SINGAPORE - ICG Face to Face Singapore
Saturday, March 7, 2015 – 09:00 to 17:00 SGT
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Good morning, everyone. We will be starting now. I hope you had good night and be able to visit beautiful Singapore.

We're going to start by seeing the agenda items proposed and we're going to agree on it so we can start.

For the transcript, this is Mohamed El Bashir. We're just waiting for the agenda to be posted.

We have some technical difficulties and hope it can be solved soon so we can be in Adobe and also we can display the meeting agenda.

Okay. So maybe just to save time, we're going to start with the protocol parameters proposal, and we're going to hear the outcome of yesterday's discussion and any questions agreed to be at least reviewed by ICG.

Then at 10:00, we're going to start discussing the numbering proposal and also the outcome of yesterday's discussion and any

questions.

After the break, we're going to review ICG time line and we're going to have a working lunch. We're going to discuss handling community comments, where Manal will brief us.

And accountability will be at 1:00, also working lunch.

And then we're going to conclude by the future teleconferences.

So any comments on the agenda, so we can start?

Okay. I see none. We can proceed.

So we're going to start with the protocol parameters proposal and the outcome of yesterday's discussion.

Jari?

JARI ARKKO: Yes. Good morning. And we had a good discussion, actually very productive, very practical and constructive, and so I wanted to say a few things at the beginning and then since Milton is just setting up, maybe he can go into the -- some of the questions that we

went through.

So we basically began with a discussion of what kinds of questions we could even be asking. Sort of a characterization or classification of questions. And we came up with three categories.

The first one is kind of like more information. One example of that is what I did yesterday when I answered the question on what is this IAOC thing and how can we -- how does the IETF approach contracting and negotiations. Like factual information that I can, for instance, provide without going back to my community. And that's one class, and also be -- you can factor in there other things that we talked about yesterday during the main sessions, like how do you -- how do you plan to go forward from what your plan or proposal has, what are the next steps, that kind of stuff.

Another category was that we have some new information or some new questions.

As an example, we find that two or three proposals have some differences where they should be the same and we might want to ask the communities, you know, what -- what they -- you know, why are they different and what do they intend to do about

aligning them.

One example that came up yesterday was this question about IANA.org. The IETF proposal speaks about different things than the RIR proposal.

And then the third category is kind of a disagreement. "Okay, so you propose X and we don't agree with that." And that, of course, is a problematic category to ask, because then basically we, either as individuals here -- and I as a member of the ICG -- disagree with your community's proposal or we as the whole ICG perhaps, even.

And then the problem with that is -- of course is that then you're going against what the community, hopefully with informed discussion, has already decided to do and maybe that's necessary in some cases but we have to be just very, very careful with that.

So that was the setup.

And then we went through the protocol parameters and numbers and what kinds of questions we might be asking.

Milton, do you want to cover that or --

JARI ARKKO: I'm sorry?

The question or questions.

[ Music playing ]

MILTON MUELLER: Hello. I should have a flourish of music every time I --

UNIDENTIFY SPEAKER: Music for you.

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah. I am Milton Mueller.

UNIDENTIFY SPEAKER: With music background.

MILTON MUELLER: With music background, okay.

UNIDENTIFY SPEAKER: Ta-dah, ta-dah, ta-dah, ta-dah.

Ta-dah, ta-dah, ta-dah, ta-dah.

[ Laughter ]

MILTON MUELLER: These Germans. It's always Beethoven. Okay. All right.

So I sent a question to the list. Did you see it? "Proposed question for the protocols OC: The IETF IANA plan working group did not think a formal request to change the arrangements regarding the IANA trademark and the IANA.org domain was necessary as part of its transition proposal, but Section 3.A.2 of the RIR proposal says it is the preference of the Internet number community that all relevant parties agree to certain expectations related to IANA.org and the IANA trademark as part of the transition.

If this formal request was required by the other communities, would the IETF be willing to make its proposal compatible with that request?"

So that was my proposed question.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah. And I guess we can go into discussion of that. I mean that seems like a reasonable question to ask, given the situation. But we also had some -- a few other things, smaller things, so that one

falls into this category of new question or compatibility with other proposals or how -- you know, something that we have detected at this stage rather than something that we asked earlier.

