
ALISSA COOPER:

Great. So I have one minute after the hour, and we've have a good group of people on the call, so I think we should go ahead and get started, and our recording is on already. So thanks to the Secretariat for that.

We have a few more people joining right now, I think. So, on our agenda for today, we have, we ended up with six agenda items, you can see it in the pod there. So I guess the first order of business is we usually ask if there is anyone who is on the call who is not in Adobe Connect. Can you make yourself known right now?

Okay. Doesn't sound like we have anyone who is only on audio. So, our agenda, you can see it in the Adobe Connect room, in the pod, and its approval, the list of action items, timeline discussion, discussion of the responses to the question that we asked to the ITF and the RIRs, or beginning of R step two, assessment of those two proposals, including an implementation timeline discussions.

And then we will wrap up with a brief status update on face to face meeting planning in Buenos Aries. Are there any other agenda items that people would like to add, or any other comments on the agenda before we get started?

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Let me just note that we still have Paul Wilson and [inaudible] that is trying to join on voice, so we have some people, as you said, that are on Adobe Connect, but not on voice yet.

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:

Got it, I see that. Thank you Patrik.

Okay. Well hopefully they will get connected soon, and obviously people can feel free to use the chat, if necessary. So first order of business is the minutes approval for the minutes of our face to face meeting. These were circulated on the list late last week, and are being projected, at least the first day, being projected.

So comments or objections to approving the minutes? I see Daniel. Go ahead Daniel.

DANIEL KARREBERG:

Yes. Well I for one, haven't had time to read all of it. At least not day two, because it's quite a long document. If I'm the only one, then I'll defer. But if there is more people who haven't had the opportunity, then I think we should table this until the next call.

ALISSA COOPER:

We can certainly do that. There are lengthier than the usual call minutes, so I don't see harm in giving people more time, even if it's only you.

DANIEL KARREBERG:

Well it seems to be a couple of people in the chat who are saying that they are in a similar position.

ALISSA COOPER:

Yeah, okay. Let's defer to the next call, and we will, we can take this up at that point.

All right, thank you. So, next item is to review the status of the action items to the previous meeting. If we can get those projected, that would help.

These look like the minutes from the second day, but we're actually looking for the set of action items that we posted on the list. There we go.

Got it, great, thank you.

Okay. So if we look at this list of action items, number one, we were to transmit this, question to the ITF and the RIRs. Obviously that is complete. Jari had taken an action item to write up some of what was discussed during the meeting so that we had an archive of it on the mailing list [inaudible]...

...or off-list from you saying that you were working on this. Is that correct?

JARI ARKKO:

That is correct. My understanding of the past was actually we had a real question that we sent to the ITF and RIRs, and then we had some information requests or clarifications that can be satisfied without the community, and we provided some information during the meeting. And my, various other discussions, I was supposed to write that up and provide the same information in writing.

That is being done. I hope to get it out either during the call or shortly thereafter.

ALISSA COOPER:

Great. Thank you. We will look for that. The next one, the Secretariat has sent the summary of the questions and answers that we discussed at the face to face meeting, [inaudible] spreadsheets, hopefully [go with the] document. So, I know people have seen that. There has been some commentary about it on the list.

Oh, there it is. Great. Thank you. So this is the summary. I thought it was very good and comprehensive. I don't know it warrants for the discussion, I'm just glad that we have it and we can refer back to it if we ever need to. So, barring any further comments on that, I think we can continue down the list.

All right. So number four, Paul was to write a clarification of, again, some questions that came up during the face to face meeting concerning the number's proposal. We have email from Paul indicating that those questions are being discussed within the CRISP team, and I've seen some mail on the CRISP mailing list to that effect. Is there anything you wanted to add Paul?

PAUL WILSON:

No thanks. Thanks Alissa, I hope you can hear me. Yeah, I've got those questions to the CRISP team, and they are dealing with them. I did not want to confirm with Wolf though that I properly represented his questions. So just appreciate it, Wolf, if you are there, if you would

confirm that your questions are properly asked there, and let me know if not. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Wolf, do we have you on audio now?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: First of all, good morning. Sorry. I was waiting for being queue in the...

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, go ahead.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yeah, good morning. How are you? I hope you are personally going well, everything is in good shape, and you are doing well. First of all [inaudible] number one, number two the answer given by numbers was almost convincing, but I still, in the report, there are two things, one thing that we don't need anything from the accountability.

On the other hand, saying that however, we lack the oversight of the NTIA. These are more or less, in my view, a little bit contradicting to all of this. It should be corrected in the [size] from Paul or others, when it comes to the final whole. Thank you.

PAUL WILSON: Paul here. I think that's fairly clear, and that's what I hope the CRISP team will clarify. I just wanted to ask Alissa, there was a matrix tabula document just displayed on the screen just before, before we went back to the summary of action items. Can someone tell, can you tell me what

document that was? Because I haven't seen it. Or is that the one that is linked in the chat window?

ALISSA COOPER:

Right, it is linked in the chat. So, I think, so at the conclusion of the face to face meeting, it was suggested that we gather a summary of all of the questions and answers that came up during our discussion of the IETF and RIR proposal, just so that we can have kind of a consolidated list of those for our own reference, because there were a lot of good questions and we had a discussion of those two proposals.

So the Secretariat put that together and sent it around about a week ago, I think. So, that's the document that is being projected and has been circulated, and has been dropped off and so forth. So it's just for our reference, and it lists who asked the question as well, so that kind of triggers your memory as to that discussion.

PAUL WILSON:

Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Yeah, sure. Okay. So I think if we understand the path forward on the numbers question, the next one was, to review details of the proposal finalization process and the timeline. So we did this during ICANN week, this was the new timeline that was circulated, and that we will be discussing shortly. So that one is done.

Number six, we had the group being led by [Manal], to be taken on some comments handling. And that has, as far as I know, has proceeded on the mailing list. We have some discussion and further articulation of that, and that's still in progress is my understanding of that. I see Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. On the last one, number six that you have mentioned, [Manal] sent me a text which was formed in the sort of very unclear, very in the passive voice, saying that if the community select or choose to reply such and such thing to [inaudible]... I think that [we need to complete] another form saying that if ICG decides to raise a question to the community, that question should be answered [inaudible] would give the matter and the authority to the ICG, to decide whether adverse question [inaudible] comment to the community, or take it differently, but not give it an option to the community to select whether they reply or not.

