

---

ALISSA COOPER: Hi everyone. This is Alissa. I think we can go ahead and get started, people are still are connecting to audio. But we have a pretty big group, given that it seems to be the majority preferred time zone, so thank you all for taking the time to join.

I see we're going to go with the recording and so forth, so I think we can get started. You can see the agenda in the Adobe Connect room. Actually, I guess I should ask first if there is anyone on the call who is not in the Adobe Connect room, please say your name right now.

THERESA: Hi, this is Theresa. I'm not in the Adobe Connect right now.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks Theresa. Anyone else on audio but not in Adobe Connect? Okay, great. So thanks everyone for joining. So we have two to three agenda items today. This first one was to talk about the proposal submission expectations. Unfortunately, Lynn and I had a bit of miscommunication, and it turns out that she couldn't actually be on the call, so I will try to leave that discussion primarily based on her work, and a little bit of help from myself and Joe that we've contributed.

So that's the first item. I'm hoping that we can wrap that up about 40 past hour, then we have some time for updates from the operational communities, and I think, I hope we have folks on the call from most of them. I'm not sure that we will have someone from numbers, but we should have someone from protocol parameters, and names, who can

---

*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.*

---

give a brief update from the communities, and people can ask questions.

And then Patrik had wanted to talk about logistics for the Singapore meeting. Unfortunately, Patrik was not able to join us, I don't think. He's not on now, if he joins later, we will try to work that in. But as of now, we will probably be skipping that item if he doesn't join. And then we will wrap up and talk a little bit about next steps, and plans for December and for our next call.

I will note to people that Samantha was not able to make it onto the call today, so she will be doing the minutes in a time-shifted manner. I will try to keep track of the action items only from the call, so that we can get them out to the list right after the call, but the full minutes Sam will produce later. So just for people's information. Are there any comments or suggestions on the agenda? Other things that people want to talk about, or if they don't like the things that we did have planned?

Oh, and Samantha is here. Oh great. So Samantha can take the action items and minutes. Thank you very much Samantha. So comments on the agenda? Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes hello, this is Jean-Jacques. I notice that on this call, Jennifer [inaudible] is present. I just wanted to make sure that is the case, and if so that will be, the people who have chosen to be secretariat are on [inaudible]... Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

So, that is not actually something that I was aware of, and I'm not clear on... I don't think we're making any information public about that just yet, since we don't have full confirmation. So I think we should just proceed, if that's okay?

All right. So, let's dig in on the discussion on the proposal, oh. I see a hand raised from Xiaodong.

Xiaodong, do you have a comment?

He may be having trouble with the audio. Well, Xiaodong, we can't hear you if you're speaking. So, I'm not sure if you're were trying to but you might need to reconnect. [Inaudible] if you need to make a comment.

So looking at the proposal submission expectations, I know that it has been a little while since we last looked at this, and there has been a lot of discussion on the mailing list. But I think it's a good time to pick it back up again, and we do have some progress that we need to make on this. So the document that you can see in Adobe Connect is a version of this document that the proposal finalization process that Joe, myself, and Lynn have been working on.

This is the version most recently updated a couple of hours ago by Lynn. And so, what I wanted to do actually with the, start at the bottom, which is where we were, incorporating some of the text related to our interaction with the ICANN Board. So if we can scroll down to the end, do I have scroll control? Yes I do.

---

So, can everyone see that? The proposal submissions? [Inaudible] like in step four? Can I get confirmation from anyone that we're looking at the same text and document?

[DANIEL KARRENBERG]: [Inaudible]... so this is [Daniel?]. It's individual scrolling, so everybody has to scroll for themselves.

ALISSA COOPER: Ah, okay. So if we can do that, that would be good. Looking at proposal submissions 17 July to 31 July 2015. So this is the text that covers the very last steps of our process, of where we talk about actually conveying the proposal, the final proposal to NCI, and just have gone through some revisions, in the last phase as we had the whole conversation at the last ICANN meeting about the fact that the proposal actually needs to be conveyed from ICANN to NCI, so it's different [inaudible].

