
ALISSA COOPER:

So I think we can start. We have what I think what may turn out to be a fairly full agenda today.

The first item on the agenda, you can see in the Adobe Connect room, is the secretariat update. I think as everyone has seen, and its public information now, we have completed the process of contracting with a new secretariat contractor, the ISOC Singapore chapter, and very pleased to have that process completed. Although, it took a little bit longer than we thought it was going to, we are I think well on our way to transitioning over to the new secretariat.

I wanted to give my personal thanks to everyone who was involved in the process both within the ICG, Adiel for his leadership of the subgroup, Jean-Jacques, Russ, and Mohamed for your work, Patrik for your support as co-chair, and everyone from ICANN who was involved – a really big thanks to all of you, and we'll let Adiel speak in just a moment about that.

But first, I just wanted people to know that we do have a couple members of the new secretariat team on the call with us today, Jennifer Chung and Yanis Lee. Jennifer or Yanis, was just wondering if you could say hello, introduce yourselves, let us know that you're here.

JENNIFER CHUNG:

Sure. Thank you very much, Alissa. Hello to the ICG members and to all. Thank you to everybody who has been a part of this process.

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.

My name is Jennifer Chung, and I am part of the ISOC Singapore chapter secretariat team that will now be supporting the [ICG]. I am actually based in New Jersey, United States. My colleague, Yanis Lee, can speak very quickly to where she's based.

YANIS LEE: Hi everyone. Thanks, Jennifer. I will actually based in Singapore and also traveling between Singapore and Hong Kong, and happy to serve the ICG.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [foreign language]

ALISSA COOPER: It sounds like we have one of the interpreters on the main line maybe. Not sure about that.

Thank you, Jennifer and Yanis. We will be in a lot more touch with you going forward. Adiel, did you want to say a few words about the secretariat selection?

Do we have Adiel on the call? Oh, maybe we don't have Adiel on the call yet. We can come back to Adiel when he actually joins the call. I thought he was there. For some reason, I missed that his name wasn't there yet, but was just hoping that he could speak to the process a little bit.

The only other note that I had on the secretariat selection is that obviously, there's a bunch of details to be worked out in terms of who's

responsible for what. We still will be relying on ICANN for a number of different services including the travel support, interpretation, translation, and those kinds of things.

We in the leadership team will be conveying a lot more of that information to the full ICG and everyone else as we go forward in terms of who your contact people are for different things and what you should expect. But we didn't quite have that put together for today because the contracting just concluded.

I see that we have three hands up in the queue. Jean-Jacques, go ahead.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Alissa. Happy New Year to all.

Three points. First, congratulations on the unit which was selected to serve as the secretariat, and welcome to their representatives here this evening.

Second point is I do have a remark. Of course, I will mention no names about organizations or people, but the delay from what I understood was due mainly to something which had not been properly organized within ICANN. That means the replacement of someone who for perfectly understandable private reasons had to be absent for quite a long time. Now during that time, the procedure of going forward and contacting the selected entity was not taken care of.

I say this because I would not like any of us to remain with the impression that it is the subcommittee headed by Adiel and of which I was a member, which had not done what was necessary. I think we

have a lesson to learn from this, which is that and I would say that very willingly to anyone [inaudible] ICANN, but in such cases, there must be a replacement or proxy provided in case of a difficulty.

My third point is that I expect the secretariat to be fully operational as of today. It's a pity that we weren't able to [inaudible], but now is the time when we will start looking at the contributions for a transition plan, and of course, their contribution in helping us will be very important. Yes.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Jean-Jacques.

I do see that Adiel appears to be on the call, and I think we should give him the floor if he had anything he wanted to say. Adiel, we were just introducing the new secretariat, and I wasn't sure if you had a few words that you wanted to say about that.

If you have audio, which you may not if there's a cyclone. Oh dear. Adiel, let us know if you're able to connect to the audio and if you want to contribute to the secretariat discussion we can certainly put you in the queue.

But I see Patrik is next.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:

Yes. I would like to emphasize what you said, Alissa, about a lot of the practical things that are going to happen.

