

## 20140710\_CoordinationGroupPlanningCall

Jari Arkko: Thank you, all, for joining this call on such a short notice. And most of all, thank you for volunteering on this task, the Coordination Group. I think transition is a good thing for the Internet, but of course it will mean some work for us in the Coordination Group, and for us in the various communities that need to be working on this; a lot of work ahead of us in the coming, what, 15 months.

And the reason that some of us thought that it would be a useful thing to have a call, is to do a few things. Talk a little bit about the agenda for next week, and also making the observation that on the agenda there will be some topics, some of which would probably benefit from proposals and preparation from you guys. So let me just -- listing things that might benefit from someone actually thinking about that a little bit beforehand, and making it, sort of, on proposal.

And I don't think we should, or can, today talk about the substance really, it's more about the organization, how do we get organized for next week. So hopefully this will be relatively quick. We are making a recording of this call and, hopefully, also minutes. And my thought was unless someone objects, that we should actually start - anything that we do we would just make it a public -- a record out of it, other than try to keep things inside.

And I thought it might actually be useful just to go around, at the beginning here, and make sure we know who is on the call, and introduce ourselves a little bit. So I might actually start. So my name is Jari, and I'm one of the IETF representatives, and also the Chair of IETF.

And perhaps if we went through the different organizations, I'll call you out, to see who is on the call, and those -- there's -- a couple of organizations where, at least I have not yet heard -- the named people, from them yet, but they might actually already have.

We'll go through some names and who might be on the call, so why don't we start with ALAC; anyone from there? I guess not. GNSO? Hartmut, are you on the call? Okay. I think he actually said that he can't make it.

What about ccNSO, any names known yet. No? And GAC? I think the same situation. And then GNSO, I think Wolf-Ulrich and Milton both are on the call, right?

Milton Mueller: Yes. I am.

Jari Arkko: Right?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. I am. So, my name is Ulrich Knoben, I sent you a short notice in advance, you know, where I am from. Since 2008 with the GNSO, and I was an appointed Counselor to the GNSO as well for some -- several years, and Vice Chair of the GNSO. And I was appointed, well, to represent the GNSO, and especially the so-called Commercial Stakeholder Group, where I was appointed from within the GNSO, and to represent here on this Committee. So, that's it from my side.

Jari Arkko: Thank you. Milton?

Milton Mueller: Hello. This Milton Mueller; I'm a Professor at Syracuse University. I was put on the Committee by the Non-Commercial Stakeholder's Group, and I'm on the Executive Committee of the NCSG, and also spanning the addressing (ph) world, and an Elected Member of the ARIN Advisory Council.

Jari Arkko: Thank you. And then gTLD? Keith and Jon.

Keith Drazek: Hi. This is Keith Drazek, Vice President of Public Policy and Government Relations at Verisign. Chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group, and one of the two gTLD Registry representatives selected by the registries.

Jon Nevett: Hi. This is Jon Nevett. I'm a Co-Founder of Donuts. Used to be Chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group for many years, and I helped form, and I served as the first Chair of the NTAG -- or the NTAG, the New TLD Applicant Group, and look forward to working with everyone.

Jari Arkko: Welcome.

Unidentified Participant: Jari, an ICC basis?

James Bladel: Jari, can I interrupt for a moment.

Jari Arkko: Yes.

James Bladel: This is James Bladel, I am the GNSO appointee that was TBD when the announcement was released late last week. I'm coming from the GNSO Registrars, and most folks know me, but my bio is that I work for Go Daddy, and I am a GNSO Counselor. So sorry for the delayed (inaudible)--

Jari Arkko: No. That's fine. Sorry for missing you, actually, on this list. And then ICC basis. Joe? Joe, are you on the call? I guess not. IAB, Russ and Lynn?

Russ Housley: I'm Russ Housley, and currently serving as Chair of the IAB, and I'm a Past IETF Chair.

