a very perfect summary in your perfect English, American English. I may not be able to talk like you, however I would like to add, not to correct, to add what you said, that it is now in a very difficult phase because of the major changes that we have made under the proposal three, from the sole membership to the sole designator.

ICANN made a 27 page of comments. And we should treat ICANN comments like any other comments. I was of different views. I was of

the view that we should give some preference, not preference, some priority to the ICANN comments, because at the end, it is the ICANN who will put his views on the recommendation.

I insisted to have a very structured agenda. Even I work during my hospitalization. The CCWG organized, as you mentioned Keith, two calls, every call two hours. We have 12 recommendations. It was indicated that at each meeting, at least two recommendations will be considered for the first evening.

And after one week, the same two recommendations we will review for the second [inaudible]. In the meantime, other recommendations will be taken one by one, but as I mentioned, the concentration was made on the ICANN Board's comments, which in my view, many of them are relevant and they have to really, they had to really consider them.

There are major issues on the table. One of the major issues is the global public interest, for which there is no clear definition. And ICANN Board, in his comment mentioned that if condition A or B or C as mentioned in their report, they will say that the global public interest is not met.

The CCWG was not happy with that approach, saying that something which has not been defined could not be made, recourse has not me. At least ICANN should be more specific, and referring to what was really not met. There is only one reference to global public interest, and that one single reference is in the article three of article of incorporation.

There are five subtitles, or sub-articles, dealing which are the global public interest. Apart from that, there is no definition. So that was the

EN

first one. The second point was, mission of ICANN. The Board was of the opinion that the mission should be concise, contrived, and high level. Any other teams currently in the mission, should be transferred to the scope of activities, and that was under discussions.

The third issue was human rights. Still that is an issue which is under discussions. Another issue was the consumer interest, or consumer trust. For that, there was disagreement first on the definition, and second whether that should be included in article one of the bylaw, or it should be elsewhere.

Two views were expressed. View one, this is not a generalized point, and we should not generalize that, because mainly, it refers to the gTLD activities and so on and so forth. The other issue was the issue of inspection, how the inspection should be done, whether inspection should be done for everything, and what is the waiting of the SO and AC in order to proceed to the escalation of the inspection.

Then based on some remark, it was decided that we will divide inspection into two parts. Escalation like accounting papers, or the [inaudible] of the papers [inaudible]. They will put it with the lower requirement of the SO and AC for the escalation. The remaining will put them in the higher.

The other issue which is very important and still under discussion, is the IRC, whether IRC, sorry how the IRP should be followed. Whether IRP should be for the policy, or should be the operational, ICANN with the review that should only be for the policy but not for the operation.

EN

For instance, the IDP is an issue which is operational and should not go under the IRP. The other issue was that whether the PTI should be subject IRP or not. The argument was made that IRP is the cases where the ICANN is considered violating the bylaws, there is the PTI issue not violation of the bylaws. PTI is under the, not control, under the supervision of the ICANN, and we could not produce in the article one, and we should not take it in that aspect.

We should definitely discuss all of these issues under discussions. However, the calls that CCWG has held, at least for the time being, two recommendations, recommendation four and recommendation 12 has been almost finished. I'm sorry I forgot to talk about the budget, and that was also discussed.

And more or less, there is some agreement at any meeting, we will request the ICANN representative to mention whether they are happy with the changes. We think that the CCWG now is more negotiations and more in the reconciliation manner, rather than the confrontation, which I truly support, and I recommend that we should take that approach.

Other recommendations are under discussion. As [inaudible] mentioned, the most important issue for ICG is that things we don't know, whether we should have a supplement for the term report, or whether we should have a full report. And if a supplement or [inaudible] report, whether they should have any public comment or not, that is not an issue that they are already concerned, the ICG, that all of these issues should not have major impact on the transition, which is more important for us.

The issue of IRP and implication or application of the PTI, is also important for the ICG because of the naming issues, and the issue of the budget also is very important because the IANA budget is under the discussions, and for ICG it is important to not have any unintended or unprecedented or [inaudible] consequences.

So these are the issues. Apart from this two meetings per day, there are other groups of the CCWG, there is a group dealing with the, they call them, sorry, the accountability oversighting. They will go into the discussions of very important issues that require further discussions. There is another group, which is working group dealing also with difficult subject with the missions, under Becky Burr.

