ALISSA COOPER: Great. So it's two past the hour, so I think we should get started. I know a few people are still getting connected, but hopefully we'll have everyone on soon. As usual, we will do the roll call based on the Adobe Connect log, and the Secretariat is taking care of that.

But if there is anyone who is on the call who is not in Adobe Connect, can I ask you to make yourself known right now?

Okay. Sounds like everyone is on Adobe Connect. That's great. You can see in the projection, the agenda we have a two hour call planned for today, and lots of materials to get through, starting the discussion on whether that Patrik, Mohammed, and myself received from NTIA. We'll go through the CWG proposal three assessment. Wolf-Ulrich will lead that discussion.

We'll talk about the response that we've got from the ICANN Board Chair concerning our statement about contracts. And then at the 90 minute mark, actually that might be before item number three, at the 90 minute mark we will lose our interpreters, so we should try to get through, I think, as much as the substantive discussion as we can in the first 90 minutes.

And then we will have, at the end of the call, some administrative issues, the approval of the minutes and the future meeting and teleconference schedule and so forth. And we put those at the end, because we knew we would be losing the interpreters at that time. So does anyone, at this point, have other items that they want to add, or

---

EN

any comments on the agenda? Please raise your hand in the Adobe Connect.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hi Alissa. We cannot hear you quite well. I'm sorry.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. I can try to speak up.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Alissa, this is Daniel. I can hear you loud and clear, perfectly.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, well that's good. Hopefully it's not a problem at my end.

Okay. No, no agenda bashing, so we will go forth with the five items that we have, starting with the letter that we received from NTIA. The Secretariat will show the letter. I think everyone is pretty familiar with it. It's from, it's been out for a while now, for a couple of weeks.

So I think the main, you know, the question to us from the NTIA is to get more information about the status of the transition plan and the timeframe. And there is really, I think, just a couple of items that I wanted to get through to start the discussion, and then to get everyone's opinions on how we [inaudible] to this letter.

And I put all of these in an email that has been shared on the list some time ago. So I think, first of all, we have a sort of logistical question

about, you know, we don't want to just respond on behalf of ourselves, we want to have community input into that response. And so we've had some discussion of, you know, us as representatives of the various constituencies being able to [fill out] to our communities, and…

Sorry, I have a crying baby at home. So we….

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We can also hear her.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, she's not sure about the IANA transition at the moment. But maybe [inaudible] or Mohamed could take this one over, just prepping the discussion a little bit and I'll try to calm her down and get back on in a second.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: She's speaking on behalf of the entire Internet community.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: This is Patrik speaking, taking over temporarily for Alissa. So, we have received this letter. And as you see by reading the letter, we are asked to, one can interpret this letter, of course, in multiple ways. My personal reaction was that they're asking for an updated timeline. And we have discussed sort of the timeline on the mailing list.

The one thing to notice, in this letter, is that the timeline is to not only, as we have discussed before, included the time that we need between

EN

now and when we have our proposal ready to be delivered to NTIA, it is also to include the time that we have absolutely no idea how long time it is, which is the time the NTIA might need for implementation on whatever they're doing on their side.

But also, the implementation time that the operational communities actually need. So to some degree, they ask for NTIA from our perspective, do ask for some input on the thinking that we might have. And let me open the discussion of the updating that, I have, so far, in the ICG, that all of us do believe that if it is the case that we do not manage to fulfill all the, everything that we are required to do, which we now understand is [inaudible]. So the NTIA time and also the time the operational community need, before September 30, then we need some extension.

I have also understood that, if it is the case that we need an extension, we need an extension of what is actually needed, and not more, which means shorter time period than two years, which means that I do think that we already before have been talking about a potential extension of shorter time than two years.

I do see some comments already in the comments, but I would like to open up here for some input from other people of the ICG that have been thinking about the timeline. Please.

Wolf-Ulrich, please.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yes, thanks.   Wolf-Ulrich speaking.   I have, at first, for the full understanding of the process here, question with regards to the, how are we going to honor this NTIA questions with regard to the timeline? I understand the NTIA has sent two letters, one to us, to the ICG, and the other one to the CWG. So that's what I understand it means. So we are seen as caretakers in this respect also for the CWG, stewardship, CRISP, and the IETF team as well.

So that's my understanding. So the question here is, am I right here? Or, how is this to be seen?

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. My understanding is exactly the same as yours. Is that we are, the ICG, we got the question. And to be really, really picky here, and detailed, the letter was not [sent to the whole] ICG, it was sent to us, the chairs, that are supposed to respond to what we believe is the actual timeline. Now, we have an agreement within the ICG that we as chairs do not speak up unless we do have a backing from the ICG as a whole, one could, of course, question whether that is the same kind of consensus that is needed, as the ICG speaks, but I really hope that we don't have to go into those details.

That said, under the umbrella of the letter that was sent to us, my interpretation, when receiving this letter, is exactly the same as yours, which is that we have to take into account the time all three operation communities do need for the implementation of whatever they are proposing. While the other letter that is sent to the chairs of the CCWG accountability, they have to take care of the implementation of

whatever they need for the IANA transition portion of their work, which according to whatever explained to us, is the implementation, or whatever they are having under what they call the test run, or whatever the wording they use.

