ALISSA COOPER:	Hi, everyone. This is Alissa. I know some people are still in the process of getting connected, but I think perhaps we should get going. It's a few minutes after the hour. It also looks that we have a fairly small group today. Hopefully people will continue to join late. The secretariat is working on the [inaudible] for some folks, so a little bit of patience is requested.
	The first order of business I just wanted folks to know that we have – the secretariat has identified one additional staff person who will be supporting the ICG on their side. Her name is Shirley [Herstia]. I hope I didn't butcher that entirely. Shirley, would you like to introduce yourself to the group?
	Shirley, do you have voice connectivity? I see you in the Adobe Connect room. Okay, maybe not, but we can have Shirley introduce herself in a moment. Shirley, we can't hear you if you're speaking. You need to work on the voice connectivity there, but we'll come back to you if you get connectivity.
	We should also identify there are folks on the phone who are not in the Adobe Connect room, so that we can take an accurate roll call. Is there anybody who's on the phone, but not in Adobe Connect?
JARI ARKKO:	This is Jari. I'm only on the phone.

THERESA SWINEHART:	Theresa Swinehart, only on the phone. I'll be onto Adobe Connect in a bit.
ELISE GERICH:	Elise Gerich, only on the phone.
ALISSA COOPER:	Thank you. Anybody else?
PAUL WILSON:	Paul Wilson here.
ALISSA COOPER:	Hi, Paul.
PAUL WILSON:	Good evening.
JOE ALHADEFF:	Alissa, I have been only on the phone, but now I'm also in the connect.
ALISSA COOPER:	Okay. That was Joe Alhadeff, I think.
JOE ALHADEFF:	Sorry.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes. Anybody else? Okay. I know that folks are having some connectivity issues. Just be aware that the secretariat is still working on those, so patience is appreciated. Okay. So I think we can get going on the first agenda item, which is approval of the minutes from our last call on January 14. The minutes were circulated last week and I know there's been some commentary on the mailing list. Some people suggested edits and I believe all of those have been incorporated. Does anyone have an objection to approving the minutes?

I don't see any hands raised. Jean-Jacques, do you have your hand raised or no? I see an icon that I'm not familiar with in the Adobe Connect room. I don't know if that's a hand.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello, Alissa. No, that was to approve your suggestion.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Oh, got it, a checkmark. Great. So I think with no objections we can approve the minutes from our last call and we can move on to our second agenda item, which is how to handle the community process complaints. So if we could just get the forum projected, that would be great.

I wanted to talk about this because we in the RFP and in some of our other earlier documents we explained to the community that we primarily expected participation through the operational community

processes, so we did establish a forum in the event that folks wanted to send us comments directly. So that's what you can see being projected.

We've received a couple in the period after having received the proposals from both the IETF and the RIR communities. As we said we would do, I have just been forwarding those directly to the communities without any comment or any context really one way or the other. I've just sort of sent them, that the communities are aware of them.

But we received one of the responses back in the numbers community was kind of asking, "Well, what do you want us to do with this?" It wasn't entirely clear just because we forwarded the comment what was supposed to happen next. So I wanted us to have a bit of a discussion about how we think that process should work because I think it's not clear to the communities if they need to be drafting responses back to us. We need to give them some clear guidance about what our expectation is.

I think in the case of these the comments were directed to the ICG and it's fine if we want to forward them to the communities and ask the communities to tell us what they think, but we just need to establish what the expectations are for that.

I would also say that I think having some kind of a deadline now that we have the two proposals submitted, having some kind of an end point where we say, okay, if folks have additional comments that they want to direct to the ICG, we [inaudible] the deadline for that, otherwise we could end up in a never-ending ping-pong situation where we keep

going back and forth with the communities and we wouldn't be able to finish our first-step assessment there.

So I see that we have a queue forming of people with comments. I have Kavouss Arasteh. Kavouss, if you're speaking, we cannot hear you. Are you speaking? Okay, maybe you're having some connectivity issues. We will try to work those out and come back to you. Next in the queue I see James Bladel. Go ahead, James.