The other ones were a little bit more in the category of asking more information. I'll just list them for completeness sake.

We had a discussion about the contract situation kind of associated with the IAOC points made yesterday, so that's certainly something that we -- from the IETF side continue -- plan to continue to provide more information on, and it's a very reasonable question to ask.

And in association with that, we also discussed whether the -- whether it would be helpful for the ICG to make some kind of statement or comment that continuous improvement or certain types of things from the proposal, as I said, that seeing them go forward as soon as possible would be helpful.

And I think that would actually be a good thing that we, from IETF at least, are believers in this continuous improvement, that we keep improving the contracts, whether we have an ongoing major transition process or not.

Then we talked about jurisdiction a little bit, and one specific sort of factual clarification that was talked about was that we get to understand the situation with regards to IAB role in deciding any disputes, and as noted yesterday, at least in the evening session, maybe also in the main session, if you look at the MoU, then if there's a dispute between IETF and ICANN, then IAB gets to decide what to do. Sort of final arbitration power.

And that's not a new thing. That's just how things are. But it was maybe not so clear in the proposal itself but it's clear if you read the reference documents.

And then Kavouss asked about clarification regarding oversight of the NTIA in the current situation, and I believe we say something to the effect of NTIA having no operational role in the oversight in the current arrangement either.

So that was the list for protocol parameters.

Any discussion on that?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: On the list, I have Lars and Alissa.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Lars Liman. Regarding the question to the parameter proposals group, I -- I have a hunch that this is doing exactly what we said we shouldn't do.

While I totally agree that this is the right thing to have happen, shouldn't we ask to the two groups to coordinate between themselves instead of trying to go through ourselves?

JARI ARKKO: Mohamed, do you want me to answer?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah, please.

JARI ARKKO: I think that's a reasonable question to ask. It's definitely another mode of operation that the ICG could take.

You know, "We've noticed that there's this discrepancy or this difference and does it matter and do you want to work it out between yourselves, communities?" Yeah. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Alissa, please.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, Mohamed.

I was just going to comment on the question that Milton proposed because I think it actually -- I think we should actually just reference the whole -- if -- however we phrase it, we should reference the whole paragraph from the RIR proposal that is related to the trademark and IANA.org.

I think the part that's quoted in the question is actually about -- in reference to a different paragraph about in-addr.arpa, so just wanted to note that. There's a whole paragraph in there about IANA.org and the trademark and that's the one that we should reference when we -- however we phrase it, whether it's the Lars version or some other version.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Jari?

JARI ARKKO: So I wanted to add my own comment, basically replaying what I think I said yesterday, that there's actually two sides of this comment.

So the way that, Milton, you have phrased this now, it's asking the IETF if we could accommodate this, but I think the other side of it

is that if you look at the two communities, one came to the conclusion that, "Okay, so this is not absolutely necessary"; the other one came to the conclusion that it is.

And you could also ask the RIR whether they -- you know, why do they believe this is absolutely necessary.

And so I -- I guess this just goes to Lars' point that, you know, maybe the right thing to do here is to ask the communities to work it out between themselves. You know, "Please align better" or, you know, "We observe this and, you know, maybe some further alignment would be useful here," and whether that goes into one direction or the other direction, that's kind of up to the communities, as long as the outcome is alignment.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah, Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: Well, I think if you read the question, that's pretty much what we're asking them to do is to -- we're not saying "Make it compatible." We're saying, "Would you be willing to make it compatible?"

So I don't know how else you would ask them to do it.

I will, however, add the fact that the point that we're discussing here was precisely the reason the IETF did not achieve full consensus, that there were very strong advocates, including some of the people who overlapped with the two communities, for taking a more direct approach to the trademark and domain issues within the IETF, and that was a very serious point of contention, so that it would seem that I think the -- in some sense the burden of proof is on the IETF to say why shouldn't be done, rather than the other way around.

It's not like we're telling them what to do. It's just we're saying, "Here's another community that said they're going to do this. Why aren't you going to do that?"

