
ALISSA COOPER:

Okay. Why don't we go ahead and get started? This is Alissa. Thanks everyone for joining ICG call number 21. Let's first just check and see if anyone is on the call who is not on Adobe Connect. If you could make yourself known right now.

Okay. Sounds like everyone is in Adobe Connect who is on the call. That's good. Next, just a note from the Secretariat that unfortunately, we do not have Arabic or Russian live interpretation for this call, apologies for that. And also that although the call is scheduled for two hours, Chinese interpretation will have to end after 90 minutes because there is only one interpreter. So our apologies for not being fully able to [inaudible] all the languages this time.

You can see on the screen the agenda for today's meeting. Our main goal here really is to finalize all of the materials that we need to have done to launch the public comment period on Friday, July 31. So we will go through them in order that you can see on the screen, the combined proposal, and then the executive summary, the public comment website material, and the Q&A matrix, which is in a footnote from the proposal, which is we need to finalize it.

So those are really the four key items that we need for Friday. If we have time, we can start going through the slide deck for the webinars that we had planned for next week. I do want to reserve a little bit of time at the end of the call to just talk about the communications plan for the public comment one. So we can see how much time we have left and make sure we reserve a little bit of time for that.

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.

And if we get through all of those things, we will do our minutes approval at the end of the call. And if not, we can do that on the mailing list. So any comments on the agenda? Go ahead Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you Alissa. Just for the deadline, also for the FAQ, when we like to have this accomplished? I do not see it on today's agenda, so [inaudible] for later, or...? Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, thanks. Very good question. I think what we should do, just because we are a little short on time, most likely, I mean, if we have time during this call, we can try to fit it in. In a way it has, I think, sort of the same priorities level as the slide deck, but I don't think we will manage to get to both.

But given that the FAQ has been around for a while, and I mean, we obviously just made a bunch of updates that we all need to take a look at. I'm hoping that we could finalize the FAQ on the mailing list. Sometime by the middle of next week, I would say, is reasonable, given everything else that we have going on this week.

So let's see what happens today, and if we don't get to it on the call, I think we should set a deadline of a day, Friday, for people to send their feedback on your edit, and try to finalize that in the middle of next week. Does that seem reasonable, Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes, yes. [Inaudible] over the mailing list. I can see the agenda of today [inaudible]... So thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, hi everybody. As I indicated in the last call, I and Keith [inaudible] in the CCWG meeting in Paris, raised the issue of interdependency of the CWG ICG, and CCWG. And several occasions, the mailing a statement that we want to be sure that we would not have any impact in any way that the ICG could clearly announce that such interdependency has been studied and taken care of.

And at various instances, we follow the matter even up to last night, that we are ICG, CCWG last call, more or less, and tried our best, in particular, we pushed that IANA budget to be separately addressed from the general ICANN budget, with the view that would not have any problem if the ICANN general budget is under the veto or under the rejection, it would not have a direct consequence on the IANA budget.

[Inaudible] ICG be in more [inaudible] situations. This is one point. And another point is that Alissa, during the last two weeks, we have made considerable changes to the matter of the word, to the activities, and to the [model] of [work] in the CCWG, and so on. So there are a lot of things in the last minute, and even today there is still something, even though the document was [frozen].

Therefore, Alissa, there is a need to be put one sentence in the beginning of the proposals for the public comment, that the CCWG has completed. It works more or less at the same time at the ICG put in its proposals, and for public comment that based on the public, there might be some necessity to review, to see whether there is anything to be done.

So whether the last minute changes, many things but it is not yet [inaudible], therefore we need to put some cautionary sentence or phrase in the beginning of the document, either in the summary or in the introduction, that the accountability issues, this is interrelated with the accountability with CCWG, and ICG has been very recently modified and to putt into public comments that might have some impact.

Some sentence is not necessary we draft it now, but the idea should be put on the table. I leave it to you and to co-chair to prepare a sentence, if you want to. Check with it us, I and Keith [inaudible] will do it, if not at least put in something. It is necessary to put that cautionary sentence. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you Kavouss. Let us bookmark that. We're going to go through the text of the document on the first agenda item, and I think there is a place where we can insert that phrase. So let's come back to that when we go through the document.

Michael, go ahead.

Michael, if you are speaking, we cannot hear you.

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Sorry that was a mistake.

ALISSA COOPER: Now we can hear you. Oh, it was a mistake. The hand up was a mistake. Okay.

Any other comments on the agenda?

Okay. So we are going to right into the combined proposal. Let's see, I'm going to share my screen so we can possibly live edit, if necessary.

Can people see the proposal on the screen?

Can anybody see the proposal? Various no.

[CROSSTALK] Yes. Yes, I can make it bigger. Is that better?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, yeah, it's better, much better. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, great. So the version we are looking at... So what happens with this is that we sent a lot of email over the last few days, so I realize that not everyone may have been able to track all of it. But essentially 24 hours, around 24 hours ago, we said that we were going to try to freeze all of the documents before the call so that people had a chance to just read a stable version of each of the documents.

And Jennifer produced a clean copy of the proposal for us to be able to do that. I saw that Yari and Paul made some edits anyway, just in the very last hour or two. So, we are working off of the version from Yari and Paul. I've looked at it, and the edits were fairly minimal, and a lot of them were just comments that were inserted, and they are comments that we kept over from prior versions in any event.

So that's the version that we are looking at right now. So what I would like to do is just do a brief check sort of on each section of the document and see if there are outstanding issues to discuss. There are some certainly listed in the comments that we've [inaudible], just want to confirm that folks are okay with each section of the text as we go through it.

So we can start with section one, introduction. Any points to raise? Are people good with this one short paragraph of introduction?

Okay. Seeing no hands. I think we can move on to section two, which is the process summary. There were some comments, I think, further down here.

Martin, go ahead.

MARTIN BOYLE:

Thanks Alissa. Yes, my apologies that I've been very inactive while this document has been developed. Certainly thanks to our colleagues, the text I think is looking pretty good. The only [inaudible] in a number of places, and in this section in particular, the way we approach the wording, seems either very defensive or a little bit negative.

So for example, the paragraph, and I'm really struggling to be able to read the print on this screen, it's four, where you say the ICG [inaudible] that some parties have been expecting, blah, blah, blah. And I certainly can't read the comment in blue off to the side. That it would seem to me that coming with that sort of fairly negative approach, what we think they might have been expecting, is too defensive for a document, for an approach that I think we all recognize was the sensible way to approach this.

So in fact, I would prefer a formulation that says something along the lines of, the ICG believes that the proposal needs to reflect current operational, current operations, and build on operational communities in the multistakeholder communities, established for each of the functions. Something along those lines, because that gives us then a, why have we adopted this approach? Rather than starting off on the assumption that people were looking for something different.

Let's not put things into minds, even if they might actually be there. And I have a similar comment on the last paragraph of the section, the paragraph that starts, the combined proposal should be considered as a whole. Where we talk about sort of, this combined document streamlined as it could be, and I think here we should be saying, we have looked at this, and talk essentially about the appearance of the total document, because we actually do believe, I think, that the different proposals can work together.

And I think that is a better approach than to just sort of say, well it's not a streamlined as it could have been, because then people will start saying, well, in that case, make it more streamline. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Martin. And I think there are several folks who have commented on this text in agreement with everything that you have just said, and in the chat as well. I see Paul Wilson in the queue, go ahead Paul.

PAUL WILSON: Thanks very much Alissa. I tend to agree with Martin about the general time. I don't see examples all over the place, but I do think we need to provide a tone of [inaudible] or negativity in general. I think there is some paragraph which mentions what Fadi may have been expecting. I didn't think particular necessary thing to include, because we can cover many examples in a similar way.