So I think, my interpretation is the same as yours.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOWBEN: Okay.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Alissa, please.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks Patrik. Yeah, to sort of further elaborate, I think, on the logistics of us getting a response back to NTIA. I think what would make sense, if we're targeting being able to get a response back to NTIA shortly after ICANN 53, which is, I think, kind of mentioned in the letter, suggestion for when they want to input that. I think we should take the time between now and then as, you know, representatives to the [inaudible] and the numbers community, to be able to go back and put in some input about implementation timeline from those two communities.

And then I think, if we could do that it would be great, obviously, it's probably a little harder to [inaudible] the implementation when the plan is more finalized. But essentially, I think we as representatives can go out to our own communities to get input in particular about the implementation timeframe, which we haven't discussed very much, and

EN

bring that back in time for the ICG to compile all of that and discuss it in our face to face meeting prior to Buenos Aries, and fold that into our response.

So that's, that was what I propose that we do, and Paul and I had a little back and forth on the matter, about doing that. So I will be interested if other people think that's an acceptable path forward in terms of getting input from the operational communities.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yes, thanks for the clarification. And so the understanding, so we have the same understanding on this. So with regards to one major point, I see with regards to the timeline.   This is the question of implementation, or let me say, the kind of level about the implementation, which has to be already worked out in the proposal we are going to forward to the NTIA. In other words, saying so I understand on the one hand, the letter asking for the, at first, for the proposal, and then the implementation phase of the proposal.

On the other hand, if I look to the CWG proposal, at the time being, on public comment, they are talking about the, a kind of consistent framework which must be further developed into detailed, fully functional transition plan after the implementation. So the question is for me, I'm not very clear at the time being around that, this is the kind

EN

of implementation they mean, or it is the plan for implementation, or what is behind it.

So there is a little bit for me, not clear at the time being, to what extent the proposal has to include a part, or to cover the plan for the implementation as well, and to what extent, and how that effects and impacts the timeline. This is an open point which I also put into the assessment, which I'm going to talk about later. And I think we should discuss that.

Maybe some of the people who are more closer to the CWG designs, could have some comment on that. Thanks.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Thank you very much for that. I think we are diving into the details in a way that I think it's important for us to discuss, but I think to be able to respond to the letter, at least my interpretation of the letter, is to more or less be able to respond whether we do believe that, for example, an extension is needed, yes or no.

And whether the extension should be for two years, or whether it should be a shorter time period. And not much more detail than that because the response that we are supposed to give, of course, we don't want to go back, and many of the budget and kind of resource allocation, of course, that all of us has been into, we don't really want to say something now and then change our mind in three months and say something different.

EN

So I think the question of the letter is more or less to give some kind of indication to NTIA on what we do believe, given the multistakeholder bottom up process, that we are sort of the part of the multistakeholder process that we are sort of the top of, if you understand what I mean, what we recommend to NTIA to do with the contracts. Nothing more.

I think that's… I think what I hear and what I do think is maybe that we need an extension, but then the question is, how are we going to word that. And now I have lots of hands, so let's take one at a time. Paul please.

PAUL WILSON: Hi, it's Paul here. I missed a little bit of the voice due to the connection here, so I hope you can hear me. About the extension, I would have thought that an extension of exactly two years is not what we want, if we assume that the extension requires that the contract actually continues for that time. I had understood that an extension of the contract for a two year period will still allow the NTIA to close it off, to cancel it, or to end it earlier. And that I understood was an essential part of this model.

If it's not, and if an extension of two years implies a two year contract, I don't think that's in line with the general expectation of what we're doing here, taking to a completely new territory, a new realm of what would happen after two years. I have heard some talk, that I have lost track of the latest developments about the possibility of a shorter term that extension of one or more extensions of only three months, for instance, which would seem to be much more preferable, or much

preferable, to an extension of two years, even with an assurance that a two year extension could be ended earlier.

I hope that's clear enough. Thanks.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Thank you very much. Daniel?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Yeah, this is Daniel. I believe before I think you should have some discussion, but it appears to me that a normal two year extension would send probably not the right signal back to the community. I have another thing that is a question in my mind. I am personally a little bit concerned about the impression that we're making as a whole, as the multistakeholder, bottom up governance model in the community.

In that we will have to admit that we will not make the deadline for a complete proposal. And I'm wondering, quite personally, whether, in order to please a better impression and give less openings to our antagonists, it might be a good idea to propose going ahead with a partial implementation or [sub right] implementation given that two of the communities are much further with their work.

And in some cases, also have some implementation plans already. So I wonder whether that the ICG, we would consider a staged implementation and transition in order to show some tangible process. Again, it's in order to avoid the argument by others that we're just completely dysfunctional.

EN

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Thank you very much. Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes. Thank you Patrik, and thank you everyone for this brainstorming. Just sharing my thoughts also because I'm a bit confused. So, for example, if the operational community, say the implementation will take something like six months, so does this mean that the ICG submits the proposal to ICANN, and then to NTIA, and then we have this period of evaluation that we don't know yet how long this would be through the US government?

And then, if we say the implementation will take like six months, then this is going to be the duration of the extension? And I mean, would everything just be ready at the same time? It's like an on/off switch that we're going to have it on a certain date, the contract expires, and then everything is implemented on paper.