It's a question, not a request for anything in particular.

RUSS HOUSLEY: This is Russ, and my view of that discussion was that the IETF wouldn't mind this to happen, but that the question that settled it was, "Does this have to happen in order for the transition to occur?" And the consensus was it didn't, even though it would be a good thing to happen in the long run.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. I have Russ Mundy, Daniel, Arasteh, and Joe.

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you, Mohamed. My point that I'd like to make is to reinforce what Liman said a little bit ago, in that our function is to identify conflicts, gaps, things of that nature, and it really -- this seems to be a very positive, if you will, example of how we've seen two communities reach two different conclusions and what -- the phrasing that should go back to them, I think, should be a relatively neutral phrasing. Not that one community is right or one community is wrong; it's that we've found these inconsistencies between these two proposals and ask that they come to a common conclusion, because in fact, I think it is a point where they are different and it would be difficult to say that we have a common result going to NTIA.

I think it's probably -- it's very conceivable that either community could go one way or the other, but it's not really up to us to even try to intone the question so that it would influence one way or the other.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Daniel, please.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: This is Daniel.

Russ exactly -- said exactly what I wanted to say, and let me add as a suggestion that we do not only ask this question to the protocol parameters but to the numbers at the same time and use the same question.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Mr. Arasteh.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Kavouss speaking. You call me by my last name. Thank you very much. I think the two previous colleagues mentioned what I wanted to say. The question need to be --

UNIDENTIFY SPEAKER: We cannot hear you.

UNIDENTIFY SPEAKER: Speak into the mic.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: To both, the question needs to be addressed to both without saying what is wrong and what is right. We say this is -- I would not discrepancies, a difference of approach. And we would seek

that they talk together with the possibility to come sort of a solution. So I think we already have the solution proposed by Russ and by Daniel, and we put the wording and ICG take a neutral position at this stage. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Milton, a quick response before Joe.

MILTON MUELLER: Well, I just wondered if anybody -- I think we have two constructive decisions for moving forward here. One of them is to change the wording of this in a way that is addressing both communities. The other is to reword it and send two separate requests, one to numbers and one to protocols. And I just wondered what people want to do.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah, Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thanks. I guess I would be in the favor of the let's address both communities and let's just make it, "We found a discrepancy, resolve it among yourselves." And I think we leave it to the communities to determine which is the best joint outcome for

them.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I will put myself in the queue before Alissa and Alan. I think there is some sort of consensus here that we need to send for both communities. So I think if that is what is, let's say, the mood in the room, I think we can proceed on this basis.

So, Alissa, please.

ALISSA COOPER: I agree. Send the same question to both.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Alan?

ALAN BARRETT: Alan Barrett. So within the CRISP team, I think we expect the ICG to be able to deal with this -- the fact that some action was requested in one proposal but not the other. I don't think we saw it as a conflict. So I'm fine with the suggestion that's been made here that we send a request to both communities to work it out between themselves. I'm pretty sure we can do that.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Thank you.

Anything else on the protocol parameters proposal? Any discussion points?

If not, we can save time and proceed to the numbers proposal because we have some colleagues who will be leaving in the afternoon, if there is no objection.

Okay.

So on the numbers proposal, Paul?

ALISSA COOPER: Sorry, Mohamed. I put my hand back up. Can I just ask, so what is the plan as far as everything else that Jari discussed? Like, what is the plan in terms of communicating something back or not or what are the next steps?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: We agree we are going to communicate to both communities.

Milton?

ALISSA COOPER: Sorry, not about the iana.org.

MILTON MUELLER: I'm just working on some alternative language.

ALISSA COOPER: (indiscernible)

MILTON MUELLER: I couldn't hear. I'm just working on some alternative language, Alissa, which I will send to the list in three minutes.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Jari?

ALISSA COOPER: Alternative language concerning the other points? Jurisdiction? NTIA oversight? All of those items aside from iana.org and the trademarks?