Even though you addressed that in e-mail, I would like to explicitly mention that one of the things that will change and have to change has to do with the domain name that we are using, which includes the domain name that we're using for the mailing list. So you will see a change in the e-mail address that we use for our communication, and that's the most important message that one day, we will swap from the old to the new list, and basically the last message will guest on the list we used today is the information about the new one. So if you don't start to read the other mailing list and update your filters, you might miss communications.

That was the only thing I wanted to say, and the rest you will see in e-mail. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Patrik. Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Happy New Year, Alissa, to you and to everybody.

I have asked one simple item to be included in the agenda, and that was the brief report of the ICG liaison in CCWG and CWG – very, very brief. But this is important that they report at least if there are something to be discussed of ICG. But not making a report, but important issue requires decisions or action at this meeting of ICG. So I would request to whether you have done that or not. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Yes, Kavouss. Let us take that as an item as part of the community process updates. I will just say a few things about community process updates, but that will be the main item I think. Thank you.

It looks like Adiel has microphone now. Adiel, did you want to say anything before we round out the secretariat conversation?

Okay. Sounds like we're still having audio trouble. Hopefully, we can return to Adiel at a later point in the call if we get your audio.

So with that, I think we can move on to minutes approval for the minutes of the December 10th call. You can see the minutes in Adobe Connect. Samantha shared them on the list, I think, not too long ago, maybe yesterday or recently in your time zone. But I was hoping that we could try to approve these minutes today if possible.

If people feel like they need more time, please speak up. But otherwise, I'd like to hear if there are objections to approving the December 10 minutes today.

Jean-Jacques.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Hello. Can you hear me?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you, Alissa. I would request just a few extra minutes so that I can go through Samantha's report once again. Thank you.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Hello?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes. We can hear you, Adiel. Can you hear us?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yes. I can hear you.

ALISSA COOPER: Just one second.

Jean-Jacques, just so I understand, let's say, could we set the deadline of tomorrow, 24 hours from now to approve the minutes? Is that okay?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: That'll be fine. But actually I was just asking for five or ten extra minutes right now.

ALISSA COOPER: Oh, okay. So maybe we'll just come back to it at the end of the call.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Sure. Adiel, please take the floor.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Thank you. Thank you, Alissa. I'm not going to say anything much because [I'm really] follow the first part of the conference because of the connectivity problem. But I guess you have already presented the final report on the secretariat.

I just want to add to your voice and thank all the member of the panel and everybody for their support throughout the process. The detail of the logistic are on the way.

Haven't followed the beginning, I cannot say anything more than that now. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, thank you. Thanks for all your work on that item.

I think we can move on to proposal assembly and finalization process. Alice, perhaps the best thing to look at would be the assessment sheet. Well, let's look at the process first, and maybe afterward, we can look at the assessment sheet.

So we have this assembly and finalization process that we agreed some weeks ago, and we've been having a conversation on the mailing list, which was triggered by the fact that we received our first community submission, the protocol parameters submission, and we've been having some discussion about how we should go about conducting reviews of that submission and the other ones that we expect to receive in the future. So I think where we are with this conversation right now is

that it seems to be the case that most people want to have multiple reviewers for each of these submissions.

There is a lot of background noise from someone's line. I'm not sure who that is.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Alissa, there is noise under the system.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I would guess feedback, too. If you all can carefully mute your microphones please.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you very much.

I think we generally seem to be in agreement that having more than one set of eyes on each of these proposals, and when I say that I mean actually looking at our step one process that we defined and having more than one person think about each of the points in step one that we wanted to evaluate on. I think we have agreement that we want multiple people to do that, and we're just debating the mechanics of it.

I've heard two different proposals. One is that we have one person conduct a thorough review of the step one points, complete the assessment sheet that Joe and I put together, and share that back with the group, and then we can have other reviewers who can also complete the full assessment sheet and do an in-depth assessment or

can just send comments and use that initial reviewers assessment as input.

Then I've seen a different model, which is that we designate three, four, or five people who are all going to do an in-depth review and complete the assessment sheet for each proposal, and share those back with the ICG. Of course, anyone is welcome at any time to do these kinds of assessments, but I was just trying to make sure that we, at a minimum, had enough people looking at the different proposals and checking off all of the criteria that we set out.

So that's really what I want to get out of this conversation is to determine should we have one person who takes the lead on this for each proposal? Should that be someone who is intimately involved with the proposal, or should we have subgroups who take the lead and do the in-depth reviews?