I mean, how would this work in practice? And then if the contract will, could be cancelled earlier, then whatever period is agreed for, if this is an option also, or we would be commented to whatever implementation sign that's going to be shared through the operational communities. But again, my understanding is the implementation would match one to one with the contract extension, right?

Hello?

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Yes, can you repeat what your actual question is please?

MANAL ISMAIL: I was asking whether the implementation, the timeline for the implementation would map one to one with the extension?

ALISSA COOPER: This is Alissa. Do you mind if I jump back in here?

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Please.

ALISSA COOPER: [Inaudible]. So there is essentially three different phases that we need to pass through, I think, before the contract will expire. The proposal needs to be finalized, since NTIA. The US government needs to evaluate it. And the plan, that is detailed in the proposal, needs to be implemented. And at the end of those three phases, then my understanding from the letter from NTIA, is that at the end of those three phases, the contract can be allowed to expire.

And so I think what we need to focus on are the two pieces of that that are within the control of the communities, and those are the finalization of the proposal itself, and the implementation. And I think, as Patrik was alluding to, I don't want us to get too wrapped up in, you know, providing some guidance as to exactly how the contract should expire,

and if it should have multiple, you know, further expiry periods, or options to extend, and so forth.

So those are the mechanics that I think NTIA was going to take care of. What they've asked us for is that the pieces of the puzzle that we actually have control over, and how much time we think they are going to take. And I think, again, those two pieces are finalized in the proposal itself. We're hoping to do some time between now and the fall, and a lot of that is on the ICG to figure out how much time we need in order to do that.

We can certainly talk about that. And then implementing what actually gets written down in the proposal. And I think that under that umbrella, that includes things like, you know, [inaudible] that they don't already exist, and then the bylaws, and doing all of those things. Setting up agreements if they don't already exist. And that's where we need input from the operational communities to understand how long those steps will take.

I don't think we need to, you know, give NTIA a calendar of when we think all these things will happen, because there are, the US government evaluation period will happen in between there. And so, you know, they just want the input about the pieces that we have control over, not necessarily a date when we say, "This is when we think [the context] will expire."

Hopefully that makes sense.

EN

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Kavouss, I saw that you actually had your hand up before the others. So please, I would like to give you the floor.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: It doesn't matter Patrik. In question of NTIA is second part, towards the end. The question contains two parts. One part would be harder to take, to finalize the transition plan. And the second part, [inaudible]. We have to accept this, the issue of the transition plan and the issue of implementation of it.

The transition plan is something that ICG would be in a good position to answer. The implementation plan, I think, ICG has no role to talk about the implementation time because it's mainly depends on CCWG and CWG. I think it but appropriate that ICG take any responsibility to get or estimate timelines for implementation. We should talk about the transition plan, and add element of implementation, and indicate implementation depends on the two other communities, or two other entities, CCWG and CWG.

CCWG, according to the timeline today, their implementation is 16 June 2016. But it has not [inaudible] mentioned that all areas that CWG has asked would be available before that time, or would need to be in that [currently results] to be June 2016. Therefore, I suggest that we limit ourselves to our transition plan, and we add that depending on the implementation, this would be the answer to the question.

We should not [inaudible] how long the contract that the NTIA, and ICANN, and IANA could be extended. This is outside of our mandate and this is outside our responsibility. And we should not accept to take

EN

such a big responsibility. We should indicate what we can do, and what the other people expect us to do. And leave it to them to discuss, and the same letter that was sent to the CWG, and I'm sure the CWG will reply.

And based on that reply, we at the Buenos Aries meeting, could review this situation, and try to have something that once again, which would not be the matter of implementation. It is outside the ICG. It is more related to CCWG and CWG. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Thank you very much. I understand, and with what I personally agree with, is that we should look at the time we need, as ICG, to respond. And we should draw the conclusion giving the context to which we operate in [inaudible].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So if we look at these three phases. The first one is we need inputs from all of the communities. We're still waiting on one. So we need to get a feel when CWG believes they will give us a proposal. Then, we have some time to do our own work, and that's already on the chart that's being displayed, so we can add that.

The timeline document we produce says that the implementation will begin as soon as the proposal is submitted, and that all of those things will run in parallel, except for the root zone approval process which cannot be altered until the contract goes away. The last little bit cannot actually be done until NTIA's contract ends.

I think we need to explain that kind of waterfall process and any response that we send to NTIA.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Thank you very much. Martin?

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks Patrik. Martin Boyle here. I'd like to go back initially to the comment that was made about failure. And I think that that, as a message, is entirely raw. I think the amount of work that has been achieved in all of the different communities, bearing in mind the complexity of the problem that they were facing, and bearing in mind the outreach and the number of people from quite different backgrounds, that have been involved.

The progress has been quite outstanding, bearing that it's also being done very carefully. So I think, when we talk, we really should be talking about the success of the process. Certainly of the good work of the process, and not diss [sic] colleagues as we are going through this process.

And the other comment earlier that I would like to pick up on is about proposing a staged transition. I think the NTIA have already said more than clearly, that that is not an option to them. Right, now turning to the discussion on the NTIA letter. I think really, that we've got all… We haven't got all the pieces, but we know who to go to ask to get the various elements, that we can then put in together, and try and identify what that solution, what that time to [inaudible] will actually be.