We should take the proper action according to what we have discussed in face to face meeting, and I'm hoping that [Manal] has finalized that. Thank you.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF:

I will say, sorry. I should have raised my hand. This is Joe Alhadeff. Alissa, am I the next in the queue, or was there someone else?

ALISSA COOPER:

There isn't anyone in the queue. The only thing I would say is that I would prefer that we actually not have the actual substantive discussion of this topic right here. I was sort of hoping we could continue it on the list, and maybe take it up on the next call. It's not actually on the agenda for today because we have a few other things that probably need to get done before that.

So if you have a kind of process point, that's fine. I appreciate the comments from [inaudible], but we should certainly continue the substantive discussion on the list and on the next call, but not today.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF:

And that's okay. We can do that, otherwise it was just a clarification, because I think two pieces of the letter are getting confused.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay. Yeah, if we can do that on the list, that would be great. Thank you. So and we will mark that down to have that as a discussion topic on the next call, for sure. So, moving on to number seven, Patrik was to coordinate with the CWG and the CCWG about our [telephone conference schedule], which definitely happened, and that's one of the reasons why we're having this call now, which does not conflict with either of the two other groups. And that's where the dates and times for the rest of the calls and the Doodle poll came from.

So my only request is, if you had not yet filled out the Doodle poll, that you please do so, and maybe we can get someone to post that again in the chat for people who may have missed it. I think [inaudible]

response or something, so we can get a few more so we can schedule the next couple of calls.

So that's number seven. Feel free to jump in the queue if you want to interrupt, but I think we're almost done with these. So number eight, we will be talking about at the end of our call today, so that's on the agenda for today so we'll talk about that.

Sorry we have one of the interpreters on the English line, it sounds like.

So number eight we'll deal with at the end of the call, and number nine, we were to discuss talking points. This was really for the ICANN meeting, and that happened during the week in Singapore, so that one has been disposed of. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, sorry. I have a request, it possibly could be met by Patrik, if he would just, the teleconference should be at least, or coordinated by the CCWG and CWG. I had a teleconference a few hours ago, and this teleconference now. It is a little bit more, same of time, eight hours. You have two teleconferences, two hours each, so we, starting and the stopping, if it is possible to not to have it, as such, in a particular of eight hours or 12 hours, we have two teleconferences, each two hours.

It is not, we cannot support that. At least I cannot support that.

ALISSA COOPER:

Patrik, would you like to speak to that?

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM:

Sure. What we tried to arrange this time is to at least not have any collisions that there is interest to have more separation between the calls, that is noted. And we'll see what we can do. The important thing for people still is to fill out the Doodle poll, the Doodle suggestions, and we will see what we can do regarding the calls.

As some people note in the chat room, there are many other calls than these three groups, that all of us are stuck into. So it's hard to accommodate everyone. We are, let me just note, that with the Secretariat's help, we will, with the help of the new Secretariat, we will get a calendar where we can note not only our things, but also other events. So it will be easier to do this scheduling. Because, of course, the scheduling across all of these other groups is extremely hard to do in an optimal way.

So my apologies, and I appreciate all feedback that I can get, for example, by Mr. Arasteh. On the other hand, the main goal must be to not have any collisions, but your request is noted. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you Patrik. So, I think we have reached the end of the action item summary, and we should move on to the timeline discussion.

So, while the document is coming up. There has been some discussion of this on the list, and I guess, I see what we're looking at is, there were four tabs in the Excel spreadsheet, but looking at the first one right now

being projected. This is from the revised alternative to the timeline that were circulated during ICANN week.

I think, in terms of the framing for this, again, I would like us to come to the framing that Patrik used during the face to face meeting, which is that we have sort of two positions. One is, what will we do between now and when we received the names proposal, and what we might do afterwards? And I think [inaudible] the face to face so that people felt very strongly that we wanted to kind of proceed along with as many of the steps from our original timeline as we can, while we await the names proposal.

And perhaps also, you know, make them a more dedicated effort to monitor an issue spot within the CWG process for anything that might come up that it has a relationship to the two proposals that we've already received. So, all the different variance of the timeline that we're put forth, have that aspect to them. And that's really kind of the first set of decisions that we have to make.

And there is not too much difference between the various alternatives, in terms of what we do between now and receiving the names proposal. I think, you know, in my last email to the list about this, I had said that the main question, I think, that we don't necessarily have consensus on, is whether we should stick the IETF and RIR proposals together, and do a public comment on that portion. And then, certainly, do another set of public comment period, you know, one or more later when we have the names proposal.

So from my perspective, that's the kind of the main open question. We can talk about the very, the narrow specifics of the timing, but if we're assuming that we have a few months before we receive the names proposal, then when we have sufficient time to do that or not at our discretion. So perhaps we can talk about that first, you know, what do we want to get done between now and when we receive the names proposal.

And then we can talk about what we might do afterward. That's what I would suggest. So let's take the first part first, if we can. I see Kavouss in the queue.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, Alissa, I have no problem with the timeline that you have mentioned, but the consequence of this would be dark. The parameters and the numbers, they have two commenting periods. They are overall including the names, have one commenting period. In other words, the most straightforward, but not [inaudible], most straightforward issues like parameters and numbers, have two commenting periods for the public.

And we combine all three, which is more complex, has only one. This is a decision that we need to provide. There are two ways to do that, either for the third one. Then the chief proposal are put together. We would provide much longer time toward the public comment, or we try to treat them equally. Not to give them two commenting period, two numbers, and two parameters or protocols, and one for the, not names,

try to do something that both have two commenting periods, as appropriate.