Lynn St. Amour: I'm Lynn St. Amour. I was formerly President and CEO of the Internet Society, and in that role I was a liaison to the IAB, and I am serving in the other IAB seat at this point. And I do not have a fulltime day job, in terms of full transparency. I'm just taking on a few interesting projects.

Jari Arkko: Excellent. And then IETF, I was one of those persons, and the other one is Alissa.

Alissa Cooper: Hi. I'm Alissa Cooper, I am one of the IETF Area Directors in the Real-Time Applications Area. And in my day job I work at Cisco as a Distinguished Engineer, in my Collaboration Technology Group.

Jari Arkko: Thanks. And then ISOC, Narelle and Demi? Anyone from ISOC on the call yet? I guess not. And then NRO, Adiel and Paul?

Adiel Akplogan: Oh, yes. Hi, Jari. This is Adiel. I'm CEO of AFRINIC. I'm also the Chair of the NRO. I also was in the Group with Paul, Paul Wilson, and who will be shortly on the call. But both of us will represent the NRO (inaudible).

Paul Wilson: And good morning, everyone. It's Paul Wilson here. I'm the head of APNIC (ph) with Adiel as NRO, reporting to the Group. People don't the NROs, the collective as far as IRRs, to prepare them. Definitely interested parties in place of IANA, and that has been (inaudible); actually the (inaudible) -- actually this, the relations from them, along with other numeric resources. Thanks.

Jari Arkko: Thank you. And then RSSAC. Daniel and Lars-Johan?

Lars-Johan Liman: Hello, I am Lars-Johan Liman. I'm one of the two Co-Chairs of the Root Service System Advisory Committee. I am -- was put together with Daniel Karrenberg, who I suppose is also on the call. My day job is to -- a Technical Lead from one of the Root Server Operators, Netnod, based in Stockholm, Sweden. Daniel, are you onboard?

Daniel Karrenberg: Yes. Hello. My name is Daniel Karrenberg, my CV can be found, and my previous sins (ph) can be found with your favorite search engine. I maintain my CV also on LinkedIn, easy to find. My day job is Chief Scientist of the RIPE NCC, one of the regional Internet registries, and also Operator of the Key Root Server.

Jari Arkko: Okay. Thank you. And then SSAC?

Russ Mundy: I don't hear Patrick. This is Russ Mundy. I'm not sure if Patrick was going to be on. I work for Parsons. I have had a lot of dealings with DNS and DNS security in particular, and routing activities. And one of the -- I happen to be one of the people that have been on SSAC for a fairly extensive length of time, and hopefully we'll be able to make some good contributions to this.

Jari Arkko: Excellent. Thanks. And then I think we also have, Elise -- Elise from ICANN, also IANA, maybe Theresa as well.

Elise Gerich: Elise is here--

Jari Arkko: Go ahead, Elise.

Elise Gerich: (Inaudible). Oh, okay. I'm Elise Gerich. I'm ICANN's Vice President of IANA.

Theresa Swinehart: And you have Theresa Swinehart on the phone as well. Senior Advisor to President on Strategy, and I'm here just to make sure that any support that's needed for the Coordination Group, that we can help fulfill that.

Jari Arkko: Thank you for that, Theresa. Anyone that we missed, anyone else on the call?

Unidentified Participant: The goal (ph).

Unidentified Participant: I think we may -- I don't know if Alice is on. I just -- I wanted to just check, she's helping manage the Adigo, and the call, and information and everything to that sort as well.

Alice: Yes. Hi, everyone. Alice here, I just wanted to let you know that Narelle has joined the call as well. Narelle, are you on? Okay. Let us know if you are able to talk. Thank you.

Theresa Swinehart: Jari, not to interrupt -- Theresa here again -- If the Coordination Group would like any updates on the names from the GAC, ccNSO or ALAC, I'm happy to provide what we are aware of so far, if that's useful.