Thoughts on that question would be most welcome. I see Kavouss in the queue.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. I sent a reply to that.

While we have full confidence with the representative of the operational community to complete the assessment sheet, we believe that the people writing the report should not be the same people that are approving the report. So the people that are preparing the assessment sheet should not be from the community should be involved in that, but should not be the only ones. That should be a team

or a group of two or three people, they should be collective assessment, but not one single person from the operating community or similar to that.

It has nothing to do with any doubt. It's full confidence to everybody, but I believe that is the situation. I don't want to give example, but I think that would be at least two or three people here completing the assessment sheet, but not only one from the community who prepared the report. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you. Lars?

LARS LIMAN:

I would support Kavouss in that notion. I saw a proposal on the list, which I support, which was to have four people. One of which was intimately involved with developing the proposal, and the reason for having that people aboard in the small group is for them to be able to explain any misunderstandings or conflict or strange parts. To have a second person who is familiar with the procedures within that group but who was not actively involved in the proposal, and then two other people who are not involved with that specific group who prepared the proposal.

I think that's an excellent idea, and I support it fully. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you. Milton? And if everyone else could please mute. Thanks.

MILTON MUELLER: Hello. According to my phone anyway, I was muted. Can everybody hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes. We can hear you.

MILTON MUELLER: Okay. I'm not sure why we are finding it necessary to be quite so formalistic about who reviews these proposals. My impression is that as many people who can and who want to should do it for each of the proposals.

I mean, there's only going to be three proposals. Each one of them is going to require a lot of commitment, so I imagine that some people will not want to do all of them. But I also don't see why anybody should be prevented from reading them.

If you want to have somebody responsible for compiling the inputs of the different members of the ICG, I can understand the need for that. But why would we want to limit the number of people who actually review the proposals?

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Milton. I would say that, from my perspective, I was actually aiming for the opposite, which was I wanted to make sure that we had a minimum number of people who were planning to do the reviews. That

might seem obvious, and people might say, “Oh, of course. I expect everyone to do these reviews.”

But in my experience, it’s a little risky to just hope that people will do something as opposed to writing their name down and saying we expect to hear from you, or soliciting volunteers essentially. So I was really shooting much more for the minimum threshold than for the maximum.

I completely agree with you. I think anybody who wants to review should review. But I also wanted to make sure that we got people from different parts of the community to do the reviews if that’s what the group wanted.

My other motivation was also to set a deadline so that people knew what they needed to do and when they needed to do it if they were going to be able to contribute to the fuller groups discussion. So I agree that there should be no limitation on who does reviews, but I was just going for the minimal set and giving them their task so they knew what they were supposed to do.

I see Manal, and then Yari.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thanks, Alissa. I agree fully with what Milton has said. I take your point that you’re trying to secure a minimum reviewers, but I would also encourage that the whole ICG team and ICG members to the extent possible review those three proposals. I think that the different perspectives, the different level of engagements, and the different backgrounds are all necessary in the evaluation process.

I would be a bit flexible who takes the first stab at filling the assessment sheet, but I would encourage that all members really review and comment on the assessment sheets and the proposals. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Jari?

JARI ARKKO: Yes. I wanted to say that I think the minimal requirement is that we have for each of the proposals we have both involved and noninvolved people on it. I think everyone agrees with that, and preferably more than just two.

But I would also suggest that it's kind of unnecessary for us to set hard rules on who actually within that team does either the initial editing of every part or any of the further steps. It's up to the team, and I would expect that in any normal circumstance what would happen is that someone takes the pen to write the first version, and then the others will correct as necessary. Otherwise, the team is not doing their job. So I think the key issue is that we have enough people in the team.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I agree with everybody. We should have some involved and noninvolved minimum team, but is not limited, and anyone could participate. I think that is an agreed course of action. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. So it sounds like we have fairly good agreement on this. I guess my question is it seems to me that we do have a minimal set who has volunteered for protocol parameters, which is the proposal that we've actually received, and that's Jean-Jacques, Milton, Jari, and Keith Drazek. So if those people are comfortable doing some sort of review, you can figure out amongst yourselves if you want to use the assessment sheet or how you want to use it or if you want to work together on one or do separate ones, I think we can leave it up to you.

