ALISSA COOPER: Great, thanks. I think we should go ahead and get started. This is Alissa. What you're looking at here is our agenda for call #20. Thank you, everyone, for joining. The first agenda item is the combined proposal assessment. I expect the bulk of the call to be dedicated to that, or at least the first half. Who knows how long it might take. Then we have some other agenda items that if we have time we can turn to: the ICG report and the combined proposal, the public comment duration, the public comment website material, and then review of upcoming commitments and schedule, and minutes approval.

We will reserve a little bit of time at the end of the call regardless of how agenda item #1 goes to talk about upcoming commitments and schedule and next steps and so forth, but the middle items we might run out of time. We'll see.

Any comments on the agenda or other agenda items that people would like to add? I should have said I was going to say please raise your hand in Adobe Connect, but I guess I should ask first if we have anyone besides Keith Drazek and Joe who are on the phone bridge, but not in Adobe Connect. Nope? Okay. Any comments on the agenda? Jean-Jacques, go ahead.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. In anticipation of a point which is to approve the minutes, I'll just have a word to say when we come to item #6. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay, thanks. All right, then I think we should move on to item #1, and if we can get the matrix projected, Jennifer, which summarizes the combined proposal assessment. A huge thanks to everyone who did a combined proposal assessment. We've been coming in over the last couple of days and we really appreciate all the time that people have put into looking across the three proposals and thinking about how they work together in a combined fashion.

Also, a huge thanks to the secretariat for taking those assessment points and summarizing them into this matrix that was just circulated probably less than an hour ago on the mailing list. There isn't any new content in this matrix. It just takes the points that were made in the separate combined proposal assessments from different people and puts them in one document, so we had something to look at while we were on this call. We can certainly project individual assessments from individual people if that's warranted.

So just a few words from me, and then we'll open it up for discussion of the combined proposal. I think there's a bunch of issues that have been raised in the assessment process. I counted about five or six substantive issues that I think are kind of common across many of the proposal assessments.

I think for each of the issues that we discuss, we should keep in mind as a means to drive towards conclusion of the assessment what options we have as far as disposing of various issues that come up. I think we essentially have three options for any issue. We can send a question or a request back to one or more of the communities, if we think we need

clarification, more information, if we think there's something missing or that they need to work on. That's the first option.

We can highlight the issue in the ICG report section of the proposal. We can summarize what our assessment is, and if we do that, we could also ask for public comment about the issue specifically and we can also decide that we're going to reevaluate the issue at a future time because there's other ongoing work that we will want to incorporate, but that isn't complete yet. I think that's the second option is that we write down our assessment of the issue and then maybe ask for some public comment on it.

Then the third option is that we do nothing. If we discuss an issue and we think it has been completed, then that's our third option.

I just want people to keep those in mind as we go through some of these substantive issues to be thinking about how are we going to conclude and what is the next step going to be from our discussion.

With that, I think we should start on the topic of compatibility and interoperability. I think in general people felt that the proposals were mostly compatible, but there were some issues that were raised in the assessment process. The first one that you can see here on the screen has to do with the IANA trademark and domain name issue. Since that was raised by so many of the assessment, I think we should start with it. Also because I think we've talked about this a lot and just wanted to bring everyone up to speed on the status of what has gone on with this topic.

As everyone knows, two of the proposals are essentially silent on the topic of who will own the IANA trademark and domain name post-transition. One of them is not. The numbers proposal says that the IANA functions operator for numbers should not hold the trademark and domain name and suggests that they be moved to an entity that is not the IANA functions operator and suggests that be moved to the IETF trust, and the IETF trust has said that they are willing to accept that responsibility and the IETF community says that they are okay with that outcome.

The CWG has not stated a consensus position on this topic. The CWG is currently consulting with their independent legal counsel to determine how many hours it would take legal counsel to do an investigation for them about this issue, and specifically to investigate a few different potential models for the IANA IPR, namely if it stayed with ICANN, if it went to [CTI], or if it went to a trust; perhaps the IETF trust

I just checked an hour ago. There was no answer yet from their legal counsel about how many hours it would take them to do that investigation. So that's kind of the current state of play as regards to that topic. At this point, I'd like to open the floor for folks who want to speak specifically to this issue. Perhaps people who did their assessment, if you want to comment on this topic and your views on it based on having done the assessment, or anyone else who has a thought about this topic. So let's start with that one. Thanks.

Are people able to raise their hand in Adobe Connect? Because I don't see any hands raised. Ah, okay. Jari, go ahead.

JARI ARKKO: Yes, thank you. I don't [inaudible] much to be said. I'm actually quite happy with [inaudible] statement put forward in the combined report about this topic. I sent a half-an-hour ago a slight modification to [inaudible] but the numbers proposal is the only one of the three proposals that formally specify the [inaudible]. So as long as the other communities are committed [inaudible] part of their implementation, then the proposals are compatible. I simply request that the operational communities [inaudible] on this topic to [inaudible] the requirement on that, [inaudible]. Whatever was said in the proposal [inaudible] accommodate that [inaudible]. That would let us move forward [inaudible].

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Jari. Joe is next.

JOE ALHADEFF: Thank you. Let me try picking up and see if that addresses the echo. No, it doesn't. For me, the question is less the proposal of the IETF holding and just more a question of if the other communities find the same solution to be acceptable. I don't think it's clear necessarily what that is, so perhaps one of the things we do is put forward the fact that there is a suggestion with a specific solution on the ground. Are all communities consistent in their view of this is a resolution? It still has an external dependency of having the transfer happen.

I think we resolved the question of timing related to IPR, but not necessarily the specific ownership. Use seems to be something that everyone agrees on, that yes it should be able to be used. Perhaps there's a clarification we can ask to the communities to just move it forward as a consensus piece as opposed to saying absent something being raised, this is the default, because one community has already made a specific request.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Joe. That's essentially what we are waiting to find out right now from the CWG. That's my take, anyway, is that if the CWG comes back from its process that it may decide to engage in with its independent counsel and they say, "The proposal from the numbers community is fine with us," then that's the solution I think.

If they say something different, then there's an issue that the communities have to work out because then there will be two different opinions about what should happen to one thing. That's basically where we are is that we are waiting to find out if the CWG position is consistent with what the numbers community has put forward or not. I guess what I'm saying is I don't think we need to ask again because that's exactly what we're waiting to find out right now.

So it looks like next in the queue I have Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Excuse me, I missed the first three minutes because I was dialed late. This is point one. Could you repeat what we are talking about? And

second, is it possible that people kindly speak a little bit slowly, separating syllables one from the other, not too fast. We are not English spoken people. I'm very sorry. Too fast. The line is not good and I don't understand quite clearly. Unfortunately, contrary to the physical meeting that I have no difficulty.

So first, what we are talking about waiting for CWG to do what? A few hours to do what? I don't follow the situation. Could it be possible to repeat? [inaudible] don't do it.

ALISSA COOPER: Sure, Kavouss, no problem. The topic that we are talking about has to do with the IANA trademarks and the IANA.org domain name. The situation at present is that the CWG has inquired with their independent counsel about whether their counsel – or how many hours it would take their independent counsel to conduct an investigation for them about a number of different options for who will hold the trademarks and the domain name in the future, namely whether they will be held by ICANN, by the PTI, or by an independent trust; perhaps the IETF trust.

That's what all of us and the communities are waiting on right now in order to be able to resolve this issue because the CWG doesn't have a consensus position about what they think should happen to the trademarks and the domain name.