JARI ARKKO: This is Jari. Yes, I think I see your point, Alissa. You are asking about the other questions. I would personally characterize those as belonging to a different category of questions. These are not questions back to the community, "do you want to rethink something." It is more like request for more information. And I

think those could actually live on a different -- different piece of paper basically so we can -- or I can make that list and send it around on the ICG mailing list and we can provide information on each of those points, now and continuing into the future as we get more information. Would that be more acceptable for those other things?

ALISSA COOPER: That works for me. I just wanted to make sure someone had the action item. Thanks.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thanks. So we can move on now to numbers proposal. Paul?

PAUL WILSON: It's Paul here. I'm not sure what the question is. Are we talking about questions that came up during last night's session? If so, I don't have any.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Any discussion points? Okay, Joe.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Actually, there was a question that came up during last night's conversation. It was a clarification which might come in the terms

of the contract, and that was: Could the RIRs separately exercise their decision to work with the numbers operator and, therefore, have multiple numbers operators with RIRs?

Equally the question is since you have five contracting entities -- well, six, when you consider the numbers operator, will the contract be specifying a jurisdiction or will you have the opportunity for the contract to be interpreted in six different jurisdictions, which may lead to divergent outcomes? So those were all things which I know you can't answer at the moment because they are dependent on the contract drafting.

But the concept is that it might be useful to provide these inputs to the community as constructive things they should be looking at during the contract drafting.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Do we need -- Joe, can you take the lead and draft that question?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: It was sent five minutes ago.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you.

Okay. Seems there is no other discussion points.

Daniel, you have something?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: This is Daniel. I have to say I'm confused. About five minutes ago, I thought we had agreement to ask -- formally ask one specific question to the numbers and the protocol parameters about intellectual property and ask no other formal questions.

Now, after the exchange between Alissa and Jari, I'm confused whether there is another track still going on formulating formal questions to be asked or not because my impression from yesterday's discussion, and this morning's discussion, was that that was the only question we were going to -- that we had decided here to formally ask. So can you clarify that for me, please.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Jari, please.

JARI ARKKO: My view on this -- and it could be that you guys have a different view. But I think we only had one formal question for the community, which we discussed. And then we have some

additional pieces of requests for additional information that don't have to go to the communities necessarily. They could be answered by me and Russ, for instance, explaining or other ICG members, This is how we work with contracting with IETF, factual information, or this is the status of process for X. So I think it's a more internal ICG thing than a question to the community.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Daniel?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: My impression was -- this is Daniel -- that we spent considerable time yesterday doing exactly that and that we were finished with that.

JARI ARKKO: That might possibly be the case. I don't know if you want to write down in an email the questions and the answers. I think that's what we're looking at more than anything else. But I guess it is up to you. I can provide more answers or repeat the previous answers if you want. But do you need it?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Milton, please.

MILTON MUELLER: I think Daniel is right, that we had discussed these questions yesterday and we had gotten satisfactory answers. However, I saw no reason why with respect to the jurisdiction question the question could not be put to them formally and their proposal clarified, you know, in ways that don't really add new information so presumably you could do that without going through a long process. But it would just make the proposal clearer and less subject to question to get that vague comment about jurisdiction out of your proposal and a more precise answer in there. That was my understanding.

So I was glad that Alissa raised the question because I do think clarification is needed even though it doesn't really involve modifying the substance of the proposal.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Alissa, and then Jari, Russ.

ALISSA COOPER: So in response to Daniel, I was just going to say that I think it would be useful to have, as Jari said, a summary of the answers, perhaps the questions, in an email just to put a capstone on the, you know, somewhat lengthy discussion that we had (indiscernible) sort of buried in the minutes of a full-day meeting.

At the very minimum I think that would be useful so we are all on the same page about how we concluded that discussion.

So that's what I thought Jari was intending to do. But now Milton has raised a different possibility which I don't really have -- I mean, we need to discuss whether there is a question that needs to go back to the community. I was thinking not.

But the other thing we can do is two separate -- that's where Jari writes down the summary and then we decide from there whether we think there is a question that needs to go back to the community.

JARI ARKKO: This is Jari. I think that's roughly the right approach. I mean, we have to consider it's more people than the people around this table. So if we have question marks around the process, getting those written up and kind of a frequently asked questions list, I think it will be a useful thing for others as well.

