DRAFT MINUTES: Sixth IANA Stewardship Coordination Group (ICG) Face-to-Face Meeting – Day 2

09:00 – 17:00 UTC – 8 (Local time, PDT), Saturday, 19 September 2015

Meeting agenda and archives

ICG Participants

Alan Barrett (NRO)	Lynn St Amour (IAB)
Alissa Cooper (IETF)	Manal Ismail (GAC)
Daniel Karrenberg (RSSAC)	Martin Boyle (ccNSO)
Demi Getschko (ISOC)	Mary Uduma (ccNSO)
Hartmut Glaser (ASO)	Michael Niebel (GAC)
James Bladel (GNSO)	Milton Mueller (GNSO)
Jandyr Ferreira dos Santos (GAC)	Mohamed El Bashir (ALAC)
Jari Arkko (IETF)	Narelle Clark (ISOC)
Jean-Jacques Subrenat (ALAC)	Patrik Fältström (SSAC)
Joseph Alhadeff (ICC/BASIS)	Paul Wilson (NRO)
Jon Nevett (gTLD Registries)	Russ Housley (IAB)
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)	Russ Mundy (SSAC)
Keith Davidson (ccNSO)	Wolf-Ulrich Knoben (GNSO)
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries)	Xiaodong Lee (ccNSO)
Lars-Johan Liman (RSSAC)	

Liaisons:
Elise Gerich (IANA Staff Liaison)
Kuo-Wei Wu (ICANN Board Liaison)

Apologies:
Thomas Schneider (GAC)

Secretariat:	**ICANN Support:**
Jennifer Chung	ICANN Technical Staff
Sherly Haristya	
Yannis Li	

1. RZM (Continued) (Mueller)
The discussion below is based on **Day 1: Action Item 6 and Action Item 7**
- Mueller highlighted principle number 2 – control of RZM in paragraph 1158 of the CWG proposal that states, "The CWG stewardship is not recommending any change in the functions performed by these two roles at this time. [But it] is recommending should there be proposals to make changes in the roles associated with root zone modification, such proposals should be subject to wide community consultation." He stated that that there is an ambiguity about what they mean by change in the functions performed by the RZM and IFO.
- Mueller referred to the draft question circulated to the internal-cg list and asked Mundy and other ICG members to weigh in.

- o Mundy agreed with the drafted text. He suggested adding introductory text for all questions the ICG will be sending back to the operational communities (OCs) explaining that the ICG is asking for clarification based on issues raised in the public comments the ICG received.
  - o Cooper suggested edits to the draft question on the Adobe Connect chat.
- Arasteh asked whether the CWG-IANA use of the phrase "wide community consultation" refers to a public comment or public consultation.
- Mueller concluded that the ICG will send the RZM question to CWG after including edits suggested by Mundy (preamble), Cooper (rewording), and the question raised by Arasteh ("wide community consultation"), and the clarification response will be reflected in part 0. See Action Item 1.

The discussion below is based on **Day 1: Action Item 5**:
- Mueller presented his write-up of public comments regarding the RZM/IFO agreement as circulated to the internal-cg mailing list.
- There was a discussion between Cooper, Alhadeff, Mueller and St. Amour on whether to cite the full range of comments in the summary pieces for each topic, or provide an overview characterization of the comments. There was general consensus to keep the summaries at a broader level.
- In response to Knoben and Arasteh, Mueller stated that the audience for the text is the commenters. He added that the key messages for ICG to convey is acknowledgement of the comments and what the ICG thinks the takeaway is for NTIA.
- Mundy suggested adding a summary of the major points gleaned from the public comments to the combined proposal as an appendix.
- Alhadeff proposed creating interim report containing summaries of the horizontal trends from the public comments. He suggested that this interim report could both be a tracking tool for the ICG and be a public record of how the ICG dealt with the public comments.
  - o Cooper summarized the ICG agreement to create this summary document and produce a summary for all the topics the ICG have and will be discussing during the face-to-face meeting. See Action Items 8 and 16.