JAMES BLADEL: Thanks, Alissa. Good morning. Can you hear me okay?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, we can hear you.

JAMES BLADEL: Okay, great. First off, thanks. First off, administrative matter. It looks like there's some spam in this submission queue if we could ask staff to maybe clear that up. It's a little humorous, but probably doesn't belong there.

Secondly, I think we want to just reinforce a lot of what you just said. Concerned about the potential of setting up this group as some sort of appeals body for folks who are not – let's say less than satisfied with the process that generated their community proposals. I think that that's going to increase as we go forward. Particularly, I see the potential for that opening the floodgates specifically within the naming community as well.

It seems like while – I agree with your position that we should perhaps refer these back to the communities and ask them to either address the process complaint in their proposal as an addendum or an annex or indicate why they believe it was just maybe a spurious or just inconsequential complaint.

The second thing would be to, as you said, establish a deadline. I think we have time for this, because as we indicated, the two communities are much further ahead than the naming community, so I think that there is time to do this in parallel without jeopardizing the overall timeline. I think that some of this will be incorporated into the first proposal coming out of the naming community with their comment period already behind them, although I do expect that we'll see some of this as well.

So those are my thoughts and I think you're on the right track. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, James. Joe?

JOE ALHADEFF: Thanks. I think we have two types of questions that arise as part of the complaints. One question was whether the process was sufficiently inclusive, because while they were saying, yes, perhaps inputs were welcome, they didn't believe there was inclusion in the decision-making process. It's not necessarily that there should have been, but those kinds of things I think automatically get sent back to the community to

say, "Hey, this came up. If you want to add any further clarification that will help us in our review, please do."

That also goes to the kind of procedural elements of what does consensus mean in your group, and did you follow your rules, etc. Milton highlighted that there might have been a misunderstanding by one of the complainants as to how the rules of the IETF operated.

But there was also a question which was going to one of the questions that Richard Hill raised, which was, was the proposal complete vis-à-vis the requirements that NTIA set forth, and that's not just something the community can comment on. That's something that we also have to analyze, because in part of our review of the RFP, it's supposed to be the completeness of the proposal to address the NTIA conditions.

I think we need to understand the nature of the complaint as we allocate how to deal with it, because some of them fall, I think, solely in the plate of the community; some of them fall in both plates. In all cases, I think the community should have an opportunity to supplement if they didn't see this during their own process. And if they did see this during their process as an issue, perhaps elaborate on how they addressed the issue, or resolved it to their satisfaction.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Joe. Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you, Alissa. I agree with what James and Joseph have just mentioned. I'd like to add that as this may require quite a bit of work,

sorting out all the comments about process and content, do you think we could ask our secretariat to take this a step further, and to make a list of those which do require a direct response of some sort from the ICG. That will, I suppose, be the minority of cases, and the others we're just going to make sure that they have been [inaudible] to the communities for a response.

My other point is that in any case, whether it comes under our hat [inaudible] belongs to the communities to respond, I think it would be good if secretariat was asked keep track of all this, so we make sure at the end we haven't missed anything. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Jean-Jacques. Milton?

MILTON MUELLER: I kind of like what Joe said. Let me put it in a broader framework. We did in our RFP set certain criteria, and we had a pretty extensive discussion of this when we were preparing the RFP. We were not simply saying to the operational communities, "Go do what you want using your established procedures." We were saying, "You are convening a process, and while we know that you have established procedures and we expect you to use them, we also want you to be inclusive of others who want to participate, and to make those people feel as if they're part of the process also."

In some sense, to respond to James, we really do have to be upholding those criteria in our assessment. It's not like we are going to redesign

that process or anything, but if the process really did include barriers to inclusiveness, and was really just controlled by a bunch of insiders, then we have to [inaudible] them and ask them to deal with some of those problems.