And we might have other group being established as yet. I personally think that we may certainly have supplement, if not a full report. Because there are changes that we have made. Fortunately, many of the ICANN Board views haven't been met, and we ask the ICANN to come back.

Today we have received comments from one of the ICANN Board, Bruce, that was positive comment. So these are the things that are going on. The issue is quite complex. There are a lot of lawyers discussing the issue. Some of the ICG members are active. Milton is very active during the last one and a half months.

He participating at all meetings. Some other ICG meeting, ICG people are also very active. So that is the situation. With respect to the public comment, unfortunately [inaudible] may not be able to have the comment in many issues, in particular about recommendation 11, which

EN

is talking about the [inaudible] 18. But on other issues we might have, one issue that is under discussion at GAC is that whether or not GAC participate in the decision making process, there are two views.

One view is that it does not participate, the other view is that it participates. The third view is that GAC mentions that it participates according to case by case, that may be some way forward that we, not we, the GAC announced that issue. This is a situation that is currently under the discussions. And GNSO, yes, you're ready for the comment, other has commented, some of them more substantially. Some of them [inaudible]…

I don't want to take all the time of the ICG. I will stop at this moment, whether there is any question, I will be happy to respond to the question. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you very much Kavouss and Keith both for those updates. And I seem to have a queue forming. So if people have questions or comments, please put yourself in the queue. And we will try [inaudible]. Russ Mundy, go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you Alissa, and thank you Keith and Kavouss for the excellent summary and the huge amount of work that you all have done. I do happen to be on those, both the CWG and CCWG mailing lists, and have tried, but failed miserably, to keep up with what is going on there. But I

think from an ICG perspective, one of the most important aspects of what they're trying to get closure reached on are the seven key points.

Though you've given a very good description of the activities that are underway, and they're all important, one of the things that I did not hear was whether or not, either or both of you, had a comment about, if the CWG has given even an informal indication that in fact, the third proposal from the CCWG meets those seven key requirements.

So if you could comment on that, I would really appreciate it.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Certainly. Could you repeat the CCWG [inaudible] need what? I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.

RUSS MUNDY: Certainly Kavouss. The seven key requirements from the CWG proposal, that were passed into the CCWG. If the CWG has given even an informal indication that they feel that those requirements have been met in this third proposal from the CCWG.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, based on the CCWG, they are met, but based on ICANN Board comments, and some of the public comment, not. For instance, I give you one example. ICANN Board mentioned that, with respect to the IANA budget, the only entity should have the decision making power should be operational community. The IETF number and so on and so forth, but not others.

EN

CCWG does not agree with that. They agree that, for instance, IETF should be included in the consultation and other decision making, nevertheless, CCWG has not agreed that other entities would be excluded on the CCWG. Because in all of the recommendations, in all process, the entire community, if they decide to participate in the process, they must be involved.

So you don't want that [inaudible] exclude entity, one and two, and just [inaudible] for the naming, for the numbers, for the [inaudible] and so on and so forth. That is one issue. With respect to the budget, ICANN mentioned the situation that we should be quite careful talking about [inaudible] and budget and so on and so forth.

So the issue is still under discussion. But I can at least assure you that I am [inaudible] or taking all possible actions in order that all of these requirements of CWG, which is directly relates to the ICG, will be met. And we give, or we try to push that these should be given priorities. However, as I mentioned, with respect to the IRP, there are some questions and so on and so forth.

And with some other area, even the questions is not [inaudible]. The naming community has asked that the delegation or re-delegations, or revocation should be excluded from IRP. But it was agreed, and they said that the mechanism for the IRP will be developed by the GNSO and ccNSO.

Then the numbering and the IETF have asked the same issue. It was agreed, but neither the numbering nor the IETF, have mentioned that where this IRP mechanism developed. It was mentioned lastly that

EN

these mechanisms existed already. Therefore, it should be mentioned in the supplement that even though we don't have any [inaudible] in the CCWG, nevertheless, IETF and real, they have already their own mechanism in place, and we don't need to be worried about.