EN

And in fact, I disagree with the idea that we shouldn't be asking them, and them includes ICANN, about some of the implementation scales, because it should be possible for them to work out on things like bylaw changes, and like… Obviously the one we can't ask about is the NTIA time scale, but in fact, once we have put a proposal to NTIA, and they're working through it, there is no reason why ICANN and other involved parties cannot already start to make sure that they have got all the bits and pieces lined up so that bylaw changes, or setting up new corporate structures, can be done relatively quickly.

So if we take all of those bits together, so long as we ask the right questions about how long the various bits are going to take place, it should be relatively easy to use our own timescale, put it all together, and come up with at least a best case scenario of when we think that everything would be ready, so long as NTIA gives the go ahead by that date.

So I would be very, very cautious about sort of turning around and saying, "Well, we can't do this. We can't do that. We can't do the other." We are actually supposed to be a coordination group. I think we should be going out and reaching out to the various partners, and getting them to identify the elements and for us then to put them together.

The only other comment I've made is that the cross community working group on names, the last chart I've seen from them, is that they believe that they will be able to get us the proposal on the 25th of June. That might be optimistic, bearing in mind, there is still consultation and

EN

piecing together the bits of consultation. But I think we do have to work on the basis of what they think is going to be achievable. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Thank you very much. Russ?

Russ Mundy.

RUSS MUNDY: Are you hearing me? I was off of mute.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Yeah.

RUSS MUNDY: Okay, good. I wanted to comment earlier on input from Kavouss, that I believe he said, if I understood correctly, that the implementation aspects would really only be relevant to the, what comes from the CWG and the CCWG names. And I don't believe that that is actually accurate. I think that there will be implementation details from other, the other operational communities.

Much, much smaller. Probably less of an impact, but I think they do have to be considered, whether they are the contract that has been identified in the CRISP proposal, or some of the things that have come back from the ITF. I think that, as a coordination group, and some of the discussions in the chat room, our job really does include to getting

EN

inputs from all of the operational communities on the implementation of their plans, as they best know them at the point in time.

And to me, it's clear only one question that is asked in the NTIA that we have an answer for. Can we make the original deadline? And I think we all know we cannot. But I don't think we want to explicitly say a contract extension of X amount, whatever X might be, should be asked for. I think that is something we should leave for the NTIA to decide. We should tell them what we know, what we believe to be our best estimates, and let them decide what to do with the contract aspect.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Thank you very much. Milton?

Milton, I don't hear you.

MILTON MUELLER: Can you hear me now?

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Yes.

MILTON MUELLER: All right. This is Milton Mueller for the record. So building on the point that Russ just made. We've been having a very vigorous conversation about what level of extension would be required. Whether it's three months, six months, one year, two years, and so on. I'm asking first, I

EN

don't think that's what we're being asked by the NTIA. Is it… They didn't say to us, "How much of an extension do you think you need?"

I think what they're trying to get from us is a sense of the revised timeline, and they will decide how much of an extension is needed. As much as I wish we can say to them, "Don't extend it more than X amount because it looks bad," I don't think that we have any say about that. And I'll be happy to be corrected if I'm wrong about that, if somebody has any other information.

The other point I wanted to make is that in all of these discussions of timeline, I think we're ignoring kind of one very important aspect of this, and that is the possibility that there won't be consensus, or there will be a perceived lack of agreement about the options, particularly at this stage where we've submitted the NTIA.

And that to me, you know, we don't know whether this, what we now have is this August public comment period, whether that is going to produce agreement and consensus, or whether it's going to require major revisions, we've thrown an additional month in there for revisions, which I think, in the names case, could be very optimistic.

So I'm not sure, I guess the bottom line of my comment is, what are we supposed to tell NTIA, given the fact that we are not in control of this timeline?

That's all from me.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Thank you very much. Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Patrik. I just wanted to support what Russ Mundy and Martin were saying, and maybe I can try to respond to Milton as well. I think as a coordinating body and the body that received the letter inquiring about both the proposal final time and the time for implementation, we are, you know, certainly capable of gathering that information and sending it back to NTIA, even if we don't, you know, currently have it ourselves, just amongst the 32 of us.

And I would agree with Russ Mundy in saying that there is other pieces of implementation that are outside the scope of the CCWG, and those need to be reflected back to NTIA. I guess, I don't see much of a point in NTIA asking a question, and then just not providing the answer when we can easily go out to the operational communities and get the answer, and send it back, and I think that's kind of what we're expected to do.

So that's what I hope we do. I think, to Milton's question, we can do the best that we can do. We can't plan for every eventuality, and obviously, if there are some pieces that fails to get consensus, or requires major revision, then everything will take longer then what we forget. But I think we might as well try to estimate how long we think the finalization process will take under relatively good circumstances, allowing some time for edits and amendments and going back to the communities and so forth.

And that's what I tried to put together on what's being shown on the screen. So I think it's perfectly reasonable for us to, for a response from us to say something like, if you look at what's on the screen, while our

finalization process is going to take four months, it will actually take four months from the time that we received the names proposal, assuming everything goes relatively smoothly. And if we can go out to the communities and ask them and say, "How long will it take you to implement your plan?" Assuming it gets approved [inaudible] amended, and they come back to us and they say, "Negotiating a SOA probably takes six months," or whatever all of the changes that need to be made on the names side.