That's why I put so much effort into the IETF review. I think the IETF assessment and the IETF proposal is very close to being finished, but I wanted to analyze the process and go into some detail about how it met or didn't meet or fell short of our criteria. I think what's been suggested so far sounds pretty good. If there is a very clear complaint about something like inclusiveness or process, then I think we need to get a formal response from the community as to how they respond to that complaint, and then making our assessment, we can do our own sort of due diligence and see whether we think it met our criteria or fell short. I don't think that sets in motion an endless process. I think it's pretty straightforward.

There is a two-step, the how do you respond— hello? I keep hearing coughing or something.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, if others could mute, if you're not speaking. Thanks.

MILTON MUELLER: So there is a two-step process in which we send it back. We don't send the proposal back we just ask for a response to the complaint. We get a response, and then we have our own assessment of what it means. I would encourage us to be fairly diligent and respectful of these

complaints, and not dismissive of them unless they're obviously silly and unfounded. Okay, I'll stop there.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Milton.

JARI ARKKO: Can I also get to the queue at some point? Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, I will add you to the queue, Jari. Thanks. In the queue I have Daniel, Manal, Wolf-Ulrich, Paul, Jari and Kavouss, assuming he has audio. Daniel?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Thank you. I slightly differ with what's been said so far in response to your question, Alissa, about how we should deal with comments that we receive directly.

Let me first say, and it has been said, we have agreed previously that we would refer comments back to the respective communities. We've published this, and I think we should stick to it. All substantive comments should be referred back to the communities.

Then you asked what guidance should we give to the communities. In my opinion, the guidance should be very simple. Basically say, "Deal with this as you see fit according to your process." It's up to the communities to make a judgment on whether the comments are

substantive and how they should be dealt with. It could be that the community says, "This is silly. We won't respond to it. It could be that they refer it back to their internal process to do whatever and do it in [inaudible]

I think we should not fall into the trap of posing questions or challenges to the communities by way of forwarding comments. We should say clearly to the communities, "If we the ICG have specific questions regarding your proposal or the process you use to come up with it, we the ICG will ask you those questions ourselves, and we will not do this by forwarding comments by third parties."

I think we should just stick to our RFP, to our evaluation criteria. Of course, if one of the comments raises something that we think is significant and needs addressing, then we as the ICG should say, "This is [inaudible]. Please respond to us on this issue." But we shouldn't get into the game of posing questions by forwarding things third parties have said.

Again, I think we should forward as we said we would do, we should give them guidance, basically saying, "Deal with it according to your own process," and we should say to them, "We don't expect a specific way to deal with a comment. If we have a question, we'll ask it ourselves." Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Daniel. Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, thanks, Alissa. Actually I tend to agree with everything that's been said by colleagues before me. I have already sent an email to the list this morning, my morning actually, and I'm sure that not everyone had the time to read it. First of all, I was thinking that we need to be consistent and predictable whether we're going to forward every comment to the relevant community, whether we should expect some formal response from this community, or we're going to depend on colleagues who are participating to this process to provide some responses to this. Also, are we going to acknowledge somehow the complaints we have received or have considered, or how we dealt with?

On the other hand, like Joe mentioned, I was also trying to think what categories of complaints we may receive. Obviously there are two categories. One has to do with the process and one has to do with the substance. If we talk about substance, then it's either something that the person who is submitting the complaint feels it was overlooked, or something that has been decided by the group that it is out of the scope of the operational community, or a point of view that did not make it to the submitted proposal. Again, this is debatable whether it has passed through the right process and simply did not gain the necessary consensus or whatever.

What I'm saying is that I think we need to try to put things down maybe in writing and have some common agreement on a process that we will be following to consistently and predictably respond to those complaints. I have already submitted my initial brainstorming to the mailing list, and maybe if we have the time and can just put one page that describes how this will go, and make it public for both the complainers and the operational communities and to everyone else,

maybe this would, I think, along the lines that we've been working with since the beginning, and maybe also ultimately add one of the frequently asked questions to the FAQ.

