
ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So this is Alissa Cooper again. I have one minute after the hour and we have a very packed agenda today, so I think we should get started. I didn't hear from any of the interpreters that we needed more time, so hopefully people are on and joining.

I see that Alice is [inaudible] the roll call. The idea that we had here with the roll call was that we can see the names of the people in the Adobe Connect meeting. We wouldn't actually run through the full roll call. Alice will continue to make the full list and we can check it at the end to make sure we didn't miss anyone who was actually on the call. But I would like to hear from ICG participants who are not in the Adobe Connect meeting room. If you're not in the Adobe Connect meeting room, if you could let us know right now, just say your name please.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Hello. This is Heather Dryden. I am going to join the Adobe Connect room. I'm just not in yet.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Heather. Anybody else who's not in the Adobe Connect meeting room?

MILTON MUELLER: Hi, this is Milton Mueller. I'm in the meeting room, but I'm not being shown in the notes as somebody who's present.

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.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: There we go.

RUSS MUNDY: Hi, this is Russ Mundy. Same thing as Milton.

DANIEL KARREBERG: I'm Daniel Karrenberg, plus one. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, great. I think we have most people accounted for now. Alice will continue to update the list and we'll verify it at the end. Thank you, everyone, for joining. I will give one caveat right at the beginning, which is that it's 5:00 in the morning where I live, so please be nice today.

As Alice and I mentioned on the mailing list, we're going to use the raise hand functionality in the Adobe meeting room to run the queue, so you should have a little figure with a hand raised at the top of your window. If you want to get in the queue at any point, please raise your hand. And if you are not in the Adobe meeting room, feel free to just let us know by voice that you want to be in the queue. Obviously you can't raise your hand.

We have a large group. We have 30 people. We have two hours. We have half-a-dozen topics to get through, so I would ask people, when

you are speaking to be brief and to the point. We want to make sure that everyone has a chance to get their words in.

We wanted to start today I think with introductions of the people who were not present with us in London. Those of us who were there got to know each other and introduce ourselves. We talked about where we work, where we're from, who pointed us here, maybe a little bit about how you got appointed and whether you are taking the ICANN funding for travel would be other things we talked about.

So if you were not in London, if you could go ahead and provide a brief introduction, that would be very helpful. Or if you were also not on the call, the people who were on the call did introduce themselves in London as well. So go ahead if you were not in London and please introduce yourself.

JANDYR DOS SANTOS: Yes, hello? This is Jandyr from Brazil speaking. Can you hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: Hi, Jandyr. We can hear you.

JANDYR DOS SANTOS: Good morning to you all. I just would like to express my satisfaction in joining this group. You can certainly count on me to help the ICG engagement governments on Latin-America and the Caribbean on this exercise.

Just a quick introduction. As I said, I've been a Brazilian [inaudible] diplomat since 2000. I'm currently heading the unit at the Ministry of External Relations of Brazil responsible for Internet governance negotiations. I am the Brazilian representative of the GAC.

I just want to say that my [inaudible] intention of the GAC to participate in this process by nominating a chair and four additional members is not to outnumber. The representative are our [de factos]. But rather to provide a balanced representation of [inaudible] and geographic and linguistic diversity are dually reflected.

And let me assure you that if we understand that the work of developing proposals will be happening not in the ICG, but in the communities and our participation in the ICG does not replace the need for the GAC engagement and the community process. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you. I think we also had one or two other GAC members who were not present in London. Did you want to introduce yourself?

PATRIK FALSTROM:

This is Patrik Fältström speaking. We have raised our hands here and waiting for a call that we should speak, but I'm speaking anyways.

ALISSA COOPER:

Sorry. I thought you could speak. Go ahead, Patrik.

PATRICK FALSTROM: I am chair of SSAC and appointed through the SSAC appointment process, just like Russ Mundy. I work in my day job for Netnod in Sweden. We run [impact connect points]. We also run one of the root name servers and run DNS for a number of ccTLDs specifically.

Regarding funding for travel, yes, some of the funding that I get as the chair of SSAC is from ICANN, but some of the funding is also through my day job. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Patrik. Next we have Michael Niebel.

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Yeah, hi, this is Michael. I work for the European Commission. I German-born and based in Brussels. I've been involved in Internet matters since the 90s of the last century, including ICANN and WSIS. I've been starting in the European policy on network security and setting up the European network and information security and agency. And I've been preparing the framework and the conditions for setting up the European top-level domain dot-eu. I've also been responsible for the last policy papers of the European Commission regarding Internet governance.

I've been nominated to the GAC nominating process. I have not requested travel support for Istanbul, but I might request partial travel support for future meetings. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you, Michael. Do we have anyone else who wants to introduce themselves? With that, I think I will turn it over to Joe. He is next on the agenda to talk about chair appointments and roles. Joe, are you there?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF:

I'm here, thank you. As I point out in the note last night, the voting was completed. Alissa was unanimously voted the chair. There was an exceedingly tight race for vice chair with obviously, although the candidates being well-respected and well-qualified, but the two vice chairs are Patrik and Mohamed. Thank you to everyone who participated. Congratulations to the chairs and thank you to Wolf as well.

Alissa, as to the roles, perhaps that might be better discussed a little later just because we had a roles document that people commented on somewhat favorably, but we're going through a process where we're discussing how to achieve consensus. And there might be a role of the chair in consensus.

So I wasn't going to finalize the roles document until we finalize the consensus process just to make sure that the roles correctly reflected whatever we saw that might be added to the officers' roles in terms of helping us achieve consensus. I think there was an agreement that it was not up to the officer's full consensus, but rather to help us achieve consensus. I just want to make sure we reflect that correctly, because I think both in London and on the list there was a general feeling that the roles of the officers were much more administrative than decision-making roles in the sense of helping us come together, helping organize

it, helping move us towards the next meeting and making sure that we're meeting punch-lists of agenda items that need to be captured.

So perhaps we can save a little time and not dwell on the roles document and perhaps take that to be an online finalization of that document once we're finished with the consensus process.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks, Joe. That makes perfect sense to me. Anyone else have comments about what Joe is proposing? I don't see any hands raised. And thank you very much to Joe for running that process. I can only speak for myself, but I'm very happy [inaudible] that he's serving and their role [inaudible] all of you as the participants.

Alice, if you could scroll back up to the minutes.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF:

Alissa, this is Joe. Could I just add one thing? Toward the very end of the process, Heather kindly chimed in and said that the GAC would not be voting specifically on something like this, and just a topic that we may need to answer in either the consensus or the office role concept is if a group knows they are not going to be participating in a decision on one related aspect of our process, should we consider whether that affects the number necessary for the concept of what a sufficient number of people participating, a forum concept if you will.

But it just came to mind that if we have five people that aren't participating or seven people to say they're not going to participate in a

part of the process, does that affect the way we think of what is enough people to be in the process?

ALISSA COOPER: James?

JAMES BLADEL: Hi, Alissa. Thanks. Yes, I want to echo Joe's last question. I was also intrigued by the message yesterday from Heather about GAC participation and the nature of [inaudible] and would like to know how that will affect our decision-making process, particularly how we will determine whether or not consensus has been reached and whether or not we should just consider these [inaudible] to be abstentions on matters of what we'll call narrow questions or administrative issues.

Maybe when we get to that part in our agenda we could ask – I hate to put Heather on the spot, but maybe she could elaborate a little bit on her message yesterday and perhaps let us know how she envisions the GAC delegation participating in some of these decision-making, consensus-building activities. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, James. We will put Heather on the spot later. So Jean-Jacques is not able to have his audio right now and has a note about compulsory voting. So we have an item on the agenda coming up soon on the consensus process, so hopefully we can talk about that then and we're going to keep working on the audio for Jean-Jacques. I've made a note of it. Anyone else on this topic before we move on?