Jari Arkko: Yes, please.

Theresa Swinehart: Okay. Sorry. So, the GAC has provided five names. Those have been submitted into the forum. I've been asked by the GAC Secretariat to reach out to the Interim Chair, as Heather Dryden, the GAC Chair is on holiday; to identify two people to come to the meeting. But it is up to the Coordination Group, of course, whether they would choose to take the five GAC representatives, or remain with the two. So, I will loop back with the Group as soon as I connect with Heather on that, and the GAC Secretariat.

With regards to the ccNSO, we understand that they are -- have finalized their selection, or are, within the next 24 hours, doing so; and expect that submission to come in. And with the ALAC, I understand that they are very close to their selection of two names, and anticipate that by Friday, as in tomorrow.

- Jari Arkko: And this is going to come back -- You mentioned five people from the GAC, do we know the names of those five that they propose?
- Theresa Swinehart: We do. One second, if you'd just give me just a minute here, I will find them. Let's see--
- Keith Drazek: Jari, this Keith Drazek. I'm sorry. Is there a consolidated list of all of the representatives at this point, so that we could -- that somebody could circulate?
- Theresa Swinehart: Yes. We can arrange for that. Alice, can you help us pull that together? I think it's--
- Unidentified Participant: It's also on the ICANN Group side of it.
- Theresa Swinehart: Yeah.
- Unidentified Participant: Yeah. I think it's better if you update the -- update the Web page, so that's visible to everyone, not just within the Coordination Group.
- Theresa Swinehart: So the names provided by the GAC were, the GAC's Chair, Heather Dryden, from Canada; Mr. Arasteh from Iran; Mr. Niebel from Europe; Mr. Santos from Brazil; and Ms. Manal Ismail from Egypt.
- Jari Arkko: Thank you, Theresa. Thank you, and that probably points us to one decision that this Coordination Group needs to make regarding that part -- information from the GAC.
- Alissa Cooper: Sorry, Jari. Can I just ask the Committee for a clarification into why that five versus two-decision would be for the Coordination Group, and not for ICANN, given the two-number was originally from ICANN?
- Jari Arkko: Yeah. Was that a question for me Alissa, or for Theresa?
- Alissa Cooper: Probably a question for Theresa.
- Theresa Swinehart: It was felt that at this point, because the proposed process had identified the two names that the GAC had come with five names, that this was a discussion that should also involve the Coordination Group Members.
- James Bladel: This is James. I'm also a little confused. Are they explicitly asking this Group to allow them additional representation? Or are they suggesting that those other representatives would be like adjunct, or observers? I'm not really clear with you on that.
- Milton Mueller: This is Milton. At the London Meeting the GAC made it clear that it would prefer to have five seats, and I think I'm very supportive of Theresa's perspective on this, that the Coordination Group itself should discuss that, probably in London, and decide what to do.
- Jari Arkko: And I would support that as well. I'll make the observation that I think our goal is to be transparent and open in the sense that people can follow our meetings. Possibly even for (inaudible) at present, but at least five persons, I'm a little reluctant to increase the number of actual members -- The actual work in the Group, more difficult and then that's a question of, you know, if they; why not some other people as well? Or we can discuss that in London.

Alissa Cooper: This is Alissa. I would think another piece of information that would be useful for that discussion, is to understand where the numbers came from in the first place. Or, why people think the numbers matter.

Unidentified Participant: Do we want to have that discussion now, or? I think that--

Jari Arkko: Actually I would propose that we don't have that now.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah.

Jari Arkko: We don't have time for that discussion now. I think it will need some time in London for us to decide that. I think it's -- observation is fine, whether we want even to make that decision, and what that decision might be. And probably would need more time than we have on this call, and I think we have more important things to worry about, than the GAC members that--

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Wolf-Ulrich speaking. A question to Theresa about -- Do we have a presentation of the GAC in London, or are they waiting for us to give them an answer right now? Because they are invited to come to London, how shall we manage that? Are we expecting five people in London? Or whether it's going to be done here?