2. Comment analysis

- Report from PTI sub-team

The discussion below is based on **Day 1: Action 4**:
- Fältström presented the slides from the PTI sub-team:
  - **Slide 1**: Issues have already been addressed and resolved by the community, thus no further ICG actions are needed.
  - **Slide 2**: Issues relating to the relationship between the CRISP and IANAPLAN proposals and the PTI. Fältström noted that submissions 72 (IAB) and 133 (CRISP Team) clarified several issues raised in the comments about the numbers and protocol parameters proposals. He stated that the ICG could include information from submissions 72 and 133 in part 0; or send a question to the OCs asking for confirmation that these questions are answered.
    - Gerich confirmed that the sub-team preferred sending a question to the OCs for confirmation. Arasteh agreed with this proposed action.
  - **Slide 3**: Issues relating to the PTI board. Fältström noted that there are questions on this issue that needs clarification from CWG.
  - **Slides 4 and 5**: Issues relating to separation. Fältström stated that this is largest category.
  - **Slide 6**: Suggested ICG process. Fältström stated that the ICG needs to first check that the issues have been correctly categorized (resolved or outstanding issue) before deciding whether to ask the OCs for clarification or confirmation.
- Fältström asked whether the ICG should delegate each category to ICG members that participated in the OC process to further filter through issues or discuss here as the whole ICG.
  - o Alhadeff stated that the participation of the whole ICG would be more useful.

- o Fältström suggested the first option. Fältström and Cooper split the slides to be further filtered by sub-teams. See Action Item 2.
- St. Amour asked if there is support for adding a section in the combined proposal that discusses PTI as a whole from the perspective of all three OCs.
- Gerich highlighted that a common thread in the comments was that people did not see the IANA functions communities as acting cooperatively. She suggested that the ICG should ask the OCs to make a statement on how they plan to cooperate going forward. See Action Item 10.
- Fältström reiterated the proposed escalation path for handling the public comments: whether the issues are addressed in the OCs and considered resolved; whether the ICG can further clarify in its text (part 0 or otherwise); or whether ICG needs to go back to the OCs to confirm a conclusion or ask for clarification.
  - o Cooper stated that the ICG's default position should be to see if it can be answered within the ICG, if not then the ICG should go back to the OCs.
- Ismail and Fältström suggested that the ICG should go through now and confirm that all slide 1 issues are categorized correctly, and if any other issues can be moved to slide 1.
  - o Wilson stated that point D1e on slide 4 while true, is regarded as an implementation issue and noted he will provide references in the SLA that cover this point.
  - o Boyle noted that the ICG must be very clear in documenting the basis of the conclusions that all the issues contained in slide 1 are addressed and resolved.
  - o Subrenat recalled a view regarding balancing the PTI board by stakeholder groups based on the submission 50/translation (CONAC), and suggested adding it as c24 to slide 1. See Action Item 4.

- NTIA criteria (Alhadeff)

Alhadeff gave an overview analysis of the NTIA criteria issues as raised in the comments (slides 29-34) and also referred to the draft summary circulated to the internal-cg list.

Issues raised (slides 29-34) **and discussion:**

- **Q5. Support for the multistakeholder model** (slide 30): Majority of commenters (62 out of 77) who answered this question believes that the proposal supports the multistakeholder model. Comments that claim the proposal does not support the multistakeholder model made points related to the question of inclusion and power dynamics across the community.
  - o Cooper pointed out that the question from NTIA is whether the proposal upholds the multistakeholder model and is different to whether the proposal was developed in a multistakeholder or inclusive fashion. She stated that the ICG should focus its answer on the specific criteria and should deal with the comments related to process either in part 0 or in the summary document.
  - o Cooper stated that the ICG has assessed openness and inclusiveness of the processes several times, and can assert that processes were open and inclusive (minimal complaints, observation of a broad participation). Mundy agreed.
- **Q6. Maintains security, stability, and resiliency of the DNS** (slide 31): Majority of commenters (42 out of 58) who answered this question believes that the proposal supports this criteria, or believes so conditional on the resolution of questions concerning issues such as PTI, separation processes, RZM. Comments that did not believe this criteria was satisfied pointed to concerns regarding jurisdiction or unilateral oversight that may create a parallel DNS system; concerns about the extent of accountability enhancements regarding ICANN responsibility; concerns regarding failure to appropriately deal with the root zone function; concerns about separation.
  - o Karrenberg, Alhadeff, Cooper and Arasteh noted that security and stability seemed to be referenced in a general way, and often out of place. Karrenberg suggested that the ICG should make clear in its deliverable that it can only address comments that clearly state what way security and stability was endangered.
- **Q7. Meets needs and expectation of IANA partners and customers** (slide 32): Majority of commenters (32 out of 48) who answered this question believes that the proposal satisfied this

criteria. Comments that expressed skepticism of this reiterated arguments made in answers to other questions as justification.