What I see actually now in the chat from Russ Mundy, which I think is a reasonable question, is if we have asked the CWG if they agree with the numbers approach, which we have not done and we could do – what

we asked was about whether the proposals themselves were compatible. I think we all agree that the proposals are compatible because two of them say nothing and one of them says something. But that's a different question from whether at implementation time we expect the numbers proposal to be implemented and I think the CWG wants to form an opinion about that before it gets implemented.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: All three of the hands that were up before are still up. I don't know if any of you is intending to be back in the queue or not. Joe, your hand is still up. Go ahead.

JOE ALHADEFF: Mine was new. Yeah, thanks. Alissa, I guess my question was – I may be misunderstanding or I don't understand the timing of the message that Paul sent, because Paul just before, at 12:10 East Coast time sent out a note of the CWG CRISP IANA Plan call, which highlighted an element that it didn't seem like the lawyers were formally asked yet.

ALISSA COOPER: So that meeting – the minutes that Paul circulated were for a meeting that occurred before the CWG put the request into their lawyers. That was from a meeting on July 7, and then on July 8 the CWG met and

decided they were going to ask their lawyers. Then on I think the 14th, they asked their lawyers. So that's the order of events.

JOE ALHADEFF: Right. So just in terms of the order of events, they've now formally asked the lawyers. The lawyers are coming back with how much time it's going to take them or with the formal opinion? It seems like the first question was—

ALISSA COOPER: The lawyers are coming back with how much time. I think the CWG – and anybody who's more in tune with the CWG than I am can speak to this – but I joined their call last week. The CWG is trying to be cognizant of their budget for their independent counsel. That's why the first question is how many hours will this take, and then they have to decide if they are willing to spend the money to have those hours clocked for this purpose. That's I believe why the question was asked how many hours and not "please go do this right away" because they need the budget estimate before they're going to decide what to do. That's my understanding.

JOE ALHADEFF: Okay. So the timeframe for this potential process is still a little bit of an unknown.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes. Yes.

EN

JOE ALHADEFF: Okay, thanks for the clarification.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes. Just to highlight one of the points that Jari made is that right now we have text in the ICG report that essentially provides a summary of the current situation and we can add more text if we need to, but sort of acknowledges that the numbers proposal is the one that provides concrete details about this and that the positon of the CWG is pending. We can leave it at that and go forward to public comments. I would imagine that there will be a lot more information. I hope there would certainly be a CWG position, and perhaps even a resolution, to the issue by the time the public comment period is done.

Manal, go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thanks, Alissa. Just to ask do we know what the fallback scenario if they need a response exceeding the budget or requiring so many hours?

ALISSA COOPER: I do not know. That was not discussed on the call last week as far as I can recall. Joe, are you in the queue again?

JOE ALHADEFF: No, I'll take myself out.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Jari, go ahead.

JARI ARKKO: Yes. Hopefully you can hear me better this time. I just wanted to make the comment that I think the communities need to make a decision on what the requirements are rather than be directed by number of billable hours and lawyers

I also wanted to make a comment on this backup plan. Obviously, there's multiple parties involved here. Ultimately, at some point, it's going to be a situation where I think from our side we'll come up with some proposal, unless something else comes up first. I think I would characterize the RIR document [inaudible] requirement for a particular arrangement, not the details of that arrangement. So the details still need to be worked out. But that's the [inaudible].

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Jari. Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: My question is that is it an urgent question that we have to continue discuss talking about how many hours? I think there is a question. That's okay. Leave it and go to the next item, and then in the meantime between now and some time later we will find that. [This is not a way] that we at this moment we have an exact reply that's 6 hours, or 10 hours, or 20 hours, or $20,000. It is not so urgent that we reply to that.

We raise it and that's all. We go to the next item because there are many people waiting for this call and we have one-and-a-half hours with so many agenda items, so let's take a second item. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Kavouss. I agree. I think we're all roughly aligned on this and we have text in the report about it. That can be the resolution for this one.

Let's scroll down to the next set of issues. I guess we have independent scroll control. The next set of issues raised in the compatibility portion of the assessments have to do with the PTI. In particular, I think the first one that's worth mentioning is this question that Milton raised, and also I think came about in Narelle's assessment, which has to do with the fact that the expectation is that all of the IANA personnel and resources for all three of the functions will move to the PTI. I think the point that Milton made was that it should be made clear that this is the case, that it's not just the names but that it's the full staff and resources for all the functions.

The question and the issue that Narelle raised is that the arrangements for this are to be worked out, so it's not necessarily that they're incompatible, but there's more that needs to be done. That was kind of my reading of those points.

So the question here is do we have anything to say? Is there anything that needs to be clarified? Are there questions that we want to send back to the community on this topic? I'd certainly appreciate thoughts from Narelle or Milton, if you're on the call, or from anyone else on this issue of the PTI covering all of the functions.

Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I think the question was partly answered in the CWG output. It is mentioned that all staff will be moved to the PTI. And then it mentioned that whether the two communities, IETF and numbering, they want to have separate contract with ICANN or separate contract with PTI with respect to their activities related. So it is up to them and up to us to discuss which is the situation. So we cannot divide the staff in three parts, main part going for PTI, one part remain for IETF, one part remain for the numbering under the ICANN. We have to discuss whether IETF and numbering they want to have a separate contract with ICANN with respect to the activities that required as far as the person is concerned, or they want to have a separate contract with PTI.

So these two, community with ICANN or the PTI. That is the question that we have to answer. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. So just to be clear, Kavouss, do you think that there's more detail that needs to be elaborated about the situation or do you think that the proposal as it stands is already clear about this?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: It is not clear because the CWG asked that – they said the following. "At this moment it is not clear whether the two other communities would like to have separate contracts with ICANN or they want to have separate contracts with PTI." So that is up to us, ICG, to investigate with

EN

the two communities apart from naming whether they want to have separate contracts with ICANN or separate contracts with PTI. Which of these more comfortable for them? Maybe [inaudible] any of them. I don't know. I can't say anything. It is up to the IETF and up to the [RIRs] to define which way they prefer. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Great, thank you. Alan?

ALAN BARRETT: I think the proposal from the numbers community was quite clear, that they intend to contract with ICANN. I'm pretty sure they've also made statements subsequent to the submission to the ICG in January that they enter contract with ICANN rather than with the PTI. And if ICANN wants to subcontract to the PTI, then I believe the numbers community has no problem with that. I can't speak for the IETF, but I think I've heard similar things from their side.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Alan. Do you think this is something that we should highlight in the combined proposal or do you think it's – because I am aware of those statements as well. I'm certainly aware of the content of the proposal, but the specific question about subcontracting to the PTI clearly is not addressed in the contents of the numbers proposal because it was written before the notion of the PTI was developed. So is it something that you think the ICG should craft some text about in the opening of the proposal or do you think it's already clear?

ALAN BARRETT: If you put it that way, I think the ICG should craft some text about it to explain how [we] intend to put it all together in a compatible way. Perhaps it would even be helpful for the ICG to ask questions of the communities, to write to the team and the IETF [inaudible] group and ask them whether they intend to contract with PTI.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, thank you. Russ Mundy, go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Alissa. I guess I am a little confused as to that there is an overlap or an inconsistency or a lack of clarity in terms of the particular point of an organizational structure being divided to create the PTI and having contracts with the parent organization to accomplish the work that needs to be done, since that set of agreements needs to exist between the parent corporation of ICANN and PTI anyway.

So I guess that I don't see this as a point of confusion or incompatibility. Perhaps a lack of clarity, but I don't see it in any way inconsistent because all three operational communities, if in fact numbers and protocols still contracted with ICANN, then ICANN has to write the contract to the PTI.

I guess I'm confused as to why this is a problem space, other than maybe seeking clarity.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thank you, Russ. Russ Housley?