So this is something that is missing, and I raise that to one or two of my main view. Could you kindly clarify that? Why names, which is more delicate, complex have only one commenting period. And the second issue, the duration of commenting periods. I understood you proposed something, two weeks, Alissa. It is too short, in particular, when you combine all three proposals together, and treating them, as we need to have much longer time for the comments, but not two weeks. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you Kavouss. And I'm going to try to get the, yeah there we go, the secretariat is going to project the optimized timeline, which is I think the one that you were primarily seeking to. So the deal with this optimized timeline, it does kind of backup still from the middle of September. So the idea was to try and see that we talk all of the steps that we have said that we were going to carry out, and make them all fit, given what we understand the approximate timing of the names community to be.

So that was the reason why, it wasn't the... That was the reason why the first public comment period was moved back into this kind of April/May timeframe, because if we wanted to have two public comment periods, that we could do one on the proposals that we received, and then we could do another one after we've received the names proposal.

That was the same rationale for the public comment period being short, and the second instance shorter than it is in the first instance, because it was trying to still have everything be completed by the middle of September. I agree with you that neither of those are particularly ideal, and my personal view of the first issue is, if people don't want to do a public comment period until after we've received all the proposals, I think that's fine.

I don't think we need to do it on the two that we have. It was just a suggestion in terms of trying to optimize and still fit in all of the steps as appropriately as we could. My only other thought that I will provide on the point of how long the comment periods are is that, they think if [inaudible] appropriately kind of message and announce, and make sure that everyone knows when there will be a public comment period, even if it hasn't started yet, because the proposal is not complete.

And so you can sometimes balance a little bit to having less time to put in the actual public comment period against the fact that people knew it was coming and could prepare for it a little bit. I agree that it's not ideal, but it's just another aspect to keep in mind. So that was kind of the thinking behind all of that.

I have James and then Milton.

JAMES BLADEL:

Thanks Alissa. James speaking for the transcript. And just a couple of quick reactions. First off, I do agree with Kavouss. Two weeks is probably insufficient for a single comment period. ICANN typically, typical comment periods are at least 40 days. It used to be reply

periods [inaudible], then phased out and folded into the main public comment period. But my question is, if we have an initial comment period upon receipt of the names proposal, and maybe you lost me here in this timeline, because I just unsynched it so I could zoom in a little bit.

So I apologize that I was reading while you were speaking. But if we have an initial comment period, are we, what specifically are we putting out for the comment, is that the proposal that we receive, or is it our first initial draft of the analysis of the proposal that we receive? Because, I can speak fairly confidently without looking at the timeline or the work plan for the CWG, that the names proposal will also undergo one or two comment periods before it is submitted to the Board, to the ICG.

So it seems like there may be some opportunities to say that we have one comment period if we are not adding positions or material changes to the topic that is put up for comment.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks James. Yeah, so I definitely agree with that. I mean, I think what we have said that we would do is, when we receive the names proposal, we would do the individual assessment that we just did for the ITF and the RIRs. We would determine if there are questions that the ICG needs clarification on from the names community. We would have the back and forth like we've had with the other communities to get those questions clarified, and once we felt that was done satisfactorily, then we would do again, our own ICG analysis of the three proposals

together for this step to capability, workability, and accountability assessment, and see if we felt satisfied.

And again, go back to the communities as necessary. And then produce a draft that would in theory, would be in the form of something that we would eventually ship on to the ICANN Board and NTIA, and have that be the basis for the public comment period. But certainly doesn't think it make any sense to just put something out for public comment, that has already recently been out for public comment.

And so I think we, as the ICG, would be to do our analysis, all the various steps, produce a draft proposal, and have that be the basis for the public comment period. And so there is a question of whether once we do that, how long a public comment period we need, and do we need more than one? I think, you know, my feeling again, is that perhaps we don't need to answer any of those questions right now. And the main questions that we need to answer are, whether we're agreed in terms of just carrying forward as much as the work that we can, on the proposals that we've had, until we've received the names proposal.

And then we just pick up, and seek to determine the rest of our timeline from when they received the names proposal. Hopefully that, that's my answer to your question, but [inaudible] might find the answer as well.

JAMES BLADEL:

Just one quick reaction. This is James speaking again. Thank you Alissa. Just one thought is that, when that names proposal is open for its final public comment, perhaps that might be an opportunity to save some cycles here by, if we spot any material, and we're going to have early

visibility to that, and possibly be further along with the other two proposals, so maybe that's an opportunity for us to ask those questions, or point out those admissions.

While their comment period is still open, before it comes to us. And I don't know if that is too presumptive on our part, but it seems like it might get us a couple of months further down the road. And I'll stop talking now, thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks James. Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Hello. Can everybody hear me okay?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes.

MILTON MUELLER: I'm afraid I have to oppose the idea of a separate comment period for the RIR and IETF proposals. It's not because I don't think, I would like to get as much done as we can, it's just I don't think we get anything done by having a comment period on two proposals that are well-known and have been pretty much vetted and approved by us. Let's not forget that the ICG is responsible for submitting a proposal to the NTIA, a single proposal.

And what we want to put before the public is that final proposal, nothing else. And I think it confuses things, and it sort of strays from our actual role to be putting partial transition proposal in front of the public. It's not that I think, of course most of the public comments are going to be about the names situation. But I... And in some sense, one of the potential arguments in favor of having a separate comment period, is that people might actually pay attention to the names and the numbers and protocols proposal.

But I think the people who would pay attention to them separately are already paying attention to them have already pretty much commented on them. We pretty much know what those communities think about these proposals. The level of public interest and participation in those less controversial proposals is minimal.

So I just don't see the point. I mean, what do we actually advance? What do we actually accomplish by putting the, you know, those two proposals, that's the public comment on their own.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you Milton. Daniel.

DANIEL KARREBERG:

Yeah, this is Daniel. Just to repeat my argument that we should do as much work as we can on the responses that we've had. I am ambivalent towards a comment period or not, but what I'd like to say for the record is that if we then decide that we want to make a combined names and numbers proposal, which was the step 2.3, I think, no.

No it's 3.1, yeah. And if we don't put it out for comment, then we put ourselves in the position that we cannot really delay these things anymore once more, or that we put... Let me formulate it differently. Put ourselves in a position that if there are substantial public comments regarding the RIR and ITF proposals, that we've missed the opportunity to deal with them while we had ample time.