Okay. So the next item on the agenda was [inaudible]. You can see on the screen we have four documents that have been out for comment and approval for a long time now: the transcript from our first call in July, the minutes of each of the first few days of the London face-to-face meeting which were produced by Samantha, and also the metrics that specifies all of our information about ourselves.

And so these have been out for a long time. My intent for today was to see if anyone has objections to approving any of these documents, and if not, I think we can consider them approved and have the ICANN folks get them up on the website. So any objections to approving any of these four documents? Kuo?

KUO-WEI WU: It seems I missed my name in the report.

ALISSA COOPER: In which one?

KUO-WEI WU: The [inaudible] missed my name there.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. I'm sorry, in the matrix document?

KUO-WEI WU: In the page you just showed here, the preliminary report on July 10th.

ALISSA COOPER: Oh, I see. The phone call in July. Did you attend on the phone in July?

KUO-WEI WU: Yeah. Okay.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So we can work with Alice to get that one fixed. Thank you. Russ Mundy?

RUSS MUNDY Thanks. On the matrix, I had missed this earlier. I will be requesting ICANN travel support in the [closure] section.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Samantha, please not that and we'll get that fixed. Anyone else? Mohamed?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah. Thank you very much, chair. Just to ensure that I did understand what you proposed. So you're proposing now that we finalize and improve the documents were in discussion in this call for clarity, please.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes. The call transcript, the minutes from day one and day two of the face-to-face meeting and the matrix. Those four docUMENTS.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. That's fine.

ALISSA COOPER: Joe?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah. Just a clarification that, at times, I may request partial funding for like a hotel or something, so I just want to be correct on that. The other thing, which I will send a slight text edit to, is while we will be representing [ICC] basis, we have also committed to do outreach to organizations that are not part of [ICC] basis, but with whom we have relationships just to keep them informed of the process. So we'd like that reflected as well. But I can send Alice a [inaudible] to that effect.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Joe. Anyone else? Okay. So Alice and Sam will make those changes and we will get these documents posted on the website. Thanks, all, for your reviews that you did.

Moving on, our next topic is the consensus process. So I will turn this over to Wolf-Ulrich. I think we have him on the call now.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Can you hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, we can hear you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, thanks. So we haven't seen the versions number two of the guidelines for decision-making also [inaudible] time we have to [inaudible] review.

ALISSA COOPER: I'm sorry, Wolf. We're having a little bit of trouble hearing you. Is it possible for you to speak up a little bit or closer to your microphone?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: [inaudible] or even so.

ALISSA COOPER: Even better.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Oh. Can you hear me better now? Okay. So I would like to discuss with you about the version number two as much as possible as we can during the time we have available today. What I try to [inaudible] is to incorporate as much as I could, and as I also commented on [inaudible] your comments [inaudible] to me. But not all of [inaudible] while there are still some major topics I would say which we have to discuss.

I would like all of you to remind you that the draft here is based on what I took from the working group guidelines of the GNSO with regards to

finding consensus or decision-making. And in the past, which today is a good consensus-finding, [inaudible].

[inaudible] procedure of finding [inaudible] just pointing to two letters. I call it here recommendation [inaudible] recommendation. In the GNSO it's called an open [inaudible] full consensus, which means 100% consensus in the [inaudible]. And the other thing is consensus of why we have this discussion and also there are some comments on the list. Consensus may be consensus and [inaudible] or else even it's not consensus, so I call it recommendation by consensus which is related to 100% consensus and recommendation which would mean a kind of minority move, which would be expressed.

So one of the questions here is still related where a [borderline] should be drawn between those two, or that should mean minority view can be expressed in [inaudible] of numbers of membership in [inaudible] or in terms of [inaudible] specific groups, stakeholders which are separate [inaudible] can be made progress here in this [mindset].

The other thing is related to the [inaudible] and we should put [inaudible] to page number two [inaudible]. Yes, thank you. Here we are.

There are two proposals. The one which starts from the beginning of that proposal, and the other alternative proposal, one which came from [inaudible]. The first one came in from [inaudible].

So what I understand here, the difference is mainly how to avoid the [inaudible] in terms of such substantive and unsubstantive issues to find out what is it, what does it need. On the other hand, it seems to me

relatively similar [inaudible] whether we can decide upon which of those [inaudible] choose for this document.

What I also put in is figure out [inaudible] is going to act [inaudible] to find decisions. It should do that, not to decide on or to designate. Not on the mailing list. It's on there to be done on the mailing list [inaudible] we should have really state positions or [inaudible] at meetings. That means face-to-face meeting or calls like this.

For this, also, we should have a [home] which is going to be decided on [inaudible] as necessary also with a majority of views but also covers at least a minimum availability of the different stakeholder groups. At least [inaudible]. So the question here is for the [inaudible] different stakeholder groups here or do we [inaudible]. So this question shall be dealt with [here].

So I think these are, from my point of view, have been the major issues we have still and I would like to open the floor for discussion.

ALISSA COOPER:

I have Paul in the queue. Or if you want to run the queue, Wolf, that's fine.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:

Yes, I can follow the queue. Paul?

PAUL WILSON: Thanks. I didn't quite catch the reason why we're considering version [two] document and not version three. I added comments to version three where I, in particular i.e. in connection with the principles, I had suggested to try and [inaudible] the wording that would take into account. I saw quite a few of the [inaudible] comments that would [inaudible] long discussion about this, but I'm not sure if that's appropriate or whether I should be putting those into version two and what exactly is happening to the version.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Or maybe I'm wrong, Paul. I mean version three and I think it's also up on the Adobe screen. So we are talking about definitely version three, which I put to the Dropbox last night.

PAUL WILSON: I think that's version two [inaudible].

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Alissa, can you comment on that, please? [inaudible] I see your hand.

ALISSA COOPER: I was just actually projecting right now, I believe, not me. So I am not [inaudible] of the things shown on the screen.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. I've actually given scroll control to everyone, so you can navigate through the document during the discussion. You should be able to scroll right now.

ALISSA COOPER: But in terms of choosing what you're actually projecting, that was your choice, yeah?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

ALISSA COOPER: And the question is whether we're looking at version two or version three.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We're projecting the most recent version, the one Wolf-Ulrich referred to [inaudible].

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, right. Indeed.

PAUL WILSON: You're projecting version three .pdf where there's a version three .doc. A doc file on the Dropbox, which I had made some edits to. So that's the confusion, I'm sorry.

ALISSA COOPER: You view-edited this like an hour ago, yeah>

PAUL WILSON: Yeah, in the last couple of hours.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: I wouldn't like to confuse anybody here. Anyway, [inaudible] but the most recent version is up on the screen and that's what we are talking about. Paul, I would like to ask you if you have comments to that version, please do so. Maybe there's a duplication in relation to version two. So [inaudible].

ALISSA COOPER: Paul, perhaps you could just speak to your comments, because I know I didn't [inaudible]. I was asleep until 10 minutes before this call. So maybe you could just give us a brief run-down.

PAUL WILSON: I suggested some alternative wordings to the alternative words under principles. The alternative words seem to require some structure and a bit of editing for clarity. I felt that the last part about the ICG [inaudible] if a small minority disagree, [inaudible] rather unclear. I actually went ahead and [wrote] something which I refer to, which I put forward rather boldly I thought, [inaudible] as a definition of [inaudible] which actually is a numerical definition requiring [inaudible] members,

including 100% of the customer community members that probably would have to look at the specific [inaudible] edits that I did on [inaudible] considered.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, thank you, Paul. I will take that into consideration. I can't see [it] right now, but I take it into consideration and we'll update that accordingly. And we can pull out this discussion.