Anyway, I'll be happy to go through this over e-mail, but just wanted to flag this to the group. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Manal. Wolf-Ulrich?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks, Alissa. I have two things. First is I [personally] suppose that all the complaints coming in are substantive. That's my first expectation, and what I suppose as well. Second is the list is called ICG Forum, which means we as ICG members have to do something with it, with the incoming complaints.

On the one hand, I agree to what Daniel was saying, that the communities' concern, they should answer to that, but I would say under the guidance of us – at least under the guidance of us. It couldn't be the case like it was in the [CRISP] so that they are just waiting on their lists, and there were some comments done. "Okay, we wait for guidance of ICG." As I understood, we have sent out already some guidance to tell them that they have to answer.

I would say we have to make it clear again to the communities that an answer in any case of complaint is expected to them, that they shouldn't have a choice to decide themselves whether they should

answer or not. An answer is expected, from my point of view, and that's what we should communicate. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Paul?

PAUL WILSON: Thanks, Alissa. Can you hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, we can hear you.

PAUL WILSON: I'm just coming back to Milton's mention of the possibility of I think what he called "silly comments." I think there is a judgment or a filter to be applied somewhere along those lines, and it might not just be whether a comment is silly or not. It might be a number of other sorts of issues about a comment, such as whether a comment was timely, whether comments which arrive late from people who haven't spoken early or entered the process should be considered in the same way as other, more coherent comments or coherent with the process comments; comments from people who might, for instance, be completely unknown within the community, unidentified by anything except maybe an e-mail address, and yet they want to come in and assert strong and influential views. I think Milton might not have been considering these kinds of scenarios in the category of silly comments,

but I think there is a judgment call to be made. In some cases, there may be a judgment call to be made on some comments.

What I think we need to be clear on is where that judgment is made and where a filter is applied, whether that's happening in the communities or in the ICG or both. I just think it's important to clarify this.

If we're referring complaints to the communities, then I think we need to be clear as to whether we're also referring a kind of responsibility to judge those comments accordingly as to whether they're silly or not, whether it has standing or not, whether they are coherent with the previous contributions which have been made in a timely, good faith manner in the process. Those are things that I think probably can be judged best by the communities, but if we're going to, as I said, delegate to the communities the complaints and those sorts of judgments, we need to be clear as to whether the ICG might overrule those judgments by reconsidering comments at another later stage. I think it could get messy if we're not clear on that issue. I hope I've been clear enough there. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Paul. I have Jari, Kavouss, Daniel, and then I will attempt to summarize this discussion. Jari?

JARI ARKKO: Thank you. Agreeing, of course, with what most people have said. Maybe agreeing the most with what Daniel had been saying earlier.

I just want to raise two more things. I do want to emphasize that community opinion is what needs to direct what we do more than any other individual person, whether the person is agreeing, or some guy in the management of some of the communities, or even the members of the ICG. That really, really is important, and it's important when we consider these complaints. It's important when we consider what direction of the ICG is. It's important when we consider whether a wrong or right decision was made on some aspect.

And many, many of these things are judgment calls. It's not a black-and-white question on whether X was done or not. Coming to consensus, a rough consensus, requires broad agreement in that everyone is invited to participate, and that we understand the different positions. But it doesn't mean that everyone has to be 100% satisfied on every aspect of the outcome. Let's be careful with that.

The other thought that I had is kind of tied into the process that we are running. I'm wondering how we deal with either when we forward some of these comments to the communities, that an official opinion of some sort from the ICG, or if it's alerting them to the fact that we got some comments. How do we do the assessments? Is there one true opinion from the ICG or do we have multiple? I think at the end of the day what really counts is of course we need to alert the communities, say, "Hey, please take care of this comment." That's Management 101 here.