And again, the main thing is that we signal to those two communities that we're progressing their response as far as we possibly can. So, but what I don't want is that in the end, that when we have all three proposals, that the whole thing gets delayed in a way that we could have prevented.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you Daniel. Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF:

Hi. Joe Alhadeff for the record. Perhaps I can... I think Milton's point is valid, but perhaps we can, as a group, help to informally bridge that gap. So within ICG basis, we had some conversations related to the proposals before we had our meeting, and we have requested a further review of the proposals, and we will also be keeping folks apprised of questions and answers. And so with the breath of the groups within the ICG, we can form a kind of an informal version of that consultation without having it as a formalized consultation, because I agree with Milton, the optics of sending out with what looks like two-thirds of a proposal, may create misperceptions among some people.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Joe. I think that's a really good kind of compromise suggestion. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, first of all, I [inaudible] that we have to have one single proposal to the NTIA, and I think the proposal should work together. It not [inaudible], you could not test two part of the [call], that the [inaudible] and the [inaudible] and we say see some difficulty here. The approach by Joe seems to do something. We have something called [provisional] commenting or comments and so on and so forth.

But we will leave until they are all together. I put in the chat form, that this timeline in here. It is impossible mission to achieve. We have to have [inaudible] CWG comment, that when the proposal is available and to inject some footnote, some indicating that our timeline should be adjusted to that accordingly, because he just bound and responsible to give one single proposal.

I don't think that we discourage the [200] community if we would not put them to the comment. But you could put them to the original comment period, or something to be done, but this is not definitely. So we have to be very, very careful and not change one of the main parts of a proposal out of the context here, and just go ahead and saying that we're encouraging those that have given.

Those that have given, thanks to them, those are not given. Also we appreciate the complexity of the work that we are doing, and we have

to wait until, in my view, our timeline must reflect that this is the extent we can do it for numbers and [inaudible], but not for the naming and timeline, need to be further adjusted. That should be mentioned somewhere in the note [inaudible] note to this timeline. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Kavouss. Jari.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah, I agree. And for the minutes, this is Jari Arkko. So I agree with the suggestion made by Joe. I think that informal communication is necessary. That's really important in both directions from the rest of us to names and vice versa. But I did want to go back to sort of the fundamental thing here, no one is proposing that we share two proposals to NTIA.

This is about progressing our work as part of the overall thing, which has multiple steps, and we need to do a full analysis of everything. And just to bring back something that we did in the ICG, we looked at the two proposals that we had. We did not have three, we had only two, but we looked at them and we identified something that we actually wanted to ask the community about.

And that particular issue was resolved, or is being resolved. So that's just a practical thing that has happened. You can do things with components. You can look at the compatibility components. You can evaluate them. You can get comments on them, and I don't think ICG is

necessarily the final word. I think it is incumbent on us to do as much as we can, including asking public comments about things.

And it doesn't mean that we claim that this is a partial solution or that we can take this forward. It means that we're progressing our work, by step, and I would at least feel funny if we have to stop everything, because we don't have all of the components. I think we can do something, just has to approve.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks Jari. Can I just for clarification, the proposal that Joe made, which is that we sort of solicit public comment on what we have by doing that informally within all of our respective stakeholder communities, and telling people that they should, you know, send comments back through their representatives to the ICG, if they have them.

Does that satisfy you? Or would you rather have a formal public comment process? Because I feel like there has been a lot of support for what Joe said, and I want to understand if you agree or disagree with that.

JARI ARKKO:

I'm not sure that it really matters public or formal versus informal bit. What, to my mind matters, is that we broadly communicate, this is what we have, and people get that, and provide feedback. Is that informal? I don't know. But my point is that we should solicit the relatively broad

input at this stage, even if we don't have everything and we're just making [inaudible].

Yes, I'd be okay.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay, thank you for clarifying. I have Milton and Kavouss in the queue, and then I will try to wrap up so that we can move on to the, we can come up with a conclusion and then move on to the next agenda item. Milton.

MILTON MUELLER:

Yeah. So I just want to make it clear that I would support Joe's proposal as a compromise. And also wanted to say something I forgot the first time, which is that I strongly agree with James that two weeks is going to get all kinds of complaints about that from various people in the ICANN community of being too short. There is a lot of people who regularly follow regulatory proceedings and layers and so on.

And they will always complain that the two weeks is too short of a time to develop their comments. I guess the third thing I want to do here is address the elephant in the room, which is that we see this timeline as sort of scrunched up around this miraculous September 30th date. And I think we're still kind of pretend that if we can hit this original goal, when we just have no idea whether we're going to be able to do that or not.

And I would think we need to twist ourselves into weird shapes in order to try to pretend like we can meet this goal. We still, of course, don't

even know the CWG will deliver something by the middle of June, much less whether it will be an acceptable proposal. And so why don't we just [inaudible] after the fact that September 30th is kind of an unlikely achievement that the NTIA will probably have to extend the contract back for at least six months.

And we could just things right based on that assumption.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks Milton. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes, the alternative proposed by Joe is good, but we have to find a good term for that. Perhaps one could say incremental provisional commenting process. Putting this in a way that we expect another one to put it in total. This phase would be incremental and provisional commenting process. And if we do that, above incremental and provisional, we add [inaudible] and underneath of the thing that waiting for the proposal from the naming community to go to full commenting proposal process.

So if we have to find a good term for that. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you Kavouss. So that's a good segue because I think we should talk about how are we going to express the result of this discussion to the public. Jari, did you have something on this? I had closed the queue, but I see that your hand is up again.

JARI ARKKO: Sorry, it was not meant to be.

ALISSA COOPER: Oh, okay, thank you. So, I think we have actually fairly decent agreement on what to do here, and the question is really just kind of what format to put it in. It sounds like, and actually it's quite close to things like [Manal] had suggested a day or two ago on the mailing list, which is that we can make a statement of what we intend to do in light of sort of changed timing on the name side.

And we can say that we will progress with the proposals that we, the two proposals we've received as far as we can, and we're already doing that right now. That when they're in a state where we think they are stable and we've completed our assessment, we will ask informally through our own stakeholder group for comment if people have them, and they can feed them back to us while we wait the names proposal.