These will probably take six to nine months, or give a range, or something, that's the kind of information that I expect us to give back to NTIA. You know, a month for proposal finalization and six to nine months for implementation is our rough guess right now, through NTIA. And as I think Milton and others said, to not focus on telling them how to extend the contracts or not, instead focus on telling them how much time we think we need for the [inaudible] that are under our control.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Thank you. Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Perhaps Russ Mundi misunderstood me, or I was not clear in any [inaudible]. I did not say that we could not talk about implementation. Any accountability implementation is outside of our control. We have three communities, two of them, almost according to what they say, they cannot be any kind of additional accountability, because what we have today is probably the situation. But the third one, which is [inaudible], requires accountability which depends then on the

accountability of the CCWG, on the ICANN budget, on community empowerment [inaudible], on the review and [inaudible], and on [inaudible].

These are the accountability, that CWG ask CCWG and CCWG put it in overall suggestion, get it to be further developed, and for that, they do not have any specific state unless they have some guess 2016. So I did not say that we should not talk about this transition plan and implementation. The accountability related implementation we should be very, very cautious, and would not be involved ourselves, because that is beyond our control.

And I ask that will be, too kindly not judge whether I am correct or I am not correct.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Thank you very much…

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: [CROSSTALK] Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Thank you very much Kavouss. And I think the message is received loud and clear. I also think that for summary, that it is a good thing for us that the letter has been sent both to us and to the CCWG, because that means that each one of us can respond given the context which we operate in, and I think that is what we were encouraging.

But that is what I hear. Manal please.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you Patrik. I just have to [inaudible]. I believe in response to the letter we are going to be answering with the full duration that is needed for implementation. Now regarding the final proposal itself. Would this imply that the proposal also should include something about the details of the implementation? Or like migration plan or transition plan?

Or this is supposed to be an internal working plan for the operational communities? So this is my first question. My second question is, now to have the implementation timeline, we need to get input from the three operational communities. So this is dependent on input from CWG and I believe the CWG is also dependent on input or coordination with the CCWG.

So how would this work in terms of synchronization of timelines? Would the CWG be able to respond with the needed sign for implementation prior to the final submission of their final proposal? I know we don't, we cannot answer on this behalf. I'm just flagging my concerns or my questions. Thank you.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Thank you Manal. To answer on your specific, on your last point regarding the CWG, the implementation time, and regarding how much they need to know from CCWG regarding the implementation of the CWG. I agree with you that we, of course, cannot look in our tea leaves

EN

and say what the CWG needs is whether, even whether they can respond or not.

It's something that I think is part of the wish and interest that Alissa suggests that we should try to interact and listen to CWG, what their view is. If their view is that they do not know and have no idea whatever because of external, from them, external events. For example, CCWG, that is up to them to tell us. But so far they have not told us, which means that I think is wrong for us to [inaudible].

So I think this is one of the reasons why I personally do think that interaction with the various operational communities through the informal connections that we have, is what we should do between now and a week or two. Xiaodong please, and then Jean-Jacques, and then I think we are done. And I would like to see whether Alissa can try to summarize, or else I would do it. So Xiaodong please.

XIAODONG LEE: Yes, this is Xiaodong Lee speaking. Can you hear me?

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Yes, we can hear you loud and clear.

XIAODONG LEE: Okay. This is Xiaodong Lee speaking. I have a big comment. I think, as ICG member, we are on behalf of this community and also connect to the different communities. So it's necessary for us to connect the necessary information about the implementation. So I think [inaudible]

EN

that is a big concern about how to implement it, and how long it will be implemented.

Another comment, you know, we cannot influence the decision by the US government, but I think as a community, it's our duty to act at the [inaudible] of the community, and just forward the message to them. We cannot make the decision, but we can just forward the message. Yeah, that's my comment.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Thank you very much. And then I give the last speaker is Jean-Jacques please.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Patrik. This is Jean-Jacques. I would just like to underline the fact that there is an ambiguity, the way the letter or letters was sent out by NTIA. Because the way they used the word implementation, or to implement, suggested that it was both the implementation, as estimated by the communities, CWG, CCWG, etc. But also what would be necessary, the time which would be necessary for implementation by the US government, meaning by NTIA itself.

So I see here that there are really two different things. On the one hand, there is a necessity of an estimate of what our communities consider necessary for them, for their part, in order to arrive at implementation. And yes, I agree that on this part, as Patrik has suggested, we should have an interaction with our communities.

Then the second thing, and here I think we should be careful, we cannot do it, it is the final implementation by the US government, which has its own constraints, political calendar, etc. So we cannot be in the business of second guessing. NTIA, or the US government in general, in their answer to NTIA, should perhaps, point out this ambiguity which is two things. And use of the same words, implementation in quotations, is not appropriate.

Well, we can say that in a nicer way. But it's not we can only answer the first part, but we cannot and should not answer the second part. I would very much like the Chair to answer that.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Thank you very much. Alissa please.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So attempting to summarize here. I think we have pretty good agreement that, you know, we know that we and the community will require, [inaudible] of more time that will put us beyond the current expired contract in September. I think, as far as the task we have before us in terms of responding to the letter, sounds like folks are okay with us as the community representatives, going out [inaudible] to collect information about implementation timeframes.