But I'd like to hear cries of opposition if any of those people will not be doing reviews. Anyone else who wants to do the review, of course, should feel free and let us know that you intend to do it.

So hearing no cries of opposition, I think we will go forward with that plan. I suggested a deadline of January 26 for substantive feedback because our next call is on January 28th, so would appreciate getting reviews by then, and let us know if you think you're not going to make that deadline for those four folks at least.

I'm looking in the chat, and I think we can figure out numbers. I know some people said they could do numbers and protocol parameters, and I was kind of arbitrary in trying to get people's names down so we can figure out numbers when we receive the numbers proposal.

With that, I think we should move on to ICANN 52 planning, which is our next agenda item.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:

Thank you very much, Alissa. As you all know, the secretariat selection was finalized just the other day, and because of that, we have not been able to do that much planning of the actual sessions. You will see more in e-mail the next couple of days including proposed agenda for the Friday/Saturday meeting.

We have got a lot of questions whether we will use both days. My answer has been, for your information, that we have to plan to use both days, and we will not know until end of Friday whether we will actually use all of Saturday in the evening or not, because it depends on weather. I think it's really important that we are able to go through whatever agenda we have decided upon having.

But I do see people, on the other hand, that have ICG members that have started to push things from Friday and Saturday to at least late Saturday afternoon. So we'll see how much we are going to use, but more about that in the e-mails.

The other thing that I want to say is that we have requested a session just like the last couple of meetings. We got the call of ICG meeting is this time in the beginning of the week instead of the end of the week. We have preliminaries [that's] okay for a meeting on the Monday after the opening session.

The idea that we proposed – and you will get this in e-mail in a couple of hours – is to divide the session in four different time slots. Each one of those time slots should be between 30 and 45 minutes. We are looking into exactly how much time it will be. Those three time slots, I propose that we should use.

First of all, one time slot that they'll give to each one of operational communities so they can use it for their proposal, and how they are using that time slot will depend, of course, a little bit on where they are within their own process. And then the fourth time slot we will use for representatives from both the three communities and ICG, so all four of us be on stage to moderate and run and answer questions from people in the audience.

That is the general layout that is proposed, and as I said, each one of those four slots will be between 30 and 45 minutes.

Regarding the logistics for the meeting, we will not be able to have all of ICG on the stage. I do understand that for the previous meeting that was a request from the ICG, but just because of the logistics of the stage and us coming up directly after the main session, there will be space for maybe ten chairs, so ten people on the stage. Given that each one of the operational communities might get two seats or something like that, we talk about only be able to have a very small set of ICG members there on stage.

On the other hand, my plan and proposal will be that ICG members are close to the microphone so they can answer potential questions that are coming up, but the answer from the microphone from the floor. But this

is something we're working on, and it will be worth it that we have to do together with, of course, both ICANN and the new secretariat. So you will see more about that in e-mail.

That was all. Any questions or anything about that? I see Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, Patrik. Thank you very much.

I don't know whether I understood you correctly or not. But I suggest if colleagues are comfortable the first date sixth of February, we have extended hours of working because that is important essential.

We don't want to push everything for the second day and so on. So if people could agree from now that the first day we work more extensively, beyond the working hours that you have set. I don't know what time you have set already – five o'clock. But we have to work a little bit beyond that. Whether people could agree or not, that is important. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:

I think this is a good proposal. Today we are set at 9 to 17 both days. That is the schedule that we have. I think it is good for people to reserve – the ones that can – to work also in the evening. On the other hand, I do know that some people including myself personally do have other commitments on that Friday evening that cannot be moved.

That said, just because a few individuals cannot be at that meeting, just like some people might in the evening, just like some people might have

to move out in the day, we just have to use the time accordingly. But yes, Kavouss, I think it's a good idea to ask people to please as much as we can be prepared of working hard and long also the first day.

That said, we will not be able to work as ICG, but we might have working groups or sub-groups that work in the evening, but ICG itself will most certainly only be 9 to 17.

But thank you for the proposal, and I will bring up that explicitly in the mail I'm sending out. Joseph?

ALISSA COOPER: Patrik, I see a couple more people in the queue including myself.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Yes. Yes. Joe?