We will monitor and pay close attention to what is going on in the names process, and try to flag in the area of overlap or issues where we think having some work done within the names community ahead of time will expedite things later. And we can refine the remainder of our timeline, when we have a better sense of when we will be receiving the new proposal, and what it might look like.

So I feel like we have proof of fairly good consensus around those points, it sounds like to me. And I think what we could do is essentially is write that as a little update to our last published timeline, and put

that out as another updated version of the timeline. And since the timeline is already on version six or seven or something, so we can go to the next version, and publish that information to the community that way.

That would be my suggestion for how to go forward. Any quick comments on that proposal? And I can work with the co-chairs and perhaps with [Manal] who made the suggestion originally to get some things together that people can review for that little update to the timeline. And so we wouldn't publish and of these other [inaudible] pictures or different kinds of things. We just publish some text that explains what we're doing, and leave it at that for now.

Silence must mean agreement, right? Okay, well hearing no objections to that, I think we should take that forward. The secretariat can give me an action item, and I will coordinate with a few other people to get that text written and send it out to the list for people to review. And we'll, I'm sure, come back to the timeline discussion in a few months.

All right. So moving on to agenda item number four, which is the discussion of the responses to the question that we post to the IGF and the RIRs. So, hopefully, people have seen these responses on the mailing list, [inaudible] late last week. And they're coming up right now.

I think we can have Jari and Alan speak to them directly. The overarching kind of message is that the community didn't really perceive incompatibility between the two proposals and then they offered some additional detail about what they would be willing to do

or accept the ITF [inaudible], said that it would be willing to accept the transfer of the intellectual property.

And the numbers community provided some further refinement as well. So Yari or Alan, if you want to speak to the responses, feel free. And if not, that's fine too. I would be interested if anyone thinks we need further discussion, or if they fell satisfied by the answers. Any thoughts or comments on this topic?

JARI ARKKO:

Yeah, this is Jari Arkko. I think your summary Alissa was already good. So I don't particularly feel like I need to add anything.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay. And Alan says he doesn't have anything to add. So, is there anyone who thinks we should, are not done with this or don't feel satisfied with the answers or anything else to discuss? Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. I have no problem with the reply provided by Jari, but my concern is that if the community raised these questions, what we would have during the commenting period? Should we need to add something when we send the comment, the proposal for comment, saying that we have identified this, and we have discussed that we have found that there is no incompatibilities.

Try to bridge some of those questions to the public when they come, similar to what we had in our ICG. Should we do something in this regard or not? Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, good question. I have people in the queue, so let's see if they have responses or other comments. Daniel.

DANIEL KARREBERG: I have a question for the ICG. Would we want to encourage the communities from which we already have responses, to amend their responses, to clarify issues like this? So that when, I think the answers are clear. I clear a few textual changes to one or both of the responses would make that very clear, and then we have a clear resource documents, and we don't need to point to the whole chain of documents and responses and so on.

So my question is, would we want to encourage the communities to submit amended responses to us and why we're dealing with this?

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Very good question. Let's see if people have thoughts for us. Mundy.

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you Alissa. My comment is slightly different. I think Daniel raises a really excellent point. And the comment that I have is somewhat

related, in that I have unfortunately have not had time to go back and look carefully at the numbers proposal, but it seems that this is something that should be detailed in the implementation aspects. And I don't know if the testing aspects make sense of it to deal with this, but it sounds to me that if what's proposed by the numbers community is sufficiently defined as an implementation step, my recollection is that it does not.

Then we're okay. But other members of the group I'd like to hear from, with respect to the implementation parts of this aspect. Because it sounds like the IANA plan would be, the group is fine, if it happens, but we don't have a sufficient description about how it will happen.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you Russ. Jari.

JARI ARKKO:

Yes, Jari Arkko speaking. I want to respond to Daniel's point or question, and wanted to clarify that the ITF IANA plan did not want to change their proposal. We are, our proposal is still what it is. The community consensus is still where it is. We were just responding the question of, we could do additional things if the whole needed that. That if the other communities and the response was yes.

So I'm not sure updating the proposal per se is appropriate in this particular instance, at least on our side. But I'm starting to see that they are multiple things that have to be explained people. Components is one thing, but propose different. So maybe that's an ICG document,

maybe that's something else, frequently asked questions list, or I don't know. But proposal update, at this point, don't seem right.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks Jari. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARATEH: Yes. I follow the lines of Jari, that it would make some difficulty if they amended the proposal, and send them to us. If we send the comments and it's up to ICG to look at this matter of record, and to the chart and take [inaudible]. It would be extremely time consuming, we have to deal with several amended proposals and compare to them, that we have had that on using our first round of ICG, then the consensus building.

We have to deal with many, many proposals, and that would be difficult to do that. While Daniel's proposal seems one way, but implementation of that would be difficult, perhaps that is to say, we should not take that part. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Paul.

PAUL WILSON: Yeah, I had the same question for some CRISP members about some with there was an intention to update the proposal to reflect the answers to questions they asked. It's not really clear that some are

reluctant because of the difficulty of creating the document in the first place, but it's the fact that word smithing in the last group is never easy. So I'm not sure that some members at least see it as feasible to release an updated proposal, but I do agree with answers to questions being given in different forms and different forums as well, we need to find a way to consolidate all of the latest information about each of the proposals.

So that there is more or less one place where anyone who is interested in the latest current status can go to find that. So I think it's an issue, I'm not sure what the answer is, and I think I'll ask the CRISP team, I'll take this opportunity to ask the CRISP team to give some more thought on that question.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you Paul. I have Alan. Alan, there you go.

ALAN BARRETT:

Thank you. I figured out how to un-mute. Right. So, speaking as a member of the CRISP team, I would say that updating the proposal would be difficult. We have to grow through lengthy community discussions, and I don't think we need to do that. However, providing a document to answers to questions is a lot easier, and I'm sure that can be done. We've already provided answers to some questions, and that can be put in a document.