What I actually didn't quite understand the intent behind it, but what I did see was that, and this put me back up into the executive summary, which I made some changes, suggested some changes, to some of the early paragraphs, was just, I think weren't very clear about the way that the approach was decided to take the proposal as three separate parts.

That wasn't given, I may be wrong, but I think that wasn't given to the ICG as a direction. It was one of the comments that was given to ICANN in its initial consultation, and the ICG took that input, which suggested this three way approach, and we accepted that on the basis that the community are independent, the functions are independent.

And I just thought this particular paragraph that they're talking about in the main proposal may be better addressed by just sort of stating a bit

more carefully about what the background is to the, in particular to the approach of the three separate proposals. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you Paul. So maybe what would make sense, as Paul has drafted some text about this up here, is that we can... What we can do is, since we had said also, on the mailing list, that we were going to try to edit the proposals first, and then essentially just take paragraphs of that and use them for the executive summary, and then also for the public comment website, so that everything is in synch.

I think what might make sense is that we take some of this text that Paul has provided for the executive summary, and make sure that it appears in the proposal text itself, in that same section that we were just looking at. Delete the two paragraphs that people find to be overly defensive, and then we will have, we also have the bases covered and we will have explained the process, why it was important to ground in the three communities, and then we can work with that, both in the proposal and the executive summary.

If that sounds good to people, we can go ahead, I can try to do that in a rough manner on the call so people can see it. And then, you know, we can have a little bit more time on the list to make sure that people feel comfortable with it. But I want to make sure that sounds good in terms of taking out the two paragraphs in question.

Go ahead Kavouss.

Kavouss, we cannot hear you if you are talking.

Okay. I see that you are having difficulties, so hopefully you can rejoin.

So, let me do this. We'll just, take some of this and move it down as a placeholder.

Okay. So now I think we have all of the points in the section, in the section two. They might be a little bit out of order, but we've eliminated the controversial text, I think, and we can do some kind of messaging of the text provided by Paul to make sure that it's, you know, it flows properly.

So that is the plan for this section. We will edit shortly after the call, and give folks a little bit of time to take a look, but hopefully that satisfies everyone's concern.

And I see a suggestion from Jean-Jacques, which I would like to, I just want to make sure that we record the whole plan here. So Jean-Jacques, do you want to speak to your suggestion? So that we can make sure that we get it in.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Sure Alissa. This is Jean-Jacques. Yes, I should have noticed this before, so sorry coming back a bit late. But in paragraph form, the process [summary], it's the expression eventually delegated to, which now bothers me a bit because it seems that the ICG washed its hands about this, and give it up to the operational community.

I see what was meant, of course, but I was wondering if the formula, which you see in the chat, is not a bit better, something like, in order to properly reflect the respective function [inaudible] respective tasks, the

[two?] operational communities are requested to submit their separate proposal. Does this make sense? Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you. I think we can work that in. I'm just, it's a little bit of a reversal of the ordering of the subject of the sentence. But I'll just make a note of it.

Sorry, I'm trying to cut and paste [inaudible]...

Okay. I see further comments on this, [Sébastien?].

If people could speak to them, it's hard for me to follow both the chat and do the live editing.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Okay. This is Jean-Jacques. Yes, it looks, it looks better.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay. I see Joe is in the queue. Go ahead Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF:

Yeah, I was going to say I agree with Jean-Jacques about the word delegated, but rather than say delegated, we can say, in that same sentence, we can say that the drafting of the proposal was anchored in the three communities. So that we're talking about, they were the basis of the drafting which doesn't talk about our giving it over to them, but rather that they are the natural drafters of the proposals.

And that then flows with the concept that we talk about the process being grounded in them, I think in the next paragraph.

ALISSA COOPER: So can you tell me where you would like the word anchored to appear?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: That was, unfortunately it had been highlighted a second ago, [inaudible]... It's were delegated had been. Trying to find a replacement for delegated.

ALISSA COOPER: I see, okay.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I just now lost where delegated is, I'm sorry.

ALISSA COOPER: So delegated was in the same sentence as grounded. [CROSSTALK]...

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: I agree with Joe's proposal.

ALISSA COOPER: So we want to say the proposal development process was therefore grounded and anchored in the three communities? That seems a little strange.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: That would be too much. I didn't know grounded was in the same sentence. I thought that was the next paragraph and then they would flow.

ALISSA COOPER: Maybe just work as is, if we can then remove the word delegated and then [inaudible]... Does that work?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah, grounded is fine.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: This is Jean-Jacques. Yes, that would be fine by me.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay.
Anything else on this point?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Do you see me Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, you're back. Go ahead Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yeah. Okay, no problem. First with respect to the proposal of marking that, putting the sentence in a positive way, I agree with him about. In any case, we should maintain the text and language that we use in our charter. So in our charter, with respect to the combined proposal, we have to look at that to see what language we have used and use the same language.

With respect to the proposal of Joe, I agree with him. Delegated is not good but perhaps we should use the word assigned. The assigned the work to the [tech] community. So that will still will maintain our integrity, that the ICG is not controlling is the coordinator of all activities, but it would not delegate our authority by this assigned the work.

So either assign, but I'm currently a little bit strong words, so perhaps we should find something. But assign it is something that works. We assign the work to them, and they could further draft and send it back to us. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks.

That works.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

And I have another question on this sources of summary. I put it in my comment, I don't know whether you have [inaudible] or not, in the second part of. Whether you have corrected, because in one part of your talking of customer, the standing committee in the other part [inaudible], a standing committees of a stakeholder. On this, there are not two different entities, which I don't believe so.

It should be spelled out similarly and identically. So we don't have a standing committee of a stakeholder and customer standing committee. Both of them are the same. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you. Yes, I did try to respond to that one, which is, I think, in the next section, so we will get to that.

So I think we have closed on the issue of the overly defensive paragraph. I just wanted to check before we move on to the next, to section three. There had been this discussion about changing the order of the parts in the proposal. I am personally very much in favor of leaving them as is.

In part for, kind of, formatting reasons because changing them is going to be difficult, given what we've done with the paragraph numbering and [inaudible] and so forth. But also, I do think folks attention to this is on part one, which was the domain names. So are people okay with leaving the order of the parts as is?

Or I guess I should say, does anyone, you know, going to vouch for changing the order at this point?

Okay. Jari, you said you were the first, and you think it's okay.

Okay. So it looks like people are okay with the order. I just want to make sure that we get all the comments. I'm checking that we did. Those are all the same, let me just check.

Alan, okay. If the Secretariat could note Alan's comments in the text, about the error in the diagram, the first sentence for number related requests is incorrect. So we need to get that fixed in the diagram.

Go ahead Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF:

Yes, no Alissa, I think I don't have a problem with leaving the order as is, but in the first sentence of proposal summary, it says that we, the proposals are reflected as received. And that might give the impression that that was the order in which they were received, and I do think we have to credit the two communities that were timely, or at least not creating an impression that they were the last proposals received.

So I think we just remove the word as, and just say the proposals that were received. That takes away any kind of indication that the proposals were presented in a temporal fashion. I know that we meant as to be, that we didn't alter them, but it can also be interpreted in terms of timing.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Joe. Fixed. The sentence right after it makes the point that we didn't [inaudible], so I think that's fine.

Okay. Let us move on to section three, I see another hand. Go ahead Alan.

ALAN: I'm sorry Alissa, my hand is about section three, so let's wait.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Well, moving on, moving right along to section three, so go ahead Alan with your comment on section three.

ALAN: Okay. I just, in paragraph nine, we say that the proposals are reproduced verbatim without changes by the ICG. In fact, we might have changed paragraph numbers and we added section numbers, or [inaudible] numbers, so perhaps we need to soften that wording just a little.

So perhaps without changes by the ICG, except that paragraph numbers or formatting have been changed. Fine.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. Good catch. Martin, go ahead.