ALISSA COOPER: Did you want to run it? I saw James next.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Oh, sorry. James, Yes.

JAMES BLADEL: Hi. Thanks, Patrik and Alissa. Apologies for the background noise.

Just a couple of points. I wanted to agree with Kavouss with his proposal. If we can pass that along, if everyone who's available can

block that time, and if we can pass that to the secretariat and ICANN planning staff so that there's food available for us, so that we can be sure to have that time available. That would be great because a lot of us will have to drop on Saturday.

The second point I wanted to ask – and I apologize if you had already covered it. As I said, I've got some background noise here at [inaudible] – was will there be an equivalent to the session that we held in Los Angeles where in addition to not just meeting with the communities and going over their proposals, where we will have just an open interaction with the ICANN community? Is there going to be a session like that in the middle of the week or is it simply going to be that Monday meeting, and then the work sessions on the weekend?

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:

Thank you very much for those comments. The first question about food and other kind of things, having coffee and tea and other things available, that is noted. Thank you very much for pointing out explicitly.

Regarding a second session, the answer is no. We have not requested a second session. Instead, the proposal from us was to make sure that we have 25% of the Monday session used for open microphone, even though it's not only ICG on the stage, but also the three operational communities. We expect that quite a lot of the questions might actually be related to the actual proposals and it would be practical to have the actual communities on stage to be able to answer those questions directly instead of having us trying to tunnel what the answer to the question is.

That was the explanation where it is that it is, but to answer your question, no. There is no additional session requested as of today.

JAMES BLADEL: Thank you, Patrik. And just to clarify, I wasn't worried about snacks. I was just building on Kavouss's suggestion that maybe if we can get ICANN to arrange for box lunches, we don't have to scatter for dinner. Everyone can stay in the room and continue working through the evening. That was my thought. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Yes. I heard what you said and understood it. I just said the wrong thing. Thank you very much for confirming.

JAMES BLADEL: I didn't want to sound like a person that was worried about coffee. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: I am worried about coffee. I'm that kind of person. Alissa, please?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes. The only other comment I was going to make to you, Patrik, to flag is about the availability in the evening of the interpreters and the remote participation, remote listening facility.

Maybe this is already on your list, but I think it's important that if there's going to be continued work that we do it the same way that we do the work during the day. That means we need to have that infrastructure in place if we're going to extend into the evening. And the availability of the room, which I know has already been booked. So a couple of things that might come up as barriers essentially.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:

Yes. There are a number of different kind of barriers, and that's why I wanted to flag at the moment.

First of all, to get this kind of feedback is exactly why I wanted to have it on the agenda today instead of waiting yet another week. So thank you very much for all the feedback.

Secondly, there are bazillions of different kind of arguments why we today. We will check with interpreters and other kinds of things, but I think as it is today, the actual real session we have will only be 9 to 17. I will check regarding room availability, interpreters, and other kind of things.

But it might be the case that we have various constraints that will limit the ability of work we can do in the evening being as that we have requirements on ourselves regarding transparency and outreach. Thank you.

Kavouss, your hand is up. Do you want to say anything more?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: No. I'm sorry.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: No problem. I just wanted to check. Thank you very much.

So with that, I don't see any more hands. Alissa, over to you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. We are here at our last topic, which is the community process update. I think people know that we received the protocol parameters proposal. I don't think we really need to talk any more about that one.

On the numbers, Adiel, are you able to provide just a very brief status update on numbers?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yes, Alissa. Can you hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Good. As a brief update, the numbers community also has made significant progress in developing its proposal.

The latest draft is public and being finalized to submit it tomorrow. I have just passed the link to the chat so you can see all the final drafts.

They are actively working today and probably early tomorrow to be able to submit that proposal. So the number community is ready. The process has been really pushed through to meet the deadline. Hopefully tomorrow the ICG will receive the final and formal proposal.

ALISSA COOPER:

Great. Thank you. Any questions for Adiel?

Then let us talk about naming, and I think since Kavouss has asked for a specific agenda item from the CCWG liaisons, why don't we go ahead and start with that? Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. I could do it as follows. First, I think we need to have some very brief report from the liaison of the ICG and CWG relating to the naming. What is the situation? Whether they're meet their deadline or not, I would like to hear formally. I know that they would not meet the deadline, but I would like to have formal information from that group, when we will receive the information from the CWG relating to the naming?