Having said that, there is still, we could not handle it [inaudible] and ensure, or assure you the ICG member, that all of the conditions will be, let us put it that way, truly met. But we do our best. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks Kavouss. Just reminding everyone to be mindful of the time. We have just an hour scheduled for this, so keep that in mind. So there is Keith and then Milton.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you Alissa. And this is Keith Drazek. I just wanted to let you know that I forwarded the CWG comment to the ICG list just now. So for those who want to review it, it has been forwarded. And I don't think I have anything else at this point. But I did want to note, just briefly, that I responded to Joe's comment or question earlier in the chat.

But I think that just to circle back to what Kavouss said, that I don't see any real problems or deal killers coming from the public comments that have been submitted, you know, to any shorts to the CWG naming proposal. There is still work ongoing obviously in the CCWG, CWG transition group has identified that there are still a couple of issues that we've just discussed, and those are being worked.

EN

So there is again, as I've said many times before, there is a clear recognition that the key dependencies must be met. And so that is definitely work ongoing. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Keith. And Milton, go ahead.

MILTON MULLER: Yes. Just a quick point to, although Keith [inaudible] the full report to prevent you from having to necessarily, every bit of it I might point out that one of the things the CWG said a dependency, that was not addressed in the proposal. Was the ability of the independent review process to be available for claims relating to actions or inactions of PTI.

That was the main dependency that they said was not addressed. I'm quickly scanning here to see where there is another, there is some minor things that…

I think the budget issue is also one where there is some uncertainty about whether the dependency has been addressed.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks Milton. Maybe, while you're there, I could just ask you [inaudible]… processes, are you in agreement with Keith that you feel that the issues raised by the CWG should be straightforward to resolve in the CCWG proposal?

EN

MILTON MULLER: Yes. I don't think, they don't look like the things that people are getting stuck on, or excited about.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thank you. Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Once on the question finished, I have to have two more small brief, but I wait for the distinguished colleagues to make questions, then I come after that. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, thank you. Does anyone else have other questions?

                     Okay, Kavouss, why don't you offer up your final points and then we'll…?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: The point I wanted to add was about the work stream two. There was a concern about the ICANN, that they don't want any specific timing for the work stream two. And also they don't want to go to the details of the activities for work stream two. That it may be have some involvement with the budget, and they say that if there are such activities that requires additional budget, the subject of the community comment with respect to that.

EN

However, ICANN would agree that they should be a reference to the commitment of the ICANN Board in relation with the work stream two in the transitional bylaw. That was accepted by the Board to do that.

Another issue that I wanted to mention is the issue of the removal of the Board. There was some discussions, and I think that all of the concerns of the Board, now it is removed with respect to the reasons that were given to the removal of the individual Board, and also providing possibility that the ICANN Board chairman and the vice-chairman, if necessary, they also attending the meeting.

Another issue which is important, the [inaudible] was that suppose that the number of SO and AC participating in decision making would be less than what we can see now, currently [inaudible], that it is very probably, and unlikely that GAC would not participate. Therefore, we could GAC to RSSAC and SSAC, so with domain only [inaudible]. If one of those also that would participate, is the main only three.

So that is the, I would say, risk of capture. Capture by the whole community by three. I hope that we could find a solution for that. Another issue was raised that if the number of SO and AC will be increased, what will happen, there is now a [inaudible] to have some criteria to have numbers, instead of seven or five participating, become six, seven, and eight and have something else.

Another issue that ICANN Board wanted to increase the waiting for some of the major issues like a fundamental bylaw from three or four AC to [inaudible], and they wanted to do it on AC present, and there is some discussion to have a [inaudible] for that one. So these are the

issues that now under the discussions and, I hope that we can find someone. But I think that maybe, the two discussions on issues and recommendations will be extended to three, because we can still have comment on the second reading.

It may go to the third reading. That is the [inaudible] that the time will be increased. So that is the situation. The CCWG make every effort that any increase in the timing, which is not clear at this stage, should not have impact on the transition, which is the most interest of the operational communities which are waiting for, I would say, about a year.