Theresa Swinehart: I need to follow up with the person who contacted me today, but my understanding is that they are looking at sending one or two people to the London Meeting.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Mm-hmm.

Theresa Swinehart: And waiting to hear a response then on the broader number.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah. It would be good--

Theresa Swinehart: So I have -- I need to follow up; I believe it is the Vice Chair who -- in contact with me at a later stage today.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yeah. It would be good to have some -- at least two of them there, because they need -- then we are going to discuss that, we should really have them available.

Jari Arkko: The minimum they need -- whoever they send needs to be able to explain why they think five versus two.

Narelle Clarke: Hello? Narelle Clarke here--

Theresa Swinehart: I will -- I will flag that for GAC Secretariat as well.

Narelle Clark: Yes. Hello? Hi. Narelle Clark just joined. I've been listening to that. Surely, it is something for this Committee to agree, firstly, that all of our numbering is acceptable to us, so that we, indeed, exercise our independence of it as far as it -- so one of us, at least, that should be able to say; yes, we think this constituency is the appropriate constituency for (inaudible), and then address whether or not the GAC question of three or five or two, or whatever it is, in that context. My understanding is that the five number comes from, say, wanting to have one for each region, otherwise they'll need to then come up with some other sort of ordering of representation. Thanks.

Jari Arkko: I think that makes sense, and definitely , I, at least, want to have the GAC people in London, so we can discuss with them, not just about this particular -- or everything else that we'll have to discuss, and then we can make a decision on their specific request, in London.

Daniel Karrenberg: This is Daniel. I strongly second what Narelle just said. I think one of the first things we should do as a group in London is basically say, this group is what we all agree to. And second, to the

question about why, from the GAC, the transcript of the London Public Session that Gary (ph) and Patrick Chaired, may have at least half-an-answer to that. So you should look at that transcript.

Jari Arkko: Okay. I think Narelle's point of view is very reasonable, and I think we can discuss the substance then, next week. The other stuff on this call that I think will be useful to talk about is the agenda. So, Alissa has sent out a Draft Agenda, with some topics that she believes are things that the Coordination Group should discuss. I think that was a reasonable -- a reasonable list, and just for your -- refresh your memory, that that one -- or that the list contained introductions, the charter of the Group's expectations to the communities, timelines, self organization, internal and external communication, what Secretariat needs and tasks we expect; and then the Coordination Group, its own meetings and calls scheduling.

So, any thoughts on that, or Alissa, do you want to say more about the agenda at this point?

Unidentified Participant: Alissa had to drop off.

Alissa Cooper: No. Yeah, I'm on the call still, but I'm now driving, so I will mostly stay on mute, but I didn't have anything to add.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Jari, it's Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Again, a question to the agenda; with regards to the Charter, how are we going -- Is there any idea, how are going to approach that? Do we have a framework available for the Charter already in London? Or should we think about how to structure that, and what are the main points? Normally, I understand that any working group or this group, have some specific points to cover in a Charter from a formality point of view? So it would be good to have some kind of structure already at the table. Is that possible?

Jari Arkko: So, the -- I think that includes both the scope and -- the scope and the tasks of the Coordination Group, and I think it is -- I mean, the way that ICANN will facilitate our proposal, you find that that definition is up to us, the Coordination Group. Now I think we will be able to make some proposals before next week's meeting. We, from the IETF and IAB side, have promised to work on that, and send you a rough proposal before the meeting.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay.

Jari Arkko: But this is definitely something that everyone needs to think about on their own side as well.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Mm-hmm. Good.

Jari Arkko: Is there something missing from the agenda that you would like to see?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Well, I think we need to have this GAC question.