But at the end of the day, we the ICG also have to make a decision on are there questions that we want to ask – "Hey, guys, we need some clarification on this?" Or there are things we observe that are either not fitting the requirements, or we [inaudible] discrepancy between the two

or three proposals that we get, and we have to ask for a change. I think that's the fundamental end goal here, to get to that point that we have [some opinion] about that, and this forwarding of messages is one minor step within that.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Jari. Kavouss, are you able to connect?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Good afternoon or good morning to everybody. Not to repeat what others said, I agree with what Milton, Joe, Jean-Jacques, and Manal mentioned. I don't believe at this stage we should go too much radical way to say [inaudible] the comments coming from community, from individual. We should look into the merit of the comments. If it is valid, it's valid. I don't think that you have to make a distinction.

I don't agree that we talk about the coherent/non-coherent, silly comment/non-silly comment, [time-wise] comment. You have to look into the comments and to take them. Some of the comments directly to be sent to the community for [instant] inclusiveness? I don't know whether it's a claim that it was the two types of the correspondence. One is closed; the other was open. You have to get the opinion of the community concern for at least some numbering communities that have received such complaints from some individuals. Some of them, you have to reply like [inaudible] to ICG whether [inaudible] question ICG. I don't know whether the type of the question or comment [inaudible] is relating to the ICG process, or relating to the community operational community process. In any case, with respect to the inclusiveness,

community should reply to the ICG also, so that we have to see clearly we have not checked.

Then we have to also mention that we should be engaging with those people [inaudible] community to reply them, and to convince them, and not leave these comments without any reply and just sending to the ICG, because we don't have any means to check the validity or otherwise of that. That is the community [inaudible].

At the end, as Manal mentioned, the [inaudible] Alissa, you have provide some summary the way it proceeds, and not at this stage categorizing community comments and individual comments. Comments are all valid. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. I think what I am taking away from this conversation is that a lot of evaluation and decision-making here by definition needs to be on a case-by-case basis. We will get comments in a different kind, from different people, directed at different issues, and we will need to assess exactly how we think we need to respond to them. But that seems to have, I think, pervaded all of the commentary thus far.

What I would propose as a way forward, given what everyone has said, I think we have the chance here to roughly satisfy what everyone has said, which is that when we receive these comments, we should, I think, forward them to the communities so that they are aware of them, so they know that we received them, just as a matter of transparency. I know that not everyone is following this forum very closely. I think I will actually ask the secretariat to monitor the forum, and forward them to

our mailing list so that we are aware of them as the first step. But then we should, I think, certainly forward them to the relevant community so that they know that we received them, and that's what we've been doing thus far as well.

I think what we can then do – I think [inaudible] assessment process going on right now. What we can tell the communities is that we received these comments, we are evaluating these comments; and if we want a specific response from you, the community, about these comments, we will let you know, essentially. We will either include that in any response that we have, because we're evaluating the whole rest of the proposals right now as well. We could certainly include a question back to the community at the end of our evaluation of the proposals that speaks to the comments in some way so that they will know directly, once they receive that response back from us, whether we expect to hear from them about the comments received.

That way, we have a little bit of time. We can look at the comments and assess whether they raise issues that we want to then raise with the community or whether they do not, and that I think we can do on a case-by-case basis based on all the different criteria that people have talked about on the call today.

To me, that is a little bit of, I hope, the best of the both worlds, as people were articulating. The communities know about them. They can have a discussion about them if they want to or not. They also know that if we want to hear from them, we'll tell them directly that we want to hear from them. That's what I would propose roughly as a process going forward. We can write that down if people want to.

I do think that the couple other issues that came up. There was the suggestion that the secretariat decide which of these should go and not go. I actually think that's our responsibility. We're hopefully not going to get a lot of these because the communities are running really robust processes, and I would prefer — there are 30 of us in this group. I think we are perfectly capable of doing the assessment ourselves, so I would prefer that we do it, although we rely on the secretariat to keep us informed about the comments that are coming in, because that's [inaudible].

Then the other thing I do think we should decide is about timeliness – or not necessarily timeliness, but deadlines. I do think, for our own sanity, if we're going to be able to get back to the communities with questions for them that arise out of these comments, we do need to set a deadline to the community that says, "If anyone is going to send us something about X proposal, we would like to receive it by Y date."