RUSS HOUSLEY: Right. One contractor, three contracts. Because I think that the naming community will obviously have a contract from ICANN to PTI. Will it have one contract with three parts or will they then take the results of the MOUs with the IETF and the RIR community and pass them down as subsections of one contract or a separate contract? I don't think we care. I think the results are the same in terms of the ability to get the job done. So I just think that's something to be sorted out during implementation. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Russ. I'll ask you the same question. Do you think as it stands the proposal is clear about the course of action or do you think there are either words that the ICG should craft or that we should get from the communities to make it clear what the expectation is as far as what will happen?

RUSS HOUSLEY: I think the expectations are clear enough, whether they write three contracts or one contract with three subparts I don't think really affects the way forward that much.

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

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, Alissa. The question is not as clear as Russ Housley mentioned for the following reasons. In the CCWG accountability, based on CWG's request, we are discussing the freeze or veto of the budget of PTI. If the budget of PTI [inaudible] also to those staff who are doing work for IETF actions or work, or [for the rework], that freeze of budget may have some implications on them.

Perhaps we should raise the questions in a clear manner that, one, in the CWG, it is mentioned that it is not clear at this stage whether these two communities wants to have separate contracts with ICANN or separate contracts with PTI. One.

Two, due to the fact that the budget of the PTI, it goes under [IPR] and under the [inaudible] community, which any action on that might indirectly have impact on the activities IETF and on the RIR, perhaps we should raise the questions formally to the two communities which of these two options they will opt.

If I were them, I would [inaudible] having contact with ICANN, irrespective of the budget freeze or budget problems and so on and so forth, continue my activities as I am going today. But I am not IETF. I am not RIR. But we have to raise the question to them and ask them that there are two links, and the link more important is freeze of budget, and CWG insists that they want to have the last word on the budget and if the budget that ICANN put for the issue is not in agreement for the community, they could freeze that and they could veto that. And that might have some impact on the activity of the two other communities.

So I suggesting, Alissa, we raise the question [inaudible] community explaining the situation and consequences of them, and then ask them if they opt for the ICANN, we put it in our report that we raise the question and [reply] that they want to remain with ICANN.

If it is PTI, they reply with PTI and they accept that, they would follow any consequence of being with PTI if the budget of the PTI due to the community involvement or community involved is freezed or is vetoed or is rejected. This should be quite clear. I suggest that we raise the question and not give it a simple answer. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Kavouss. I think the issue is, as Alan was saying, is that both of the communities are very clear that they will continue to contract with ICANN. That is, I think they have already made this decision and said so publicly, that they intend to continue contracting with ICANN. I'm not sure if there's a question to ask because they've already said that.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. If they said that, so there is no question, we in the ICG report mentioned that with respect to the statement of the CWG, the investigation or the information received from this community indicate that they want to remain with ICANN. Full stop. That's all. And nothing else.

ALISSA COOPER:	Okay. Okay, so I think we are clear on what the situation is. The question is just do we need to write this down or is it clear from the reading of the proposals? My sense, honestly, is that it wouldn't hurt for the ICG to include a little bit of text highlighting this in our ICG report section, just so that it's crystal clear for everyone. But people seem to have different opinions about this.
	Mohamed, go ahead. Mohamed, if you are speaking, we can't hear you. Maybe we will go to Kavouss, and Mohamed, we can work on your audio because we still can't hear you. Go ahead, Kavouss.
KAVOUSS ARASTEH:	If the question is clear, I suggest that we document it to be formally in the report of the ICG to NTIA that this question was raised and the answer is they want to remain with ICANN and it is well-documented and well-written without saying that it is clear for us. It should be clear for everybody in a written manner. Thank you.
ALISSA COOPER:	Thank you. Mohamed, can we try you again? Okay, maybe that's still not working. Let's try Xiaodong.
XIAODONG LEE:	I think when we get the proposal from the community, because the PTI proposal is not ready [in the] proposals. So [inaudible] with ICANN, but if we can check with them if it is okay for them to move their operation to PTI, we can just confirm [inaudible]. I think we don't need to make [inaudible] and ask them to have a subcontractor or not. So if we can

just confirm with the community if we want to [inaudible] by PTI, [even better].

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, thank you. I mean, I think, again what we're hearing from the people who are in the communities that they have confirmed that already, at least from Jari and Alan as far as I can tell. But maybe they can get in the queue to respond.

Mary, go ahead. Mary, did we have you in the queue?

MARY UDUMA: Can you hear me now? Hello?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, go ahead.

MARY UDUMA: Okay. As I said in the chat, the numbering community or IETF, they have made it clear that they want to continue relationship [inaudible] with IANA – I mean, with ICANN. I think we should notice and also note that [inaudible] up to ICANN to now incorporate whatever services that PTI should be rendering to the numbering and for the [inaudible] community. In the culture that ICANN is going to enter into [inaudible] PTI. ICANN is [inaudible] NTIA now, and [inaudible] in the contract with ICANN.

EN

So in that way, I think it's very, very clear and it's very simple as I understand it. Maybe I'm wrong, but ICANN [inaudible] whatever services PTI indirectly will be [inaudible] to communities. So I think [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Mary. Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. The third reason that IETF and numbering they opted for ICANN because there is another situation that we should look at. It is in the proposal of CWG if by one or other reasons PTI doesn't work, they will dissolve the contract with PTI and go to the external. Therefore, in order to have a stable situation, it is preferable [and the] right decision that they remain with ICANN and we should document as such. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Kavouss. So I think we have maybe two courses of action. One is to look at the [sets] that we have in the ICG report, see if this is documented there. I don't think it is. And possibly put in some work to make sure that this is clear in the ICG report.

Then I think on the topic of whether we need to confirm anything with the communities, I would suggest that we take that to our mailing list to decide. It sounds like the people from the communities feel strongly that they have a firm position. Some other folks may be not quite clear on it, but I think we can continue to discuss that on the mailing list and it need not be a blocking issue for going forward with the proposal and

the public comment period. That's my suggestion of what we should do with this one.

With that, I think we can move on. I think on compatibility, those were the two topics that jumped out at me as far as warranting some discussion. Are there other topics that people who did the assessments want to raise specifically about the compatibility of the proposals? We will then move on to accountability next. Any other topics on compatibility and interoperability?

JOE ALHADEFF: Alissa, if I could?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, go ahead, Joe.

JOE ALHADEFF: It's just a question of as we talked about whether we can determine whether if something is compatible without one of the proposals being complete – and I don't think we need to discuss this now, but we should just find some agreement on what is the language we use to describe that concept? Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Good point, Joe. Noted. I mean, I think essentially what we can say and I think we're about to talk about this during the accountability section is that we present our assessment and acknowledge the fact that we will

reevaluate after the accountability pieces have been completed in the CCWG. That means we don't just reassess the accountability piece. We can reassess everything in light of the work that we expect to be completed.

JOE ALHADEFF: I guess for me the reason I wanted to go back to specify the language is when you indicate a proposal is incomplete it makes it sound like it didn't fill in one of the elements. They filled in the elements correctly. They can't agree that they're final because they have an external dependency. So I think we just have to be very careful and I think there's nuance in the language which needs to be addressed.

ALISSA COOPER: Got it. Understood. Anything else on compatibility? Okay, let's move on then to accountability. Here in accountability there were a few different topics raised. I think the one that got the most attention was the fact that there are dependencies on the work of the CCWG. I think we have a well-documented plan as to how these will be handled.

Just to recap what the plan is, when we put the transition proposal out for public comment we will make it very clear that there's a parallel process that is developing the accountability mechanisms in the CCWG and that there are dependencies between the names proposal and the outcome of CCWG work stream 1. We will point people to the public comment process that is to occur on the accountability side to make sure that everyone understands what it is and that it's available to them.