So you can now see that this is essentially a three-step process, where we would post the final proposal on our website, we would send the proposal to ICANN, with respect to ICANN to send the proposal to NCI, are modified, and then we have some text in here about what happens if, for some reason, ICANN feels that they are not able to do that.

And so, and the edits you can see here, some of them proposed in the yellow and red by Paul previously, and then the blue ones, at least for me they look blue, at the bottom proposed by Glenn. We've had a little bit of a discussion on the mailing list about this, some kind of clarification questions. You know when we say at ICANN, what we are

---

talking about, those kinds of things. And then some discussions today about the actual, the process at the end, and what the interaction with the Board should be like.

So I would like to kind of open this up for discussion, just on this bit of text. What do we think about? How it looks right now? And versions and commentary on the list. So please raise your hand if you want to get in the queue.

Daniel.

DANIEL KARREBERG:

Hello, this is Daniel. Please, gee, [inaudible]... I would propose to use A, B, and C that is in black, and not make it any more specific. My reasoning about that is that we should really do our work, [inaudible] to ICANN, with ICANN I mean the ICANN Board, because that's what ICANN is for this purpose, and the Board should do with it.... A general... [Inaudible] ...as early on with everybody else.

But I wouldn't even do that. I wouldn't make such that. My main reason is that I don't want to open a perception that we treat them as special, and we want to negotiations that were above the final results, because that's a road to disaster. So again, we should use A, B, and C and not anything else.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you. Joe.

---

JOE:

Thank you. I guess for me it's a modified version of Daniel's comment in the sense that, I think in the current construction, we seem to be providing the ICANN Board a special status, which it does not warrant. I think it warrants that we call out the expectation that the ICANN Board will be participating in the comment process to the same extent and at the same time that other commenters are participating in the process, and therefore we would expect to transmit a final proposal to ICANN, that they have participated in the consensus development on.

And not, my concern is that the way we phrase it, almost gives them a slightly special status that if they have a problem at the very end, we're going to resolve their problem more than anybody else's. And while it might be a reality that their position is different, I don't think we should be treating them as different than any other commentator.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you. Martin.

MARTIN BOYLE:

Hi. Thanks. It's Martin Boyle here. Yeah, generally I agree with both Daniel and Joe. And it's almost like me giving them a veto over our work, but not only a veto over our work, a veto right at the very end. As I said on email earlier this evening, or was it earlier this morning? We've already got liaisons both from the ICANN Board and from the IANA team, as part of the ICG.

And I really do think that these liaisons, their key role, is to flag whether there are difficulties and issues, and if they are then, if these issues have

---

been raised after the 17<sup>th</sup> of July, as this section would imply, really what have they been doing? It seems to mean that we really, really, really shouldn't be putting this special status here. And I'd actually go one step further and say that we ought to be making a specific reference, that if there any concerns, those concerns should have been raised by the liaison at the stage when the overall proposal was put together.

In other words, around about Singapore or immediately thereafter. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Kuo.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: In the chatroom, he had audio problems.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, we'll keep him in the queue, and hopefully we can work on closed audio a little bit. We'll go to Gene.

GENE: Thanks Alissa. Gene speaking for the transcript. And I just want to be a bit of a contrarian here, and note that it's not our proposal review process that grants the ICANN Board special status, it's the fact that the NTIA directed this request to the ICANN Board, or to ICANN to convene

---

this transition proposal in the first place. So they do, unfortunately, have some status that is different the rest of the communities.

However, I think that we can address that in this statement here by removing the second paragraph C, about should the Board have concern, instead, direct that, perhaps, higher in the process where we would say something along the lines of, I think this is now going to Martin's contribution a moment ago, that the liaisons...

KUO-WEI WU: Hello?

GENE: Hello?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can hear you but...

KUO-WEI WU: Good. Okay. I'll wait.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you.

GENE: I'm almost finished here, and then I'll turn it back to Alissa so she can get back to the queue. But I think that we can, as Martin said, establish



---

a trigger line where we would say essentially that because the ICG expects ICANN to transmit the process, for the proposal unmodified, to NTIA and to publish that transmission on its public website in a timely manner, we are expecting that the liaisons are resolving any outstanding issues by date X.