MARTIN BOYLE:

Alissa. The, I guess it must be paragraph 10, so the next paragraph down of this one, right at the end, there was, these provisions apply to the names functions only, which for the first time reader, I think, would lead everybody to believe that these provisions are not accepted or not [inaudible] by the other two communities, which probably is reasonably right, but again, just going back to my...

I think the section, the part zero, is important to be as positive as we can be. I would like to see us coming in with a statement that these provisions are actually coherent with the approaches adopted by the other proposal, rather than just leave it as it stands which makes it sound like this is a rock of its own, and people then reading the rest of the document, believing that you have got an inconsistency here, with these three proposals.

So, I've also got a comment on the next section, but you want to have a look at that input first.

ALISSA COOPER:

Yes. I think the point of this sentence was that the reviews conducted by the CFC and the IFR are meant to apply only to the names function. I think that, so this is like a half of a sentence that you already put in at some point, and the other half was left, and I tried to fill in what I thought the original intent was.

So it's not meant to, you know, put the names proposal apart, it's actually just meant as a statement of fact in terms of the scope of what the CFC and the IFR are meant to be looking at. And my understanding of the proposal is that the reviews that they conduct from a

performance perspective or otherwise will be looking at the performance of the names functions, and not the other functions.

So first of all, does that match your understanding?

MARTIN BOYLE: Yeah, I think that's fine, but my point is that that in its own right, doesn't make the names functions incompatible with the others. So the line that I feel is missing, here as the second paragraph on the proposal summary, ends up with this, this only applies to the names functions. Yes, but you're still missing that bit which would be, it might only apply specifically to names functions, but in our view, that doesn't lead to an incompatibility, which is why I suggest saying that the fact that that only applies to names functions, they are still coherent with the other proposals.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So if we clarify this, maybe we can clarify this in a way and get rid of that last sentence, [inaudible] community responsible for monitoring [inaudible] performance.

MARTIN BOYLE: Just drop between those words would meet my problem.

ALISSA COOPER: Right.

How do you feel about that? Because I do think it's important to just be accurate about the scope. Personally, like I don't see that separate performance review processes of the different communities, I mean, that's not really a way in which they are incompatible. They sort of, as I think Mary has pointed out, it sort of layers on, you know, multiple layers of review, for the different functions, but doesn't create an incompatibility.

So are you okay with framing the scoping and the way it looks now? Deleting the last sentence? And that's how it would look?

MARTIN BOYLE:

Yes, that's fine for me. I think my concern is that we've got a document here, for some people, this will be the first time they will have read it. And therefore, we need to make sure that they don't, early in the document, get an idea that, because we've put something in terms that makes it sound as being particular or special to one.

And then sort of leaving them to think, ah well, mark that as being an issue, because it's not the same as the others. But making the reference earlier, I think, makes it just a little bit more positive. So I'm quite happy to put it in that particular way. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay. Great. Thank you. And I think that it's important to note that the other, the descriptions of the other two community proposals also, you know, explain the better review processes. So they each have the future, which is a positive I think. So thank you. Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

[Inaudible]... because you have now shared the screen. Before making any changes, please listen to all of the interventions, then change. I had a proposal, not to change anything but delete the last paragraph, saying that it is only for the functions support. The reason is that we refer to part one, and part one has been explained in detail of the remaining part of the combined proposal.

We don't need to put all of the details in this very summary. So the last portion that we have discussions, simply delete it, and not changing the paragraph itself. The paragraph as now modified, does not seem to reflect to the other thing. So the previous paragraph was okay, and a special review of the PTI. And then full stop. But not on the PTI relating to the performance function of the name, the name function.

So please do not change that paragraph, leave as it is. The last portion that we have difficulty, delete that because that does not add anything and the region [inaudible] the value of the paragraph. So really this one, and I have a comment on the sentence that you have changed to become the multistakeholder standing community and so on and so forth.

We don't have such a thing. We have the customer standing community. I don't understand what does it mean, this standing community of multistakeholder and expert. Where it is on the proposal of the naming. We have CSC, that's all. Customer standing community, but not multistakeholder standing community of experts. So we should have one definition everywhere.

We should not have various because the reason it would be totally lost. So first, fix this thing, don't, kindly don't change the sentence and delete the draft portion, which would take out all of the doubt, and come to the next paragraph. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks Kavouss. I see a long queue, I guess, people probably going to respond to that. So I will just leave it frozen as is. On your second point, I think you're talking about the multistakeholder IFR, the multistakeholder IANA function review process. This is language taken directly from the CWG proposal, as far as I know. So it's not being invented here, it's exactly how [CROSSTALK]...

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

That is okay. I am dealing with the other paragraph, next one after that, you referred to, paragraph 11. A standing community of multistakeholder experts. This is the paragraph that I have difficulty, but not the one you have highlighted. The one you have highlighted is okay. I'm talking about paragraph 11, last [inaudible] starting of eight, standing committee of stakeholder and expert.

We don't have that. We have CSC, customer standing committee. But not a standing holder and so on and so forth. Where does this come from? Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay, thanks, maybe Martin, if you could get back in the queue to clarify, I think this text comes from you, from your evaluation of the

proposal. If this was meant to be the CSC, we can replace it. But I'm not clear on if it was meant to be the CSC. So we can come back to that one. Joe, go ahead.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF:

Yes, thanks Alissa. If we want to keep the paragraph, paragraph 10 the way it was, one potential option would be at the last part of the sentence to say, this review processes will be focused on the names community. That does not create only, which I think was the problem. But I also wanted to highlight that proposal summary is not the place to start introducing the conclusions that we came up with as to the compatibility of the proposal.

These are just statements of what the proposals have said themselves. We later on in the paper talk about that. And that's why we have an executive summary that gives us the entire picture in a few pages, so that they won't just take something out of context if they don't want to read the whole thing, what they'll end up reading is the executive summary, which gives the whole picture.

But I would start, I would have a lot of problem if we start in a proposal summary, introducing conclusions of compatibility.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks Joe. Xiaodong.

XIAODONG LEE:

This is Xiaodong. Can you hear me?

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, we can hear you.

XIAODONG LEE: Yeah, [inaudible] suggestion, I think that [inaudible] because [inaudible] service level agreement, but after we use service level accreditations. So [inaudible]...

That maybe is a generic [inaudible] for the naming community to provide service level agreement. So another words, because we use, the first [inaudible]... accept the PDI as an [affiliate?] of ICANN. I'm confused. I'm not sure if the PDI is still an affiliate of ICANN, or if it is an independent [inaudible].

So I just think that maybe that would make the community confused [inaudible] is an affiliate of ICANN. Maybe I'm suggesting [inaudible] which this [inaudible] of ICANN. We do need to indicate that.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks Xiaodong. Again, I think, I'm sorry go ahead. I didn't mean to cut you off.

XIAODONG LEE: That's all, that's all.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, okay. Again, I think this comes directly from the proposal, because it is indeed, affiliate is the official term to describe what most people think of as a subsidiary. So I think what other folks is right, we should kind of stick to the authoritative text, which comes from the proposal as much as we can, and this is really just trying to be a one paragraph summary.

Personally I think maintaining that specific phrase is very important, because otherwise as Joe just said, if people only read this part, they would not even know that the PTI is actually a subsidiary of ICANN. So I think leaving that in is pretty important, and we should write it exactly the way that it is written in the proposal. That would be my suggestion.

XIAODONG LEE: Okay. [Inaudible] if we can copy that, it's okay. Thanks. [Inaudible]. Yeah.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. Martin, go ahead.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks Alissa. I think, well certainly I had my own comments on this particular paragraph, but perhaps I ought to do as invited and respond to Kavouss's comments on the standing committee of stakeholders and experts.