I'm a little reluctant to ask questions back to the community unnecessarily unless we really think there's a real thing that people need to look at because that could be misinterpreted. So I'd rather do this in this not a formal question route than the

formal question route. But, you know, it's ICG's decision.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Mr. Arasteh.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. Kavouss speaking. Yesterday, I raised two questions.

(off microphone).

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Sorry. Keep quiet. Why are you shouting? We have a chair. And Chair could tell to speak into the microphone.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: If you could speak loud in the microphone, that would be useful.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Could you maintain the order of the meeting or not? This is the first time I (indiscernible) everybody.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Please, Mr. Arasteh, please proceed.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I raised two questions yesterday. One was on Section II(b)(2). At the end of the paragraph, RIR said -- replied that if the policy sources identified as Section 2A are affected, identify which one. Explain the situation.

The answer is, however, it would remove a significant element of oversight from the current system. (indiscernible) how it will be replaced because it really is mentioned that oversight will be taken. There will be no oversight. So how this gap will fill up? This is the first question.

The second question that I raised yesterday was on Section III(a) and I raise the question in the paragraph before Section III (a)(1) and Paul said that he does not have the text before himself and he would consult and come back and reply to the questions. These are the two questions that I raise, and I would very much appreciate if answer be given to that. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Mr. Arasteh. Just to confirm, you were reading from the numbers proposal?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Exact.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you.

I have Lars and Paul if you can give a response to Mr. Arasteh.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: This is Lars Liman speaking into a microphone. It is much easier to maintain order during the meeting if people speak into the microphones so we can hear what's being said.

My comment is that if things are removed in a proposal, maybe it's because they are superfluous. Maybe they are not needed.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Paul, please.

PAUL WILSON: I'm not sure I understand the question. There was some issues raised by Mr. Arasteh yesterday about that particular section of the document. And I thought they were simply to be noted for the information of the CRISP team. So the question for me I don't understand.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Mr. Arasteh, can you please repeat the question again?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. The first question is answered by Lars that perhaps that oversight was not -- or is not needed anymore. That means at present, there is this oversight. But if the transition will take place, that oversight is not required. I am not convinced of that, why it is not required. And I would wish very much that the real reply to these questions but not others.

Number two, Section III, it mentioned that it is assumed that -- first of all, it is an assumption -- I would like to know whether this assumption is the fact in reality.

And, second, it is mentioned that there is a need to coordinate between these three communities, and I would like to know who will make that coordination. I hope this time the question is clear.

Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Paul.

PAUL WILSON: All I can do is suggest that we ask the CRISP team to clarify those issues.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: So we have an action item that we need clarity -- clarification from the CRISP team.

Daniel?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: I'm not here as an RIR, but I read the proposal. The answer to Mr. Arasteh's questions are in the proposal in the section subsequent to II(b)(2). And they follow the format of our RFP.

So the specific questions of what replaces this is oversight is covered in the proposal on page 7 and 8 in detail.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Alissa, please.

ALISSA COOPER: Daniel said what I was going to say. I was just going to try to help clarify.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Thank you.

Any other issues? Michael, please.

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Michael Niebel. Just for my clarification, for the presentation of these two strands to the outside, we have questions and we had a discussion yesterday where some other questions were answered which are not reappearing in the questions of today.

Now, for the outside world to see what the -- this group has done in handling these two trends, is it sufficient to read basically the protocol? Or is there going to be, as I seem to have understood Alissa, that there will be some kind of resume' or presentation of the two strands saying what was clarified regarding the different proposals? That's just a question of clarification of our presentation and communication of having dealt with these two strands.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Joe, please.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. This is perhaps further to the same comment in the sense that Jari was talking about an FAQ. And something which talks about the substitution of accountability to IANA probably is something that is worth having a clarification because the clarification is it's undertaken now by a direct contractual obligation. So perhaps that would be a --

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Joe, if you can raise your voice, please.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Sure. Perhaps that would be a question and answer that could be included in the FAQ.

I think the other thing which might have caused some confusion on the second question is perhaps answered at the end of that paragraph which is that efforts to facilitate this communication and coordination should be undertaken by the affected communities via processes distinct from the stewardship transition process.