And then we could probably eliminate everything that follows. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Kuo.

KUO-WEI WU: Hi. Can you hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes.

KUO-WEI WU: Okay. First of all, I think the ICANN Board, we have, talking about the issue just last week, and right now, we have an understanding for the final report for the ICG. ICANN basically will only check the legal issue, and we are not going to change any statement regarding for your final report. How to deliver it, I think was based on the timeline, I think it's about around 14 days, and we will be able to deliver to the NTIA, [inaudible].

We have other concerns, we will make a separate comment, but we are not going to modify any single word in your final report. And I think this

---

is very, it's a list of right now, we have such an understanding right now, at the same time, I think the ICANN Board, we're looking for end of [inaudible]. And we are a participant in all of the general communities, and of course we also think about the possibility to set up a meeting with the ICG.

And if that is to happen, basically I think we are looking for the public, is not a private meeting. So I think this is a country status. [Inaudible] happy to answer the question you have. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks. Yes, why don't we keep you on for a second there? I have one follow up question, and others may have questions as well. When you say, "Only look for legal issues," can you elaborate a little bit on that? I mean, obviously, many of the issues related to the various components of the transition plan will be legal in nature, or are likely to be, at least some of them.

So, can you talk a little bit about that?

KUO-WEI WU:

Yeah, I think legal issues that basically, as you know, the ICANN is established in California, so we have to follow the Californian law. Basically, we are not intent to modify or change any kind of word in the final report. And if you have follow up, such a legal issue, I think we have a meeting in Singapore, then we can answer in more clear and detail, because such an issue... Basically, we have understanding to

---

modify or change any final report is not a good behavior from ICANN point of view.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay. Thank you. We have a little bit of a queue, but obviously if people have further questions for Kuo, please get in the queue. Thanks. Xiaodong.

Xiaodong, we still seem to have trouble with your audio, unfortunately, can't hear you. So maybe we can keep trying to work that out and get you back in the queue. Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you Alissa, this is Jean-Jacques. Two comments. The first to support what [inaudible] speakers have only indicated that both of the [inaudible]... We should not provide ICANN or, in fact, any other organization or contributor, any special status in this process. The point made by James is valid, that NTIA [inaudible] ICANN facilitator of this process, which we are engaged. But that does not mean that we should give them a special status.

It is a [inaudible] channel. So I think that, for the purposes of transparency, and [inaudible], we should avoid giving ICANN a special role. My second comment...

---

ALISSA COOPER: Sorry Jean-Jacques. People and I are having a little trouble hearing you. If you could speak up or speak more into the microphone, that would be great. Thanks.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Okay. Should I repeat what I said on my first point, or should I carry on to my second point?

ALISSA COOPER: Maybe you could just summarize your first point and then move on. I could hear you, but there are people in the chat saying they couldn't hear you.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Alissa. This is Jean-Jacques. Yes, I have increased the volume on my microphone. I will repeat my first point. As others before me have pointed out, we should not make a special case for ICANN, or give it privilege status [inaudible]. My second point is that [inaudible] draft, we should not suggest that the way of communication between ICG and the ICANN Board could be either its liaisons or some other way.

As Lynn suggested in her draft, I read, I quote, "If [inaudible] arises at the ICANN or ICANN [globe] level, during the transition planned development process, the ICG expect individual staff or Board members to raise these concerns within the community process, or exceptionally, to raise it at the [inaudible] via the ICANN liaison, during the proposal development."

---

Now, what bothers more than anything else, is actually the phrase, “or exceptionally, to raise the [inaudible] via the ICANN liaison.” There is a basic principle built into international law, which is that one cannot stipulate for others, one can only stipulate for himself.

We are not the ICANN Board, so it’s not up to us [inaudible] those will who will represent the ICANN Board. The ICANN Board has been [appointed?] a liaison, so it’s quite natural that we should use that channel. It’s not up to us to change or modify that representation. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you Jean-Jacques. Joe.

JOE:

Thank you. This was kind of going back to the concept of, that the ICANN Board might need to review something for legal purposes, based on its location of incorporation. And I’m really hard pressed to figure out things in the proposal we are coming up with, will be impactful of the California not for profit law. So, and if it is, that’s something we should know ahead of time as well.