Jari Arkko: Mm-hmm. Good point. And Narelle's generalization of the GAC question, if this is the right set of people, or right set of organizations involved in this Group to begin with?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yeah. I think that could be part of the Charter discussion. But definitely--

Jari Arkko: I think it will--

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: --you should define that -- as Narelle find it.

Alissa Cooper: Yeah, so -- this is Alissa, again. I've been thinking the same thing, which is that it might be helpful to have the Charter discussion first. I've been a little perplexed, the last time -- in the last few weeks, you know, trying to determine who should be in the Group is a difficult thing to do when you don't know exactly what the Group is going (inaudible). So that would be my proposal, and I

could go back and edit the agenda, and put what Narelle is bringing, somewhere after we have the charter discussion.

Unidentified Participant: That makes sense to me.

Joseph Alhadeff: This is Joe Alhadeff. On that point, all that (inaudible), but I would also agree, the Charter discussion upfront makes sense.

Jari Arkko: Indeed. And I also agree the discussions in the last month have maybe too much focus on who is on the table rather than what is on the table, and we need to get to that second question first, and then maybe it is a case that two versus five doesn't really matter even.

Unidentified Participant: Well, I think it does matter. But I think that discussion is something we have to have later.

Narelle Clark: Hello? Narelle, again. Hopefully there won't be any (inaudible). I would suggest that this all sounds really good that we have the Charter discussion first, and then you have the Constituency discussion. I mean, that makes imminent, logical sense. I just believe the GAC in a situation where, say -- you know, they don't know whether it's been two, whether it's been five or, you know, whatever the number is. But perhaps we could invite them to send their whole contingency as observers, you know, just for the interim, because I suspect in the longer term, our aims will be to try and get consensus, and then we can--

(Background Noise Interruption)

Unidentified Participant: That background noise is me.

Narelle Clark: So it's our aim in the longer term is to get consensus, and we already have a constituency yelling from the roof tops that they weren't allowed in the first instance, so I think that we are causing problems, right at the word go. That said, of course there will be the famous issue. Is there anybody else we know that feels that they are left, and that they are banging on the door? We need to identify those as well. Okay. I'll go back on mute.

Russ Mundy: This is Russ Mundy. I had a general comment in that space, and that is that I believe we need to think about, as members of this Group, that our structure, we can lay out in the Charter, needs to identify whether or not the individual members of the Coordination Group are acting as individuals, or if they are there representing particular constituencies. So, for instance, if they came to a voting situation, there is, for example, to say vote for constituency; or two, then however many people that are there, shouldn't matter that much.

But if it's individual-voting, it could make a very significant difference, and hopefully we won't have to do voting; right? It will just be coordination and getting the groups to work together, and you could see either larger or smaller numbers being more effective there.

Jari Arkko: That's a good point, and I'll point out also that one of the requirements from the NTIA is that we'll have some agreement within the multistakeholder community that this is the right path forward, for whatever proposal we bring to them. And if we find ourselves in a situation where we have to vote and kind of that requirement is already somewhat (inaudible) violates. So I think we'll have to shoot for a model where at least, huge majority of us are on board with whatever we are doing.

Unidentified Participant: And from a process point of view, those are the kind of elements, that also needs to be defined in the Charter. I think the constituency elements become more problematic, and it is difficult to draw the line where one constituency begins in some cases, and another ends. ISPs and registrars may play specific functions, but they are also businesses. So are they a business? Do they have a technical function? The constituencies don't break that cleanly across lines, so I think that kind of super-majority, or consensus concept really has to be what guides us.

- Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Wool-Ulrich speaking, on the EFG and in the GNSO, and I'm saying that so that you can see where the GNSO is where the -- it is a complex entity, and the different stakeholder groups we have already, and so maybe we can also then, explain that more and in London, so how -- on which basis we are going to work within that Coordination Committee.
- So, for example, for myself, as I was appointed by the Commercial Stakeholder Group, that means, either have in my background, a kind of supporting team because the Stakeholder Group consists of three constituencies. The ISPs, the Intellectual Property Constituency and the Business Constituency; and all three of them, they send one or two guys to that team so that I have somebody in the background where I can talk to and communicate to, what's going to happen here in this group. And so that is how we understand about the bottom-up model.
- So within our constituencies as well, it is going to be discussed, and these things are going on -- that forward, so that is the basis, maybe we could lay down that in the Charter as well, that it is well understood, how we are working. And on that basis then we can decide how we find our -- let me say, recommendations or decisions, through voting, if necessary at all, or by consensus.
- Jari Arkko: I think the other thing that -- discussing the constituencies in terms of representative capacities will do in the context of the Charter, it just may alert us, if we have a glaring omission of a constituency that isn't represented in any way.
- James Bladel: This is James. I just wanted to add that I think we should -- if we want to have these discussions that's fine, I think we should be, perhaps, a little cautious about revisiting the composition of the Committee, because I think that one, you know, I know that this was the result of some fairly extensive community feedback. And two, you know, we certainly don't want to be in a position where we are second-guessing other slices of the community, and whether -- you know, if we feel like they are -- they need more representation that's one thing, but if we feel like they are over-represented, or something like that, I think that's a very, you know, kind of sticky road that we may not want to go down. Particularly because I don't know that this Committee is empowered to change its structure.
- Or, maybe we are. Maybe that's one of the other things on the table that we can add or subtract from our existing membership. And I think, you know; if that is something that we are willing to entertain, then someone needs to, I guess, set me straight on that point. Thanks.
- Lynn St. Amour: This is Lynn St. Amour. I'd just like to really echo what James just said. There's an awful lot of work to do in a relatively short period of time. And, you know, I'm sure if we took a lot more time to debate all this, we might get something which is better. But likely we are able -- we are likely to just rerun a lot of discussions that have already been run with no significant advantage.
- I think we also need to think about representation, and make sure we are not confusing that with engagement or outreach. Because there are ways to get engagement and outreach, and have, you know, very robust communication without being a member of this Committee, and putting too much -- an (inaudible), if you will, under this Committee, will perhaps take away from the importance, I think a number of us place, and working back within our own communities and our own processes.
- Keith Drazek: This is Keith Drazek, I'd like to comment (inaudible) and give you some -- (inaudible) some questions to be -- to be heard, maybe could give -- are there other thoughts?
- Adiel Akplogan: Yes. Hi, Paul. This is Adiel. Can you all hear me now?
- Jari Arkko: Yes, (inaudible), Adiel.
- Adiel Akplogan: Okay. Well, thank you very much. Now, I have -- my first portion was about the reasons behind the request that the GAC -- the GAC has put forward for adding more representatives to the

Coordination Group. What is the reason behind that? Are they understanding that we'll have (inaudible), we are allowed to have them or not? That was my first question.

And my second question, which I was trying to ask the -- as part of the Charter, but it's something, maybe, we need to discuss as well, and agree on. As representative of different stakeholder in the Coordination Group, although we are appointed by them to work in the Coordination Group, we represent both interests in the Coordination Group, or do we just ensure, work together to ensure that the work that the Coordination Group would do, reflect, kind of, a multistakeholder consensus? Because having clarity on that, we really are -- seeing from the work that we are going to do, and can offer help solve the position of the GAC, which is asking for more representation of the (inaudible). So those are the questions I was trying to ask, but it seems you were not hearing when I was asking for the floor.