I don't have the exact location in mind, but if you look at paragraph 11.4, combined [inaudible] proposal, it's around about page 47 of the

document. And in there, we talk about the authorization of changes not just to the content, but to architectural changes, which is [inaudible]. And certainly my recollection was that the recommendation is for a standing committee of stakeholders and experts to be created, that would then look at such issues, and they would then provide for basis for consultation and eventually recommendations to the ICANN Board for approval.

Probably would also need to go to other communities, if those communities were effected by any changes, any changes made. This actually is a little bit vague because it's very hard to imagine what might come and hit us around the corner, but certainly there is... of stakeholders and experts for this one sole function of architectural and operational changes in the management of the root zone.

[CROSSTALK]

ALISSA COOPER: Martin, can you say the number of the paragraph again? So I can try to find it?

MARTIN BOYLE: I can't give you the exact number of the paragraph, because I haven't got that far down the document yet, but it's in the section that starts with paragraph 11 49, where the initial stuff talks about the root zone. Right, okay. It's the 11 52, change of the root zone management architecture, and then subsequently there is then the, yes the post-transition 11 54, 11 55 where you have subparagraphs one, two, eight,

and in fact, eight I now see, the standing committee should cause with the NTIA at the time of transition to transfer relevant information, blah, blah.

So that's where that text comes from. I can certainly give you chapter and verse offline later on this morning.

ALISSA COOPER: I've tried to highlight it on the screen.

I mean, this sounds like... Right. So this is what you characterize as a multistakeholder committee of experts...

MARTIN BOYLE: I didn't say it was a multistakeholder committee of experts, I just said it is to be based on the recommendations of a standing committee of stakeholders and experts.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. If we go back up to where we were.

Ah. A standing committee of stakeholders and experts. Okay. So, just to try to close on this point, Kavouss...

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: He's right, referring to that. That is good, however I suggested, in order for the people not to mix up the CSC with this stakeholder standing committee for stakeholders... After that, just put paragraph 11 50

whatever refers. Refer people to that paragraph to not confuse that with the CSC, which is referred in several parts.

This is specifically for the root zone architectural arrangement and [inaudible], so let us just make small reference to that, to direct the readers to that, if you want to include that. Just ask that, see paragraph so and so. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay. I have no problem with that. I think that works. So let's go back up to Joe's suggestion here, to try and resolve what we had, oops that is not what I meant to do. Okay.

So, Joe's suggestion to try and find a compromise here. Was to slightly edit this, and hopefully this will get back to what Kavouss was saying.

So, my question is, if we sort of go back to this but we change the wording so that it is more specific but also less strict. Okay, I see that works for Kavouss in the chat. Martin, does that work for you?

MARTIN BOYLE:

Not desperately, but I can live with it.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay. Xiaodong is your hand still up from before, or do you have a new comment?

XIAODONG LEE: I'm sorry Alissa. I have no comment.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, okay. So I would like us to move on, we are extremely short on time.

I think all of the other comments in this section have been dealt with. We did end up inserting the diagram. Joe, go ahead, you are in the queue.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah, just a quick note on the suggestion that Kavouss had made about the footnote to the section. If it's going... People aren't probably going to flip back to that section. We could just put in a short parenthetical which just says, a different entity than the customer standing committee, to just clarify that there are two standing committees. Because that might actually because you're not asking a person to dive into a document which is unlikely that they will do.

And then would put the clarification right on the same spot.

ALISSA COOPER: I'm fine either way. Kavouss, you have an opinion?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I'm supporting Joe's proposal, it's okay for me.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay.

Okay. Good.

So we have [inaudible]. Russ Mundy, do you want to talk about the diagram? [CROSSTALK] ...still in the queue. Martin, yeah.

MARTIN BOYLE:

Yes, Alissa sorry about this, but when I intervened on that standing committee, I did not because I had a small issue a bit higher up in that paragraph, bearing in mind there is only five lines in that paragraph, that's not too, that's pretty critical.

Again, I felt that the way that this was dealt with, was just a sort of little bit incomplete. What we're saying is, the names community proposes to discontinue the authorization rules and changes that is currently performed by NTIA. I think actually what we're saying is that not that we will discontinue the authorization, but only you have a bit which is performed by NTIA.

The and in fact, I wonder whether we should look at the wording, something along the lines of, the names community proposes that the authorization root zone change that is currently performed by the NTIA, does not need to be replicated with a new process. So in other words, actually make it quite clear that it is just that one bit, and it's that bit that we're not replicating, otherwise it read to me that we were just saying, okay, there is nothing sitting there.

And then I would like to just go one step further on there, which would then be, relying on ensuring adequate process controls. So what we're

doing is moving the functions currently held by the NTIA, which is a clerical, an administrative function, into the PTI and ICANN. They are doing the authorization. So that function is still being done. It's not being done by an external body.

So that was why I was just suggesting a slight difference in the wording that makes it clearer. There are still the process controls that would be natural within ICANN for covering this point. So my wording would be, the names community proposes that the authorization of root zone changes, that is currently being performed by NTIA, do not need to be replicated with a new process relying on ensuring adequate process controls within the system.

ALISSA COOPER:

So my question here is, as Manal point out, again, this is almost like a direct quote from the names proposal. So I'm happy to kind of edit this, but we are a little short of time, and I think it's important that we maintain consistency with the text within the proposal itself. This is now on the screen.

It says that the [inaudible] recommends that the NTIA will be discontinued. So can we sort of stay faithful to that somehow and still make the points? I'm just a little nervous about kind of, you know, [inaudible] in the summary again, because I don't want us to get too far from what the proposal actually said.

MARTIN BOYLE: Yes, I certainly recognize the concern there. However, and I happen to have had a chance to go back to the text in the CWG proposal, but the CWG proposal is slightly longer than that on this explanation. And therefore, and that's why, it seems to me, that what we've done is [inaudible] without explaining that, well actually, we're not destabilizing the system, we're not throwing the thing into jeopardy, but rather this is quite a deliberate choice.

But anyway, I'm quite happy after this call to go through and try to extract what I have got a vague recollection of from the text, and provide some wording if I can justify it from the text. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, great. Let's make that an action item for after the call. I think that would be helpful, and then we can do the others afterwards. Thank you.

Russ Mundy, go ahead. You wanted to talk about the diagram.

RUSS MUNDY: Yeah. Before we, before I talk about the diagram, I would just like to make one comment about Martin's last intervention on the elimination of including NTIA. One of the things that I think has happened a couple of times is, people often merge together the activities that an organization is doing, and particularly NTIA, or in ICANN functions, where they are trying to, or intending to talk about the operational ongoing day to day, you know, some TLD operators submit the change,

and there is not really explicit oversight addressed with that, but there is an ongoing action that needs to be done.

I think that the action that was referred to primarily in the section that was just discussed, is that ongoing action to check off that, yes, things were indeed done that. As opposed to the big picture overview of, is the overall performance being done appropriately and adequately in the broad sense. And I think that's what the PTI and CSC things are really more focused at, rather than the individual one at a time changes.

So I think this is something that maybe we need to, if we can, differentiate between. But that also is related to the comments that I have on the diagram, and incorporating it sort of directly out of slide 28 in the original draft set. And that is that the things that are in the diagram, address primarily oversight, and the review process, and really don't provide, in the case of the names function, doesn't identify sort of the lower level, ongoing, how do we handle a minor dispute kind of thing.

And the part of the slide deck that shows the names only, it does show the interaction that occur down there, and then CSC and the IFR. But the thing that seems to be lacking from the diagram, is some illustration of the ongoing functionality of what the IANA does. And this is something that I think is just too easy to lose sight of, and that is that IANA functions must continue to work securely, stably, resiliently, as they are today, throughout this entire process.