But the reason why I raised my hand earlier is that I have to say something different, which is I think that coordination resolving issues

between the different proposals is an ICG task. So, looking at the question about the IETF trust and the IANNA IPR that was asked to the numbers and the protocol parameters communities, it turned out that we didn't have to update the proposal for that, and I think when the ICG prepares a combined proposal, that combined proposal should speak about the way that the issue was resolved. But I think there is no need for the two input proposals to be changed to deal with it. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you Alan. So I think what I'm hearing is that we should consolidate this information that we, have already started accruing, and we'll certainly continue to accrue as part of the assessment process, and the back and forth of the communities in an ICG document of some sort, and I think you report that, you know, once we have a consolidated proposal, can be published to the community together with the proposal, so that people know when we will have the one place to look for answers to these questions, and we'll understand the assessment process that we went through.

So I heard a bunch of people say, similar, make roughly similar suggestions. It sounds like there is support for that. If anyone thinks that's a bad idea, you know, shout right now. But if not, I think we can plan to do that and maybe after the call, figure out a [stuck-y] for getting that going.

I don't hear any cries and screams, so let's plan to do that and if the Secretariat can write down an action item that we intend to do that, and we need to find someone who will hold the pen on that for now.

Although I don't think it's particularly urgent, so we can take our time to determine how to do that.

All right, looks like support for [inaudible] that's good. I think we can move on to agenda item number five. Step two assessment process. All right. So, we have scroll, do we each have scroll control? I think we do.

Okay. So for the ITF and RIR proposals, since we have completed, essentially, the step one and we're into step two, and we started to have some discussion on the mailing list about these items, and people have shared their thoughts. And if anyone who have shared their thoughts on the list wants to give a brief summary or recap on the call, that might be helpful since there have been some good comments on these items.

But essentially what we said we would do in the step two part of the assessment was to look at the compatibility between the proposals that we've received, the overall accountability mechanisms, and the workability of the proposals that were made. So this is the assessment that we should be doing right now. I will also note that Wolf-Ulrich has brought up the question about implementation, and the plans for implementation.

And so, that is something we didn't talk too much about during the step one process, individually for the proposals, but we can certainly talk about it now. We still have the two in front of us. So, now is the time to talk about these things, and if you have opinions about how the proposals look together when you join them, with respect to these various access, then please put yourself in the queue. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. My comment on the [inaudible] with ITF is in the early [effort] of accountability, it is a very complex description. Many, many entities they have mentioned, some of them they are clear, [inaudible] and this, but there are many others referring to various other [inaudible] and it is really difficult to know who made the accountability with respect to whom.

It would be very help if ITF kindly provide us a diagram, indicating the flow of the accountability, putting various issues, starting them [inaudible], up to the end, because in the proposal, that I read several times, there is a back and forth. And we don't know who is who, and what is the [inaudible] the role of each. Perhaps we need to have an indication of the accountability that is current done.

And the IETF mentioned that they don't need any additional accountability. They clearly mentioned that. I come to that point in a minute, but first the request of Jari. Is it possible to have the diagram in this [inaudible], the flow of accountability within the IETF of a program, sorry, [inaudible] or not? That is the first question.

Second question, IETF said there is no need, or there has been no accountability, not accountability, oversight by NTIA. Is it possible that [inaudible] NTIA, whether they also seem likely, because we can't comment on that. This is the statement and differentiation of IETF. We don't know whether really the NTIA has some oversight, or does not have some oversight. And we cannot judge that. These are the two first here, the action on the [inaudible] with respect to IETF. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Kavouss. Jari.

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko speaking. So we did provide recently this blog article that explains how we view oversight and ability to deal with various bad situations. And I guess we can make a graphic out of that. And graphics usually is a good idea. I think that's a good suggestion. We should do that.

I mean, not just for ourselves here in this group, but also more widely, we can explain with a graphic. That's always good. The other question was about NTIA oversight. It's kind of like we're in the land of the imaginary in some sense, like, maybe there is some people who imagine that if something, if we did not believe in this world, but some slightly different world where something bad might have happened, then NTIA might had done something.

But the fact of the matter is, the NTIA has not done anything in terms of controlling the protocol parameter assignments in any fashion. It's all run by the community. And so my view of the oversight, or there [inaudible] has been that they've let this system grow, and build up the IAB and other entities and all kinds of processes that we have. And now we have them, and we are using them, and that is what is happening on a day to day basis.

I don't know if there is any other version of that that could be provided. But that is certainly the reality that we see today.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Jari. Narelle.

NARELLE CLARK: Sorry, just coming off mute. I'm not entirely clear here, Kavouss, what type...? Are you talking merely about getting a diagram to show the NTIA accountability system? Or are you talking about asking the ITF to draw a diagram that it expresses its own internal accountability systems for all of the IANA interaction and other things, potentially even? Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARATEH: Yes. My suggestion did not involve NTIA, although there will be internally, IETF, IND, and many other entities that are referred to [inaudible] explanations of about this oversight. This is something internally, that I have to see who really controls what, and who is the one that has this oversight on the overall issues inside IETF internal.

I don't talk about IETF [inaudible]... relating to the currently process in IETF, including the overall oversight of IAD and many other communities, because sometimes they talk back and forth, it's in one entity to another. We don't know whether one of them is responsible to the IND, or they are below that, or above that. This is the chronological and the hierarchy arrangement, internal. I'm not dealing

with any issue to involve NTIA in that bag [inaudible] internally for the IETF. On the other hand, there is the mention. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you. And it sounds like maybe Jari would think about doing that, although I would say that perhaps reading the blog post and also the other action item that we have outstanding, which is the response to a very similar question, might provide some further information there as well. So maybe we could, Jari has that action item first and we can see how far that gets us.

So, I do want to come back to this combined assessment that we are supposed to be doing of the two proposals that we have. There are a few responses on the list saying that people are interested in, they want to do this, but we haven't really had a substantive discussion about it too much other than a little bit on the call today.

So I guess the question is, first, if people just feel like that have thought about this, and they feel satisfied with the proposals, and we can begin to move on with the rest of our work? Or if we need to do something like we did in step one, where we get a couple of volunteers to say, "I will sit down and think hard about this and write up my answers to the questions that we're looking at on the screen." And we have a further conversation about it.