EN

Once the CCWG work has concluded and the final accountability proposal has been sent to the SOs and ACs for approval, we will seek confirmation from the CWG that all of their requirements have been met. At that point, depending on what they say back to us, we can make our final determination about accountability, but we can't really do it before then for the names piece because we are awaiting the CCWG.

That's the plan. I think people kind of highlighted that there's the dependency, but we do have a plan for how we will assess later.

Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. After the BA, the CCWG is making a total review. We have finished almost last night and [freeze] the document what is related to the community empowerment. With respect to the community mechanism, whether we take single membership or multiple membership or designator or quasi-designator or volunteer designator is not yet clear. We're waiting for Paris meeting on 17 and 18 of July.

With respect to the IRP, Independent Review Panel, or process, that also is still waiting, so I don't think that more than some discussions we could have a clear idea until and unless this meeting in Paris is finished and the issue goes to the final report, which will be published at the beginning of August. By 28 or 29 of July, we would have a clear idea what option we take. Apart from all of this, they are also thinking some sort of the community council. There's another idea came in. So there is a lot of ideas, but none of them has been decided and all of them is on the table.

We have every day two or three calls every day, and we're working very, very hard, but I don't think at this stage ICG would be in a position to make any decisions with respect to the accountability unless if you have any questions that you believe it merits to be answered, I and a few other people that are going to the CCWG in Paris will raise those questions and come back to you at your next call.

To the understanding that I [inaudible] ICG, I have raised whatever question I should have been raised, and similarly, Keith has done that. But if you have further questions that you would like to be answered, please raise it. We will discuss it on Friday and Saturday in Paris. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Kavouss, for the update. Russ Mundy?

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Alissa. I wanted to thank Joe for going through the proposal and supplementing what I sent to the list earlier as the synopsis of the pieces that were in the front part of the CWG proposal that identified the set of things throughout the proposal that were identified as being dependent upon the output of the CCWG.

I read through Joe's – I read through, again, the proposal and I am comfortable with the fact that those summary points of the seven items do capture what is spread throughout the CWG proposal, but I did want to ask if anyone else on the ICG has concerns as to whether or not the

summary points accurately reflected the information in the rest of the proposal. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Russ. That's a good question. And thank you, Joe, for doing that work. Go ahead, Joe.

JOE ALHADEFF: Yeah. I would agree that I don't think I see major concerns, although there were some things like the dependency that the names community found related to some operations that might occur over time. So it was not really related to transition, but how something in the future may affect current operations.

This is where I think we have to be a little careful because some of these dependencies may not be related to structural elements of the transition. They could equally be problematic today. And they're highlighted because it was a very complete effort by the names proposal.

I'm not sure that those few that might be outliers are something we need to be concerned about because I think they may be beyond the space of consideration for the transition, so I would come down in the same places as Russ.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Joe. So seeing no further hands, I think again we need to take all of the assessments that were done and consolidate them into

some text that we add to the ICG report about accountability, because right now there isn't any text in the ICG report about accountability. There's just a placeholder. So I think we can just highlight this topic in that section and that will be the course of action for this topic.

Does anyone else have things to say about the dependency topic? Go ahead, Joe.

JOE ALHADEFF: I guess, Alissa, assuming we're – based on the timeline that Kavouss provided, which I think is the most current that we've seen – assuming we may go out for a comment process before we get a finalization, do we make any statement related to if all elements of the proposal are accepted, we believe the proposal to be compatible or something of that nature? I don't know if that's speculative. Because otherwise, we're giving people a document that I think may confuse them as to what we're asking them to do with it.

I guess I want to understand how we're approaching the fact that we have to caveat the lack of finality, but we're asking people to comment. So does the comment suggestion assume everything is true, if there's a problem, we will come back to you or something of that nature?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, Joe. I think there is actually some of the people who wrote assessments actually wrote them exactly that way, which is to say they said assuming that all of the CWG requirements are met by the CCWG, then we consider that this combined proposal provides the necessary

accountability mechanisms for the transition to go forward. If that doesn't happen, then we will reevaluate are the words that we'd add. But I think we can certainly write that up in our report that way. I see no problem with that.

Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, Alissa. I have carefully studied CWG requirements. I'm sure other people – Martin, Milton, and others – they have done so. If all those requirements are met and properly addressed by CCWG, there would be no difficulty as far as ICG is concerned in relation to the transition. But we have to wait. As I mentioned, there is some sort of difficulty at the moment whether we [inaudible] in CCWG to properly address that.

But if we put our comment on the condition that provided that all those requirements are met by CCWG, I could declare that ICG would have no problem to indicate that there would be no transition problem as far as we see from the document. Whether something happened in practice, that I don't know. But from the theoretical point of view, that is sufficient provided that they are met. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Kavouss. I think that's a good summary of where we are. Seeing no further hands on this topic of the dependencies, there was one more that I wanted to just highlight that came out in the assessments which was this point about the arrangements with the root zone maintainer and the fact that there's still details to be worked out

about how the root zone maintainer will interact or what arrangements there will be in place between it and the PTI, and ICANN potentially.

Russ Mundy has provided text that we will look at in the next agenda item on this topic. So I think we are covered as far as that topic goes, but Lynn did raise it in her assessment, so I just wanted to raise that to see if there was any further discussion that people thought was necessary about that issue.

Go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. You mentioned that these are the issues that Russ Mundy has addressed, because in the CWG, there are several questions raised and the answer is not given. So perhaps maybe Russ has already studied that and we should reply to that, for instance, whether the root [maintainer] [inaudible] contract will be continued with NTIA or would not be continued. So there are many questions raised in various parts relating is the root zone maintainers and the software and so on [inaudible] these questions have not been answered by CWG, but raised the questions. So someone should answer, and in fact, it has some impact on our views or our, let's just say, final decision.

So if Russ has already studied that, I keep quiet and listening to his intervention and his outcome. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:	Thanks. Yeah, when we go to the next agenda item and we're actually looking at the text that he provided, maybe we can have that discussion in more detail. I think he's covered it well.
	Okay. So any other topics on the accountability front before we move on to workability? Go ahead, Mary. Mary, it looks like you're muted.
MARY UDUMA:	Hello, can you hear me now? Hello? Can you all hear me?
ALISSA COOPER:	Yes, go ahead.
MARY UDUMA:	Okay. I wanted to go back to the point raised by Kavouss in the [inaudible] withdrawing on [inaudible] of the CWG proposal. I am worried that if we say there are dependencies, there will be new people, new stakeholders, [inaudible] our proposal and [inaudible] insight into what's happening in all these proposals.
	Most times people complain that the volume of [inaudible] to be read so much that they [inaudible]. If we put up our comments with that caveat, we will not be confusing some people. The public [inaudible] about the processes.
	So I think we should have a [rethink] of both our timeline and our wording of the public comment. I think it would be better for us to draw a conclusion on that. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:
Thanks, Mary. I would certainly appreciate other people's thoughts on this. I will say that if we don't go to public comment until after the CCWG proposal is finalized, then we are talking about probably an entire ICANN meeting cycle of delay. I see – I guess some folks had difficulty hearing Mary. I had a little difficulty too, so I will try to summarize what she said.

What I think Mary was saying is that she's concerned that if we put the transition proposal out for public comment before the CCWG work is finalized or while it is also being finalized and we talk about the dependencies between the two processes and so forth that it will be confusing for stakeholders who are new to the process who maybe haven't been following along the entire time, and as a result, we should maybe rethink our timeline. That's what I heard Mary say. She can get on and correct if that was wrong.