And I believe that the diagram, as it sits, emphasizes really only the oversight and the big picture view of what happens when things go

wrong, or is the IANA in fact functioning in a big picture sort of way properly, without showing what they're doing or that there are many ongoing actions that occur on a daily basis.

And that's the problem that I have with this. It doesn't really illustrate that the IANA is and must continue to do these things effectively on an ongoing basis. There is sort of no real day to day customer flow of any kind in the picture.

ALISSA COOPER:

So Russ, in the specific image for the names, they are the positional boxes and arrows that show the customers having input into the PCI, and how they handle service issues and complaints, and so forth. If that was added to this overall diagram, would that resolve your issue?

RUSS MUNDY:

Well, it would help for the names community. But, for instance, let's just talk about the IETF IAB community in the picture. I don't see where that picture shows what occurs when a registry change is needed, or a new registry needs to be created for the IETF.

Similarly, for the RIRs and the number community, I don't see how the diagram shows how a reassignment of an IP block occurs. It really only focus on oversight, and response to problem area.

ALISSA COOPER:

Yes. So I think, I mean, I will say that was by design, because the transition is really about the oversight. It's not about changing the day

to day. So that was on purpose. And at least, from the sort of IGF perspective, I don't think, I mean I don't really consider the actual protocol parameter assignment as part of the oversight. That's actually the function itself.

So part of this was how much detail can you really provide in one diagram? And what is the proposal focused on? And the proposal is really focused on what are, you know, changes that may or may not occur with respect to the oversight, as opposed to changes in the functions themselves, which aren't really expected. So I'm having this back and forth with you, because I actually think keeping the diagram in the document is really important.

I think it will actually help a lot in terms of people's understanding of what the proposal overall says. And so if we can find a way to keep it that makes everyone happy, then I would like to do that. I completely understand the part about the missing chunk of the names piece, and I think we can easily have the design folks add that in.

And so if that can get you onboard with keeping the diagram in, then I think we should do that. I don't think we can, at this point, start adding in the detail of all of the other assignments that the PTI does, because the other pieces have already been kind of vetted with the other communities. And you've seen the structure of the whole deck. So that's my question to you.

If we added the customer piece that shows the, you know, how minor issues are resolved, if you could get onboard with keeping the diagram as is, otherwise.

RUSS MUNDY:

I would be okay with that, if you will, from the diagrammatic perspective. I haven't had a chance to actually look at the explicit text that is surrounding where the diagram is, because that was, I just didn't have time to do that before the call.

But the problem that I would have, even with adding in the additional piece, which I think is a good edition, but I am fully in agreement that we don't want to let it get excessively busy. The problem that I have in the broader context is that it is not clear that this represents the accountability and oversight aspects only.

And that the ongoing set of activities that the IANA conducts on a daily ongoing basis, is not shown here, but is... Whatever set of words are, but is expected to continue without interruption, without problems. In other words, things that are working today, we are not breaking by overlaying this.

I don't find any text, either in the slide deck or when I went through the combined proposal before, that actually makes that point. And I think that's perhaps the most important point here, is that the operational aspects of the IANA functions for all three communities, are expected to continue to flow more or less in a manner that's fully consistent with today's operations.

And in many cases, or maybe most cases, not change at all.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Russ. So here is my proposal. We can go back to the designers and have them add in the bit that's missing from the names side, and then perhaps after this call, try to draft up some text, some further text for this paragraph 17 that we introduce the diagram and make it explicit, what is and is not covered, so that's clear to people that the point of the diagram is just to represent the contents of the proposal for the transition of the oversight, and there is a lot more detail that is not reflected in the diagram that relates to the day to day operations of IANA.

RUSS MUNDY: I would be perfectly satisfied with that. I think that's an excellent approach.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, good. So, one thing I will say is that we are very short on time. We have not gotten very far through this, so I would ask that people, as you get into the queue, please keep your interventions short. We really need to get through all of this stuff and a few others in the next 45 minutes.

So Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes Alissa, fully agree with you. There is no time to use new ideas. There is not time to use any perfection. Whenever we call something from the naming community, that is it. I do not agree that we say that

no it is not correct, let us [inaudible]. With due respect to Martin, I am not in agreement with the changes that he proposed.

He is right, but we are not [inaudible] for perfection. We have just about 40 minutes, less than that, and we have to finish this document. So anything you add to this diagram, to demand high level and to demand something that everybody agrees. That's all. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thanks Alissa. Just very quickly... We were [inaudible] Daniel's proposal in the chat, just to add the word oversight in the diagram caption. And it's gaining support in the chat. So the [inaudible] might be interesting to do. But again, I have no objection to the way forward, if this would better address, thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. Got it. I don't know what's going on with the screen. I tried to stop sharing and re-sharing, hopefully we can work around that. Okay. So Alan, go ahead.

ALAN: This is Alan. On the diagram, I think the diagram made more sense in the slide deck, where it was part of a deck, rather than stand alone. As a standalone document, it's missing the idea that those different colors,

different shades of blue or green represent different communities. So perhaps we can draw a bubble around the RIR side and say this is for oversight of the numbers function, and draw a bubble around the CSC and IFR and say, this is what oversight of the names function.

That kind of thing. And that context was present in the slide there, but it seems to be [missing] in the standalone document.

ALISSA COOPER: So you mean that just because there aren't other slides, that have the same color, because obviously there is the color...

ALN: Yeah, just because there aren't other slides... Yeah there is color coding. Okay, maybe then it just needs a key explaining what the colors mean.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. We can ask the designers about that.

Okay, I don't see anyone else in the queue. So I'd like us to move on to section four. Let's see.

So, sorry. I'm really struggling with these white boxes, I don't know what the deal is. Maybe that helps.

So do people have comments on section four? The main thing, I think, that happened in the last short while was that I added this sentence here, and pulled it out of all of the other sections about the processing

of concerns that we received in the form. So this is now at the top. We just say it wants to explain what happened, and that's all.

We don't make it specific to the various different process complaints that were received, given that this was sort of summarizing.

So, any comments on section four A, I guess? Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes. I'm very sorry. There were so many things that people raised that I forgot at some point, in the section that proposal summary, you revert to two paragraphs of the RFP, and I suggested that you include a cross-reference to that in hyperlink. I don't know whether you have done that or not. I refer to paragraph C 70, paragraph 161 of the RFP, and also 620 and 28 60.

The readers should have access to that, and therefore I suggest that you hyperlink whatever reference that you made to this. This is very important for the reader. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks Kavouss. I inserted footnotes for all of those.

So comments on 4A, comments on 4B. Okay, so 4B is now where we have the text about...

So this is where we have the new formulation what the status of the completeness of the name proposal is, here in paragraph 34.

Okay. Seeing no comments.

Any other comments on 4B?

Paul, go ahead.

PAUL WILSON:

This actually relates, [inaudible] for reference to something that's coming up under work, I believe, where I think paragraph 41, which I think is about VeriSign, and the agreements as the root zone maintainer, seems to me would be better for that to be under completeness.

I'm not quite sure it's under workability, so [inaudible] we talk about that when we come to 41 or before end the completeness sections, but it seems to me that that is actually a comment about the need for, in fact [inaudible] some sort of agreements will be essential. That's actually something about some, maybe something about completeness work in workability.

ALISSA COOPER:

So I'm happy to move this. So I've highlighted the paragraph in the document, 43, on the screen right now. So the proposal is to move this up to this section about completeness. I have no problem with that. If anyone else does, please get in the queue, otherwise I will move this.

Go ahead Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you Alissa. I'm not sure if this is the right moment to raise this, but just to note that I tried to highlight in blue things that describe the CCWG accountability work is under development currently being [inaudible] things like that, that might not be accurate by the time this is out for public comments, as well as the CCWG proposal.