- o Alhadeff noted that there was an unintended scenario where commenters opted out of answering the question due to thinking that this question was not directed at them.
- **Q8. Maintains openness of the internet** (slide 33): Majority of commenters (32 out of 44) who answered this question believes the proposal fulfils this criteria.
- **Q9. Does not replace NTIA with government or intergovernmental solution** (slide 34): Majority (37 out of 47) of commenters who answered this question believes that the proposal does not replace NTIA's role with a government or intergovernmental solution. Concerns raised in comments (aside from jurisdiction issues) included IANA and ICANN remaining incorporated in the US; fears that PTI might seek to become an 'international organization'; role of GAC (voting role in the CCWG proposal); role of governments in the CSC via ccTLDs; and lack of legal immunity to guard against government interference.
  - o Boyle and Mundy noted that governments were mentioned in many comments as having a role as one of the stakeholder groups in the multistakeholder environment. Both suggested including clarification text in the topic summary.
  - o Mueller suggested answering the question of whether the proposal replaces the NTIA with a government or intergovernmental solution in a straightforward manner, and did not agree with singling out any particular stakeholder group.
    - Arasteh agreed with Mueller. *Adobe Connect chat:* Wilson and Subrenat concurred.
    - *Adobe Connect chat*: Drazek stated that the issues raised in the comments are not without merit but do not undermine the fact that the NTIA criteria is met by the proposal. He supported responding to this question narrowly.
      - *Adobe Connect chat*: St. Amour, Boyle, Subrenat and Santos agreed with Drazek.
  - o Cooper agreed with Mueller in that the ICG should stick to stating the facts and base it on what has been said in the component OC proposals. She added that the ICG can explain in the combined proposal what the envisioned role of governments is as well as what it isn't.
    - Alhadeff and Niebel agreed with Cooper's proposal.
  - o Lee stated that the ICG does not need concern itself with trying to define the multistakeholder model or clarify the role governments play. He supported simply stating that is it a multistakeholder solution. Mueller restated Lee's suggestion that the ICG go back to the OCs to clarify concerns raised in the comments regarding the perception of the role of the US government.

Alhadeff summarized the ICG agreement to look at part 0 to see if there is a place to factually state the role of governments as a stakeholder in the multistakeholder process, and narrowly answer this question in the context of the NTIA criteria. See Action Item 9. Alhadeff was asked and accepted the co-editor role for the summary document. See Decisions Taken 4.

- ccTLD issues (Knoben)
Knoben gave an overview analysis of the ccTLD issues raised in the comments (slide 22):
- 17 comments (approx.) raised ccTLD related issues, most were affiliated with ccTLD managers or related organizations. Knoben highlighted that in the first pass analysis done by the volunteer group, one ccTLD comment was rated as 'hostile'.

Issues raised (slide 22) **and Discussion:**

A: References in Section P1.II.Ai: to reflect the changing policy development in the ccTLD space; editorial request to remove references to ICP-1 and other outdated texts.
- Boyle suggested that the ICG ask for confirmation from CWG-IANA regarding the editorial request. Davidson and Cooper concurred with Boyle.
- Knoben summarized that point A1 in the slide is not contentious and point A2 is a point of clarification to CWG-IANA. See Action Item 3.

B: **No appeals mechanism for ccTLD delegation/re-delegation**
- ▪ Knoben noted this is an open and contentious point. Boyle concurred and added this should be considered a post transition item.
- ▪ Davidson in his capacity as ccNSO Council vice chair explained that ccNSO is considering forming working groups to specifically address the appeal mechanism in RFC 1591 and develop policy for retirement of ccTLDs between now and ICANN 54. He added that the ccNSO is also seeking agreement with the ICANN board to defer delegations and re-delegations that are not impacting the security and stability of the Internet until the policies are developed.
  - • Gerich and Davidson agreed that the ccNSO and IANA should discuss the deferral point.
- ▪ Knoben raised a point of discussion: "What would happen in case a decision takes place and there is no PDP at that time and the oversight function of the NTIA is going away."
  - • Arasteh stated that the only action the ICG could take on this issue is to flag this as currently developing work in CCWG-Accountability.
  - • Davidson responded that there has been no appeal mechanism in history and the NTIA going away will not change that. *Adobe Connect* chat: Getschko agreed.
- ▪ Cooper concluded that the ICG will have no action for this point, but to cross-reference the work in CCWG-Accountability and draft text on this topic for the summary document.
  - • Arasteh, Uduma and Boyle agreed. See Action Items 17 and 18.