So these are things that no one knows about the situation. So perhaps, at the end, there might be the time of the US government to review the change, may it [deduce?] if we cannot change the deadline for the transition. So these are the things that are not clear, and some of them have not been discussed, that will be discussed. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Kavouss. So I think we all now have a good overview in terms of our understanding of the variety of issues that have been raised in the public comment period for the CCWG, and that uncertainty about the timeline. As Kavouss was saying, the target of getting the CCWG work done this month, was previously set on the basis of estimates that the US government review process would take about four to five months, and that the implementation process thereafter would take about four months, and the contract expiring in September of this year.

EN

ICG call #25 – 13 January 2016

So if you back all of that up, you know, that takes you to NTIA [inaudible] needing to have a contract essentially in February of this year. So in light of the developments of the CCWG and the uncertainty about the future timeline, I just wanted to check back with the ICG that folks are comfortable with our current trajectory, which is just to keep waiting, essentially indefinitely until the CCWG finishes.

So that was kind of the purpose of getting the update and bringing us back together. Would appreciate people's thoughts about that question. I see Jean-Jacques in the queue. Go ahead Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thanks Alissa. This is Jean-Jacques. Yes [inaudible]… Is it really impossible, is it unthinkable, that the ICG would send to the NTIA its report as is, meaning [inaudible] or some just [inaudible] saying that whereas we have undertaken, of course, to reach for the contribution of the CCWG accountability for obvious reasons, that they were completed, etc.

Would we consider, as the ICG, that the change in title, or the change in [inaudible] timeline, may not be favorable to the transition itself? And therefore [inaudible] our duty to draw attention of [inaudible] to the fact on that is way [inaudible] as is. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Jean-Jacques. I think we know that is an alternative that we could discuss, if people thought they wanted to change course. So

Page 18 of 33

EN

that's certainly one of the options that we could talk about. Daniel, go ahead.

Daniel, if you are speaking, we can't hear you.

So Daniel [inaudible] we can work on the audio issues because we still can't hear you. And next, I have Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I think I'm very happy that Jari raised the question which I raised before. I think should request you however to put in discussions for few minutes, the necessity otherwise to send you a message to CCWG, that the target date, or whatever you call them, should remain intact, should remain unchanged, therefore there should be a tradeoff between various timelines and so on and so forth.

In order that even if there is a supplement or whatever, in order to meet that requirement of the target date. So I request if you kindly agree, you have a little discussion now for a few minutes, to see, to write a message to the CCWG quite clear that any changes in the process should be [inaudible] various deadlines between now and September 2016.

This is one thing. The other thing that I want to also suggest, not to ask the floor again, is that I suggest that at least we need more meetings between now and Marrakesh, in particular after the round of the CCWG in order to consider where we are and how we should act after that. Thank you.

EN

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Kavouss.   To the suggestions there that I hope, as other people join the queue, they will comment on.   Let's just see if we can get Daniel back.   Daniel, let's try your audio again.

We still cannot hear Daniel, unfortunately.   Okay, let's move on to Joe. Go ahead Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Can you hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, we can hear you.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Okay.   For me, the question is, just remembering what our remit was when we started, is to arrange the proposal, and the proposals were supposed to be final.   So I think, while, you know, suggesting to the people who are having the current issues and coming to some kind of collaboration that they should accelerate their process to try to meet the deadline, I don't have any problem with that.

But the concept is, I think, if there isn't an issue in the communities who have created the proposal, I think we have to wait for them to tell us it's final, because if by some chance, what ends up happening is to not meet the requirements…   I mean, for me, the big issue for us is, if we have to reopen the proposal and have some kind of a consultation.

Absent that, I think our role is to wait until we can submit it. I'm not sure what submitting a placeholder does, especially [inaudible]…

So for me, that matter submitting, you know, Jean-Jacque's proposal, while I understand where it's coming from, I don't understand [inaudible] NTIA thinks that the interim consideration would be useful.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks Joe. I obviously agree with what our remit is, so I think another way to think about this is that all of the people in all of the communities that we represent, put in a tremendous amount of effort into the transition proposal itself. And if we see a danger that, you know, the feasibility of implementing that proposal and getting accepted by the US government is in jeopardy, then I think it's, you know, certainly in our scope to represent all of the people who put in all of that work, that they are, you know, that will all go to waste if the CWG doesn't act with some haste and focus on the features that are actually required for the transition and so forth.