I'm not sure if we are going to review this, to agree to it as is, or what's the plan? Again, it's in different parts, not in separate section. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you. I think we can expect that we will make some changes to this sort of temporal language after the public comment period. So I think as long as we feel that it is accurate as of, you know, today, that's fine. And we'll have to go back and make some changes after the public comment period based on what happens with the CCWG.

Russ Mundy, go ahead.

RUSS MUNDY:

Thanks Alissa. This is Russ Mundy. I think that the particular paragraph that you're referencing and that has been suggested to move to completeness, more accurately this, and workability, because in terms of completeness, if we mean completeness from the perspective of RFP answers, and completeness of what direction coming out of the March 14 letter was, that is really sort of on the edge of whether or not the cooperative agreement should be considered part of this or not.

And I think it really does fit more appropriately in the workability section. I don't have super strong feelings that way, but I think it actually does fit better in workability rather than completeness.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Paul, can you live with it staying in workability?

PAUL WILSON: Well, I take the point. I think it's out, it's kind of out of scope probably the entire process. I'm not sure if it does [inaudible] workability, or arguably on completeness, if we're going to determine completeness as to scope. I'm not entirely sure. I mean, I don't feel particularly strongly. It probably does need to be somewhere, but I'm just not sure we've got the right place for it. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: I would suggest that we leave it, because no one has a real strong feeling, and that's where it is now. I will take this point though, that has been raised in the chat, and that Manal has a comment about, which is that we didn't mean that they disagree, we meant that there was no written agreement, which is the same phrasing that is used in the CWG proposal, I believe.

Okay. I don't hear anyone screaming that we must move it, so hopefully leaving it there is fine. So other... Okay, so Manal has this one other comment about the trademark issue. I feel pretty strongly that we should just discuss each issue in one place, and not repeat. And so we have the trademark issue, I think, thoroughly covered in the section

about interoperability, and so I don't think we need to say it again in the accountability section, which is why I didn't make any edits for that comment.

Anything else on section C? Moving on to section D, where we talk about the criteria.

So the one piece that I did want to flag is that this is the section about how the proposal does not replace NTIA's role with the government or inter-governmental organizations. So there has been this placeholder here, for a text about how ICANN is protected against capture by governments or inter-governmental organizations. I think this is important.

We make this point for the other two portions of the proposal, and so I think we need to make it here for the names portion as well. I just wasn't as familiar with all of the, what all of the safeguards are, but some folks help out, tracked this text just today. So you can see it now. It's the text in blue. Michael, go ahead.

MICHAEL NIEBEL:

Yes, thank you Alissa. I thank you for drafting something. I have a problem only with the sentence that says, these include bylaws, provisions that prevent officials from governments or treaty organizations from serving members of the ICANN Board, and limit governments to an advisory role within ICANN through the GAC.

Now that's the status quo, and the whole construction is discussed in the CCWG, and so we're kind of precluding the possible outcome, which

can be a possible outcome. So I would strike that phrase because that is really not yet right how this is going to be constructed and it shouldn't preclude discussions, both in the GAC, within the GAC, and the CCWG. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Michael. Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. This issue was discussed last night, and after some discussions about the previous working party one meeting, it was decided that we mention in bylaws, and we mention in the procedures, that the GAC maintains its position as an advisory capacity, without any changes and so on and so forth.

We did not make any change at all. We did not put the GAC advice on the IRP, independent review panel, nor on the IRP binding as it is. Therefore, I think we need to delete this paragraph totally, this portion that has been added. Moreover, there is additional paragraph mentioned in the CCWG last night, in the community empowerment and voting, raise that three advisory group, the RSAC and SSAC, and GAC may in the future, if so decides associate themselves with some collections, activities, or collective activities with other entities, and that should be something in the future.

Therefore we do not need to mention about this, this is additional unnecessary positions, and must be deleted from this text. GAC has not yet decided to do anything whether join the voting, or does not join the

voting, in the process, therefore we should not regard this situation. So delete this portion which has been added in blue. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks Kavouss. Who do I have next? Manal, go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you Alissa. I think my point has been made. I think [inaudible] and I join the [inaudible] you, for the sake of time, I'll stop talking. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, thanks. So that's fine. We can remove this. I guess it sounds like we will have something to say after the conclusion of the CCWG process perhaps. I do think we need to say something here eventually, but we don't need to say it now. So we can defer this until after the public comment period.

That would be my suggestion. It sounds like this is essentially influx, and so we don't say anything now, but we can revisit this after the public comment period. But before I hit the delete button, I have Martin in the queue. Go ahead Martin.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Alissa there is [inaudible]... So Alissa, there is a comment from Lynn which we should look at.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, I see that as well. If people can get in the queue, that will help me a lot. Martin, go ahead.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks Alissa. I must admit I tend to agree with the comments made by our GAC colleagues, in that we're not really in a position to say very much. The reference though, and I think probably the most important part of any system for avoiding capture, doesn't just refer to avoiding capture by governments, but avoiding capture by any community. And I wonder whether what we should be looking at in this section is building on the part of the paragraph as existing, which actually did use the terms of avoiding capture by any community.

I can't remember the exact wording that was there on the text, on the screen a few moments ago. But actually, then specifically noting that within the multistakeholder community decisions cannot just be made by one stakeholder group. And I think that then covers the position quite nicely, because that is pretty much a principle of the work that's been going on within the ICANN community. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Martin. I guess what's unclear to me, oh. Sorry I should say, we are five minutes past when the interpretation was supposed to stop, so it's going to stop now. So thank you to our interpreter who did that alone.

So, I guess what is unclear to me, it sounds like everything in this paragraph is still up for debate in the CCWG to some extent, and so I

definitely don't want to write anything here that isn't, that is perhaps subject to change, based on the conclusions of the CCWG process. So again, kind of noting the late hour and so forth, I would suggest that we just remove this text and leave essentially the first two sentences as is, and go forward that way, and park this as something that we need to revisit after the CCWG process is closer to finalization.

Understanding that it's important that we provide an explanation here. We have a short explanation already, but if all of this is essentially influx, then we can't say anything right now. Kavouss, go ahead.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH:

Yes that is the paragraph that I suggested to add somewhere to cover all of this points, and saying as follows, it is to be noted that the activities of CCWG, you can spell it out totally, relating to the ICANN enhance accountability, and community empowerment including independent review process, are being completed and published for public comment at the same time as ICG document.

Just a general cross-reference to that, that everyone will see that, and all of these issues we are discussing are there. Everything is there, and some of the issue is that putting aside the process two, or for the work stream two, therefore we need not to go to this [inaudible], just a general sentence that I have read. If somebody has taken note of that, so far, so good. If not, I can repeat it. Cover the whole points. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you Kavouss. I just put a placeholder in. If you could send that sentence to the mailing list, that would help and I can work that in. I think...

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I put it in the chat. I will put it in the chat. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Put it in the chat, that's fine. Okay.

Manal, go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thanks Alissa. Just to note that the short part of this section already describes what is in the CWG proposal, paragraphs 211. So the issue has already in the CWG proposal, and this is as far as they got. And I think this is our [inaudible], just to help [inaudible] people that this comes from the CWG, and already grabs all what the CWG has said about this issue.

So I don't think we need to go further. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Good point, thank you Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL: Paragraph 211 in the CWG.

ALISSA COOPER: Got it. Okay. Thanks. Good. So I think we have closed on that. Thanks everyone for your contributions. And that brings us, I think, to section five. So section five is now really just focused on the, listing the implementation items, basically everything that we expect to be implemented that flows from the proposal, does not include timeline information, which I felt that should be kept separate, doesn't really belong in the substance of this proposal.

So, comments on section five. [Inaudible].