C: **Composition of IFR**: optional rather than mandatory requirement for 1 non ccNSO ccTLD
- ▪ Boyle explained that there were very few non ccNSO ccTLDs active in this environment, and noted this could be clarified with the CWG. Davidson and Mueller agreed. See Action Item 3.

D: **Proposal worsening positions for ccTLDs individually and collectively**
- ▪ Boyle noted that this can be categorized as an individual view as it came from one ccTLD comment. Davidson agreed with Boyle and added that this does not affect the consensus of support from the ccNSO (155 ccTLDs), CENTR (40 or more European ccTLDs).
- ▪ Knoben concluded that there is no further comment to be made by the ICG on this point.

E: **Service Level Expectations (SLEs) to be in place prior to transition**
- ▪ Davidson stated that the SLE matrix has been finalized and is moving towards implementation with IANA. He suggested that the ICG should receive the matrix formally and append them to the names proposal to form part of the combined proposal.
- ▪ Cooper flagged this point for discussion as part of the 'completeness' agenda item later.

Discussion on the process of ICG interactions with the OCs coming out of this meeting:
In response to Karrenberg's request for clarification, Cooper proposed four categories of ICG actions:
  - i. No action needed (comments forwarded to the OCs as an FYI)
  - ii. Clarification question (no text change to the proposal)
  - iii. Refer comments received to OCs, OCs may decide to send back edited text to be incorporated in the ICG proposal
  - iv. Refer comments received to OCs, OCs may decide to send back edited text that require substantial changes to the ICG proposal.

There were no objections from the ICG members with the proposed categories. See Decisions Taken 3

3. Future call and meeting planning (Chairs)
Fältström gave an overview of the upcoming calls and face-to-face meeting schedule:
- • **ICG Call 23** – Wednesday, 23 September: 11:00-12:30UTC
- • **ICG Call 24** – Thursday, 8 October: 19:00-20:30 UTC
- • **ICG Dublin face-to-face meeting and working sessions**:
  - o Saturday, 17 October: 13:00-17:00 UTC+1 (local time)
  - o Sunday, 18 October: 09:00-13:00 UTC+1 (local time)
  - o Monday, 19 October: Townhall session 10:30-12:30* UTC+1 (local time) *Tentative timeslot

- Thursday, 22 October: 10:30-12:30 UTC+1 (local time)
- Friday, 23 October: 09:00-17:00 UTC+1 (local time)

There were concerns that the plan to finalize the ICG proposal in ICANN 54 is overly ambitious, however the ICG has agreed on to proceed with its work and move forward as much as possible. See Decisions Taken 1. ICG members highlighted the importance to give the OCs sufficient time to discuss their response to the ICG questions, and agreed with phrasing the questions with some flexibility. It was decided that the ICG will finalize questions for the OCs before Call 23 (23 September), and request a response from the OCs by 7 October (before Call 24) or 14 October (before the Dublin meeting).

2. Comment analysis (continued)

- ICG criteria (Chairs)

Cooper gave an overview analysis of the ICG criteria issues raised in the comments (slides 25-28):

Issues raised (slides 25-28) **and Discussion:**

- **Q1. Completeness and clarity** (slide 25): discussed on Day 1 and also slated for discussion later.
- **Q2. Compatibility and interoperability** (slide 26): The majority of comments viewed the proposals as compatible. Commenters who viewed the proposal as incompatible generally opposed the overall transition. Some commenters who had reservations regarding compatibility reiterated issues they had with other elements such as IPR and PTI related issues.
  - Arasteh stated that the IPR and PTI related issues are not relevant to compatibility.
    - Cooper responded that commenters put their answers in the questionnaire wherever they chose and thus may not necessarily be related to the question. She noted that this can be stated in topic summary for the summary document. See Action Item 19.
- **Q3. Accountability** (slide 27): dependency with CCWG-Accountability's work discussed on Day 1.
- **Q4. Workability** (slide 28): Most commenters (48 out of 60) viewed the proposal as workable or conditionally workable. Most commenters who believed that the proposal is not workable opposed the overall transition. Additional workability issues include:
  C1. ICANN needs to be turned into a California for-profit organization to become accountable;
  C2. ICANN Board can alter its own rules while recall procedure is in process.