So I think that was more the idea of, or that was [inaudible] why we have a dog in the fight, and why we might send a note. I have Jean-Jacques next. And I'm going to close the queue, so I have Jean-Jacques, and then Daniel if we can get him, and then Kavouss. Go ahead Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes. Thanks Alissa. This is Jean-Jacques. I would like to [inaudible] with Joe's comment and yours. I think that I agree fully with Alissa, when

you say that our duty, as it were, was not only to wait and then to be perfectly in line with our mandate, I think [inaudible] contribution [inaudible]. I think there is [inaudible] to this, which is that we were asked to do this work in order to prepare actually for transition of [inaudible]…

So, in political terms, that's more important actually. So what I would suggest now and also look at what Jari has written on this chat, this is what I would suggest. That we prepare a letter, a message, to the ICANN Board and to the CCWG accountability co-chairs, saying that we already need to have their contribution put into our final text before the Marrakesh meeting.

I'm sure we could find a wording which would explain why we think [inaudible] it is important to respect the time. I think Alissa, that the working backwards on the deadlines that you suggested is driven to [inaudible] in the ICG, but maybe [inaudible] other people in the community [inaudible]. So maybe we should use this message to state very clearly that we do have concerns about being able to meet the deadline, which is in fact, the termination of the contract.

So, in doing so, we could send a note with a letter or with the message, our draft proposal as it is today saying, well we do realize there is [inaudible] which is [inaudible], but we would think that process as soon as it comes to us. So I think it's a way of putting some kind of frenzy pressure on the Board and the CCWG accountability.

It's also taking a public position on why we consider it is so important to respect as much as possible, the deadline. Thanks.

EN

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Jean-Jacques. Kavouss is next.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I could, I tend to agree with both Jari and Milton. I agree with Jari that we should reiterate objective dates, or target dates, but Jari made another important point that, [inaudible] for a compromise. That is the key element. People should not [inaudible] on their own proposal and try to find a solution, which I meant from the very beginning that there are always solutions for every problem.

But if you stick to a particular point and will not move forward, we cannot fix that. So we should take that aspects that Jari mentioned, and also Milton mentioned that. It is not very usable to have a transition without the accountability, because that was not be implementable. That are two issues.

But the last point I want to make, is the following. That if the amount of changes on the nature of clarification, or reconciliation, or inclusion of the [inaudible], that if they make changes, major changes, perhaps the people say that we should go ahead again with the public comments.

So we should take that into account. What I am suggesting that perhaps in our letter, we should mention, we should make every effort not to inject new ideas, because people in the CCWG, they are hundreds of people and all of them every day, they have new ideas and they wish to go to our profession.

EN

There is no profession everywhere in the world. We should access some threshold. We should access something that beyond that we could not see a redline, that above them we could agree. So we should mention this situation.

But I want to emphasize that we should mention that if there is any changes in the timeline, should we trade up with old entities and so on and so forth, including I would mention in next CCWG, including NTIA, instead of the [inaudible] that we want, we should produce the time.

So that is the situation. The more perfect proposal going to NTIA is not perfect, so we should not sacrifice to send something incomplete NTIA. It is better that we not wait, we put more time to that. And also, I mention CWG. It is useless that we, CCWG, put something to the ICANN Board that ICANN disagree with.

The NTIA will be faced with two proposals [inaudible]. We should try to avoid everything, and try to [inaudible] as much as possible. These are the things that I would like that we put in the letter, that I want to mention [inaudible]. That we could write a letter, the deadline would be Tuesday 18th of, 19th of January. Otherwise, CCWG will go toward the end, and then it would be useless to send any letter at the end of the one month procedure.

This is my comment. Thank you.

EN

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you Kavouss. Milton, I had closed the queue, but I will let it slide. But first, Daniel had asked that he go first since he was having audio issues. So this is from Daniel [CROSSTALK]

Oh, we can hear you now. Okay. Daniel go ahead, and then we'll have Milton and the queue is closed, and we need to wrap up on this. And talk about ICANN 55. Go ahead Daniel.

DANIEL KARRENBERG:

Okay, this is Daniel. Thank you Alissa. [Inaudible] solved my audio problem. I have two things I would like to remark. Number one is, I think that the only thing that prevents us from submitting our work product to NTIA via the ICANN Board, is our obligation to CWG to arrange for their sign off.