My concern there is the way that the processes are going forward now is that they are really quite parallel and they're envisioned to end at the same time. If we take all the time between now and Dublin, which is a solid three or four months and we shift that to after Dublin, then we are introducing a solid three to four month delay and that's true for the response that we send to NTIA about how much time we thought we were going to take and their planning and it's true for everyone else who we said we were going to try to wrap up in the next few months.

So I would have a lot of concern about shifting the timeline now. There's a lot of aspects of this process that are complicated, not just this. So

there's a lot of explaining that we have to do. We can do that in the proposal itself. We can do it on the public comment website. We are planning these webinars to happen. We can do it there. We can put a lot of resources into explaining this so that new stakeholders understand what is being asked of them. That's my view. I have a little bit of a queue, so go ahead, Joe.

JOE ALHADEFF: Thanks, Alissa. I just wanted to point out that in the executive summary draft we've been [popping] back and forth, I tried a shot of some of that language so we could circulate that after the call and people could work on that because I think it may help clarify some of the concerns. I would support the idea that we cannot afford to take the time, but we have to be very clear so that people are understanding what they're getting, what they're being asked to review and what the consequences are if that changes.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Joe. Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Alissa, I don't think it's a matter of weeks. It's a matter of days. By end of July, CCWG situation is quite clear. I don't think that we need to decide anything before that time. We maintain our timeline and we wait. If there is a little bit of adjustment, a little bit, two days, we will do that. But otherwise, we maintain the timeline that we are [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:	Thanks, Kavouss. I think Mary's suggestion was actually to wait until after CCWG has concluded work stream 1, which is I think not planned for a few months. But maybe I misunderstood, possibly.
	Joe, are you back in the queue or your hand is still up? Okay.
	Just looking in the chat a little bit, I think where most of the group is is that we should proceed as planned, but appreciate you, Mary, raising this concern. Maybe we can turn a lot of our focus into making the whole thing very clear to newcomers. I think we should definitely keep that in mind, as Joe said.
	At this point, are there other topics related to the accountability assessment that people want to raise? I don't know if people read Milton's assessment. He's not on the call. He had a point related to the trademark and accountability. I think that is in hand, but if there are any other topics about accountability, please raise them now.
	Okay. I think for the accountability section, the plan would be to take the text that the various assessors wrote and try to synthesize it into some paragraphs that we can put into the ICG report. And when we go to the next agenda topic, I might ask for a volunteer to do that from the team of folks who did assessments. That's I think the plan for accountability.
	So if we move on to workability. In workability, I think the top-level summary was that people – the [inaudible] proposal may not be the most elegant document you've ever read, but it does seem together the

EN

proposal components are workable. But I'd like to spend a little bit of time maybe first on the point that Narelle made about the ccTLDs. Is Narelle on the call? She is not. It looks like she is not. Do we have any – oh, I guess we have Mary at least. We're missing our CC contingent a little bit, which is unfortunate. But I'll just raise it and if folks have thoughts, please share them. And if not, we can defer to the list.

Narelle had raised this question about whether the text in the names proposal as regards to the ccTLDs raises an issue of incompatibility with the NTIA criteria because it invokes the idea that governments would manage their own ccTLDs. I just wanted to get some reactions to that because it didn't come up in our assessment of the names proposal earlier. Any thoughts about that point that Narelle made? Go ahead, Lynn.

LYNN ST AMOUR: Yeah. I actually don't see it as incompatibility. I think what Narelle is quoting there is a very thin [inaudible], if you will, of government's role and responsibilities as it related to a whole host of Internet governance matters. But the primary notion of sovereignty and that each nation is responsible for things within its own border. I can dig up the specific language and [inaudible] list if that would help, but I actually don't see it as incompatibility myself.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Lynn. I do think since Narelle is not on the call, that would be helpful if you don't mind responding on the list to that point specifically.

Russ Mundy, go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Alissa. I don't believe it is an incompatibility because the issue of how the CCs will interact and continue to interact in the future is probably best covered – and I've been trying to remember the short abbreviate – but it was actually raised in the names proposal that the update to how the CC world will be addressed and it is currently awaiting action as far as accepting the output of that work group by the ICANN board.

My reading of the names proposal, that was the appropriate addressing and handling of the CC issue, rather than describing it as an incompatibility. It's just not as clear as it should be and ICANN board needs to act on it as the SSAC report and the names report noted. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Russ. Joe, go ahead.

JOE ALHADEFF: Hi. I also don't see this as an incompatibility. There's a difference between government participating as a stakeholder and government having an exclusive role. Some domain names will be run by private sector organizations and that's part of the mix. It doesn't seem to be an incompatibility as far as I'm concerned.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, thank you. I think the general feeling is that this is not an issue as regards to the NTIA criteria. Lynn has taken the action to send some text, send a response to the list to make that clear in regards to Narelle's assessment.

Are there other workability topics that we should discuss? I didn't see to many. Milton and Paul had an exchange on the list which I didn't think there was more to discuss, but please get in the queue if there are other workability topics you would like to discuss. Go ahead, Joe.

JOE ALHADEFF: Yeah. Alissa, this was a topic I had raised at the actual meeting when we discussed the proposal from the RIRs, and it had to do with the ability to determine that they would switch operators because of a dissatisfaction or a breach of some kind by the operator, which is perfectly understandable and legitimate.

But the way it seemed to be drafted was that each of the RIRs retained the ability to do that independently, which then might lead to multiple operators.

My question is just a question of do we need to consider that from a workability perspective? Because would multiple operators increase complexity and lead to a potential for discontinuity or fragmentation?

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Joe. So just to be clear, your concern is that one of the RIRs could choose a different numbering operator than the other four?

EN

JOE ALHADEFF: It seems possible under the contract. I could not imagine that would be a likely scenario, but I don't know. It's not an impossible scenario under what I understand to be the terms because these are rights to the individual RIRs, not a right that can only be collectively exerted by the group. If I'm mistaken by that, then I'm happy to be corrected.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thanks, Joe. Maybe Alan could get in the queue as a respondent, but first I have Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. There is a point in the report of CWG which we could take it as workability and that is the following. The activities of PTI will be monitored by customer service from [inaudible] or committee. If there is a difficulty, they will escalate it [inaudible].

But coming to the CC, the ccTLD, they said that the IPR would not be dealing with that matter and that is to the ccTLD people whether they are a member of ICANN or not a member of ICANN to go ahead providing a particular way how to dissolve the issue which could not be resolved up to that date, neither by the customer service committee nor by the IPR, nor by any other thing.

So it is clearly mentioned that they do not suggest that IPR or the Independent Review Panel take care of the issue of the ccTLD. So that is an issue that might have some connection with workability and it is clearly mentioned and documented in the CWG. Thank you.

EN

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So you're basically just saying it could have been an issue, but because it's documented, we don't need to raise it as a workability issue.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. It is documented, yes.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, got it. Thank you. Alan, go ahead.

ALAN BARRETT: There's no intent for different RIRs to choose different IANA numbering operators. I don't know how that could even work. If it appears from the draft SLA or [inaudible] contract that that's a possibility, I characterize it as a bug in the draft and we should look at it and fix that.

So just to repeat, there's no intent and I don't think it would work to have different RIRs choose different IANA numbering operators.

ALISSA COOPER: Joe, does that relieve your concerns or do you need further confirmation of that?

JOE ALHADEFF: We can take that offline. I like where in the text that might be a problem. The draft framework of the SLA just came out, so I'll look at that. But part of the question was whether the [inaudible] should do

EN

that rather than the individual RIRs which then would solve the problem. I'm fine that it's not the intent and we'll just work around the details.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, thank you. Any other workability topics? Xiaodong, go ahead.

XIAODONG LEE: Just [inaudible] workability. I didn't see my input in the metrics.