Although it also sounds like there is still some confusion as to what does it mean to implement, and what actually has to be, which steps should be incorporated into that kind of timing. And so I think we probably need a little more discussion on that, unless people think that it's clear.

EN

But to me, you know, if I had to go out to the ITF community and say, "Okay, we're supposed to go tell the ICG how long it will take to implement our plan." I might well get questions with some people saying, "Well, what do you mean by implement?"

And so perhaps we can refine that a little bit more in the coming days, and then as representatives ourselves, go out to our communities and try to obtain that information. I think that might be a little tricky in the names community, as the plan itself is still under development. And that's fine. I don't think, again, that we need to need rush a response back, and we have more information about the ability of the names community to provide us that input, I think, in a few weeks from now when a lot of the intensive work and the public comment periods are over.

So that's kind of what... So what I would suggest going forward is that we try to refine a little bit this concept of implementation on the mailing list, and then decide to take it out to communities that have concluded their plans. And then kind of wait and see what happens with names and circle back on getting the implementing [inaudible] communities when we see what's going on with the proposal itself.

And then the other piece that we need to do, that we didn't discuss today, we'll hopefully discuss on the list and on the next call, is what we're looking at on the screen, which is the amount of time that [inaudible] ICG for the proposal finalization process. So that's still something that we need to agree on in terms of process and we can continue that on the mailing list and on the next call.

EN

Did I miss anything Patrik?

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: No, I think that's a good summary, and I don't have anything to add on that. Do you want to take over the call?

ALISSA COOPER: I can try. We're just turning it over to Wolf-Ulrich now, because our next topic is his pre-assessment. So we can turn it over to Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Hello. Wolf-Ulrich speaking here. So we are on the second topic with regards to the so-called pre-assessment of the CWG proposal. Just to remind you why we came, or why this suggestion was made by myself, there was, because of the timing issue. So in order, thinking was, how can we make use of the time of the, during the public comment period, in order to find out or to assess better, the proposal could meet the criteria, [inaudible] in the NTIA has set, once it is finalized.

So in this status, we understand all that the proposal, the draft proposal and it's on public comment period, it shall be sent out after the public comment period began to the stakeholders, to the different advisory committees. And in these stakeholder groups. And there maybe some more comments, and some more work to be done on that proposal.

Nevertheless, the target of this so-called pre-assessment was not to judge on the content of the proposal itself, rather than to try or to find out whether this may lead, if it's really finalized after that. And if

EN

possible, then to come up with questions which could be sent to the CWG, not through the public comment itself, but separately, if necessary, in order to guide them with regards to the expectation we may have with regard to that proposal.

So that's the basics of the guideline. I have seen [inaudible] tried to pre-asses the proposal. So what I did then is, I used the same format, the same sheet, as we have been doing with the CRISP proposal and with the IANA plan proposal. And went through the different questions and tried to find answers to them. I found out that some questions I'm not capable to answer because it's an ongoing process still.

In fact, there was, at the end, one major question to me with regard to that proposal, and this is what we have been discussing here, almost one hour right. The question with regard to understanding of the level of implementation, which should be covered already in this proposal before it could be sent out to the NTIA.

The question tends to avoid, then that the NTIA might [inaudible] where the implementation is covered, or the plan of the implementation, and to what extent, and to what detail. So this is, for me, an open point to that. And this is the major issue I have seen with that. With regards to all of the other points of this pre-assessment. It can go so quickly. As you can see, there is only little answers to that.

For example, let's go through that point. Am I in control of the Adobe screen? Or is it just everybody is in control of screen? [Inaudible] operator.

ALISSA COOPER: I think we each have our own control.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. So let's go just through the five pages, to the second of page, consistency is the [RFP] requirements of all persons [inclusiveness]. So, the first two questions have not been, they're not to be the outcome yet, because we are still waiting for comments, [inaudible] the comments after the proposal is finalized.

The question of definition of consensus, can be answered. The definition of consensus in the proposal and it is different from that, how we have defined consensus, and there might be a common understanding necessary about that. But it is defined on the understanding of the CWG.

Page number three, consensus is not yet achieved. Okay, naturally because it's in progress. And then to the page number three, meeting the RFP requirements. We have set out in the assessment on criteria against we are going to assess that, and the third criteria is the one that I was already referring to, that is the question of proposed post-transition oversight and accountability arrangement.

So this is… What is going to be suggested here. And as I see it, there are two steps. The first step is the kind of same proposal, which talks about, you know, how should the proposed IANA should look like. And then a second step is seen and is necessary here, and this is the [publication] of a transition plan [inaudible] successor of the IANA functions operator.

And this plan should be developed after the transition within 18 months. So this is, for me, still the question here with regards to the question, is that enough here? Or should we, something more before the transition takes place.

Then with regards to the NTIA criteria, I found personally that the criteria under, the criteria could be for [inaudible] proposal now. Others may be of different opinion, but that was my impression of that. And very [inaudible] the criteria with regards to the governmental, potential governmental led organization solution, this shall be the present proposal not be the case because the proposed structure shall not be government led.