The next one is – Alissa are you still..?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, I'm in the queue. I have some other things to say, but I'm not next I don't think. I think Milton was before me.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Then Milton, please.

MILTON MUELLER: Okay. Can you hear me? Can you hear me now? All right.

So first, if you post a new document one hour before the meeting starts, you should not be surprised that people haven't seen it yet. So I'm reviewing your document and comparing it to what Wolf has proposed. I think I like the alternative language in Wolf's the best, although there are some simplifications of editorial reasons for preferring some of your language.

But to keep the debate on a conceptual level, I'm not sure I want to say, even though I have supported the idea of customer groups being

somewhat privileged in the [inaudible], I'm not sure I would be willing to say that 100% of those members would be required to reach a conclusion. I think that the agreement that I was willing to go with was something as if everybody in a particular customer group didn't like a solution, then that would be sufficient to kill it, but the idea that every single customer community member on the ICG has veto power I'm not comfortable with at all.

The other thing that I would say to Wolf is that I really like the language – I think I'm fighting with somebody to scroll here. "Identify probable ways in which a proposal could be modified to make it acceptable to them." In other words, this is in Martin's original language. Yes, if you're going to object to something, I think you have a responsibility to identify how it could be modified. So if we could retain that language, I would like it. That's all from me for now.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:

Thanks, Milton. Just to understand, you're [inaudible] more to support Martin's text. Did you provide in written form also your suggestion with regard to the ultimate wording?

MILTON MUELLER:

I was saying in your draft that you had up here on the Adobe, I like the alternative language better than the original language. It's just that that bullet point about identifying possible ways in which the proposal could be modified to make it acceptable, I think that should be retained from Martin's original language.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. Good. Thank you, Milton. I see Joseph.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. I guess my concern goes to I have no problem with adjusting that the customer communities have – what we call the operational communities – have a special place and need to be on board. Whether that's on board in terms of their representatives in our group on board, not everybody in the community is on board but the vast majority of that community is on board. That we'll have to figure out.

I fully understand why those communities need to be in that place. My concern is when we go to a numbers decision, whether it's in terms of calling it a minority or calling it four-fifths, there is a possibility that a small group could be representative of the majority of business and non-business end users. And it becomes problematic if, because numerically their representation is small on the committee, their voice is extinguished.

So I'm a little concerned if we don't take into account the fact of if large segments of a group are having an issue, that is also an issue with consensus in terms of what will be accepted when this goes out to At-Large. And I think we do need to capture a way, not so that any single organization can hold this hostage, but that if you have representative groups that may be numerically small but representing a large segment, there's an issue there as well and we need to figure out how to deal with that.

Unfortunately, I'm suggesting a problem without an answer and I'm sorry for that because I don't know what the solution is. I mean, it could be that if we went through a numerical calculation it would be four-fifths of individuals and four-fifths of organizations or something like that, so at least we have a threshold so it's not just how many representatives you have in terms of physical people, but how many organizations are a part of the consensus. That might help alleviate the problem. Thanks.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:

Thanks, Joe. I would like [inaudible] chat to remind all of you please to say your name at the beginning for the transcript, thank you. Thank you. I think one of the key issues really to [inaudible] developing the [inaudible] of conclusions we have to do. And also, we [inaudible] to the specific goal of [inaudible] community maybe, or stakeholders, or what else.

If you look at the competition of [inaudible], you see that we have I think at least 13 [inaudible] stakeholder groups, stakeholder meetings [inaudible] ISOC, GNSO and so on. So you have 13 different ones and they play a combined role in some respect. Maybe ccNSO and GNSO and others [inaudible].

So it would be helpful if you could find a key how to allocate those groups or to specific points where we have to take [inaudible]. That would be helpful. I tried that. I couldn't find that at the time, but that may be [inaudible] think about later.

So [inaudible]. Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, hello. Can you hear me? Can you hear me? Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yes, we can.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. Two points. I think it was Joe, but I'm not sure because names were not given at the beginning. I think Joe said something like groups represented. I'm concerned that this would lead to a sort of waiting of positions expressed, which would be rather complicated. I think we have to stick to the notion that there is a given number of ICG members and it is that which we [inaudible].

I say this also because I find that the whole idea of consumer or customer communities is important from the point of view of the operational entities, of course. But by underlining this too strongly, in certain cases, it eliminates our sidelines, other important elements in our group that is the user community. That was my first remark.

My second remark is about the paper we are seeing on the screen just now and I would like to refer to the paragraph entitled "Principles." That is currently under [four], methodology for making decisions and there is the part entitled "Principles." The second bullet point says "The cost to any form of voting should be the exception" and then there's [inaudible].

So I now request that we add, or whoever is holding the pen on this should add that a member of the ICG can request voting to be taken on any specific item or something to that effect, because we don't want to

simply say voting is unhealthy. We also want to say voting is possible if and when that becomes necessary.

I say this because right at the beginning of our joint work I had asked for voting to be installed for a limited number of topics or items. One of them was deciding on the chair structure and also populating the chair structure, because I thought that was important. That is over now, and congratulations to those who were elected. But there still may be cases where it would be much clearer to require voting.

Now, voting means that everyone has the obligation to take the vote, but can of course say yes or no or abstain. And when abstaining, choose to provide, or not to provide, an explanation for the abstention. So I would request now that something to this effect be included under “Principles” bullet point two. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:

Thank you so much, Jean-Jacques. I take that into consideration as well. I think we’re mostly running out of time on that topic, but Alissa had to cut that if that is really the case. I would like Heather as well to get the floor with Martin because he was providing the policy principles. Maybe afterwards we can finish with that topic and continue on the list discussing [inaudible].

MARTIN BOYLE:

I would like that – and Alissa was in the queue and has been patiently waiting for her turn. So does Alissa want to go first?

ALISSA COOPER: Go ahead. I'll put my comments to the list [inaudible] have time. Thank you.

MARTIN BOYLE: Okay. Thanks very much, Alissa. Certainly, because I suggested the initial set of principles. I'll put my hand up and say I'm quite happy with the revised wording that came through with the – and I thank Milton for flagging the requirement for people who are [inaudible] on getting to a form of consensus to identify the way that they think propose could or should be modified, make them acceptable to them. So I would like to see that one collected into the final version.

[inaudible] been quite hostile to the idea of us ending up being pushed into voting, particularly where there is perhaps quite a delicate balance between the different sides. I don't like voting because it ends up with losers and it's the [cheat's] way out because we go for a majority view no matter how simple the majority. It [risks] people not being [inaudible] taken into account and looking for some proper balance and fully-agreed input.

The idea that you then have across the community table [inaudible] at least the input agreement. Yes, I think [inaudible] a way of us getting to a point of saying, "Yes, okay, there is a safeguard, so I could accept in some cases." I would still always go back, though, to the fact that I would much prefer not to see us going to a vote unless there is a very, very good reason for it, or if it is just a [inaudible] concern of [inaudible] like our chair structure, like selecting chairs and co-chairs.

I think those were the only points I had on my list that I was concerned of, so thanks very much.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Martin, very much. [inaudible] would like to comment as well, please.

ALISSA COOPER: I will defer my own comments to the list and try to figure out how to put my hand down or have Alice put my hand down for me. We do really need to move on. We did have the earlier question to Heather about the GAC and voting, and I think it's important to hear from her, so I say we give her the last word and then move on to the next topic.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, thank you. Heather, please.