So this shouldn’t wait again, once for the proposal has been transmitted. This should be part of the comment process. If there is going to be an issue as to forum, let us know as we’re going through the process. Nothing should wait until the last minute as a time to review something. That’s why we have a consultation process. This is a process of the entire community.

---

ICANN is part of the entire community. The fact that it is the last... That it receives the document in order to transmit it, doesn't diminish its obligations to participate as part of the community across all aspects of its participation.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Joe. Daniel.

DANIEL KARREBERG: Actually it occurs to me, as to what Kuo has just said, i.e., that the ICANN Board intends to transmit the result of our work to the NTIA unchanged, maybe add comments of their own, any part of paragraph four that's not in A and B, so I just [inaudible]... would want to 4A in black and 4B in black, with the transmit in it, and be done with it. Because if we have the [minutes?] that we need.

KUO-WEI WU: Can I answer Joe's questions?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes please.

KUO-WEI WU: I agree with what Joe is saying. I think the ICANN Board will deliver the earliest part of the final report sending out, and I would think I would pass this message to ICANN Board, and to reconfirm the legal concern would be raised as early as possible before the final report is sent out.

---

And thanks for your comment. I think that it is understandable. And I think we would be just like you're asking.

I think the meeting last week, we ended on a good, and we are willing to participate as early as possible in this process, and not in the final report. And thank you for Joe your comment, I think we [listened to it]. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

So, yeah, just one follow up on that exchange, as you were both talking. I'm wondering if, as a next step, we... It sound like we're sort of diverging a little bit on what we want to do with our text right here, which is essentially what Daniel proposed, or we can hash that around a little bit more amongst ourselves. But I think Kuo, if the Board were to essentially write down what you said to us on this call, as far as the expected process and early participation, and that you would transmit it unmodified and any comment of yours would be separate.

If the Board feels that they can write that down and send that over to us, I think we might be essentially done at that point. We have mutually agreed, a process, and so if that is something that you think that you can take up with the Board as far as just, you know, sending us a mail that says what you said on this call, especially because not everyone is on the call, I think that would be good to help us kind of close the loop on this.

---

KUO-WEI WU: Yes. I fully agree about what you are saying. And I will attach this message to item four, and I think [inaudible] we will try to participate as early as possible. What you are saying, I think to change any final report is not a good behavior, or if you're thinking about this, not a good thing to happen. And we are not looking to do that. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Great. Thanks. So Xiaodong. Can we hear you now?

XIAODONG LEE: Yeah. This is the English channel. I think sorry for the problem, I'm going to check the [inaudible]... work on the Board to send somebody to be the observer or supporter to doing the legal support for the ICG. So to work with some legal issues. [Inaudible] following California law.

ALISSA COOPER: I'm sorry, you were breaking up just a little bit. Do you mind just repeating your suggestion one more time?

XIAODONG LEE: I think because the Board have a concern to check the legal issues from the, under California law, I think maybe they should work on sending somebody to be the supporter to ICG, I mean from the [inaudible] council of ICANN to give support before we forward the proposal to ICANN Board, and then we can work on the legal person to turn the [inaudible] to discussion before we forward the proposal. It would be better.



ALISSA COOPER:                      Okay. Thank you. Daniel.

DANIEL KARRENBERG:              Just the principle, while it would be nice to have an email from the ICANN Board chair, or [inaudible] Board [inaudible], in some way more formally, so that we have [inaudible]. For me personally, [inaudible], it's good enough. He's the liaison, as far as I'm concern, in our context, he speaks for the Board, and I'm sure he has kept careful enough not to saying anything, but the Board wouldn't [inaudible].

Formally, for me [inaudible]...

ALISSA COOPER:                      Okay. I mean, that's fair enough. I think I would, so I think you're breaking up a little bit Daniel, but I think to repeat what you said. That Kuo's explanation to what he gave on this call, properly minute-ed, is enough for us to go on, we don't need a formal statement from the Board. I think that's fair enough.