I would like to get a sense from the group about whether people feel satisfied that we assessed the proposals for these criteria that we're looking at on the screen, and we're done, or if they feel like there is more work to do, or if people intend to do this in the coming week or

two or three, and bring their thoughts back to the group. I would like to hear from people what they think the status is of this part of the assessment. Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah, I was a little bit confused. At first I thought we were reviewing this process document, but now it seems like you're asking us about whether we think the numbers and protocol proposals are complete, or that we have looked at them properly.

ALISSA COOPER: [CROSSTALK] doing the process document, definitely. These are just the questions we're supposed to be answering about the proposal that we have.

MILTON MUELLER: Okay, good. Okay, so in that case, my view is that we have successfully vetted, and we have gone through, let me see, we have gone through step two, yes. We have successfully gone through step two for numbers and protocols, and I think the only thing we have agreed to do is to do this informal consultation, or what Mr. Kavouss famously called the incremental provisional consultation process.

So we still need to do that.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay. So, Milton you are of the opinion that we have thought about compatibility, accountability, and workability for the two proposals together, and people feel, and you feel satisfied that we're done with that. That's what I'm trying to ascertain, I just want to make sure that, okay. That is how you feel.

Okay, that's good. I will, perhaps, formulate this in a very specific question to the mailing list, just to confirm that other people feel that way, because I haven't heard from too many folks about that. Lynn is also confirming, thank you. But we can, that's great from my perspective since that was a fairly simple process. So that's excellent.

But I will please secretary give me an action item to send that question to the list and I will do that just to confirm with folks who maybe couldn't make the call, and anyone else who wants to think about it a little bit longer. So my other question is, do we have Wolf-Ulrich on the call? And does he want to talk about implementation? Yes. Go ahead Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:

Yes, thanks. Wolf-Ulrich Knobén speaking. I think I pretty much have to repeat what we already had talked about on the list. It's clear the question of implementation, or implement ability, or whatever, with regard to the proposal, was brought up by Larry in Singapore. And that caused a discussion about well, what does it mean? And to an extent, the implementation of the proposals should be ready by delivering the proposals.

So this is very [inaudible] where we circulate around the discussion. And as I already mentioned, also the discussion is going on the CWG now, started up around that, and questions were raised, what does it mean? To what extent? What detail? Implementation has to be discussed and has to be documented in advance to providing the proposals.

So I would like to raise this question as well. Also under this point, where we talk about the second step of assessment, and the question, does this fit all together? And to what extent all three proposals have to provide some input on implementation? I noted what Jari was saying on the list as well, that it maybe not our task, the ICG's task, to set limits or to set a frame on that to the various communities, other than to leave them, discount them internally to what detail they would like to come up with this implementation.

However, I also feel that this has to be some coordination on that. And there was also some points raised that it may be to a different extent, detailed, this question of implementation. So this is just to start off with that, the discussion, and I think ICG should do something, should come up with some kind of guideline, not to specific points, but in order to frame the discussion about implementation. So far from my side first. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I'm not clearly following, what implementation we are talking about. Are we talking about implementation refers to be NTIA? Or are we talking about our implementation? What is the [inaudible] under the ICG? [CROSSTALK]...

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah. So I think the aspect that Wolf-Ulrich is focusing on is with respect to actually [inaudible] the proposal that gets written down by the various communities. So for example, if you look at the CRISP proposal that we received from the numbering community, the proposal is that there will be, there are some existing mechanisms that will continue to exist, and then there are some new mechanisms including a SLA, a review committee that provides a place to the NRO. And the question, I think there is a couple of questions.

One is, how much detail needs to be in the proposal that comes to the ICG, and also that goes to NTIA, about exactly how those kinds of items have implemented? Obviously, the SLA that they envision is not written yet, so we don't know. The details of it are not in the proposal, or included by reference. And there is similar questions coming up in the CWG, if there is going to be a new contract, if there is going to be a new entity, how much detail does there need to be written in the proposal itself about those kinds of items?

So that's one aspect. And then I do think, he didn't really speak to it too much on the call, but on the list, there is a related question, which is, how much of that needs to already be in place either before the proposal gets sent to NTIAA, or before the transition happens? And I

have an opinion on that, which is that we know we're not in the business of deciding when the transition happens, and deciding when the proposal is ready to go, so we should really focus there. But that's my understanding of what implementation we're talking about.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Excuse me, may I have a follow up comment? The implementation of what CWG is dealing with, and CCWG, contacts and so on, support, these are entirely different from implementation under step two. Under step two, I told we are just focusing on the protocol parameters proposals. All of the sudden it jumped into the numbers. I have no problem if we try to do that, but for the time being, let's concentrate on step two on the protocol parameters.

In that case, I don't think they need anything explaining about the implementation, because they don't change anything at all. They continue to do what they are doing or they were doing six years. So for IETF or for the parameters and [inaudible], we don't need to have further explanations about the implementation. When it comes to the numbers, I think we will do that. But I think at this time, it is better we concentrate on the step two to the parameter protocol or [inaudible] parameters, but not go to the numbers at this stage. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you. So I agree with you on the substance. I will say, this step two assessment is an assessment of numbers and protocol parameters together. So we have the two, and we look at them together and we say, "Are they compatible? Do they provide accountability? Are they

workable together?” So we are not actually strictly focused on one or the other, we’re meant to be look at both. I have Milton, Daniel, and then Joe, and then I’m going to close the queue so that we can get to the last agenda item and wrap up. Milton, go ahead.

MILTON MUELLER:

Yeah, so I think Wolf-Ludwig is correct to raise this issue, but I hope that we can raise it and dispose of it. I don’t think we can make implementation kind of a new criteria to the NTIA’s existing criteria. I think implementation is primarily a matter to be decided by the operational communities, in terms of how and what optimal level of detail they specify.

If a proposal is not actually implementable, then I would expect that to arise first in the community consensus process, and secondly, in the public comment period. And again, the ICG is in no position to specify a level of implementation detail, except in so far that it might be encompassed in what we call accountability.