Okay. Seeing no hands, that means we have made it through the end of the ICG report. So everyone give themselves a little pat on the back. I think we are essentially there. We have a few items that we will work through directly after the call. And get these into the document. And we'll give people, I guess, 24 hours, actually can I check with Jennifer?

Jennifer, do you think we're okay if we give people 24 hours from the close of the call just to review before we ship off to the translators? Will that create too much of a problem with translation? I know that we're already a little bit delayed with translation anyway.

JENNIFER: Hi Alissa, this is Jennifer speaking. I'm not sure if you can hear me.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah, we can hear you.

JENNIFER: Okay. Yes, we are a little delayed on translation already, so I think this is probably important that to give people enough time to put in the edits that we need to put in. That's a fine suggestion.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, good. So we'll make all of the edits and clean this up and give people 24 hours to review and send any final objections to the mailing list.

So then we should move up to the executive summary.

So what I would propose for the executive summary is that as we do that final set of edits, that we just ensure that all of those are accurately reflected in the summary. So to the extent that the executive summary already draws from the ICG report section, that we just copy and paste on to make sure everything is consistent.

So for example, we had the text from this paragraph that people thought was overly negative. We deleted it from the proposal. We'll also delete it from the executive summary. If folks feel comfortable with that, then I'm not sure we need to discuss the executive summary too much, unless there is other things people wanted to talk about, but I think we'll, you know, leave the text essentially as is, and other than reflecting the changes that were made in the document itself.

Joe, go ahead.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF:

Thanks Alissa. For me, I had raised the question on the discussion list a couple of days ago, and it's the construction of having people provide opinions as opposed to comments, because I think that's kind of a somewhat strange construction, because in some cases, then the lack of people providing opinions may provide a negative implication, versus comments.

The answer is you provide comments when you're unsatisfied. You don't necessarily provide comments if you're satisfied. So just a little concerned about the phrasing of providing opinions, because I'm not sure that some of the opinions are things that we can factor in any way as good, bad, or indifferent, or that they actually give us any direction on how to fix a problem if someone sees a problem.

ALISSA COOPER:

Yes, Joe in fact the text that you are referring to is not an executive summary, but it's in the public comment website. And I actually already reflected that change, which we will look at in the second.

Any other comments on the executive summary and the plans of the executive summary?

Okay. So let's then look at the public comment website. So folks received this, this is the password protected version of the site, which the Secretariat has been putting together. The content is the same content that we had in that document, the Word document. And you'll see Joe, that here, change [CROSSTALK]...

So yes. So this is kind of what it looks like, and this is the opportunity for people to provide feedback, both on kind of the structure and also the content. We've obviously been vetting the content on the list quite a bit. So, comments on the website.

The same thing here. If we make changes in the proposal document, we will come back to the website and make sure that they all get reflected in this text as well. I know there is a section, yeah, this section down here. The proposal summary is really out of synch with the current proposal summary text in the document. We will make sure that it all is matching across, between the website and the proposal itself.

Okay. Not seeing any hands. Just so in case people haven't had too much time to look at it, in terms of the submission, there is two ways that comments will be accepted. One is via a web form, which you can see here. This is still in development, we're working through some issues. It needs like a title for example, this page. But essentially if people want to provide structured input, they can do it in a form.

There is a box for each question, and they submit it at the bottom. I think we're going to get rid of this file upload, if people want to send us files, they can do that via email, which is the other way that comments can be submitted. And then we're working on a way to archive all of the comments received.

This is kind of the mockup of the table, where comments will be reflected and you'll be able to see them organized by question. And also just a list of comments overall. So Mary, go ahead.

MARY UDUMA: Can you hear me? Hello?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, we can hear you.

MARY UDUMA: All right. I just want to read this issue of, this format of response. Maybe because we're asking for opinion, and we said yes, you explain [inaudible] and [inaudible] when it's negative [inaudible]...
Now that we're asking them for comments, not opinions.

ALISSA COOPER: Sorry, I didn't quite, I don't quite understand the proposal. You were talking about this [inaudible]...

MARY UDUMA: Yes. I'm asking, did we propose that format because we're asking for their opinion, and some respondents could just say yes to what we speak. And move on, without having to explain.

ALISSA COOPER: Obviously, people can, despite whatever prompt we provide, people can say whatever they want in these boxes. I think we were asking for the explanation because it will help us to build the public record that thoroughly demonstrates how the proposal meets the criteria. That

would be a lot easier for us to do, if people not only say yes, this does fit the criteria, but also why they think so.

Sort of to the discussion we just had about the last bit of criteria, in terms of, you know, we can create our own rationales as to why we think the proposal meet the criteria, but if people want to provide and that will help us I think, [inaudible] that section of the proposal in the final version. So I would like to keep the suggestion that people provide explanations. If they don't want to, they won't.

That's up to them. Does that make sense?

Well, if that's unsatisfactory then get back in the queue, Mary.

[CROSSTALK] Go ahead Mary.

MARY UDUMA:

Okay. I'm still here. I'm saying that sometimes people get discouraged from responding to some of this public comment, because of the [inaudible] issues that we will... So in my own, what I think is that, I agree with, what you have said, but I think the explanation for [inaudible] will be more of it, that when you [inaudible], but I agree with what you have just said. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks Mary. Joe, go ahead.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thanks. Alissa, when you were scrolling through the web form, I wasn't able to see it. But either at the beginning of the web form, or at the end of the web form, we should have a free text box, if someone wants to provide an overall impression of the document. That may be a summarization of some of their thoughts, or whatever, because sometimes people would like to provide a [inaudible], and if it's in an email, then it might be displaced from the web form, so it's easier for the web form gives them at least one free text box that's not associated with the question of, if you would like to make any other comments or provide an overall impression, or something like that, then that's a catchall for something they would like to do.

And I think that might also answer Mary's question of what happens if someone doesn't want to go through the boxes.

ALISSA COOPER: Yup, we have this last question for general comments. Does that suffice?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah, I just wasn't able to see it when you were scrolling.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, good. Paul Wilson, go ahead.

PAUL WILSON: Thanks. I'm not sure if it's covered but are we going to have a downloadable structured answer form as well as a web form?

ALISSA COOPER: So I guess a couple of people [inaudible], I think that's fine. Jennifer, do you think it's possible for us to create that? So I guess, Paul you were thinking like a Word document?

PAUL WILSON: Yeah, because a web form is not collaborative. It's really sort of for one person to fill in and [inaudible], you can't sort of create a draft and share it with your colleagues and so on. So I think there is sort of a group response from organization that requires that kind of collaborative sort of effort.

And I want to choose the structured form, then it should be given in an Adobe document or something they can download and edit, and upload or send to us, you know, afterward. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Jennifer, do you think that's workable on your end?

JENNIFER: Hi this is Jennifer. So just to clarify from Paul's suggestion that he would like a downloadable Word format of the questions? Is that correct?

PAUL WILSON: Sure, yes. And it doesn't need to be a Word, a Microsoft Word form, because those documents themselves are a bit tricky. But just a document that can be filled in. You know, a document that contains all of the questions and can be filled in an edit process. That's all.

JENNIFER: Sure. I will [inaudible] my team and get that on the table.

PAUL WILSON: Thanks a lot Jennifer, thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Manal.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thanks Alissa. Apologies if this is already on the team, but I was on mute for the specifics. But, I have proposed that we also pose a question on the ICG report, the executive summary. I mean it's only that we give a chance for people to find all parts of the overall proposal. So if we agree, maybe we can say [inaudible] the ICG report and the executive summary, clearly reflect the overall proposal.

So I submitted this suggestion on the mailing list, but I'm not clear whether we [inaudible] or not, and whether it's reflected on the web form or not. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thanks Manal. That hasn't been requested on the web form yet, but we can take that and do that. That could be done. So we will make sure that this is reflect the latest version and suggestions from you. That was in the Word document.