ALISSA COOPER: Oh, okay. Let's see what happened there. Well, it's possible that it got left out because the matrix was put together in a hurry. But if there are issues that you raised in your assessment that you want to discuss, then please raise them. Otherwise, we can just make sure to get your text added to the matrix.

Was there something specific that you thought we should talk about?

XIAODONG LEE: [inaudible] for discussion [inaudible] make sure that the input is out there.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Noted, thank you. And apologies for that. Joe, are you in the queue again?

EN

JOE ALHADEFF: Yes, thanks. It's just that of all the communities, obviously the workability of the names community proposal is the one that has the greatest challenge because almost every other – the other two communities are really delegate established processes that are merely transitioning. They're not really creating much of anything new. There might be a new element that they've memorialized terms that existed in less formal fashion in an SLA or something like that. But the names community really is the one who is looking at new mechanisms altogether and they have in their documentation provided what scenario analysis they can, including from Sidley on some of the legal scenario analysis.

Perhaps the only comment we should make as a result of that community is any changes to what they have done should be tested as to workability in an extremely thorough fashion because that would help us take less time to review new things that come to us, if they do. It might not be fair to highlight one community over the others, but there's one community that hasn't finalized its proposal and that community is the community that has the greatest number of new elements on the table for which we have some workability but not exhaustive finality as to them. I think they've done what they can, so I'll accept that if nothing changes they've provided enough.

But that was the community [inaudible] general business perspective created the largest concern just because these are new things that we may not have been able to well forecast all the wrenches that could be thrown in the works.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Joe. I think there's good words in your assessment, or one of them. I read them all at the same time. But there's good words that we can take into the report to sort of explain that I think and we can certainly say that we will reevaluate workability after the CCWG work stream has produced its draft. So point taken on that.

                       Mary, go ahead.

MARY UDUMA: Hello? Hello, can you hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, we can hear you.

MARY UDUMA: Can you hear me? Hello?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, go ahead, Mary.

MARY UDUMA: If you can hear me, I don't know with the IPR or the naming and IPR of the [CRISP] proposal whether there's a [inaudible] of workability because there's the review of the IANA functions whether [inaudible] how it will work out more smoothly because while many communities will be reviewing – the numbers communities will be reviewing as well. I consider it that it will be a lot of burden if the [inaudible] maybe a lot of

[inaudible] on the IANA function [inaudible] we have the [inaudible], the IFR, the SIFR and all those reviews, including the [CRISP] review. Then we can look at this [inaudible] workability issue.

Did you get that?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, thank you. I think maybe just to summarize back, the concern is that with the multiplicity of performance reviews that might be conducted on the PTI after the transition that those might place a significant burden on the PTI because there are multiple different reviews being conducted by the different communities. Is that approximately what you said?

MARY UDUMA: [inaudible] considered as a workability issue.

ALISSA COOPER: So I think that's a good question. I will note that the IETF also has a performance review process that it already engages in and will continue to engage in with its corner of IANA. So I think that's a good question, because in a sense, I think IANA has already been a party to a multiplicity of performance reviews from the different communities. The IETF has already been doing them. I think there's already some performance reviews that happened from the names side. At least I've seen the numbers published in terms of how they perform.

So the question is whether adding these more reviews create a workability issue. I think that's a good question for the group if people want to chime in on that.

I have next in the queue Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: There's no workability problems. Many new entities have been proposed to be created – PTI, board of PTI, CSE, IPR, and so on and so forth. All of these things are new and there are relations between that. In addition to that, the community empowerment and the community mechanism that may stop [inaudible]. If the community decides to recall the entire board members, it has it impact on the workability and so on and so forth. So we should table something that – because of the multiplicity of the entities has been created and because of the interrelation all of these entities an because of the community empowerment and because of the community mechanism, there might be some workability problem, in particular at the beginning of the process. Until the time that process will be put in its place, it is a transient arrangement, so we should really mention that it is not possible for the ICG at this stage [inaudible] talk that there is no workability problem. There would be because of these multiple things and because of this empowerment and so on and so forth.

They are empowered to remove [inaudible] board member. They are empowered to veto the budget. They are empowered to veto the strategy plan. They are empowered to change the bylaws. They are empowered to remove the entire board. So there are all elements that

have impact on the workability, so we have to think it over and we have to put down some, not questions, some text together and address that issue that it is impossible for ICG at this stage. We started to think that there would be no workability problems. There would be. To what degree, how long, we don't know. Thank you.

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

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Alissa. I get Kavouss's point. However, I think that the point made by Mary is important. Simply I have some doubt as to where and in what [inaudible] we can attract the attention of the powers that be in Washington or the ICANN board, to the [fact] that at a certain point there might be a crunch because of the culture of multiple and [inaudible] review mechanisms which have been increasing within ICANN.

I think it's more in relation with ICANN than really independently for the IANA function. I'm afraid I'm not making this perfectly clear. For instance, I am not in a position to suggest right away a few lines to draw people's attention to that, but I'm just trying to express it.

As consideration on Mary's concerns, ICANN certainly has entered over the past three or four years into a cycle of – how should I say? – increased and ever more complex reviews of itself. [inaudible] question of allocating the proper resources, and in that sense, it may lead to a crunch. Thank you.

EN

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Russ Mundy, go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY: Thanks, Alissa. I just wanted to reinforce what a couple of the other folks have said, that it could very well become a workability issue in terms of, in particular, the workload for the current staff that's in place and it potentially might result in a need for increased staff. I would say that is the kind of thing that's an implementation detail, but it might be worth noting something of that.

I can say with certainty that the SSAC has an advisory committee. It's very common for us to be in a position where we don't have enough resources to be able to react to and respond and to answer or act on things that people send to us.

I'm in support of what the last couple folks have said, but I'm not sure how we want to say something about it in the report. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. I think – well, first, I should say we have hit the 90-minute mark and we only have one interpreter each for Arabic and Chinese, so Arabic and Chinese interpretation will stop now. Unfortunately, we didn't have two for those languages, so people need to rejoin a different language bridge or the English bridge if you are listening to Arabic and Chinese. Apologies for that.

I think what we need to do with workability is try to come up with some text for the report that synthesizes the conversation that we just had and a lot of what was written in the assessments to essentially say that at present it looks workable to us and then highlight some of the challenging parts that may arise as the whole proposal gets implemented. I think that's probably the best that we can do. That would be my proposal for going forward. Seeing no hands go up, I assume that we can go forward with that plan.

I think we have concluded the combined proposal assessment. We have, essentially for all of the issues we discussed, we have either text to go – we need to develop some text to go in the report or we have a little bit of further discussion amongst ourselves on the mailing list to be had, but we have resolved all the topics that we needed to resolve.

So I think we should move on to our next topic, which is highly related, which is the ICG report text. Let's take a look at the latest version. Okay, which version are we looking at, Jennifer? Can we look at the V4?

JENNIFER: Hi, everyone. Yes, we can look at V4. I'll change it right now.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. It's a very large document. It takes a long time to upload.

JENNIFER: Yes, apologies. This is the one that Jari sent out most recently.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, great. Thank you.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Whilst this is being uploaded, just a quick comment on the last item on the agenda just to [inaudible]. I just put in the chat a little suggestion about what we could do about workability. That's all.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Thanks. Okay. The document that we are looking at is the current draft of the proposal. We each have scroll control, I guess. Is that how it works? Yeah.

                             So right now the proposal has five sections. It has an executive summary section, it has the ICG report and then it has each of the three constituent proposals from the operational communities.

                             If we scroll down, the executive summary is currently blank. It needs to be filled in. We will come back to that topic after. I'm just going to kind of give an overview of what is in the ICG report and then we can talk about what we should do for executive summary.