Discussion:

- Wilson reminded the ICG to not discount comments that opposed the overall transition without careful consideration of the reasons given by the commenters.
  - Alhadeff and Cooper agreed that this point should be considered across all the topics discussed.
- Knoben asked whether submissions that commented about the complexity of the proposal belong in the workability section.
  - Karrenberg suggested that the ICG address the issue of complexity in its deliverable.
  - Alhadeff noted three ways complexity was raised in the comments:
    i. complaints that the ICG did not merge the three proposals into one seamless proposal;
    ii. complexity due to administrative burdens of the overall process;
    iii. creation of PTI as an addition of unnecessary complexity and bureaucracy.
    Alhadeff viewed the first category of comments as under ICG's remit could be further clarified, and the other two concepts have been addressed by the OCs.
  - Wilson elaborated on Alhadeff's first category and explained that the original ICG decision was to solicit the component proposals from the OCs to be developed through a bottom-up and not a top-down process.
  - Cooper stated that the ICG could bring the text from their charter into the proposal explaining the reason why the ICG solicited proposals from the three OCs. See Action Item 11.
- Karrenberg asked whether the questions 4 C1 and C2 are accountability questions that belong in the CCWG-Accountability process.
  - Cooper suggested noting the receipt of these comments in the topic summary for the summary document. See Action Item 20.

4. Role of ICG in implementation phase (Chairs) (continued from Day 1)

The ICG received submissions that commented about the need for ICG to have a role during the implementation phase (slide 35).

- Karrenberg and Arasteh stated that the ICG will need to have a new charter if the ICG will take any role during the implementation phase.
- Cooper proposed deferring the discussion on this topic to the ICG face-to-face meeting in ICANN 54 Dublin. See Decisions Taken 2.

5. Items leftover from earlier sessions
- IANA IPR (Arkko)

Arkko presented the circulated text for part 0 regarding the IANA IPR.

- ICG members commented that the OCs have not settled on the solution as being the IETF Trust, and details are still being worked on. The ICG agreed to have the part 0 text precisely reflect the text from the CRISP proposal. Arkko agreed to circulate another draft based on this. See Action Item 12.

- Circle back on RZM

Mueller presented the circulated revised question for CWG-IANA on RZM:

- There was discussion about what the ICG will do after receiving the answer from CWG, since the RZM is not within ICG's scope. Editorial suggestions were made to frame the context as the ICG receiving this question from the public comments and requesting for clarification from CWG. Regarding the response when received from CWG, it is proposed that this be worked into the summary document which will be publicly available. See Action Item 1.

- Circle back on proposal completeness topic

Cooper asked whether the ICG needs to do any or all of the three tasks:
    i.   summarize these comments in the summary document;
    ii.   create/complete an inventory of implementation issues;
    iii.   prioritize the implementation steps

The ICG agreed that a summary of the comments and an inventory of the implementation steps is needed. See Action Items 15 and 22.

- Process issues

Cooper stated that the ICG needs to summarize the comments related to process for the summary document. See Action Item 21.

Mueller offered a high-level categorization of the process comments:

- Commenters that rejected the legitimacy of the entire process because the US government set the parameters.
- Commenters that claim they did not have a full opportunity to participate.
- Commenters that confirmed that the process was inclusive and had diverse participation.

- Institutionalization of NTIA criteria

See Action Item 13.

- Editorial issues

There were several comments related to editorial issues (slide 19):

- IETF raised two transition points in paragraph 3062 and requested that it be added to part 0.
  - Cooper noted that the first point should also be handled by the person creating the implementation list. See Action Item 15.
- IANAPLAN draft expired July 10, 2015.
  - Arkko clarified that the draft has an expiration date specified, but it does not actually expire.
  - Arkko confirmed Cooper's query that the draft will remain with an expiration date in the past until after the ICG is done with its process.

- Suggestions to improve the clarity of the review mechanisms the numbers community has with PTI as shown on the [diagram on pg. 10 of the combined proposal](#).
  - o Cooper will work with XPLANE and make a proposal back to internal-cg list and numbers community.
- Comments on freedom and free speech in relation to IANA functions.
  - o Drazek that noted these comments would be more appropriately addressed in the ongoing human rights discussions in CCWG-Accountability, and not by the ICG.
  - o There was agreement to acknowledge the receipt of these comments in the summary document. See [Action Item 23](#).