So that's it for the time being. How I saw this. And the only major question opened to me and which I would, if I would had to say, I would put it over to the CWG with regards to the question of the implementation plan. So I was wondering, in between, since I have sent out this pre-assessment whether any comments could come in. There was no comment yet on the list, but I'm open to any discussion of the questions, what shall we do with that, pre-assessment should we continue with that or should we leave it at this, and wait and see what's going to happen with the public comment period and afterwards start this real assessment. So that's so far. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Wolf-Ulrich. Milton.

EN

MILTON MUELLER: [Inaudible] do I have the mic?

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, we can hear you.

MILTON MUELLER: So yeah. Wolf-Ulrich has recognized the proposal not being finished yet. You did about as much as you could to… I just had questions about certain parts that puzzled me. Obviously in terms of the NTIA criteria, we are not dealing with an inter-governmental organization.   We certainly are relying on a multistakeholder model. You could probably make a better case as to how this contains stability, security, and resiliency of the DNS.

But it's a question about the seed that customers, I didn't understand what you were saying in your last paragraph. You say the registries, at the beginning of the proposal development process, were declined to keep the status quo with no big structural changes. What does that mean exactly? Decline to keep the status quo.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: I'm sorry, it must be inclined.

MILTON MUELLER: Inclined. Okay, okay, inclined. Now I was, yeah, I think that some of the registries were that way. Clearly not all of them because we had a number of ccTLDs supporting contract co and thought that there was a

EN

lot of debate about that. I just wonder why you characterized it that way.

ALISSA COOPER: Wolf-Ulrich, do you have a response?

[CROSSTALK]

MILTON MUELLER: I can propose edits to that online. I guess it's not necessary to discuss it here now that I know what you mean. We can discuss that online. I'm finished.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks Milton. I have a question, Wolf-Ulrich. I'm not entirely clear on the kind of one item that you called out in RFP requirement number three, when you talk about the [inaudible] proposal versus the transition plans that a successor IANA functions operator. And that might not be necessarily defined prior to the transition itself.

So when you talk about the transition plan, was that the, a transition plan away from the PTI? If the community, you know, chose to not continue to use the PTI as the IANA functions operator, then there would need to be a transition plan define the transition away from the PTI? Or am I misunderstanding that? Sorry, I'm not totally familiar with all of the details of the proposal.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOWBEN: Wolf-Ulrich speaking. As I understand the proposal, and then Milton you can, or one of the other who are members of this group can [inaudible] better. But if I read that correctly, so it is in the chapter on the [inaudible], framework for the transition to the successor of IANA intent functions operator. So, and so this is sad, you know. There is…

This proposal can only comprise or outline a framework for this transition to that operator. But the framework, it's just a framework, it's that, but it must be further developed in more details. And so, and this will take, as a guess, around 18 months to develop that. And so this is the question whether this has an impact on the plan itself, or it's just, you know, a placeholder for something which is to be developed, or does it…

Isn't there a need to have some more details already in place in order to make clear to the NTIA what's going to be expected? So this is my question here.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thank you, I understand that better. Are there other folks on the call who have questions or comments on Wolf-Ulrich's pre-assessment?

Or other thoughts about anything we might want to ask or raise to the CWG based on your own individual readings of the [inaudible] proposal at this point?

Okay. I mean, from what I said, I do think that this question of the level of detail in this proposal is certainly a relevant one, but I also, just from being on [inaudible] and so forth, appreciate that a lot of the details are

EN

still being worked out and that members of the group of highly aware that there is more detail needed and on its way.

But only that it is necessarily something for us to really ask about there, but I appreciate that it's an outstanding question.

I think, I don't see any other hands, so I think we can… Do I see one more hand? I do. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I think the assessment is based on the status of the proposal in public comment, what has been judged the comment which could have been made by community in respect of any of these answers that [the viewer] has been replied with certainty. Without it could be any proof that it depends on the judgment of the community. Perhaps this sort of view should be repeated, at least once the public comment received and the [viewers] know the views of others, if not on its own judgment. Thank you. Personal judgment.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Kavouss. I think that's exactly what people were expecting. You know, us trying to get ahead of things and see if there is anything that we needed to ask or do at this point, and it seems that there is not.

So I think we can move on to the next agenda item.

Okay. So the next agenda item concerns about the response we got from Steve Crocker about our statement on contracts and other agreements. And we've all seen it on the list, and it's here on the

screen as well. So you know, the answer that we got back from Steve is that, ICANN essentially agrees with the statement that we made, and is committed to making his positions publically known within the community processes.

So I didn't see any reaction to this on the list, and just wanted to check and see if there is anything else that people can [inaudible] to. I can certainly send Steve an acknowledgment, which I haven't done yet, but that's just an administrative thing. But wanted to open this up for discussion in case there is more that people wanted to talk about, the response.

I saw a hand from Daniel, but it went down. Daniel, did you want to say something?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Maybe we can make this very short. I think it's quite straightforward [inaudible] and we should thank the Chair of the ICANN Board for [leaving us a dancer] and move on.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. That works for me.

And I see support for that in the chat room as well. Okay. I will do that then. That was easy enough. So we can move on. I think we have minutes approval, we're doing our call in reverse order today.

All right. So we're looking at the minutes from the last call that we had on April 22. These have been out for quite some time, so hopefully

EN

people have had a chance to take a look. So at this point, I will ask if there are objections to publishing these minutes.