                             In the ICG report right now, there's a brief introduction. We have a brief process summary with pointers to more information about the process, as we discussed at the face-to-face meeting. Then we have a section that again briefly summarizes each of the three proposal components. That's section three. All of that text is taken I think almost – oh, no.

There's some liberties taken with the summarizing, but it's very much based on the abstracts of the proposals themselves.

Then section four is our ICG assessment, and it is composed of a number of parts. The first part is derived from our individual assessments that we did on each of the proposals as regards to the community processes. So if you remember, when we did all of the individual community proposal assessments, we looked at whether their processes were open and inclusive, and if they had received any process complaints. Did they handle them and did they achieve consensus by their own definitions?

This section has one subsection each for each proposal that talks about that. This is also the place where, to the extent that there were some statistics available about the processes and how many people participated and so forth, this is the place where those statistics are to, again, fill the public record in [defense] of the proposal and reinforce the point that the processes were open and inclusive. So that is section 3A.

Section 3B talks about the completeness and clarity. This was the other step that we went through with the individual proposal where we tried to evaluate whether they were complete and clear. I know that some people want to talk about this question of calling the names proposal incomplete so we can talk about that as a substantive issue. But I just want to kind of go over all of the text first.

Then section 3C is where we have the combined proposal assessment. This has some text in it already about the IANA trademark and domain

name issue because we've already written back and forth to the communities and there was text that I could pull for that. But this is the place where we will need to essentially synthesize the discussion we just had and the assessments that came in over the last two days and produce the text about accountability and workability that we've just been discussing.

The final – well, not the final section, but the final subsection of section 3 is where we present our explanation of how we think the proposal meets the NTIA criteria. That, again, includes a lot of text from the various assessment documents. It will include the text that Russ Mundy provided about the root zone maintainer as well.

Then there are two sections at the end that haven't been filled in yet. One is the listing of the implementation items that need to be completed, and then I think at some previous points someone had added in a next steps section, which I wasn't quite clear on what was supposed to be in there but I left it because someone had added it previously.

So that is the sum total of what is currently envisioned to be in this ICG report. We will need more text to be created based on the session that we just had, so I will shortly ask for or try to pin someone down to write that text. But otherwise I would like to just hear from people if they feel comfortable about the direction which this is going, if there are other whole sections that they think are needed or substantive topics that aren't there that we need to have added into this, then I'd like to know that now and we can talk a little bit about some of the detailed issues after that.

Alan Barrett, go ahead.

ALAN BARRETT: I'm quite comfortable with the overall direction, but I think there are some extra items that should be added. What comes to mind is an explanation or clarification of points where there might be a perceived incompatibility. We've looked at several cases where we had to ask the communities for more detail, and so in any of those cases, I think the final report would benefit from a summary of what we've done.

So for example, just to pick on one thing, the names community expects that PTI will created and that ICANN will contract with PTI. Whereas the numbers and protocol parameters envisage that they'll contract with ICANN. I think the ICG report should say something about this and that it's not incompatible because we can do them both simultaneously or [inaudible] needed is that ICANN subcontracts to PTI.

That's not the only case. I'm sure there are other cases where clarification could be added.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Alan. That's a good suggestion. I mean, we do have the section about compatibility so that's where I would suggest what we need to certainly add the piece that we discussed today to that section.

Okay, seeing no further hands in terms of overall issues – oh, Mary. Go ahead, Mary.

EN

MARY UDUMA: [inaudible] and the fact that we are putting in summary makes it easier for the public to read. The section is now [inaudible] where we do a conclusion on [inaudible] submission of proposal—

ALISSA COOPER: Mary, I think we're having a little trouble hearing you. Could you speak up or get closer to your microphone.

MARY UDUMA: Sorry, [inaudible].

ALISSA COOPER: That's better.

MARY UDUMA: Okay, that's better. All right. I said that I am happy with the structure and it flows very well. I just want to raise the point in the assessment section, the section when we finish with the names section and the numbers section, when we go to the protocol parameter, paragraph 17, the last sentence says the "[inaudible] working group and the ICG board conclude considered process [inaudible] that the ICG receives." And it concluded that the [inaudible] process was open and includes [inaudible]. We didn't draw such conclusions in the other two proposals. Is there any reason why we don't do that?

EN

ALISSA COOPER: That's a good point, Mary. I feel like there has been text in the other sections about that, but maybe it got removed in the editing process. In general, because this is the report of the ICG, I think maybe we need not restate in each section what the ICG concluded because the whole thing is essentially what the ICG concluded. So maybe the simplest thing to do would just be remove that section of the ICG's conclusion because all of the text reflects the ICG's conclusion. Would that resolve the issue?

MARY UDUMA: Yeah, thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Go ahead, Russ Mundy.

RUSS MUNDY: I wanted to ask one question about the – I did find the acronym. Looked it up while I was away. A framework of interpretation, which was the effort that was put forth by ccNSO and a number of other committees, that is basically an update I believe on how the CC realm of the TLDs for the root zone will be handled and so forth.

Do we want to note anything in the ICG report with respect to that issue? I don't think that it's currently mentioned, and in particular, since Narelle had brought up the issue of CCs, perhaps there should be something said. It is included in the [inaudible] endorsement or approval of the CWG report. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Russ. Can you just maybe restate what you think the specific point is that may need to be made?

RUSS MUNDY: Well, I think there may be concern that the ccTLD interactions with the ICANN PTI structure aren't as clear as they could be and I think that the framework of interpretation working group's final report helps clarify that, but the ICANN board has not yet accepted that.

So whether or not the ICG believes that a statement about that is necessary or appropriate to show broader incorporation of views relative to the ccTLDs is needed. Whether or not we should say anything about that aspect.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, thank you. I would welcome other people's opinions on that, since it's not really something we've discussed too much as the ICG.

Maybe, Russ, if you could formulate that as a question to the mailing list that would help.

RUSS MUNDY: I will do that. Yeah, thank you. Especially since a bunch of our names people just couldn't make the call today. [Will do], thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Okay. I'm cognizant that we have a few logistical things we need to discuss and we only have 12 minutes left on the call. So what I

would ask is that if people have detailed edits to this existing text that you please send them to the list let's say by – what's today? Wednesday. I would say no later than Sunday 23:59 UTC and I can put this to the mailing list as well, because we will then have only about a week before our next call and we need to iterate on this text and come to consensus on it in very short order. I would ask that – I know that there's been a lot of text thrown at you and that people have been doing assessments, but now that the assessment part is essentially completed, if you can turn your attention to this text and see if you're comfortable with it and if you have edits to suggest, that would be very helpful.

Manal, go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thanks, Alissa. Just before we conclude, can I ask very quickly what we intend to put in the section 6 next steps and also implementation I mean, just the [inaudible] sections to understand what we need to put here to start [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Manal. That was actually going to be my next topic, which is that we also have placeholders for things that need to get filled in. Good that you're in the queue, Manal, because I think I tried to volunteer you on your behalf to try and get some of those filled in. So personally, I didn't really understand what the next steps section was for. If someone had a thought, then we can keep it if someone can articulate what that is supposed to be, but otherwise I would say that one could be deleted.

For the others, there are placeholders in the text that need to be completed. The big one is the synthesis of the accountability and workability assessments with the discussion that we had today to produce some text about accountability and workability, but there are a couple of others as well including the list of implementation steps and a few other minor things.

I don't know, Manal, if you feel comfortable trying to draft all of those, or if you would like, I can work with you to try and find volunteers to draft some of them or all of them. But would appreciate your thought about if you feel that you can do some pieces of that, or all of it, or none.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thanks, Alissa. I'll give it a try maybe tomorrow and then I can share something, and then if others please could help with missing text, it would be great.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thank you very much. I see that Kavouss is in the queue. Sorry, go ahead. Manal, did you have another thought?