I would like to pull that portion out of the minutes, highlight it on our mailing list to everyone else who was not able to join the call, and make sure that they feel that it's sufficient, and that Kuo agrees how it's, obviously, represented in the minutes as well. And I'm happy to go forward from there, you know, without any further statement.

Would be interested to hear what other people think about that. Mary.

---

Mary, it looks like you are muted.

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

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, yes.

MARY UDUMA: Can you hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: We can hear you.

MARY UDUMA: I'm saying that, you stated what I wanted to say. That I think we have the level of comfort from the statement that [was posted] this morning. I don't think we need further communication. And [inaudible] I think whatever else they will also do, walk with that for now. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. And I see some support for that in the chatroom for that as well. Any other comments on that issue?

Okay. So, it sound like we have a rough plan. We will obviously get this meeting minute-ed, pull out the portion what Kuo said about the Board's approach, make sure that everyone on the mailing list, you

---

know, takes a look at it and feels comfortable with it. I will take a stab at editing our document, along the lines of what people have discussed here, maintaining the black text of A and B, was the suggestion.

I still feel that the first sentence of C is useful as well, hopefully other people do too. So I have two open questions on that. One is that we can see the highlighted text from Paul in part B. Personally, I mean, I think it's fine for us to schedule a meeting, after we have transmitted the proposal. I don't think it's strictly necessary, especially since we don't expect any modifications or anything. So, I'm not sure that I would want to include that in the process. So I'm curious if other people have talked about that.

And then my other question is, we talked a lot here today about the need for everyone, including the ICANN Board, to provide early feedback about all aspects of the proposal, whether they be legal or otherwise, and to use both the community feedback and the liaison mechanisms to surface any issues that Board members want to raise. That's the expectation for everyone involved in this whole process, so my question is, do we need to say anything further about that in any kind of written document?

Or can we just assume, in particular since we will have the minute-ed text from Kuo, that that's taken care of, and that we as the ICG do not need to say anything further on that point about early feedback and community participation? So two questions if anyone has thoughts on those in the last couple of minutes.

---

I have a strong feeling, I see some in the chat. But maybe removing the highlighted text, keeping the first part of letter C, and perhaps not addressing further this issue of early feedback.

Okay. Well, I will take the action to make those edits, and also to pull the text out of the minutes when the minutes become available and circulate that for confirmation with the full ICG. And then I think we can move on. So thank you everyone. So I will say, we just looked at this one part of this document today, and there has been not a lot of discussion of the edits that happen to all of the other pages of this document.

So I would really like to get that discussion revived on the mailing list, so that we can finish the document as a whole. Paul has suggested a substantial number of changes in his last revision, and I will definitely, to make it a priority to try and respond his comments and get the discussion going on the list for the other sections of this document, and I really don't know if other people will participate in that discussion as well.

It would be great to wrap this up maybe by our next call, which is December 10. So, that is the plan there. There haven't been any questions. Before we move on, we had a question earlier from Xiaodong about the update with the secretariat. And unfortunately, I have not confirmed on this call the finalization of the new secretariat. My understanding is that we are very, very close.

I have been in touch a little bit with [inaudible], who is not on the call, and that's my understanding of the situation, but I don't have any

---

further details that can be shared publically right now. But we're getting very close, so hopefully we will be able to get some details really soon. And I agree with everyone that this is a priority and we're really trying to wrap that up.

So hopefully that is sufficient for now.

With that, I think we can move on to community updates. Martin, I think you had generously agreed to provide a community update on the names community, so we'd love to hear from you about that.

MARTIN BOYLE:

Okay. Thank you. It's Martin Boyle here. And Wolf-Ulrich, who is also on the call, and he was, like me, present in the face to face meeting that we had of the cross-community working group on names last week. The cross-community working group has been working to the different sections on the request for proposals, and has pretty well completed its responses to section one on the community use of the IANA functions, section two on the pre-transition arrangement.

And last week, in our face to face meeting, it identified a way forward on proposed transition oversight and accountability arrangements, and it was section three. And the intention is that will form part of a conference call later today, i.e. Wednesday. The first meeting of the discussion on section four, the transition implications, took place yesterday, i.e. Tuesday, and that has now kicked off work, and there will be further call on that on Friday.