So one way forward, taking Jean-Jacques idea, which I like very much, would probably be just to ask CWG whether, in the light of the delays or changes in timeline, to put it [inaudible], they will be okay with us submitting anyway, because we're moving between the two, as you rightly know.

The advantage of that would be, A we're done. And B, the evaluation of the operational parts with our proposal could already start, and I would very much like that. So that's my first proposal. So I completely propose that we decide to ask our chairs, to ask our CWG chairs whether they would be happy if they just went ahead and submitted.

The second remark I have is regarding the discussion about sending a letter to CCWG accountability, let's say, hurry up, hurry up. I think we

should not do that. I think it's not our agreement, but it's something that is clearly outside our mandate, and it's also something that [inaudible], because I don't think that it will change everything.

So I'm against taking any action in this, in this regard. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Daniel. Just one question for clarification, quickly. NTIA has requested that the proposal be delivered by ICANN, which is why in our process we are slated to send the proposal to ICANN, to the Board, and then ICANN's Board will send it to NTIA. Are you suggesting that we circumvent the ICANN Board and send the proposal directly NTIA?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Not at all.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, so the question is that the CWG would be, do you want us to send the proposal to the ICANN Board? I'm just raising that because I can envision a scenario in which we send it to the ICANN Board, and the ICANN Board says great, thank you. We're going to wait for the CCWG process to conclude.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: That's fine. At least the ICANN Board [inaudible], at least the ICANN Board can stop their [inaudible], if they have. Anyway, I wasn't suggesting that, if I did then I misspoke because I'm tired.

EN

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, no that's fine. I just wanted to clarify. Okay, Milton and then we'll wrap it. Go ahead Milton.

MILTON MULLER: Okay. Thank you. So, within the CCWG time crusher has been an extremely sensitive issue. There are many people complaining that things are not being done right. And corners are being cut in order to conform the timeline that is perceived as somewhat arbitrary. And I see intervention, ICG intervention that effects as hurry up and meet a deadline, is going to be seen as taking a side in this controversy between the CCWG.

It would not be welcomed by many people in the CCWG, and it would certainly undermine the objectivity and perceived neutrality of the ICG. To address Dan's point, I'm glad to hear that he doesn't think that we should say hurry up, however I think the idea that we can decide when we're done, irrespective of the CCWG, may be interpreted as contributing to that perception.

The process is not done until the CCWG is done. And as Alissa just brought out in her question, if we send a proposal to the ICANN Board, then before the CCWG is done, then we are in effect, sort of giving the Board a lot of discretion and authority over when they decide to submit the proposal, which could be perceived as circumventing the accountability process.

EN

So I think that's a very dangerous. And I don't see what we accomplish by saying we're done, and we're not doing anything anyway. So why does it matter whether we submit this proposal where it's actually done a bit early?

I just don't see what the, I guess if you hate having these conference calls so much, that you could know that they're over, that might be one thing, but I really don't see what is the gain of us submitting it according to our own timeline, rather than the CCWG's. Okay, that's it.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, thank you Milton. I think it's obvious to me anyway, that on both of these points, first the question of whether we should send a note to anyone encouraging them to do anything, we don't have some sort of obvious consensus about that. And also on the question of whether we should inquire with the CWG of whether they wish to forward the proposal to the ICANN Board.

We seem to have a few different opinions about that as well. And we are four minutes from the close of this conference call. So my suggestion would be that we move this conversation to the mailing list, on both points. If you feel very strongly that we should a note to the CCWG, or the Board, or NTIA, or anyone else, please make your proposal on the list.

And others can respond to it. Or if you feel strongly that we shouldn't do that, send the mail to the list. And same for the other topic of forwarding the proposal on the consent of the CWG, and we will continue the discussion on the mailing list. Let's see how it goes in the

EN

next few days, and if it's a very active discussion, we can have another call specifically to, but we'll do something, we'll have to [inaudible] on the mailing list.

Our other topic here was about meeting in ICANN 55. So I think as people know, the ICANN staff prepares the meeting agenda for each ICANN meeting months in advance. And the chairs [inaudible] session with the staff about whether the ICG would need to meet.