Jari Arkko: Good questions, Adiel. And I think, personally, that the more we make this a community thing, that the Multistakeholder Community that drives this and we are just coordinating. And it's the communities that drive their thing, and we are, again, just coordinating, making sure that if something is happening over there, and the difference groups be together, and that nothing is forgotten, the easier it is for us to get rid of too many -- too much heat regarding, you know, what the composition of the Group is, and everyone gets exactly the right representation. I hope that--

Keith Drazek: Sorry. This is Keith Drazek. I just want to jump in and completely agree with the recent statements that were made, that this Coordination Group really should be a facilitator for community bottom-up consensus recommendations in our IC (ph) to sort of -- as we look at the IANA functions, we are looking at three, sort of, major categories, if I'm not mistaken, naming, numbering, protocols. And part of the role of this Group, I think, is to ensure that the various communities, that may have very different processes, fit together and come together at the end, and a recommendation that is truly bottom-up and multistakeholder in a timely fashion. So I'd just simply like to reinforce the comments that were just made, I think by the last three speakers. Thanks.

Unidentified Participant: This is (Inaudible). (Inaudible) should we reinforce those comments, but there's no way to meet the IANA conditions -- I'm mean -- sorry, the NTIA conditions if we don't use that process; if we (inaudible/audio skip) and it doesn't meet the NTIA requirements.

Jari Arkko: You were breaking up.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah, I was just saying that the only way to meet the NTIA requirements is to have that kind of a broad-based, bottom-up consensus.

Daniel Karrenberg: This is Daniel. I think we all agree on that, but I think we have to also face that we actually have to achieve that consensus, and my personal opinion is, if it takes, you know, a couple of more people at the table, to deal with resistance that would otherwise be assured, let's have those people. We are already almost 30 people. I mean, it's like, you know, having 10 more is not going to make any difference in the practicalities. And if, and I say if, you know, bringing someone more to the table will make it -- make consensus in the end more likely, we should seriously consider it.

Paul Wilson: Well I have to say -- it's Paul here. I have to say I do agree with Daniel. I sure have got some -- a lot of sympathy for his proposal. Thanks.

Jari Arkko: Yeah. Although, let's not run next week's discussion here on this call. This sounds like an argument that we should have in London, about the general situation and the specific GAC situation.

Unidentified Participant: Just preparing.

Jari Arkko: That's fine. Thank you.

- Milton Mueller: Jari, this is Milton Mueller. I just want to say that I have to leave the call now.
- Jari Arkko: Okay. And that actually brings me to the point that I wanted to make, that it seems that we are roughly on the same page regarding the agenda. One thing that I think will be useful is for people to volunteer to take on some aspects of that, and provide some material from their sides, to the agenda points. And we'll send in something about the timeline, and we, from IETF and IAB, have promised to work on the Charter. There's lots of other things on the agenda, as well as it will probably be useful for other people to also think about the Charter as it's so important -- So, any volunteers for particular items?
- Keith Drazek: Maybe you should call out some items.
- Jari Arkko: Okay. The items were: charter, expectations to the communities, the timeline, sales organization, internal and external communication needs. The role and tasks of the Secretariat, and then the Coordination Group's own meeting and call scheduling.
- Keith Drazek: So perhaps this is something -- the assignments or something we can do on the email list. I'll probably need a little bit of time to think about it myself. This is Keith, sorry.
- Jari Arkko: Sure. That's fine too, and this is the last moment to decide what you want to work on. I can send the list again.
- Keith Drazek: The other thing I think that might be useful is, as we have different people who may be representative of different communities, those communities may have different consultation processes, and that may be just a useful thing to know, so that we understand the timing between events or the timing between the way we look at documents or positions, because of how will the outreach be done in that community, what is the process for that, is a useful input; so where people do not commit those processes to some form of writing, that would be useful for all of us to understand each other's processes.
- Unidentified Participant: If those could even just be pointers to Web pages where those processes already are, that would be fine.
- Adiel Akplogan: Yeah, this is Adiel. I talk -- something about the timeline. I think this is a serious discussion we need to have, but at the same time I think we, as the Coordination Committee, have to set some kind of framework for the timeline of the different community as well, because we have a very diverse community. Like, for instance, for the NRO (inaudible) we have our own timeline, but some element of that timeline would depend on what will be the global timeline.
- So by setting the global timeline from our side, meaning the Coordination Group, you know, will allow the other groups to adjust their own accordingly. So I think us, defining our timeline will be very fundamental to help others to do the same. So I'm not saying it's the other way around. I understand other timelines will be (inaudible), but I think it is us to define the global timeline so that others can -- others can adjust accordingly.
- Unidentified Participant: I understand that but, you know, there was a very bad experience with that concept at NETMundial, where the timeline for consultation was, in some cases, nonexistent. So on these process issues, I completely agree that at the end of the day, we are not revising ourselves based on timelines, but these are inputs to our decision-making process, also, considering the timeline.
- Jari Arkko: Exactly. Yeah. (Crosstalk)--
- Unidentified Participant: Yeah. And we can't really override what the communities will do, we can make a proposal and hopefully find some alignments with them, and among the whole set of communities.