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes. I was just going to say that I'm just not clear on parts like the next steps and things like that. I mean, summarizing what we concluded today and trying to reflect this into the ICG report. This is what I'm going to try to do tomorrow and maybe by Friday. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:
Great. Thank you, Manal. I think unless someone is going to offer an idea of what belongs in next steps, I think you can go ahead and delete next steps since it's not clear what would belong in there. But appreciate your willingness to do the other pieces.

The other one that still has kind of a question mark is now that we have this section, it's not short but it's not terribly long either, the question has arisen as to whether we need the executive summary because there's short summaries of the proposal and the process and so forth now in the ICG report. So if people have opinions on whether we need to keep the executive summary and fill it in, Joe has been working on that, but the question came up as to whether it's really necessary given what we now have.

If anyone has a quick thought about that, please get in the queue. Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:
Yes. I wanted to say something else, but you raised this point. I think we discussed this issue at the previous meeting and I understand that we agreed to have executive summary and we agreed to have introduction or background. This we have already discussed, so why we discuss it again?

But I have another question to raise or another comment to make while I have the microphone or whatever you call them. One of the difficulties that CWG and CCWG were faced was the lack of some clarity in the

question raised to the community and they complained that question was not clear or was vague and they found difficulty to answer. Have we checked that any question respect to section or [inaudible] that we are raising are quite clear on the point or we have not? I'm sorry I was not following that work. If it has been done, I don't [inaudible] if it has not been done, we should be very careful because we are for the first time doing that, but CWG and CCWG they have done it before and they face this difficulty. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Kavouss. We had this for a later agenda item to discuss the questions for public comment. We are clearly not going to get to it today, but we need to have that conversation on the mailing list. Thank you for raising that and we'll take it to the list. Go ahead, Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Alissa. Yes. I still think that an executive summary would be useful. Why? Because it depends on who will be reading this and the higher up you go in the US administration, in Congress, but also worldwide. It is the most technical people who will be reading everything with a microscope checking every word and every sentence.

But at another level, I'm more concerned with perhaps governments in a wider sense. I think that it would really be useful to have a summary. I realize it's not easy to do. But typically in a long report like this with a lot of technical parts an executive summary would contain a digest of proposals or findings or recommendations.

I know that our work is not mainly turned towards recommendations, but I think that we should boil down the rest to an executive summary of maybe half-a-page or one page of this format. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thank you, Jean-Jacques. I think the message is loud and clear that we should continue on the course that we had decided previously with the executive summary. Joe has some text that he has worked up whenever he feels comfortable that it's in good shape. Joe, I would ask you to share that on the mailing list. I think we can conclude this topic for now. Manal will be sending the next update with new text and people should review the existing text and please send your comments to the list.

Joe, go ahead.

JOE ALHADEFF: Yeah, just one clarification. I assume we would be looking for the executive summary to be within the bounds of what is delivered to NTIA so as not necessarily being geared to providing reviewers at the public comment period with some of the context they might need to review.

Some of that was in what I drafted because what I drafted also had the ability to be used as a [inaudible]. So I will suggest that I will start from scratch after Manal has finished her section. This way I can capture all the sections after they're completed. The digest that Jean-Jacques has suggested, making sure that I am not creating an opinion in any way. One of the difficulties of a summarization is you choose what to include

and not include. That's one of the concerns I have with the draft, but I will do my best to be as exactly neutral as possible in the drafting of that summary, but what I may suggest, Alissa, is to put the letter in the discussion group now for the purposes of people thinking about whether some of this text is useful for a cover note or for a public communication.

ALISSA COOPER: That sounds good, Joe. We do have this separate document with the text that is proposed to go on the public comment website, so I would also encourage you to take a look at that as you're thinking about this and see – if you have suggestions for things that you don't end up including in executive summary, but that you think should be incorporated there, that would be very helpful as well because we do have that separation in terms of things in the document and then everything – we can put as much on the public comment website that we want or that we need to for further explanation.

So I think we have a plan there. [Secretariat], if we could go back and project the agenda for the meeting. I realize we are almost at the top of the hour, but I hope folks can stay maybe five more minutes. We can talk about one more topic that I think needed – I just wanted to confirm. We got through topics one and two.

Topic number three – Joe, did you have a hand up from the last topic?

JOE ALHADEFF: Sorry, leftover.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay. So topic number three, the public comment period duration. We have this proposal out for the public comment period to run from July 31 to September 8 which is 40 days. I asked people to send any final objections to that to the mailing list. I didn't see any, so my assumption is that's what we are driving towards. Obviously things can change between now and then, but for planning purposes, that's what we are driving towards. Just wanted to give anyone a last opportunity to object, essentially. Okay, fantastic.

With that, just a note in terms of upcoming commitments and schedule. In order for us to get to that public comment launch on July 31, we really need to have this ICG report text finalized as soon as possible. Our next call is on July 29. I assume that we won't be able to finalize it until that call. If we could finalize it on the mailing list, that would be great. We can try to do that. I really encourage everyone to review everything this week if they can, including the new parts that come in from Manal and Joe tomorrow, and expect to iterate on that next week.

I realize that it coincides with the CCWG meeting and also coincides with the IETF meeting, so we will really try to work it over e-mail and hopefully get final consensus of the ICG on all of that material during the July 29 call. Same thing for the public comment website material. If you haven't looked at that, please take a look. Send your comments to the mailing list. Lynn St. Amour has agreed to shepherd that document, so she will be fielding comments and edits and incorporating them back in. But that really needs to be done on the same time schedule.

EN

Part of the issue is that we need to get all of this material translated. The proposal – the meat of the proposal has already been translated. Most of it has, so we're in pretty good shape there. But with working with the translators, it's pretty hard to get documents turned around in 24 hours or something. They usually take longer than that. So the sooner we can conclude, the sooner we can get all of that text off to the translators and have it ready hopefully for July 31.

The other material that you will probably see coming towards you next week is for the webinars that we haven't scheduled yet, but we intend to schedule for the first week of the public comment period. So there will be some visuals for you to review hopefully next week and get consensus on and also hopefully [inaudible] July 29 call.

I have a little bit of a queue. Go ahead, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Just what time is the 29th of July? Is it 6:00 or not? What UTC time?

ALISSA COOPER: Secretariat, do you guys know what time it is? I think it's 5:00.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: 5:00 UTC.

PATRIK FALSTROM: I can confirm it's 5:00 AM UTC.

ALISSA COOPER: Are we scheduled for two hours?

PATRIK FALSTROM: That is confirmed.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, thank you.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Okay, thank you. 5:00 UTC. Yes, thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Daniel, go ahead.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: It would be really helpful if the secretariats could maintain a list of the current most recent drafts of all the pieces both for our document and for the supporting materials so that one can go to one place and see which ones are the ones that should be reviewed. It's a bit unclear to me at least. Maybe it's just because I'm [inaudible]. But it would be really nice if there was one clear place where one could find a list of the things that are for review.

EN

ALISSA COOPER: Sure, no problem. I think secretariat could make one folder in Dropbox and try to keep that up to date with the latest versions. Would that work, Jennifer?

JENNIFER: Yes, that would work. I will make sure that the latest versions are available on Dropbox and I will [inaudible] links for that.

ALISSA COOPER: Great, thank you. With that, I think we will wrap since we are over time. We can take the minutes approval to the list and just do that on the mailing list between now and the next call. So thank you, everyone. Looking forward to your exchanges over the next week-and-a-half before the next call.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]