HEATHER DRYDEN: Thank you very much. I will be brief. To the extent that I can offer further [inaudible] point, in terms of voting generally, I think the GAC, and certainly in my view, we have quite a bit of hesitation when it comes to voting. I think that's generally speaking.

The instinct of the government side of things is very much to focus on consensus and consensus processes and so on. I think Martin was very clear in his comments about seeing the emphasis really needing to be

on working towards consensus and not exiting that kind of process [inaudible].

So I think, generally speaking, this is really the way that governments tend to look at processes for coming to some kind of decision on the point about consensus.

And then, in particular, a question is what I'm calling a narrow question. If you're talking about the vote, the process there for electing a particular candidate or if there is a Doodle poll used that's asking a very, very pointed question, it's unlikely that the participants at the GAC have the [inaudible] to participate in the ICG would be able to vote.

As I mentioned, when we had our meeting in London, the people that have been put forward for [the staff] are not really there to express an active view, and so then that comes back to this question about voting on a particularly narrow question.

I do think when we're talking about consensus that it's quite possible, and what the Contact Group, which is comprised of the participants in the ICG from the GAC and the leadership of the GAC which includes the vice chairs and so on, what we will endeavor to do is to convey a view, and it may be possible that there are [options] or particular views expressed more than one in what comes back to the ICG. But I think that that is just seen as positive and a way to get input on more substantive issues.

So the Contact Group will be wanting to guide the GAC as well as involving individual governments and those that are not members of the GAC [inaudible] conducting some kind of outreach to help with that

aspect of things. It's clear that there are individual governments that do expect to participate or submit input however that happens and we have had questions about the public comment processes that might be available as this process moves forward. Again, I think that's also positive.

I found it very useful to hear from Joe on the list and the questions that were raised there about silence and how that should be understood, and this point has been taken on – certainly taken on by me – and I think whenever we are able, then [if] the GAC participants are not going to express the view or “vote” that we should do our utmost to explain, so that there can be understanding about what that particular silence means or to explain how we will be providing input into those kinds of issues.

I hope that is helpful and I'll leave it there. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:

Thank you very much, Heather. Before I hand it over to Alissa, which I would like to come back to, because Alissa already commented on the list. I strongly understand that from a JAS point of view that they would like to have a clear basis where to go and how to go. With regards, if it [cast round for round] and try to find a consensus, then the question is when it shall end. When shall terminate it and how shall we terminate it? [inaudible] come to a conclusion. So that's one thing.

Also, what I understand here from the discussion [inaudible] different kind of expressing their voice is going to be handled. That has to be prepared in the document in a little bit more detail. That is one thing.

On the other hand, [inaudible], if it comes to whatever you call it, voting or polling or in a rare case is something which means that people vote or prefer the one or the other. The question is maybe in which cases shall we define those cases or not? I'm also going to bring that up maybe [on the] list and some topics which have been mentioned already here could be put on that list for discussion.

Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you very much, Wolf. I think that was a productive discussion. I know that people have a desire to kind of wrap this up and move on, not least of those is myself. But I do think this was productive and we should give ourselves a little bit of time I think to kind of refine some of these things on the mailing list. I would suggest that maybe by the time people are getting on the airplane to go to Turkey, we set a deadline sometime next week, middle of next week to say we want to have this done and see if we can make it there and everyone make their suggestions with that in mind, that we're trying to close on this. I will send a few suggestions because I know that I'm one of the people who has some outstanding issues. It sounds like there are a couple others as well. So hopefully we can get this wrapped up next week.

So let's move on to the charter, which Jari is going to lead the discussion on the charter. Jari, we have eaten away a lot of your time, so let's see how quickly we can talk about the charter.

JARI ARKKO:

This is simple. I'm going to share the document. There we go. First off, this came in pretty late, like an hour before the call. My apologies. It took longer than expected. But [inaudible] look at everything that I had seen, all the comments [inaudible] and tried to understand what they were saying and characterized them a little bit, basically editorial or minor issues or major [inaudible] point of view of the person who is objecting and then things that are outside the scope of the charter.

One example, there was a couple of comments that I think were more related to the solution that we are supposed to get by next year rather than the charter. I think those should be deferred to other things.

If we look at the second to last page, this document that I'm showing you, there's a summary of [inaudible] changes. I'll very briefly go through this and then show you the document itself [inaudible] and there aren't too many. A very small number. Then I'll also, finally, take you to some other issues that, in my opinion, I wouldn't do anything based on [inaudible] know about them. Make sure that we [inaudible].

And for the record, just to set up for this request for feedback was that we have a major objection, then we should consider it. [This is not an] opportunity for rewrites or stylistic changes or small things. In my recommendations, and it's of course up to you guys eventually, but my recommendation, I was, shall we say, a little bit heavy-handed in deciding that this is something that we need to really do and deciding the other things we can [inaudible].

Anyway, the few things that I thought that definitely deserved addressing somehow are on this page that you see now. The first one

[inaudible] is about the other input that we get from outside operational communities. You know the charter does ask for that, but it doesn't actually do anything with that. I think it's actually a bug in the chart we need to be aware of [inaudible] overall community [inaudible]. So I'm suggesting a [sentence] of that.

The other thing that came up in I think several points was whether the [inaudible] should be documented or not. Personally, I think that's good practice and it doesn't take away from the weight of the overall recommendation. It just [brought] support for that. And I don't think that's a charter issue where we have the other documents that is talking about the consensus process, so that can be dealt with there.

The same with some requests that came that we should have a link to where the parallel discussion on accountability is going. I guess we could add a link to the charter if we had one. I'm not sure if there's any stable link for that discussion [that would last] over the next year. I'd rather have that link in the ICG web page than in the charters.

And then there was a comment from [Sean] that if there is some need to update a proposal from a particular community – for instance, let's say from the IETF during the ICG process, we detect a problem with that proposal. We send it back to the IETF and have them make a change that corrects a particular issue, then when it comes back, it should be subject to whatever review and verification steps are taken for proposals. Anyway, I think it's reasonable.

There was a couple of editorial details regarding the information sharing part, first of all, that's it's mandatory, not an optional thing and

something about the website [inaudible] but I think we could easily get it done.

And then a big comment was also – and I think this came from many sources – was that we should be more specific about the relationship, our work, and the accountability work. There is good reasons why we're being a little bit vague there. However, I think one way of resolving that comment would be to add some text to the part where we evaluate or assess the proposals and indicate that the overall concept, that the the whole that we gather from the parts actually needs to deal with those aspects of accountability that are relevant for the IANA function. Not all parts of accountability that anyone could ever think about within ICANN, but those parts that are relevant for IANA. So suggesting adding that.

Then finally, several people commented that there should be enough time for commenting. I took this one-week example of the charter review as a negative example, although, in my view, the charter has been out there for months, so I think people have had time to look at that.

But again, that's something where we have a separate document in process, and something that we should specify in the charter, that by this date, you have to do things. It's just good practice in projects to separate tasks and not put everything in the same document. I think we can deal with this separately.

Now I'll show you the edits, then I think we can open it up for comments in just a moment. I hope you guys have seen my scrolling, by the way.

This is the charter, the first page. There is no substantive change there. I'll actually have to go through the whole thing until page five, I think, to find the first change. Here it is.

This is the part where we add a requirement about the accountability being there, as well. We're talking about the whole that we put together from the pieces. Then we say, "The whole also needs to include sufficient accountability mechanisms for running the IANA function."