This is my first question, and then having answered that, I would like to make the following issues.

I have seen in several occasions people commenting on the review of the activity of CWG. ICG has been criticized that imposing a deadline of 15th of January to the CWG in which CWG is not able to do this work.

I would like that ICG make a statement saying that ICG has not imposed any deadline. Deadline coming from 15th of September 2015 from NTIA announcement, and we have worked that date backward, and we come to the best of our ability the 15th of January the deadline for that.

So no deadline has been imposed by ICG, and no criticism should be associated with the ICG. If there is any deadline, this is from the total process, but not from ICG, and ICG should not be accounted for that.

That is something that I request you, Alissa, to make it clear either in a statement or something that the deadline is by the process, but not by ICG. This is the first point.

The second point is the following. I have heard that the chairman or co-chair of CCWG, Thomas Rickert and Mathieu Weill, discussed with you, and you have told them or they quoted from you, Alissa, that you do not expect anything from CCWG relating to the accountability. If that is the case, I have a very doubt about that because the whole process, according to the NTIA, is that the accountability should be clear before the transition take over. If we do not expect any accountability from the CCWG, then I don't think that the mission has been completed.

So the question is that have you make that declaration to the co-chair of CCWG that ICG would not expect anything from them or not? Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks, Kavouss. I will use the chairs privilege and speak to both of your points, and then I see that we have some other folks in the queue.

On the first question about timelines and targets, and target deadlines, I think I am in agreement with you. My understanding is that there has been a good amount of discussion within the CWG itself about timelines, and the fact that the original timelines that the ICG set out is quite unlikely to happen or furthermore, the January 30th target that the group had been working toward, I think it's becoming clear that that's going to be extremely difficult if not impossible for the group to meet that target.

This is a topic of active discussion amongst myself, Patrik, Mohamed, and the chairs of the CWG. We've been chatting about this, and they have helped to make us very aware of the situation. It's also obviously a live topic of discussion within the CWG itself.

My understanding is that the CWG is working on essentially quantifying how much more time they think they need, and readjusting what they think would be a reasonable timeframe for them to deliver a proposal to us. I think we should certainly be on the lookout for that and have a fulsome discussion within the ICG should we receive more detailed information aside from just that initial deadline is not going to be met, but to understand better what the expectation is within the group and within the community as far as what a more reasonable target deadline would be.

When we get that understanding from them, then I think we should certainly take it up within the ICG and determine how that affects our process that we've laid out, and also how we think we could accommodate that given the rest of the milestones in the timeline that we set out. I think everyone is aware of that, and we should certainly

discuss it further, but it would be good I think to get more input from the CWG itself, more concrete input before we have the whole discussion about the impact of that.

As far as your question on the CCWG for accountability, the question that I received from the chairs of that group was whether we were, as the ICG, expecting to receive a proposal from the CCWG on January 15th, and that is the question to which I answered no, because I'm pretty sure that's the understanding of all of us that we were not expecting to receive a transition proposal from that group, and that what we are expecting to receive is a transition proposal from the CWG when its complete and when it has community consensus.

Now that isn't to say that there isn't potential linkage between that transition proposal and what the CCWG output may be, and I understand that there is a lot of active discussion about the relationship between the work of those two groups right now. We can talk more about that. I have some other thoughts about that.

But to your specific question, they wrote and said we weren't expecting to send anything to the ICG on January 15. I said no, and I don't think the ICG was expecting to receive it because that was based on all of our previous discussions.

We have a long queue now. Wolf-Ulrich?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks, Alissa. The timing and the timeline is critical. As we know and we can see from all these e-mail exchanges and [interim results] which

coming up from these both groups the TWG and the and the WCWG. So the question is really how we are going to deal with that.

ICG, I think we can lean back on the one hand and wait for formal, let me say, information we get as input from those groups, primarily from the CWG as this is in their operational community. Or we can, on the other hand, start while as we are knowing that there is a problem with the timeline to start the discussion and to just from the beginning and finding out what is really behind that. So that the second one is what would I would like to not just to wait for information.