And of course, this is mostly a names issue. In some way, it’s far out from the controversies over naming proposals, and I would be very wary of letting that fall out spilling over to our work, because I don’t think it’s appropriate. I think some of the talk about implementation levels is really kind a way certain people have of privileging some models over others, rather than actually engaging on the substance of those models.

So I think that if we try to defend that, we’re going to be essentially very much risking becoming an arbiter of what proposals are acceptable.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Milton. Daniel.

DANIEL KARREBERG: I'd like to do two things. First I would like to speak to Wolf-Ulrich's question, and then two, something that Kavouss said. To Wolf-Ulrich's question, I think it was much more detailed in an email he sent less than 24 hours ago. And if I understood this correctly, we could expect some questions from the CWG, on the level of detail, and that we think we require. And we can't put our heads under the rug and say we want to get those questions and we'll ignore them, in order to be impartial towards the CWG discussions. I think we have to address those questions at face value.

I'm not sure whether we can answer it. In the end, it's something that we have to construct a comment proposal from their response. And the ultimate goal is that it is acceptable to NTIA to, in order for them to make the decision to withdraw. So, I think we have to prepare ourselves for this question arriving. And we have to make up our mind on whether we want to answer it, whether we want to punt it to NTIA, or whether we want to give a very general answer by saying, "Give us all the detail that you can. The more detail you give us, the more we have to work with."

But we cannot avoid the question, answering that question. So that's number one. And I think Wolf-Ulrich made himself the [inaudible] of this, I think he should have, get an intervention in this discussion. The second, speaking to Kavouss, is that of course, we have to deal with the

numbers proposal, right here, now, because what we're doing, as Alissa has said, our next step is to at least make a combination of the two in preparation for making a combination of the three.

And we cannot defer any issues or questions that we have with a numbers proposal, that would be totally unfair to the numbers community. So if you have any issues to raise, raise them now, and not delay the whole process by raising them in a month or two.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you Daniel. Joe. And well, so I will [inaudible], we have, in theory, four minutes left. I have Kavouss and Wolf-Ulrich back in queue, and I have one more agenda item. So if everyone can be very brief, I would appreciate that. Thank you.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF:

Joe Alahadef for the record. Yeah, I think I'm kind of in between Daniel and Milton in the sense that, I think it's a question we have to ask for a completeness purpose of the proposal we are sending forward. For the two proposals we already have, the answer is, they are not substantially changing their implementations, and their statement just needs to be something to that effect with a pointer to the fact that they have had implementations over a period of time.

Names may have to have something broader. That doesn't mean we're evaluating the substance, it's up to the community to determine the substance. But I think it doesn't fit neatly within workability. And I think implementation is an issue that has come up that we have to deal

with, and the question is from a completeness sake, we have to have that information in the proposal, and then it's up to NTIA to determine if the implementation is sufficient.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks Joe. Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes Alissa. This is saying you should not talk about any questions [inaudible] because it does not know what is the question of [inaudible] be worried about that. Our plan is to have the two proposals that we have, I have no problem with compatibility, whether they're compatible or not. If we say that they are not incompatible, that's all. And if we have to finish this at this meeting, or we have a next meeting, again, going through these two proposals for step two, I don't think that we should rush. We should read the time, maybe we have some other questions about the step two of the two proposals together.

I don't think that we should do it at this meeting. So I exclude anything relating to the questions raised by the CWG, and anything similar to that, but just concentrate on the two proposals. I have no problem [inaudible] two together, but not finish everything at this meeting. We have to have time, and still we can come back to see whether we have some difficulty. But from the answer we have received, there are not incompatible. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Wolf-Ulrich, and then we will wrap this up.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks Alissa. Thank you. I may put it in a [inaudible] understand correctly. It's not about creating new work, and it's just we have two things. The one thing is that we are dealing right now with the question of step two, but on the other hand we have to get an equal framework for all the other, for all proposals. And the question of implementation was raised with regards to specific examples.

For example, if some new entities are going to be created by any kind of proposal, let me say the review committee, or any other customer committees, it's not just about what the question that this is a kind of new entity as an idea, but the question of, how is that set out? How is that going to be dealt with in the future? Maybe a charter draft should be held for such a committee. These questions are the ones who are the concrete one, who maybe open, and I would be prepared for those questions which may come from the NTIA. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. So I think this was a good start to this discussion. I think we should continue it on the list, and maybe pick it up again on the next call, because there is still, people are asking a lot of good questions, but we need to kind of sort out what our answers are collectively about the implementation aspect. So thank you for raising that Wolf-Ulrich.

I'll turn it over quickly to Patrik, who is going to talk about the ICG face to face meeting in Buenos Aries. We really don't have time to discuss it, but he'll just give people the current status, and then after that I will wrap up. So Patrik.

PATRIK FÄLSTRÖM: Yes. The status has unfortunately not changed much since the email that I sent on the list. We are still waiting for feedback at the moment from the local host to ensure that we have the room that we need on the Thursday and Friday before the meeting. I have received very strong comments that we cannot have the meeting before the ICANN meeting going later than lunch on Saturday. But the goal at the moment is still to end Friday evening. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. And we'll look for an update from you when you have more information. So with that, I think we are about ready to close the call. I will just note for people that today is my last day of work before maternity leave. So I will be on leave starting tomorrow, and will be away from ICG duties for some time until April.

So Patrik and Mohammed will have everything in hand, and I will certainly take care of the action items that I took today before going on leave. So just so people know that. And the Secretariat will, as usual, produce the set of action items, and the minutes, and the roll call and all of that, and it will be on the list for everyone. So with that, I think we can wrap up the call.

People have hands up, do people want to have further thoughts?
Kavouss and Paul, I see your hands up?

KAVOUSS ARATEH: Yes Paul from [inaudible] is much senior than me, as seniority. On behalf of everybody Alissa, we wish a very, very safe delivery.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. I appreciate it. Paul did you have a comment?

PAUL WILSON: Well, here, here to Kavous. But I wanted to just mention for information that APNIC's annual meeting is coming up starting next week. And on Monday afternoon we are holding an IANA transition information session that will be focused on numbers, mostly of course, but it will be webcast.

So anyone who is interested, you can find about it on the website. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Paul. All right, that's a wrap. Thanks everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]