Then a little later, further down here, it says if changes are required to fix problems in a particular component, then we send it to the particular operational community [to] rework, and then update [a] subject to the same verification review and consensus process at the initial proposals. As to what the [inaudible] and now we don't have to do any public review or anything. I don't think that's appropriate.

Finally, the last page, the information sharing, I deleted the word "should" and I added the words "publicly accessible and open" in front of "website" – minor change.

Those were the things that I personally gathered from the comments that we got. There might be additional things that we should cover. I think this will be a good time to talk about whether this set of changes is reasonable in people's minds.

I see a few people. Alissa, do you want to run the queue, or should I?

ALISSA COOPER: Go ahead, you can run it.

JARI ARKKO: Okay. Jandyr? Should I do something in order to enable a person to speak, or can you just speak?

ALISSA COOPER: He should just be able to speak. Jandyr?

JANDYR DOS SANTOS: Yes. Can you hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes.

JANDYR DOS SANTOS: Yes. Please. First of all, I'd like to thank you guys for putting this draft charter together. At the outset, please bear in mind that my comments should not be interpreted as the GAC input, but rather as the views from the government in my region, my own, on the issue that I take.

When revising our draft charter, in particular, the suggestion that the ICG substantive work should be done among the communities most affected by the IANA function, the domain names, numbers, and the

protocol parameters, I'm compelled to think about the public policy [related] implications of the different region of IANA stewardship away from the NTIA.

Even though governments, indeed, do not have a role to play in the day-to-day operational matters of the IANA functions, I believe that it might defeat the purpose for which the ICG was established if the ICG operation were to be guided by a purely [inaudible] perspective without the necessary political endorsement.

Let me explain what I'm saying in more detail. I fully understand that the relevant community in the ICG for GAC purposes is to deal with the issues of substance – is the domain names.

By the way, we look forward to working closely with a very aggressive timetable with the GNSO and the ccNSO on that important responsibility.

But let me recall, however, that the U.S. decision to announce its intention to transition its stewardship over [inaudible] in that domain name function to the global multi-stakeholder community was mainly driven by political and not technical motivation.

This, I believe – and this is the view from my country – that this is an additional reason why government views concern and positions should be duly taken into account in the decisions regarding both the ICG's working matters and the substance of its discussions.

Let me underline one point about that. This view is still fully compatible with the NTIA announcement. You folks should recall that this

announcement did not say there should be no government influence in the process, but rather that the solutions should not be [inter-governmental informed].

I'd just like to raise this point before we get into the details of the draft charter. Thank you.

JARI ARKKO:

I suppose I should quickly respond and say that you didn't say anything that I disagreed with. I think that's exactly right.

You also mentioned that you look forward to working together with the ccNSO and others, and I think that's exactly the right approach – make sure that the concerns and thoughts you guys have are included.

I guess that's a question. Do you have a specific thought in mind that we haven't covered something in the charter that prevents you doing that or do you have a problem or are you just expressing [how] you would like to work?

JANDYR DOS SANTOS:

Thank you. I just expressed the views of my country, as I said. This is not a GAC input. As I said, this was important to us, so we'd like to raise this point.

I'll definitely work together with the ccNSO and the GNSO on these issues, and try our best to see this point reflected in our comments and our suggestions to the draft charter. Thank you.

As you correctly note in your comments, Jari, it's not the purpose of the charter to provide a detailed mechanism by which we intersect with the other accountability process. The charter is simply saying, "What is our broad outlines of our activities?" It cannot go into detail. It's not an operational set of rules or regulations or bylaws, nor is it a detailed process. It's a charter. It's telling us what our basic job is.

I think some of the people making comments did not understand that sufficiently and were really loading a lot of concerns onto the charter debate that actually belong elsewhere.

If people are concerned about how we deal with the accountability process, the other accountability process, or with how we handle accountability in the actual proposal we submit to the NTIA, then they should get involved in those processes where they're actually taking place. The enhanced accountability process is taking place. It's just being established by ICANN, so of course we cannot define a detailed mechanism for intersecting with it.

The specific proposals that create accountability for IANA will of course come out of these operational communities and their other participants. They will not come out of the ICG. I wanted to make that clear.

And that, to conclude, leads me to the point made by the Brazilian representative, which is he's concerned about the so-called public policy issues related to the IANA transition.

Well, the primary public policy issue of the IANA transition is simply that we had one government in charge of it, and that government was in a

position to circumvent or veto policies coming out of the ICANN community, and the main political objective of this process is to put an end to that situation.

It's not like they're inherently public policy issues in the way IANA implements policies that are coming out of ICANN, or the IETF, or the Numbers community. Indeed, that's the whole point of this transition, is that the IANA should not be a policy-making entity and it should not be a veto point for circumventing policies.

If staff members or the government of Brazil is concerned about the public policy implications of DNS or any other part of the Internet, they should work in the policy-making communities. And our job is to make sure that the IANA process accurately and securely implements those policies, not change them. That's all.

JARI ARKKO:

Thank you, Milton. James?

JAMES BLADEL:

Hi, good morning. Just a couple of quick comments. One observation from the Brazilian GAC member, contrasting the interests of public policy interests versus technical interests, I would put a third leg under that stool, which would be the commercial and economic implications of IANA transfer. I think that is something that cannot be entirely disregarded. I don't think it really has a home in our charter, but it's just something that perhaps could set the foundation and context for our work.

I just wanted to make, I hope, a minor editorial suggestion that will go a long ways to establishing some clarity here. Whenever we introduce the term “accountability” in our charter, I would like to propose that we also include the adjective “independent accountability mechanism.”

One of the things that I’ve seen recently is that the word “accountability” is in danger of being overused and overloaded to the point where its meaning starts to become diluted.

I think that tying it to the concept of “independence,” because that is what the IANA function traditionally provided, was independent accountability mechanism on policy-making functions.

If we’re going to include the term “accountability,” I think that we should identify that it’s independent. That’s my comment. Thank you.

JARI ARKKO:

Thank you. I have no strong objections to that. I wonder if other people on the call, what they think about that.

The big problem with accountability in general has been that there is different types of accountability – accountability of the policy process, or accountability of the IANA function, which is what we should be focused on here.

I’m fine adding the word “independent” to the text, if others agree. We can put that on the list. Mohamed?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR:

Thank you for the perfect summary that you gave us. I have just one comment on the document. There was a discussion on the mailing list and also on the RFP regarding ICG and decision, this tendency to make decision about who should submit proposals, [on our] proposals from which communities to be selected.

There was a couple of discussions on the mailing list about us avoiding to clearly identify that, and basically allowing other communities to submit if they wish to submit.

The part in the second page of the charter, which lists the main tasks, the reference here is [policy] operation of communities. I think myself and others, we all understand that this is a very critical transition for the operation of community. Definitely, their input is crucial. Their proposal, either jointly or separate proposal, is really critical for the success of this [inaudible].

This part needs to be aligned with the RFP and the discussion currently we're having on the RFP regarding the submission, who's able to submit proposals, so we have two documents that are consistent. That's my comment here.

I think early I suggested [maybe referencing] communities and also directing communities to the current processes, but we might be in a difficult position later on if we receive the proposal that doesn't fit within the community's channel.

I think there was Martin and [Manal] had very valid points. Martin has very valid points about ccTLDs who are not members of the ccNSO. I

just wanted to raise the issue of consistency between the two documents in our approaches. Thank you.