6. Does the proposal have broad community support?

Cooper asked the ICG members to consider this question:

- Karrenberg noted that the ICG members may have subjective views, but the ICG has to come to a consensus as a whole. Karrenberg believed the ICG proposal has community support in all dimensions. St. Amour agreed. *Adobe Connect chat*: Arkko and Mundy concurred.
- Boyle stated that the OCs processes are based on developing consensus proposals, and noted that the CWG, with all the difficult discussions, never had to resort to voting.
- Alhadeff pointed out that the entire interactive process with the stakeholder communities; the outreach done; and the open consultations on the component and combined proposals all speaks to the breadth of the community exposure without having to make a judgment characterizing the support as being broad or not.

The ICG agreed that the combined proposal has received a breadth of support and agreed that the ICG should describe this breadth of support in part 0. See [Action Item 14](#).

Overall Summary of Action Items (Day 1 and Day 2):

Work that might result in communications to OCs – Deadline: September 22 at 23:59 UTC

1. **Mueller to edit question to CWG concerning RZM (take Arasteh's suggestion into account) and circulate to the ICG list.**

2. **Sub-teams to do the next level filtering for PTI related issues listed in the PTI slide deck, review comments received, and make recommendations for ICG course of action** (http://icgsec.asia/1FTPuNB).

   a. Sub-team Slide 2: Housley, Barrett
   b. Sub-team Slide 3: Knoben, Arkko, Barrett
   c. Sub-team Slides 4, 5: Boyle, Mueller, Wilson, Arkko

3. **Boyle to draft a note to CWG regarding Points A and C on slide 22 (**http://icgsec.asia/1Kt8l39**) on ccTLD issues.**

4. **Secretariat to work with Subrenat to add a point C24 to slide 1 in the PTI slide deck concerning composition of the PTI Board based on the submission number 50. (to be confirmed with Subrenat)**

Work for Part 0 – Deadline: September 27 at 23:59 UTC

5. **Cooper to write up summary of comments in general, e.g. statistics, general support or opposition, etc. (was Day 1 action item 1.)**

6. **Cooper to add the expectation of numbers and protocol parameter community in regard to the scope of PTI in the Part 0. (was Day 1 action item 2)**

7. Boyle to draft text summarizing comments and highlighting concerns received re jurisdiction to include in Part 0. (was Day 1 action item 3)

8. Mueller to extract/draft text about RZM for Part 0.

9. Alhadeff to redraft text about the role of governments based on the names community proposal; separate the summary of comments from ICG conclusions related to NTIA criteria.

10. St. Amour, Gerich, and Fältström to summarize how collaboration works today between the OCs.

11. Karrenberg and Wilson to draft text related to "complexity" for Part 0 of the proposal.

12. Arkko to edit Part 0 text concerning IANA IPR.

13. Cooper to draft text re Institutionalization of NTIA criteria for Part 0.

14. Chairs to draft text describing community support for the proposal.

15. St.Amour to create inventory of items to be completed in the implementation phase.

Work for the summary document – Deadline: October 6 at 23:59 UTC

16. Mueller to extract text about RZM for the summary.

17. Davidson to draft the summary of ccTLD related comments regarding point B on slide 22.

18. Knoben to draft summary of ccTLD comments on slide 22 other than point B.

19. Chairs to draft text summarizing comments about compatibility/interoperability for the summary document.

20. Karrenberg and Wilson to summarize workability-related comments for the summary document.

21. Cooper to summarize the comments on process for the summary document.

22. St.Amour to summarize the comments on proposal completeness for the summary document.

23. Chairs to draft text acknowledging receipt of the comments related to freedom and free speech in the summary document.

Overall Summary of Decisions taken (Day 1 and Day 2):

1. ICG to continue with its process and aim to make as much progress as possible on the ICG proposal by Dublin.

2. ICG to defer discussion regarding 'Role of ICG in implementation phase' to face-to-face meeting in Dublin.

3. ICG public comments sent to the OCs to follow the following four categories:
   a. No action needed (comments forwarded to the OCs as an FYI)
   b. Clarification question (no text change to the proposal)
   c. Refer comments received to OCs, OCs may decide to send back edited text to be incorporated in the ICG proposal
   d. Refer comments received to OCs, OCs may decide to send back edited text that require substantial changes to the ICG proposal.
4. Alhadeff and Ismail to be the co-editors of the summary document.