I understand the approach to you or to some of us from those groups as finding out how to deal with that item. I really would like to see if that item is to be dealt with in the very near future and find out what is really the problem behind that. I understand the CWG might be in the position to come up with a proposal by the end of January, because that was their original timeline, but under let me say a conditional set of accountability items.

Let me say it that way. That's what I understood from the chairs' statement from the last weekend they had. So we have then to understand what it means. I saw that sheet, which shows us how they intended to coordinate between the accountability part and CWG, but there is no timeline in that, and that's what is missing really. Then we can really see what is the effect on our work here.

My proposal is to start immediately to contact those groups from our side with regard to that timeline discussion, and try to find out. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. Keith Drazek. Keith, if you are speaking, we can't hear you.

KEITH DRAZEK: Sorry, Alissa. Can you hear me now?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes.

KEITH DRAZEK: All right. Apologies. I thought I would give a brief update on the developments around the CCWG accountability. Kavouss and I are both the ICG liaisons to that group, but also to provide a little bit more background I think in terms of the questions that Kavouss raised at the beginning of this part of the session.

I think it's very important that we're all clear that the ICG is focused on the operational communities recommendations or proposals for the IANA function stewardship transition. As such, the naming community group that is responsible for that is the CWG transition. So the ICG is and should be expecting a proposal from the naming community, from the CWG transition group, but the ICG should not be expecting any sort of proposal or any input or any submission on the greater question of ICANN accountability.

That is a parallel but separate track in the way that this has been constructed by ICANN and that the CCWG accountability will be submitting its recommendations directly to the ICANN board and to NTIA.

That said, it's very, very important for everybody to understand that the two groups, the CWG transition and the CCWG accountability, are working together. The co-chairs have been in touch and have been identifying the issues where there may be overlap or where there may be dependencies between the two groups.

This is one of the reasons I think that there are concerns about possible delays from the naming community, but the work stream one issues that have been identified for the accountability CCWG are likely very much interrelated and inextricably intertwined with the work of the CWG transition.

I guess just to summarize, the two groups are working together and have identified the areas where there may be overlap, and that work will continue. But as it stands today, the ICG should only be expecting a proposal from the CWG transition.

I'm happy to answer any questions. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Keith. James?

JAMES BLADEL:

Thanks, Alissa, and thanks to Keith for that. I thought it was very, very succinct explanation of the difference between the two work tracks. I can tell you that the accountability working group is both well underway in its work as well as its about to convene for a face-to-face in Frankfurt next week Monday and Tuesday to really push through its work and accelerate its timetable.

My question was more of a practical one and that was to perhaps address some of the concerns that were raised by Kavouss. I think Wolf touched on it as well.

Is there a point on the calendar or a deadline date, whether it's the end of January or at some point in Singapore, where this group, the ICG, says that if we do not have a complete report by – and we can call out the naming community specifically because it looks like they/we are going to be the holdup – but we could say if any community, if we do not have a completed proposal by all three communities, because it's possible that one of the other communities may need to rework some elements of their proposals as well, that beyond this date, we will have to publish a revised timeframe.

I understand it would be a lightning rod for potential criticism, but it also might get out in front of that criticism rather than having it swell to a crescendo over the next eight to ten months. I'm wondering if there's any merit to establishing some date and saying we need to have all three completed proposals by date X in order to meet the target that we have laid out in our most recent draft work plan.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, James. We have Kavouss, and then I have a couple of thoughts to round it out.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Alissa, I'm very sorry. The situation is mix up by everybody. CCWG accountability has two work streams.

Work stream one is accountability required for the transition of IANA stewardship. If CCWG output of work stream one does not come to ICG; therefore, this transition of the stewardship is not complete.

CWG working on naming only, but if support should be finalized by CCWG on the work stream one, and I don't understand why the co-chair for CCWG and chair of the ICG, they're mixing up the situation saying that they don't expect anything. Either the charter of CCWG is wrong or if their charter is right, the work of stream one is accountability required for transition. That means we expect something from CCWG in relation with the transition. That is very, very important.

Number two, I think time is very short, and I don't think that there should be anything available from CWG, but even by end of January because it may not go to the community. It may not receive any comments, and that is something in French says [inaudible] quickly done and badly done.