All right. Hearing no objections, I think we can consider the minutes approved. And ask the Secretariat to get them listed. Thanks.

Our last agenda item is about future scheduling of conference calls and meetings. We've had a bunch of different polls out so we wanted to just circle back on this. Patrik, did you want to take this one or do you want me to take it?

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: I think you can take it. I'm sorry, it took some time to get out of mute. So please continue.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So, we Doodled for a couple of calls coming up, just knowing that we have, you know, a few things, a few ongoing items to discuss. I think the discussion today is, NTIA response we could, and we can continue that back to our shorter one hour call next week. Hopefully we'll have some more meat on the bones in terms of questions about implementation, and we can perhaps use that call to finalize what it is that we want ask the community for input about.

So that will be our next call, next Wednesday. I just looked at the Doodle poll to figure out a time before, right before this call. So you haven't received an announcement yet, but the Secretariat will send out all of the usual announcements, and [counter insights], and so forth. So that's the call next week.

And then if we flip down to June, you could see, we all Doodled for a call on June 10, and that we have booked as a two hour call. I think that worked well today. I realize that we're not going to need the full two hours today, but I think it's good for us to be able to use the extra time. We almost always go over the one hour slot. And as we prepare for Buenos Aries, we'll probably have a few more things to discuss, especially after the comment period for the naming groups.

We might have, you know, more to discuss regarding these timelines and so forth. So we've booked a two hour call to the 10th. Then we have our face to face meeting just prior to the ICANN meeting. We have the ICANN meeting week. And then we still have our working sessions booked for the 26th, is it booked for the 26th? I thought it was booked for the 25th.

I think it's actually listed incorrectly on this calendar. I think it's on the Thursday of the ICANN meeting, we have a working session booked in the morning to do any kind of wrap-up, have any kind of wrap-up discussion that we might need at the ICANN meeting. Again, as we discussed last time, we won't be taking any decisions at that meeting. It's just time we put on the agenda we can get back together at the end of the meeting.

And I'm sure we'll probably have things to discuss. And then if we go to July, we, thanks Jennifer. We have also booked in our first call for after the Buenos Aries meeting as a two and a half hour call for July 8th. And this is, you know, again, the Secretariat will send out the usual calendar information and so forth. So on the theory that we will have received a names proposal during the ICANN meeting, this will be an intensive

working session for us to try and work through our own assessment of the proposal, and hopefully people will have had time to look at it after the ICANN meeting, but before this longer call.

So this has been booked as a two and a half hour call right now for after the ICANN meeting. [Inaudible] change, if we don't feel like we need the time, we can always cancel these things, but we thought that we should put them on the agenda to make sure that we have the time booked.

So any questions or comments on the future call and meeting schedule? Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Anything after ICANN 53 is provisional, subject to the needs and subject to the further provision. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, definitely. We wanted to put it down so that people will reserve it in their calendars. But we'll have to make a decision later in June about whether we need the time or not.

Other comments, questions? Martin.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks Alissa. It's Martin here. Just, can we go back to the meeting at the end of June? Because it looked to me like the end of the ICANN

week, we'd originally spoken about this being on the Thursday. Yes, I see that that has now been flipped to the Friday.

ALISSA COOPER: No, it's actually on Thursday. It's just listed incorrectly on this calendar. It's on Thursday.

MARTIN BOYLE: Right. Okay. I am relieved. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Me too. I'm leaving on Thursday night. So it's on Thursday.

                           Daniel.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: It is already confirmed that we'll have remote participation possibilities for that meeting on that Thursday the 25th of June?

ALISSA COOPER: I think so. Does the Secretariat have a definite answer on that? Yes.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Thank you Josh.   And then I have a second question, a second suggestion, question for clarification.   What does provisional mean, after the ICANN meeting, we all have full calendars. And I would very

much welcome if we had meeting slots for the discussions of the CWG proposal, assuming that we get it officially already booked.

I think it would not be very useful to do this ad-hoc at the end of June, because it might be a conflict. It would certainly [inaudible] need for conflict. So I would like to [inaudible] plan ahead for six weeks, if possible.

ALISSA COOPER: So you're saying beyond the July 8th call, you want the calls following the July 8th call to get booked this far in advance as well?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Yes, I would prefer that. And it was also a reaction on Kavouss's intervention, who said everything is provisional after June, which sort of gave me the impression like, oh yeah, we planned July at the end of June, which is not practical.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, fair enough. I think we're happy to Doodle for the calls after July 8th, if that makes it easier for people's calendars. We really want to do that one because that would be long, but we can look into setting up polls for, you know, July, last of July and maybe the beginning of August.

[CROSSTALK]

EN

DANIEL KARRENBERG: This is Daniel. I would support that. We can always cancel the meeting. It's much easier to cancel a meeting that's scheduled and in my calendar, or in people's calendar, I'm sorry, then to schedule one on short notice.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. That's fine. Unless someone objects to that, I think, Patrik, could you take an action item, or work with the Secretariat on call scheduling for July and August?

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Yes, absolutely.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks.

Any other comments on the upcoming calendar?

Okay. Great. Then I believe we are done with this call. Maybe 90 minutes is our safe spot. I guess we'll find out. Thanks everyone for joining and we'll talk to you next week.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]