Now everyone knows also that we had planned to not have any regular meetings, have them on an ad-hoc basis if necessary. My thinking was that given that there is no way that we will know if we, you know, otherwise would have had a conference call that week, or if there is some topic that comes up that we would need to discuss, we just can't know what the agenda is for the ICG right now, if we had to schedule something in March.

But the meeting organizers need to know. So my suggestion is that we tell them to book us a slot. I had said two hours, hopefully that would be sufficient. That is one hour was not [inaudible] for our discussion today. Book us a two hour slot during the ICANN meeting week. Folks who would normally travel to an ICANN meeting, could gather in person, but folks who had no other reason to be at the ICANN meeting could join by phone, just the way that we all have joined today.

So it would essentially be a conference call that is scheduled during the ICANN meeting week. And we can take advantage of the fact that some people would be there face to face, but it's not a reason to travel

EN

necessarily. So that is kind of my compromise suggestion in terms of our need to respond to the ICANN staff about the timing.

And I'm certainly open to other suggestions, but my thinking was that, again, given the time that is ticking, and the fact that every day or week may make a difference at that point, if it happens to be the case that that's a week when we would finalize the parts of our proposal that refer to the dependency and agree to send it to NTIA, for example, that we might as well have a slot on the agenda to do that, if we need it.

So let's try to not run over more than five minutes here. We are almost at the top of the hour. I see people in the queue, please keep your comments short. Go ahead Kavouss.

Kavouss, I am not hearing audio from you. I'm not sure what happened. Let's move to Daniel and try to fix Kavouss's audio. Go ahead Daniel.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Okay. This is Daniel. Can you hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, we can hear you.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Okay. I am not favor for scheduling a meeting for the ICG as part of the ICANN agenda. I think we have decided that we will be dormant until the CCWG has done their thing and CWG tells us it's all fine. And I think

EN

it would be, it would send the wrong signal to meet formally, even in the way that you suggested Alissa, as just a phone call.

I also think it's unfair, it would be unfair who cannot, or have no intention to travel to Marrakesh. There is always a different quality as to a general phone call where everybody is on the phone, and a call where like, you know, a significant number of people are actually in the room.

So I would say, would not be in favor of requesting a slot. We can always have a phone call, probably not during the Marrakesh week, but I wouldn't think for the two reasons I outlined. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, thanks Daniel. Do we have Kavouss back?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I suggest that those who are going to ICANN 55, a part from the ICG member, they could get together during the ICANN meeting, [inaudible] for the entire ICG, and communicate that for the ICG with a conference call [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, thank you Kavouss. Jean-Jacques, go ahead.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Alissa. This is Jean-Jacques. I agree with what has been said by Daniel. I just want to add one element, because I am part of the

EN

[inaudible] small group of people whose day track is not look [inaudible] ICANN [inaudible]. I'm retired. So I depend entirely on the willingness of ICANN, and travel, constituency travel, to pay for my travel and accommodation.

So I just want to leave a note here that it would be rather nice if we could know in the coming two weeks or something, if the likelihood of meeting of the ICG in Marrakesh is coming our way or not, because we need to make arrangements.

And for those of us, like myself, have to request specifically support for travel and accommodation, it takes a lot of time. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Jean-Jacques. Indeed, if we were to schedule an official ICG meeting in Marrakesh, there would be ICANN travel support available, but that's kind of a decision that we need to make. I think, it sounds like maybe the appropriate compromise position here is that we not schedule a slot on the ICANN meeting agenda, but if it turns out that it would make sense to have an informal gathering of us, of those who happen to be in Marrakesh, then we can work that out and we don't have to have such a long meet time for that.

And if we need to have a meeting of the full ICG around the time of the Marrakesh meeting, we can schedule a conference call either before or after the meeting. That seems to me what [inaudible] I don't think anyone would object strongly to that plan.

If you object strongly to any part of that plan, speak now.

Okay. Seeing no strong objections, then I see it's a good suggestion that we book teleconferences for the week before and after, that seems like a good plan. So, the chairs will take that back and figure out a future call schedule, under the assumption that we will need at least one more call at some point to close once the CCWG is finished, if not before that.

All right, thanks everyone. Thank you all for staying late. And we will continue the discussion of our earlier items on the mailing list. And the chairs will get back to everyone about the call scheduling to the extent we think we need calls. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]