- Daniel Karrenberg: This is Daniel. I'd like to second the idea that came up like three speakers ago; I didn't identify who spoke, to actually give an exposé of the various communities around the table, and what the processes are, and give some background information. So what I would suggest is that everybody on the call, and on the list, is encouraged to send a short exposé of that, telling who they are and what they are -- sort of background is. Like somebody has already said that they have groups behind them, and what the decision-making process in their community is. That would be extremely useful.
- Jari Arkko: Very good. I agree. Okay; anything else that we should do before the meeting next week?
- Daniel Karrenberg: This is Daniel again. So, let me just clarify. They are going to use the email list that ICANN provided for communication, right? So if everybody agreed on that, even, you know, though ICANN is reading it, you know, I have no problem with that. I think we should be as transparent as possible.
- Unidentified Participant: Yeah, I think that's fine too, because transparency is what we need.
- Jari Arkko: I think that's fine--
- Alissa Cooper: I think it's okay in the interim; I think it should be a point of discussion as to how -- You know, in the future, do we need a private list, and a public list? And you know, if we end -- I'm sure we will probably end up with our own, you know, sort of Web space, and do we just move the list up there? So I think it's fine for now, but we should have it be as part of our discussion about communication needs.
- Unidentified Participant: And part of that discussion should be to -- what the archive of that should be as well.
- Jari Arkko: Yeah. But in the interim, you know, before we have that discussion we need the list that ICANN provides, that was my point.
- Alissa Cooper: Yes; sounds good.
- Jari Arkko: Yes.
- Unidentified Participant: Sorry, is this in relation to the list on the IANA transition?
- Unidentified Participant: No. I thought we were talking about the internal-CG list.
- Jari Arkko: Yeah. That's what I was thinking about.
- Unidentified Participant: Okay.
- Unidentified Participant: Yes. We are only talking about that for now.
- Unidentified Participant: Right. I was confused (crosstalk) which list -- Okay, I was confused which list we were on at this point; apologies.
- Jari Arkko: The CG might have some external communication needs that we'll talk about in London, for a broader list, but for now we are -- the emails that we are sending between the members of this Group, that's the one that ICANN has created for us, and we'll use that for now.
- Unidentified Participant: The other thing I would say is, when we think about the consultations with the different communities, I think it's useful to make sure that we are all sending the same information for consultation with the communities. Because too often there can be an interpretation of something, and then communities are looking at different things, and then, you don't reach consensus because you've been having different discussions on related, but not similar topics.

Unidentified Participant: Elementary.

Jari Arkko: Okay. Any other points that people want to raise before we end this call?

Unidentified Participant: Well, thank you, Jari, and the IETF for pulling this together. I think this was very, very useful.

Jari Arkko: I feel good about next -- Thank you. And I feel good about next week. We have a good agenda from Alissa, and this discussion, I think, has been very useful and extending that, and bringing up the points that we have to discuss and some of the challenges ahead of us. So we are looking forward to meeting you all next week.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah. Thank you.

Jari Arkko: Thank you.

Unidentified Participant: Thanks. Bye.