For the two proposals that we've received, they've been out there a while now. I would say perhaps set that deadline of February 5th or something, before we meet again. Just make an announcement today that says, "If anybody else is thinking about sending comments on these to us, please do it by February 5th so that we can have a timely evaluation of those." That's what I would propose as a process going forward, and we can continue to evaluate this through each stage of our own process. That's what I would suggest for now.

I see in the queue Kavouss, Milton, Martin, and Paul. Let's have that discussion, and then perhaps try to wrap and move on. Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, Alissa. May I suggest that one of the ICG members, perhaps if Manal agrees, take lead of this work in consultation with you and with the assistant of the secretariat [preferred] [inaudible] one-page document [outlining] the process that we follow with respect to this complaint. It would be – Manal has done a very good job in question and so on and so forth, frequently asked questions. I'm sorry, I have not consulted her before, but maybe she will take the lead of this action. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Kavouss. I am completely in agreement with that suggestion if Manal is willing. Milton?

MILTON MUELLER: I think I got a bit confused when you were describing your approach. I think I agreed with the thrust of what you were saying, but it seemed very hard to pin down and remember, so I proposed a specific process on the chat, which would basically be, number one, we get a complaint. Number two, we apply the silliness filter or the [standing] filter, which would include timeliness. If it passes that filter, I believe we should acknowledge receipt of the complaint, and then send it to the operational community and request a reply. Does that sound like a simplification that makes it clear what we should actually do to you? Is there something wrong with [inaudible]?

ALISSA COOPER: I think that is okay. I would definitely be in the camp with those that the seriousness filter should be fairly weak. That is, as James pointed out, we received a spam message on the forum. I didn't forward that to anyone. It was quite obviously not pertinent. I think if we set deadlines, we should certainly not continue to process things after deadlines. I'm not sure that we want to go too far down the path of otherwise deciding that comments are not appropriate to be forwarded to the communities based on their "seriousness" or silliness.

Essentially it's a public forum, so the idea is just to make sure that if we got something, they know that we got it, and then we can do all of our evaluation of whether we think we need to respond in that step three, I think. I'm trying to scroll back up and find your step three, but in the step where we decide whether we need a reply and what sort of reply we need. But otherwise I think that's fine.

As far as acknowledging the comments, I'm happy for us to perhaps have the secretariat do that. Again, it's a public forum and everything that we do is public, so I think it's quite obvious whether we're acknowledging things or not. But if, out of respect for commenters, people think they need a personal e-mail, we can do that, too. I don't have a strong feeling either way. Martin?

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks, Alissa. I liked what you outlined as process, and I do recognize the need to acknowledge that we have received input from people. I think that's just plain common courtesy, and I certainly have nervousness over us applying any strenuous sort of seriousness filter.

But the bit that had me putting my hand up from what you said, Alissa, was your reference to going back to the communities and saying, "If we want input, we'll let you know." Now, at least on one of the threads from [inaudible], I'm aware that there has been some discussion within community based on the concerns that the person has raised, and it would seem to me to be appropriate to go back to the community and invite them to comment on any background they have to that particular complaint.

The reason that I'm suggesting this is that I'm feeling a little bit nervous about the idea that people didn't get their way in the consensus-building process within the community, and therefore they come to us, essentially, to reopen what in some cases might well be very difficult judgment calls.

That's where I think actually relying on the community to come back and say, "Okay, this has been discussed, this was the background to the discussion, this was the process that was followed in getting to consensus," as being something that helps us understand how that process worked.

The other thing I think is important is the raising visibility, that we would like to see additional input on the process. I'm not necessarily sure we do want lots and lots of people to put in, because we're already having difficulty knowing exactly how to deal with them, but I think it would be useful to get an idea, an impression, of whether the comments that are raised by some people are actually more widely shared or not.