---

So, overall, I'd say the work is pretty well up to the wire, because the aim is for the work to go out for consultation on the 1<sup>st</sup> of December, which if I'm right, is just this coming Monday. And there is lots of discussion going on, on the list. So there are some problems about meeting the 15<sup>th</sup> of January dealing. As the communities identified right at the beginning, but the work is going on at quite a horrendous pace for those of us who are trying to follow it.

There is still, in my mind at least, a very big issue over the relationship between this work, which is going on in the naming functions cross-community working group, and a separate ICANN accountability cross-community working group, in particular stream one, which will be looking at the ICANN accountability stuff that needs to be addressed before transition takes place. And in particular, this is all about the accountability of the policy functions which are then directly related to the decisions that are made in the IANA functions.

This cross-community working group has only just started, and therefore is going to be a little of a low for the naming community, and I don't have the timeline for that work yet. So, that's sort of my brief summary of where we are. Wolf-Ulrich might have, indeed, a comment that he would like to add. But thanks.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you Martin. Wolf-Ulrich, did you want to add anything?

---

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yeah, thanks Alissa. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Martin covered all. I would like to point to the questions to the timeline, which Martin also touched. Since the TWG, on their schedule, they have to, the deadline of the 31<sup>st</sup> of January to submit the proposal, because counting back, so they need the time to make the proposal. I also understand that they're having [inaudible] and [inaudible] meet, to come up with far in advance.

But, that may happen, that the proposal is going to be submitted on the 31<sup>st</sup> of January. And if I look to a document we have just talked about earlier, so we have to take that into consideration, or I wonder how it takes that into consideration, whether there should be early in advance, a contact between the chair [inaudible] group, with regard to that question. That's my only comment to that. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, that's a good point. So, I can only speak for myself. I have been following the process in the working group a little bit, and was aware that the kind of settled upon deadline for trying to complete the names work was the 31<sup>st</sup> of January, or for trying to complete the initial proposal. And I guess my thinking was since, we have that... The community seems to be, I mean as far as I can tell, seems to be making extraordinary efforts to get the work done quickly, which I very much appreciate.

And seeing as we had set the deadline for January 15 and said that the deadlines were targets and not hard deadlines. And also that I think in terms of the proposal finalization process that we had, you know, the first thing we will have to do as a group is evaluate the proposal

---

components individually. That maybe we could take the time between when we received the other two components, which will probably be January 15 or earlier, and the time, which will hopefully only be February 2, until we receive the names component, and do those individual evaluations.

And potentially have some back and forth with those communities as necessary, or at least get that process started, if you think we need to. And then hopefully, by the time we would have the names of both of them, then we could do them a little bit sequentially. So my thinking was sort of that the community seems to be working very, very hard on getting things as quickly as they can, and as close enough to our timing that we had suggested, it seems to me like it could work out.

Now I think if it delays too much further, we're going to end up having a problem, but hopefully that won't be the case. That was my thinking, but I'm happy to hear from others. Martin.

MARTIN BOYLE:

Thanks Alissa. It's Martin Boyle again. Yes, one thing that perhaps I should have mentioned is, that current discussion is looking at contracting and separate ability of the IANA function operation, and the possibility of revisiting. And in the face to face meeting last week, I did flag that obviously also has implications for the other communities, the naming and the protocol parameters.

Now I'm seeing that bit as passive. Our job, when we see the different proposals, of trying to make sure that there is coherence between those three bits. But you know, again, it would seem to me to be probably



---

useful to have that fitting as being a point of discussion or liaison between the people who were chairing the three different strands. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. That's a good note to flag.

So I think we should probably move on so that we can get all of the communities covered. Russ, are you able to talk a little bit about protocol parameters?

RUSS: Yes, if you can hear me.

ALISSA COOPER: Your audio is very bad. You sound like you're in a tunnel.

RUSS: [Inaudible], I don't see where I can adjust. I'll speak up. Does that help?

ALISSA COOPER: A little bit, yes.

RUSS: Okay. So, the version that I just typed into the chatroom, points to documents that the ITF are developing in the IANA plan working group. Today that was basically trying to resolve the lack of comments that

---

were received during working group last call. We are about to start a week ITF wide last call. We will hope that will finish in the next two or three weeks.