We should be very, very careful. We are harsh in the other situation. We are hurrying up the matters, and we should be very, very careful not to rush for the situation because the issue is very important.

Accountability, if it is not done, nothing is done. I'm not worried about these parameters and so on and so forth. They are well done already. The important issue is the accountability.

Please kindly consider that. We need to have output from work stream one of CCWG, ICG. I cannot agree that saying that we don't expect anything from them. We expect from CCWG work stream one, accountability required for transition. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Kavouss. I see Milton in the queue. I want to just jump in with a couple of responses to various things that people have said.

To your immediate point, Kavouss, I think building on what Keith said, maybe there's a little bit of nuance here. Indeed, I'm so pleased that you're not concerned about the protocol parameters.

But actually, all of the communities have this same aspect going for them to some extent, and maybe this will help to clarify, which is that we asked the operational communities to deliver transition proposals to us, and we have specified a full process that will take us from receiving individual community proposals to having a final product that we deliver many months from now. The aspect that all of those proposals have in common and why that timeline is important is that in the January target, we said this is when we want for the ICG to receive the proposals.

It was the first milestone. It's not the time at which transition is actually being implemented or executed. It's just the first milestone.

It's looking like, to me at least, that all of the proposals from all of the communities have the same aspect, which is that they articulate the transition plan -- here is the plan, our community has come together, we have consensus around this, this is what we want to do -- and there is some future work that needs to be accomplished in order to effectuate this.

So within the numbers proposal that I've seen, there is some work that is called out and left for the RIRs legal teams to finalize. Within the protocol parameters proposal, there is a similar aspect to it that says if there's things that need to be done, we have a team of people who are willing to do it.

I view the names proposal the same way, which is that the community, the operational community that needs to deliver a proposal to the ICG is the CWG.

If that proposal contains links, pointers, items that the CCWG needs to implement or even needs to implement in a particular way in order for that consensus to be accurately represented, then that's the work that the CCWG is going to need to take up, and if that doesn't turn out to come to pass, if the proposal can't actually get implemented the way that the CWG has specified in the proposal that they send to us, the way that we have structured our process says that if issues come up in these later months of comment and feedback, the March to July timeframe, that what we do is we send the proposals back to the community to deal with those issues.

I certainly hope that won't be the case, but it's not as if the target that we set initially is the time at which the transition is effectuated. It's the time at which we wanted to receive proposals. I think we all agree that we might not receive them on time, and we can figure out the implications to that, but it's common to all of the communities that there is a relationship between the proposal that says here is what needs to happen for the transition to take place, and we expect these things to come in to place before the transition actually does take place in the future, and in each community is a role for a body that will take care of those issues.

I know that we are at the top of the hour. If we can take five more minutes, I think it would help us round this out.

There was a proposal from Wolf-Ulrich to actually send a note to the CWG essentially letting them know we've noticed that the timeline is a potential topic of discussion. Please let us know when you have information about what you think your adjusted timeline is.

I'm happy to send that note if people want to, and we can continue discussion of that on the mailing list to see if people want to do that. For my perspective to James's point, that's the first step. We should see what that produces, and then I think when we have a little bit more information, we can talk about how that affects our process, if we want to set some drop deadline or something for our process to James's point. So that would be my proposal for how we handle those things.

I will follow up and send a mail to the mailing list about both of those, so that we can continue the discussion. We're running out of time on the call.

I did have Milton in the queue. I wanted to give him a chance to speak. Did he put his hand down? Milton did not want to speak.

Since we're at the hour and the queue has emptied, I think we should certainly continue this discussion on the mailing list if anybody wants to. I will send my note and continue the process piece, but if people have other thoughts of substance, we should continue on the mailing list.

For the benefit of the secretariat, I think we had essentially four action items from today. As far as further division of responsibilities between various secretariat functions, the co-chairs will follow up about that and send a note that outlines that in more detail for people.

We approved our minutes. I got a note from Jean-Jacques that he's fine with the minutes, so thank you, Jean-Jacques. We approved the December 10 minutes.

Patrik will follow up with a mail about working late on February 6th, and whether that can be accomplished, and I will follow up with a mail about timelines and should we write to the CWG and get that conversation going with them.

Unless anyone has any final words, I think we should close and get people off to their next meeting.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]