The two [cases] come through. It's very difficult to know how much weight that particular complaint might be, whether that be just a single individual who feels that they weren't properly included or whether actually there are quite a lot of people who feel that they were not properly included. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, Martin. The only thing I would say in response is that I'm not entirely clear how you felt about the sort of process that we were discussing. Because I think one thing I heard from Daniel and others [inaudible], we do want to have a point before we [inaudible] up the whole community to say, "We want to hear from you on this issue," which in some of the communities is a bit of a heavy lift. It's not just a matter of a few people get together and formulate a response to us. We want to formulate the question to them based on what we heard from the commenter. That's just one intermediate step that I do think we should take before asking the community to respond to us. I don't think we should just forward every comment and say, "If you have something to say to us, let us know," because I think that's an unfair burden on the communities.

We have Paul and then Daniel. Paul, go ahead. Paul, if you're speaking, we cannot hear you.

PAUL WILSON: Very sorry, I was muted. I think I agree with Milton's one-two-three proposal there, including the first-cut filter which is exercised transparently anyway, but it really means that we don't follow giving

EN

time to spam and so on. We then pass the comments to the communities.

As Martin said, I think we need to be clear that we're passing those to the communities with the responsibility for a response or resolution, and if we're offering any kind of appeal, a further appeal, then that needs to be very clear. I'd hope the community's process would be final, and that we wouldn't be coming back to leaving appeals available except perhaps in very, very defined conditions. That's my view on those things that have just been discussed.

I would just finally point out I think it is going to be necessary to clarify what is the decision here, and convey it fairly quickly to the communities. I know, for instance, that the CRISP team will be handling, or it's wanting to handle or preparing to handle the various comments that have come in there. I think Izumi Okutani as chair has asked you, Alissa, for your advice as to what's next, what the CRISP team should actually be doing, and I'm sure it will be very helpful for that advice to be given before the open session in Singapore.

I hope that what we're doing here is resolving the next step and able to convey that next step to the communities, if not as a result of this call, immediately, then at least in the next couple of days so that people have got time to prepare before Singapore where these comments are possibly going to come up again. There needs to be a clear method and timeline for handling them. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, thanks, Paul. That's a good point. I cannot tell in the queue whose hand was up before and whose was not. I think we have Kavouss and then James, and then I don't know if Milton, Daniel, and Martin are in the queue or not. If you don't intend to be in the queue, put your hand down. Otherwise, after Kavouss, I will reassess. So, Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Alissa. I looked into the chat and I see that almost everybody agrees that Manal take up this issue with the help of the secretariat and prepare some background data of one or two pages and share on the list with the others and finalize the issue. Then we have a way forward how to proceed. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Agreed. I hope this is not a very heavyweight task. Thank you, Manal, for taking that on.

Okay, I have James, Daniel, Martin, and then I'm going to close the queue. James, go ahead.

JAMES BLADEL: Thanks, Alissa. I'll be quick, because at this point I'm not really sure who I'm agreeing with and who I'm disagreeing with. I just want to reiterate that I think we should keep a very light touch in making any substantive reviews or judgments on these complaints, and send them back to the communities wherever possible. I think that if we don't do that, we run the risk of, later in the process, this group will be subject to complaints that we are engaging in a top-down process. I think that's something

that we want to avoid, because I think in our RFPs out to the communities, we specifically noted that each community will have its own process for determining consensus, and that should be defensible internally for them. If it's not, that's not really…

Anyway, I just wanted to put a final note for caution in this regard, and I don't think that's necessarily discounting the concerns that folks have. I just don't know that it's appropriate for us to resolve those. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Daniel?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: First of all, I think, at least from the discussion, I cannot see that we agreed to delegate the handling of complaints to Manal. In fact, I'm opposed to that, not because of the personal . . .

ALISSA COOPER: Sorry, it's not the handling of the complaints. She has agreed to write down a process.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Okay. If that's the case, then I retract that. Fine. But I'd really like to be very, very strong about the fact that I am very uncomfortable with the way this discussion is going. I think we're digging a huge hole for ourselves by — how to say this correctly? — by defining a process on how we deal with comments or input. I would also encourage us not to

talk about complaints, because that reframes something. We should talk about comments or input.