It will give us plenty of time to resolve, comment, and meet the 15 January deadline. So that's what is going on at the moment.

ALISSA COOPER:

Questions for Russ? Russ, do you want to say a word or two about the summary of the proposal?

RUSS:

Basically we are saying no new organizations are needed. We have a service level agreement in place that is updated each year. All of the new things that people have wanted to include will be included into the 2015 service level agreement. So we think it should actually be implemented by the time [inaudible].

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you. Questions for Russ?

Okay. So, Daniel I know that you were not necessarily prepared ahead of time to speak to the numbers process, but seeing as you are in that [inaudible], seem to have been following it, is there anything that you wanted to say about the numbering process?

---

DANIEL KARREBERG: This is Daniel. I certainly have no mandate in that since, but I posted a URL in the chatroom, the CRISP team, which the RIR communities have been setting up. That's now complete. So AfriNIC having selected their members. That team is to develop a proposal, part of their mandate, by the 4<sup>th</sup> of January or earlier. That team consists of three representatives from each regional community. Two from the community and one from the RIR staff.

And I'm quite sure that they can walk [inaudible] open, much less on working [inaudible]. So anybody can follow it [inaudible] members, to follow that work and see [inaudible], and flag anything that might make our own work less successful. And with that, I'm open to questions.

ALISSA COOPER: So I have one question which is, can you talk a little bit about the relationship between the existing proposals that have surfaced, and the individual RIRs, and the work of the CRISP team? Are they sort of using those as inputs? Are they trying to harmonize them? Are they just, were they just kind of theme setting?

DANIEL KARREBERG: It's a very bottom up process. They are organized regionally, and that has a [challenge]. All regional originally come up with their own ideas, and obviously the object of the CRISP team of regional communities represented, is to come up with a joint proposal. And speaking for myself personally, I haven't seen all of the discussions and all the meetings, but not having followed very, very closely, I see certainly something already happening.

---

Personally, I'm quite confident that there will be a more clear proposal much before the end of the year.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you. Any questions for Daniel?

Okay. So, I think this has been a productive call. Thanks to everyone. Just a few notes about the coming month or so. We've been a little bit not too active on our mailing list lately, which is possibly understandable, but there are a few things which I think we should try to finalize before the end of the year. And I will try to spark some discussion on the mailing list about the, and we do have another call about two weeks from now, so hopefully that will help us wrap up some of these items.

We have the action items from today, related to the proposal finalization process. I will also take an action to perhaps follow up with Martin on the point that he raised about the need for coordination across the three stands of the operational communities, on this question of revisiting the IANA function just to make sure that we're actually doing the coordinating that we need to do, and that the communities are informed about what's going on in each place.

So those are the actions, I think, from today. Hopefully very soon we will have information about the new secretariat, and you will be learning about the transition there, and getting introduced to those folks. So look out for that. We have the thread that Manal hopefully picked up on the FAQ. I think that's a very good suggestion that she made on the mailing list to get the FAQ updated.

---

It's supposed to be a living document, and you know, it doesn't need to be perfect before we post new information. So, people should take a look at that thread, and make comments so we can get that up on the website. And then when we have Patrik back with us, he will have some follow ups regarding logistics for the Singapore ICANN meeting. We definitely want to get some time on the ICANN agenda, as we had last time, to talk with the community.

Obviously there will be our own working meeting, and we have the possibility again for side meetings. So we need to start deciding some of those things. And he will also be following up about our general meeting schedule for next, call and meeting schedule for next year. So you should be getting a Doodle poll sometime in the next few weeks I would say. So please respond to those Doodle polls.

If people don't respond, then it makes it really hard to schedule the calls. So hopefully you'll be seeing a more steady stream of mail on the list in December, and we can get all of those items wrapped up and prepared for the work that we have ahead of us, once we receive the transition proposals from the community.

Any other thoughts, comments, questions, concerns?

Okay. Get one minute back, 30 seconds back, whatever it may be. So thanks everyone for joining, and we'll see you on the mailing list.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**