JARI ARKKO:

Thank you. That's a valid point. I now also realize that in this charter, the eighth document, I actually forgot one thing, which I had suggested to be done, which is [inaudible] – that the ICG should also compile the input [aptitude] beyond the operational communities and assess the impacts of this input. Maybe that, in part, helps you with your issue, as well. That's, indeed, missing from V8. It is now.

I don't see other hands up at the moment. Alissa, did you want us to stop here or do you want me to go to my list of other things that I did not recommend, the other comment?

ALISSA COOPER:

I think we should stop here, for the sake of time. We have a few more topics to get to. But I'm wondering, as far as proceeding, how you'd like to proceed – if you feel that we need to have list accession about the other things before we can call for any objections to adopting this, or do you think we can do that now, [modulo] a few more edits that might get made based on our discussion today?

JARI ARKKO:

I'll have to do one more edit, because the one that I forgot and the word "independent" that was discussed. Maybe we can discuss those on the list?

I wanted to hear from the group if you, in general, feel that this edit is roughly what we need, because of the comments period, or if there is anything major that is missing, other than the ones that have already been discussed today. Feel free to speak now if you want something more or if something is broken. I'll take silence as agreement.

ALISSA COOPER: Joe and Paul raised their hands.

JARI ARKKO: Joe?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Joe Alhadeff with ICC/BASIS. The only question I had was I thought I remembered in the charter – and it's always hard to read a document to find what you're missing – I thought we had had at one time a reference to one of the purposes was to maintain the stability and operational functionality of the IANA function, which is an important concept to the beneficiaries of IANA, as well as to the operational communities.

I just wondered, was I imagining that that was in this document, or did we somehow lose that somewhere in the editing process?

JARI ARKKO: In the first paragraph, it says, "Blah, blah, blah, ensure that its proposal support the security and stability of the IANA function," which is a shorter version of that.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Oh, okay. I skimmed over that part. Sorry.

JARI ARKKO: Okay. Paul?

PAUL WILSON: Yeah, thanks, Jari. Thanks for all of your work on this. I think it all makes sense. I would like to proceed with publishing whatever we are agreed on, whatever makes sense, as soon as it does.

I thought we had a general principle, though, that we weren't setting anything in stone, and if we take that approach, then we can publish an updated charter and still have the ability to reconcile a few of those remaining points later on as discussion goes on.

JARI ARKKO: I think that makes sense. I thought I had certainly heard agreement here during this call, so if I post the one with the two missing edits, I will have a couple of days of e-mail verification if needed, if people have any issues.

Then by the end of this week, we publish this version as the current version and as noted, if next month, or sometime later, we have an issue, then we can do another edit.

JARI ARKKO: Daniel?

PAUL WILSON: Right. Thank you.

JARI ARKKO: Daniel. Daniel Karrenberg, you raised your hand.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Hello?

JARI ARKKO: We hear you.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: My only suggestion was to give it like a whole week of comment – not comments, but serious disagreements call, rather than to the end of this week.

We just got the whole thing today. While I agree that we need to be quick and be almost ready, I think we should give it at least five working days or something like that.

JARI ARKKO: That's reasonable. I can do that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Jari?

JARI ARKKO: Yes, [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just to the point that Daniel just said, maybe it will be a kind of a parallel comment period, where we discuss it on the mailing list and at the same time, the community has the opportunity to do it, so we don't have two processes.

As soon as we finish this meeting, the version we agree on can be published for the community comment. At the same time, we discuss it on the mailing list and we close it after five days, so we don't have two consecutive comments discussion periods.

JARI ARKKO: I'm not sure I want to go sort of publicly on the website and say, "This is another comment period," but rather, that we agree what it is, and we put it out, and then if later there is some issue, we can open it. But I think it's only up to us right now, because we've gotten the comments that we're going to get.

ALISSA COOPER: We really need to move on in the agenda. We have a few things that we're not going to get to that we probably should before the IGF. Can we proceed on the list with this? It sounds like we have rough

agreement about what we're going to do. We need to hammer out a few details.

JARI ARKKO:

Yes. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you very much, Jari, for all your work on that. In the interest of time, I think we're going to shake up the agenda a little bit and move onto the secretariat discussion. I hope we can get to the RFC at the end, but I think we need to talk about the secretariat and the IGF statement first.

Adiel, we have very little time, so as quickly as we can get through this, that would be great. Thank you.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Thank you, Alissa. I will try to make this quick, because globally, I think we have consensus on most of the [inaudible] of this. What we need to discuss and agree on quickly is how we proceed.

This document has been [inaudible] with assumptions of a few agreements that we seem to have in London, which is, one, first, we contracted an independent company to chair our secretariat. We get funding from ICANN. And there was also discussion at that time that we should contract that independent secretariat through an independent contractor. That was the original assumption of this document.

Now, from the various discussions we have on the mailing list, I think we have – I’m not [sure] – please raise your hand. We have ruled out the necessity right now to have an independent contractor for the independent secretariat, which means we can make the independent secretariat contracted by ICANN to do the job.

That is what I am seeing emerging from the discussion, while several people on the mailing list have raised the concern about the timeliness of this process. We need to move very quickly on this to be able to have a secretariat in place.

So [inaudible] comment, there are also some input or some leaning comment to having ICANN [inaudible] as secretariat, but reporting exclusively to the ICG. We have those two options on the table right now that we have to agree on.

I think one critical factor to take into consideration while this person is the timeline. We have to be realistic and make sure that what we put in place as process work fast and quick, so we become operational.

I think we need to get agreement on those two questions. One, do we want to still have an independent secretariat, but contracted by ICANN and funded by ICANN or are we okay to dedicate a staff from ICANN to share a secretariat who will exclusively report to the ICG? That’s what I can quickly say.

What is in the text which is projected here on that is we agree here, we can quickly adjust the text to reflect our final decision. So, comments? Any comments on those two questions? I think that I have Russ followed by Mohamed.

RUSS HOUSLEY: As I said on the mail list, I really think we need to select the independent secretariat. Of course, we have to follow whatever procurement processes and procedures ICANN normally uses.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Okay. Independent secretariat contracted by ICANN.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Correct.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Thank you, Russ. Mohamed?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I think we should proceed with the independent secretariat, but for the time being, support can be provided by ICANN should continue I think until we finalize that.

My question is about timeframes. Do we have any sense of how long and this process could be conducted, according to the ICANN procedures?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: I don't have the details of ICANN procedure, but in the document, there was some suggestion that there [has to] be able to – well, this is now,

but originally, the intention was to have the secretariat elected by the end of August.

We still have one week or ten days for that, but I'm not sure ICANN process can fit in those ten days. I'm not sure. If somebody from ICANN is there that can enlighten us on ICANN process? Theresa?

THERESA SWINEHART: Yes, Adiel. Do you want me to respond to any specific question?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Yes. How long do you think, if we issue an RFP, from an RFP to a final [contract], it will take following ICANN process?

THERESA SWINEHART: I'll need to revert back to the staff to identify an exact timeframe. It would be establishing the RFP based on what the ICG wishes to have in it. A review of that, obviously, a call for request for input, obviously from any interested parties, the selection process, and all those steps.

With regards to the specific timeframe of what you need from the staff, I'll need to revert back and get that answer from them.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Okay. But from what I can see from what the [inaudible] just now, iwe are talking about something around a month for the whole process, for the RFP, I think we can take most of the things from this document to build an RFP and issue a call for submissions.

THERESA SWINEHART: Right, Adiel. What was outlined in the e-mail are the specific areas that need to be looked at, including ensuring budgeting for the process in the context of what the requirements are that are outlined in the RFP, etc.

The points identified under the section, “Should the ICG seek a secretariat function that is separate but funded by ICANN?” are the steps that would need to be covered. Then obviously, working with the ICG.