So the only, if there, there is no one else in the queue, just on the accessibility point about the captcha, our feeling on that was that since we have an email submission, that you know, people can submit either way, that we have sort of taken care of the accessibility issue. But if people disagree with that, please speak up. That was kind of our solution as far as accessibility goes.

Joe, go ahead.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF:

I was actually, sorry, I was typing it in as we were speaking. On Manal's point I just wanted to suggest that perhaps we don't ask the question of, do you think this correctly reflects, but just give them the opportunity to provide comments if they wish to provide comments on the executive summary. Because again, the first phrasing is going more towards an opinion, rather than if they don't think it reflects something, they will give us comments.

So I would just make it a comment box, not a request for their opinion as to whether it's a correct summary.

ALISSA COOPER:

Okay. So you just want it to say, asking people if they have comments on the ICG report section?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah. Comments on any other sections of the ICG report, including the executive summary. Or something like that.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, okay. Got it.
Xiaodong, go ahead.

XIAODONG LEE: Hi. This is Xiaodong Lee speaking. I am seeing that [inaudible] there is country list, because I cannot check the list for this website, but I prefer that we use the country code, for the ISO [inaudible]... It would be better for people to work on these issues.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Jennifer, can you taken an action on using ISO country codes instead of the country list [inaudible] suggestion.

JENNIFER: Sure, I will do that.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks.

XIAODONG LEE: Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you.

Okay. So well, Manal, go ahead.

MANAL ISMAIL: I'm sorry, very quickly. Why in specific the [inaudible] proposal is not the [inaudible] country and the names? I mean, the full country names should be understood by every single person, but the ISO codes might be for the ICANN community people, or ccTLD people, or...

So are we adding the [inaudible] or replacing the country name of the [inaudible]?

ALISSA COOPER: Xiaodong, do you have a response? I was assuming that the important bit was that the specific list of countries that have ISO country codes, but go ahead Xiaodong.

XIAODONG LEE: I think [inaudible]... and the country code defined by the ISO. So [inaudible]... mention that we can use the country or [inaudible] record, instead of country. So I think is, if every country member issues in ICANN, so I prefer us to follow the ISO [inaudible]...

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. And now I see a suggestion by Elise, order them by ISO codes, and include both the name and the country code.

 Just looking at all of the suggestions to try to figure out what to do here.

 Perhaps we can take... Let's see.

 I see, okay. I'm seeing what the issue is.

 What we should do.

 We should just go with the ISO country codes. I think that will solve, and this is really just for our benefit anyway, so that we can later reflect kind of the, if we wanted to say, explain [inaudible] comments, and we can do that. So I think we should just go with the ISO country codes, if that's okay, and label the field country, or, I'm sorry, country slash economy.

 Any objections to that [CROSSTALK]... economy and then we use the ISO country codes?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible]. May I speak?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes go ahead.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible] very easily track the IANA website, because all of the country code, I believe, [inaudible] website. [Inaudible]... by the IANA website. I remember that even IANA also called the customer of ISO, who better?

ALISSA COOPER: I'm sorry, I'm having a little bit of trouble understanding. But you're saying that the list, making these a list from the IANA website?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes. If you check the IANA website, you will see that, let me see.
I'm sorry, I didn't [inaudible] bridge for the IANA website.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, my suggestion is that we maybe take this offline, if you know, ask the web team to see if there is a list that we can use. If it seems to be complicated, let's say within the next 24 hours, we can also just delete this field. It's really just for our benefit, we don't really need it. So if it creates too much difficulty, that might be the easiest thing to do.

Because we do have to like nail down the website in the very immediate future. So let's see if we can work out country slash economy, and ISO codes, and if that can't get turned around in very short order, then I think we should just remove the field.

So that's an action for the web team. And we'll look at the IANA website.

Okay. We are five minutes over, so we need to get going on finishing up this call. The one other item that we really needed to discuss, which hopefully won't take long, it's been out for a long time, is the matrix, because it's referenced in the proposal. So if the Secretariat could project the matrix.

This is the same matrix that we've had since we did the assessment of the protocol parameters proposal. The Secretariat has added documentation of the questions and answers that we discussed regarding the names proposal, so those are there now. And so the idea here is that we will publish this on our website, and then we'll have a stable reference, and we can include that in the footnote, in the proposal where we referenced this.

So I just wanted to give people one last opportunity to comment on that plan. I think we've known for a while that that was going to be the plan, but I just wanted everyone to be clear on it.

Martin, go ahead.

MARTIN BOYLE:

Thanks Alissa. Looking at the document that was circulated yesterday among, actually on the screen. [Inaudible] quite happy with it, but I did notice that under the names there had been a section 1.1, that just now seems to have disappeared. That came under a heading of proposal development process related issues, that was specifically related to an issue that Richard Hill had raised before.

[Inaudible]... might actually be quite useful, certainly for me to understand why it was deleted.

ALISSA COOPER:

So in looking back over what we had done for the other ones of these, maybe I was incorrect about this because I was doing it too quickly. But we had some of those questions and comments from external parties on the other proposals as well, and they are not reflected in this matrix. This was the matrix for our kind of internal discussions of issues.

So that's why I didn't think it really belonged in this matrix. I mean, we have two sentences now in the proposal that explain that we received comments and how we dealt with them in terms of interfacing with the communities. And so since we hadn't documented the way that we did that, the specificity of the other two proposals, I didn't think it was appropriate to do it for the names proposal either.

It's supposed to be the internal matrix. Does that seem acceptable Martin?

MARTIN BOYLE:

Yeah, that's okay for me, just as long it hadn't dropped off the list, and just as long as we're aware why it had been dropped. As I said, I wasn't wedded to that particular comment, because I think all of the communities were open to receiving input and responding as appropriate. And if somebody raised their hands specifically, minority statement, as is happening in the CCWG at the moment, then the process has been opened for such to happen.

So I'm happy to see that go, I just wanted to know that it wasn't dropped. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. I had Michael on the queue and then I know people need to drop because we're running late. So I will have Michael and then we'll try to wrap after that. Go ahead Michael.

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Thank you Alissa. I have a comment, 2.3 and 2.5. While [inaudible] in the context of our discussions internally, the clear discussion, I think, to publish it for the outside in this form, is a little bit confusing. And I would like to propose a kind of streamline question, whereby 2.3, is [inaudible] because it's about the question whether it suffices that ICANN makes acknowledgement of a legal obligation.

And that's a little bit convoluted question. And 2.5 is basically overlapping so we can delete that. I can make a suggestion on the list or put it now in the chat.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, if you can make a suggestion on the list I think that would be the best. We're out of time and we need to wrap on this. We'll do the same thing for all of these, like 24 hours of review from now. So if you can send that as soon as possible, we can incorporate that and make sure people have time to look at it.

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Okay.

ALISSA COOPER: Great. Thank you. So we have gone through all of the content we needed to, to go to public comment on Friday. So I think we are essentially there. We will publish to the list the updated versions of all of these materials, give people 24 hours to review. So until, I guess, 7 UTC on the 30th, and we will plan to go to public comment on Friday, assuming no one brings up an objection in the next 24 hours.

And we can communicate the com plan on the list as well, that is [inaudible] that is in the works for Friday and as we see on the list, we have those people find an enhance the webinar’s plans, and we’ll continue the discussion of the deck and the webinar materials on the list, and try to come closure on that within the next couple of days, so we can get back to the designers on that.

So that is a wrap, I think. Thanks everyone for all of your hard work in this period. It’s truly been extraordinary. And especially the Secretariat who has not been sleeping, as far as I can tell.

All right, thanks everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]