I think by even discussing filters for discussing a process of attaching guidance or something to it to communities on how to deal with it, I think we're going down a road that opens us up for all sorts of really substantive criticism that will be difficult to deal with.

I'd like to reiterate that I think our process should be very easy. We should forward all the input that we receive to the communities, and we can even make it very easy for ourselves by just pointing the communities to this forum and saying, "You should monitor this and address anything that you feel impacted by in the way that you see fit according to your processes."

We should also say, independent of all the comments or input, that if we have specific questions that may arise or may not arise from the input we receive about the substance of your proposal or about the process you use to come to the proposal, we the ICG – and not anybody who comments to us or whatever – we the ICG will ask you those questions. That should be the guidance. The guidance should be, "Do your normal thing, and if we have anything specific, we will discuss it.

We will discuss in the ICG the merit of the input, and whether we agree with it, and whether it leads to questions asked by ourselves." I think that should be our process. This should be the guidance we should be giving. If we do anything else along the lines that – filtering and all those things that have been discussed, I think we're making life much too difficult for ourselves, and also we will be unclear.

As to the deadline question that Alissa raised, I think the way we should deal with this is say, "If you would like us to discuss your input at our next meeting, we have to receive it before X." The reason I propose this formulation is that there might be input that comes later that would lead to an action by us later. So it's not an absolute deadline, but it's a deadline that gives us the possibility, if it's received later than the date, to not discuss it at the next meeting. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Daniel. I think we are agreeing a lot more than it seems like, because what I suggested, and what others, I think, have suggested, is that the comments come in, we forward them automatically after making sure that they're not spam and that they're written in coherent words that people can understand and we let the communities know.

I do think that's important actually as opposed to just telling people that they should monitor this forum, because frankly it's a forum that we set up, and as far as I can tell, no one in this group monitors it other than myself occasionally and maybe one or two other people.

I don't think it's really fair to say, "We just expect people to monitor this thing," because we haven't even been doing that ourselves. But I think it's reasonable for the secretariat to monitor for comments to us. If they don't look like spam, we forward them to the communities and we say, "If we will be seeking a detailed response from you about this, we'll let you know." Then we roll that decision about whether we need to ask the community a question into the evaluations that we're doing of the proposals anyway, because we have a process that we're undertaking

right now where we're trying to figure out, what do we need to go out to the communities?

I thought that suggestion was actually quite in line with what, Daniel, you had proposed, and also with what most of the others have proposed. It's not adding a layer. It's not adding an appeals process. It's making sure the communities know that the comments exist, and we're taking a look at them, and we will figure out if we need to ask the community a question as part of our existing process that we have documented, because we've told the communities already, "Thank you for sending us your proposals. We're going to read them and get back to you."

We even have an item in the proposal evaluation process that said, "Ask us to look at community comments." I think we're actually well-covered for this. We just need a little more detail about who's doing the back-and-forth. I definitely agree on the timeline.

We are over time on this call right now. I'm glad we had this discussion. I'm sorry that we did not get to all of our topics, but I think this was very important and timely for us to discuss. I think Manal has an action item to try and write down this process that we think we would use going forward. Again, I don't think this needs to be incredibly detailed. I think it's pretty straightforward and can be fairly lightweight. I will also take an action item, I think, based on what Paul said, and my intuition as well, that in terms of the comments we've already received, we need to figure out something on a fairly short order in terms of what we're asking or what we're telling the communities. Especially the number community has asked us for a response, so I will attempt to formulate

what I think we should say in the interim before this group meets again, and we can finalize all that on the e-mail list, hopefully this week or sooner.

That is what I would propose going forward. I think we have the action items coming out of this discussion. I appreciate everyone's contributions here. Look for communications from myself and from Manal, and I think, with that, we will close the call.

Thanks everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]