The timeframe, whereupon the ICG is reaching agreement on what needs to be in there and the process for posting the RFP, receiving expressions of interest from the different parties who may be interested in participating or interested in the role, and then going through whatever process the ICG identifies in a transparent manner to make their selection.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: I think in terms of the selection and the transparency there, I think we can quickly put something together and some suggestion have already [flowed] on the mailing list. We have a very straightforward spreadsheet with few notations, and we will do that. I think issuing the RFP and giving time for people to submit and evaluating them, which would be the most important.

There is also the fact that if, after all the submissions, we haven't found anyone that really can do the job or proven to be able to do that, we also have to think of a plan B right away. I'm not sure.

I see Alissa. Alissa, do you want to cover? I see you have raised your hand.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you. I fully support what has been said already, in terms of finding independent contractors. I think it sounds like we have a lot of support in the group, from anyone who is commenting. I think we should go ahead and start moving on this.

As far as the content of the RFP and all that, I would be happy if we set up a little subgroup involving yourself, Adiel, and two or three more people who are interested who can drive this forward.

I think the text that you have is great. We need to convert it to be more specific for an RFP purpose. That's fine. We should just go ahead and put it out, and elicit proposals from people.

I don't think, at every single stage of this, we need to get full ICG consensus or a call for support on each different version that we need to create or whatever. I'm totally happy for a subgroup of people to run this process and deliver a recommendation to the full ICG at the end, and provide some justifications for why they're recommending it, and move on. That's what I would say we do.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: So far, it seems like we have the way forward on this. We will have an independent contractor, an independent secretariat, which will be contracted through ICANN process and ICANN funded, through the [inaudible].

So move on, and finalize an RFP that we probably – I'm happy to work with anyone that would like to join a small working group for secretariat selection process to continue working on it.

RUSS HOUSLEY: Adiel, I'm willing to help.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Daniel?

DANIEL KARREBERG: I have my hand up. Sorry, Russ. I'm concerned that this may take longer than we all expect. What I would like to see is a realistic time plan.

I remain still opposed to actually doing all this, and I saw some other people on the mailing list joining in on that. I don't think we have consensus on moving in this direction. So what I'm requesting is, as quickly as possible, a realistic estimation of how long this will take.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Daniel, that was the question I put forward for ICANN, because if we are going to use ICANN process to contract this, we have to follow ICANN process.

From our side is to put the RFP forward. This can be done in a week, to have the RFP out there, and actually, when that is done, the rest will really depend on the procurement process of ICANN, basically.

I'm not seeing this happening in less than 30 days, less than a month, realistically, so we are talking about something by the end of September.

In the meantime, I think we will continue using ICANN, as we are using ICANN staff as we are using [a voluntary] measure. I think that is what we are left with.

THERESA SWINEHART:

Adiel, can I ask for one question? What would be helpful in receiving also from the ICG is how long they will have the RFP out for, to ensure that the information gets out to everyone with adequate time to respond.

That's just a point for consideration as the ICG is looking at the timeframe and we're factoring in the different elements. I can give the respective staff that I need to get timeframes from the right information. That's just a request, as well. Thanks.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

I think we can issue the RFP for 15 days, maximum. That would be my suggestion. Yes?

ALISSA COOPER: It sounds like we have a bit of a fast-forward. Adiel, there's a request for putting a timeline out to the mailing list. I think maybe in the meantime, a subgroup can start working on the pieces that need to be done, and we can perhaps continue the discussion on the mailing list of whether we want to go forward with it.

I had actually not seen a couple of the e-mails this morning on the list about this. I apologize for characterizing something as having broader support maybe than it did. But I think there is enough people interested in the independent secretariat that we can move forward on that, try to get a timeline out to people, see if that makes anyone more comfortable with it, and continue on the mailing list. Okay?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Okay. That works for me.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you very much, Adiel. I'd like to move onto Joe, who is going to talk about the IGF statements, and then hopefully we'll have a few minutes at the end to talk about the community's RFP, but we have the IGF coming up very soon. I thought we should at least begin discussing what our process is going to be for this. I will turn it over to Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thanks, Alissa. There is a panel at the IGF on IANA transition. While a number of us will be on the panel, it seemed that it would be appropriate to at least, whether it's a read out or have in the room, a statement that would be an update and a status of where we are, a link

to a website that has relevant documents and information about us, the constitution of our group, the way in which we were constituted, etc.

So what I tried to do when creating a draft document – and this is by no means a draft that is meant to be considered in its form for final. It's the straw man to throw things at in a very rapid-fire succession. Essentially, I took some of the elements of the charter to define what we were talking about.

I tried to pull together a few of the elements from the RFP at a very topical level to indicate where we were seeking guidance; discuss a little bit of our transparency; and then highlight it from the charter, the operational procedures – we'll have to make sure the language is consistent with the most recent version of the charter; and then finally, have an "other administrative topics" section, which includes the selection of chairs, the vice chairs, the description of officer roles, etc., which I'm not sure where we're going to be on some of these in terms of their completion.

That's what makes this document especially difficult. Some of the stuff I'm referring to is work in progress. I can't get too far ahead of it, and I want to make sure that we're discussing it correctly.

I also wanted to try to describe that we have participation from both operational communities and what I call the "broader stakeholder group," and that they're working together. Both have roles and inputs that are being provided. That's what I tried to capture, because I thought that's what some of the thoughts would be.

I also think the extent to which we can put down at least a calendar of the next couple of dates that are of relevance to us, that's also useful if people want to try to plan their participation.

We also should recognize that, for some, there is going to be an issue of how they can participate in our meeting at the IGF, because some folks may actually be going home on the day we're meeting. We want to make sure that we link to recorded versions of that meeting, because some people may be in transit.

That was the concept. I don't yet know whether this is something that we can read in, or whether this is a document that can be circulated. We haven't really approached the organizers to put that in as a formal role, nor have we had an internal discussion as to who the formal spokesperson of this document might be.

I just wanted to kick start the fact that we need something for the IGF, and this is the straw man to throw things at.

ALISSA COOPER: Joe, would you like to run the queue?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: If you could run the queue, that would just be great, because I wasn't paying attention to what order things were coming in.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Milton?

MILTON MUELLER:

I appreciate your effort in putting this together, Joe. I think, however, that the – I guess I would take a much less formal approach to these talking points.

From my point of view, [I think what] we'll be doing at the IGF is hopefully introducing and showcasing our RFP, which I hope we finish in time for that, and that we will be convincing communities to get involved in that and trying to explain to them our approach to the development of proposals.

It might be much more of a bullet point, PowerPoint kind of explanation might be much more effective than a formal statement of this sort, which presumably people would read. As a document, I'm not sure how well that would go over in terms of actually bringing the points home that we need interaction on.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF:

Milton, just to answer that. I wasn't sure that we have an opportunity to present it, so I drafted it as a document, and agree that this would not be the way one would read talking points. Talking points would be much shorter than this, much crisper, and hopefully would be something that generated interactive conversation.

But I don't have any verification that we will have any opportunity to have formalized talking points that can be read in as part of that transition panel. I thought that it would be useful to at least have

something also on the ground that we can use as the basis for what people understand what we're doing.

I would just stay away from PowerPoint slides, just because I hate them, but I think we can derive from this a more narrow set of bulleted points that doesn't have as much of the background information.

MILTON MUELLER:

Okay. I guess I would just say there is some unresolved issues that we might make progress on in the next ten days, so we should keep this flexible.

Again, as much as we all hate PowerPoint, it's just – you put a bullet point up there, it doesn't commit you to a lot, but it does conversation and discussion going. That's just my approach to it. I'll shut up now.

ALISSA COOPER:

Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you, Alissa. Yes, I'd like to follow up on what Milton has suggested. I think that, first of all, we should make sure that there is a possibility at the IGF for this presentation to take place.

The second point is that, yes, this seems a bit formal. Thank you, Joe, for drafting this and presenting it, but I think something more user friendly would be even better.

My third point is, as usual, that if there is to be wording, you have to be careful that IANA clients, on the one hand, and the rest of the composition of the ICG should not be made out to be too different.

I do recognize, too, that the wording that you have used at the beginning of your text is fair and balanced. I'd just like that to be carried forward in whatever final form is chosen, whether it's a PowerPoint presentation or just speaking from notes. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER:

Daniel?

DANIEL KARREBERG:

Just very briefly, I thank you, Joe, again, for doing this, but I agree with Milton that it needs to be a bit more crisp and have the main points.

I think the main points are [our] RFP, and the fact that we're seeking input through the various communities that are developing proposals, and that we make it very, very clear that participation in developing the proposals should be through those communities and not through the ICG.

I think if we get these points across, then we've done all we need to do, and then we can have further mentioning or references to our charter, the officers we just elected, and that we actually having some momentum in this group.

But I think it's most important to mention the RFP and the way the final proposal is going to be developed through the community. I think this needs to be made.

Also, I would advise against copying too much language. I think referring to it is much, much better.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF:

Can I just remind people that the IGF community is not necessarily a fully ICANN-aware community? While a lot of folks at the IGF follow these issues, a number of folks may be stumbling in with a curiosity factor.

I agree on talking points. We should be focusing on where we are. But if we do decide to have a document as well, that document needs to include some of the background, because some of the folks looking at it aren't going to be able to put this in context.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Yes. Just to pick on what you just said, and Daniel. I wanted to say that in fact, what we need is two documents. We need one document, which will be an ICG brief, which we can use, we can print and distribute during the whole IGF that will spread the word and let people know exactly what we are doing. I think we can do that and we can use people to add more to what is there. So thank you very much for what you have done, Joe. It will be useful for people to know.

Then, I think one of the major thing that people will be interested in in a forum like IGF will be the RFP – what exactly we expecting from people

and what will be the process that those operational community are going to use.

I think we should use that opportunity to allow operational community as well to describe what they are planning to do, and we will talk about how we are going to take their input and come up with a proposal, because that's what people are looking for. That's what they are going to question us on. That's what they are going to willing to engage with us on.

Maybe we should focus a little bit more on the RFP and have something almost close to final, or open for comments during the period we have IGF, so it's already ready out there for comments, so we can interact with people specifically on the RFP and the timeline for the whole process.

People out there are also asking a lot about the timeline. What is the exact timeline that the ICG is going to use for this? Because the community, they are waiting for that timeline to do their own thing.

I think if you can focus the comments then on the RFP and have it published for comments before IGF, focus this session on that, that would be very, very useful. And then have this wide background document that can be worked on and published for wider discussion.

ALISSA COOPER:

Joe, I'm very mindful of our time. I think we've gotten a lot of useful input on this. In particular, that we might need both a document and a set of talking points. We should be [filled in], we should focus on the

RFP, and so forth, so we can keep refining this on the list between now and the IGF. I think that's a good plan, if that works for you?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Fine.

ALISSA COOPER: We have five minutes. I know people have a hard stop. I do think we should spend five minutes talking about the RFP, since everyone wants to get it done, or have at least a solid draft of it before the IGF.

Let's talk about that for five minutes, and we'll go only one minute over on wrap-up and making sure that everyone knows what the next steps are. Paul?

PAUL WILSON: Hi, Alissa. Thanks. This is the lightest RFP document that Alice has just thrown up on the screen for us. I have taken what became a very messy document with a lot of comments and edits and notes. I have made my best effort to reconcile all of those comments and edits, including approving a few of the edits and making a couple of edits that are reflected in the comments there.

I think there is one macro issue with this document that still is quite up in the air and that we need to resolve. That is the issue is about the process more than the document. The question is about the openness of the process, in terms of how widely we will receive and process responses.

Further to that is the question of how actively inclusive it is. We have defined the customer or operational communities of the IANA quite clearly, but we haven't really defined what is our relationship or the relationship with this process for the other communities.

There are other specific communities that are defined in the composition of the coordination group, of course. Whether or not those communities are explicitly expected to input in their own right, or whether we're really trying to insist that all communities try to enter the process through the existing operational communities.

I'm leaning myself towards openness, but I'm not really trying to create a situation of an impossible task force here, but I think the comments to the document were pretty much largely leaning towards a more open situation, expressing concerns that if we appear to be over structuring and over constraining those who could contribute, then we really would not be creating the right impression.

I think that's it, by way of explanation. There's still an open question as to really, in particular, the community outside of the operational communities and how they should be invited or included or approached.

Then I think the rest are really a bunch of details. If we had time, I would have planned to go through this document in some detail. We don't have time to do that, so I can see the discussion starting on the chat about having an open quorum. I think that sounds like a good idea.

Milton is trying to speak.

MILTON MUELLER:

Yeah, okay. Just very quickly, yes, we were having a debate about the degree to which the processes should be led by the operational communities. I see in this draft you've sort of taken a position on that, which I'm glad to see that you recognize is not really consensus position yet, just that you're making that proposal.

One issue that I think is very important to me that I want to address – you have the identity of the community in this checklist. To me, that checklist was not about the identity of the community, or should not be about the identity. It is about what the proposal actually addresses. Are we making proposals about numbers or names or protocols? I definitely do not want this to be about the identity of the community.

It seems to me, particularly when we get into trying to categorize people into other effective communities, we are encouraging people to just talk to their own group, work in a silo, and come up with their own proposal. We just don't want to do that.

We want the process feeding into our process to be as broad-based and consensus-based as possible. I would reframe that whole section zero to say just, "What is the proposal about?" not "What is the identity of your community?"

PAUL WILSON:

Glad to hear that.

MILTON MUELLER: Now I have to go.

PAUL WILSON: I really do agree with you.

ALISSA COOPER: Paul, we are at the hour, and I want to be respectful of people's time. I appreciate you highlighting this issue. I do think we just have this one major issue, and the others are pretty minor.

We're having a little side chat about maybe having a call next week to try and resolve this. I think we can take that to the list, and also, we should continue this discussion on the list. It does strike me as something that might need a little bit of real-time interaction to really finish on.

But if we do that next week and we really do finish, then we'll have something, at least in a very stable draft form before the IGF, which sounds like a lot of people want to have.

I'll send some mail about possibly setting up another call, and I think in the meantime, we should really push on the mailing list and see if we can get to a resolution. Does that make sense?

PAUL WILSON: Does to me, yeah.

ALISSA COOPER:

Great, thanks. With that, I think we will wrap up. I will ask Alice to publish the attendance list to the mailing list, and if you don't see yourself there and you were on the call, or if you do see yourself there and you were not on the call, please respond to that so we have the proper list of who was in attendance.

Samantha was taking notes and will be circulating minutes. We'll go through the same process for minutes approval. Otherwise, I think we have a couple of action items. We're going to try to wrap on the consensus document next week, also on the charter.

Joe has an action item to work on some talking points and keep driving on the IGF statement. We'll close on the RFP, and hopefully next week, set up the call.

Adiel has the actions on the secretariat. Thanks to everyone for all your hard work on this. We'll see you in Istanbul.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]