So it could be additional information was included that is perhaps outside the direct remit of the transition process, and that's useful additional information but perhaps not pertinent to the transition. And I think that's something that perhaps we can think about as we look at the proposals because obviously things that are additional to the transition process as we think about the three proposals when they all come in are probably beyond the scope of what our comparability should go towards.

Suggestions of things outside the transition proposal which might have been included in a proposal for completeness are also probably beyond the scope of what we need to be comparing at

the end when we look at all three proposals together.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I have Alissa and Russ Mundy.

Alissa, please.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you.

So Michael, I think your suggestion is a good one.

What I would propose is that when we conclude this topic, that we agree that we will write a summary of essentially two things: Questions that we discussed amongst the ICG, and answered to all of our satisfaction; and the question that we will -- sounds like there's one question that we intend to put to both communities. Or if there's others, then, you know, list those in the second part and have that be, you know, an announcement that we put out so that everyone in the world knows what happened at this meeting in a concise way.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Russ, please.

RUSS MUNDY: Thank you. Russ Mundy here.

One of the things I would caution all of us here is, when we get inputs as part of the proposals that have, from some interpretation, answered the questions in the RFP and yet we don't necessarily agree with the answer that was provided, that that is probably going -- if we wanted to go back, that is probably -- I think it's going beyond what our remit is, unless there is a specific inconsistency or gap that we see between the proposals as a result of that input.

So in other words, if one community says, in response to a particular RFP paragraph, "We're going to do A, B, C," and some of us as members of the ICG say, "That's not such a good answer," I don't think it's within our remit to go back to them as the ICG saying, "That's not such a good answer."

It might be perfectly fine for us as individuals to go back to the community and say such a thing, but I don't think that that's what the ICG is supposed to be saying.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. I think Alissa's suggestion seems like everyone is agreeing to that, or at least there's consensus that we can move with that

approach.

So if there is no further comments, we can close the discussion on the -- on the -- both proposals here.

Okay. So we're going to utilize the time to -- and start discussing ICG time line.

ALISSA COOPER: Sorry, Mohamed. Do you mind if I ask one more question on the last topic?

Sorry I can't be there to get in the queue as actively as I normally would.

I just wanted to confirm, before we move on, that everyone feels that the community comments received in the forum have all been taken care of. We sort of discussed some of the substance of them and we've discussed, obviously, the process a lot, but I just wanted to make sure that we're all on the same page as far as the community comments go.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. I think we -- we are.

So we can -- we can --

ALISSA COOPER: Great.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: -- we can proceed to the ICG time line.

And so basically we have seen the time line. I hope the discussion will be basically about our time line, what we need to do really to achieve our tasks, and maybe any interrelations with the CWG and CCWG time lines.

So the floor is open for discussions.

Joe?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. I just wanted to highlight I think it was maybe Alissa yesterday raised the topic, but I think with a revised time line, it might be useful to also issue a revised narrative because I think the narrative is a place that we can also put some of the conditions related to the time line so that we can give a complete picture of the likelihoods and possibilities and that the time line is kind of a best estimate based on those likelihoods and

possibilities.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Patrik, then Daniel.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I think to be able to move forward, as I said earlier, I think we in ICG, to start with, should concentrate in talking about how much time we need for our activities and what we are going to do whenever we get information, for example, from the names community.

We should start there, and that -- that, I think, is the most important part of the work that we should do now, and not mix it up with a potential discussion of interaction with, for example, the names CWG or what kind of conclusions we draw when we are -- some -- when we are adding up the data we have got from the names CWG with the conclusion of the time that we need.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Daniel, please.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: This is Daniel.

I fully agree with Patrik. I think if -- I would propose we structure the discussion as follows: First, do we see any change in the time that we require to do our work, once we have received all the inputs from the three operational communities?

We had a plan, agreed in London, I believe. Do we need to change our part of that plan?

So once we have everything, do we -- will we take longer, shorter, or the same time?

My personal opinion is, the same time.

Let's address that question first.

Then the second question we might want to address is: When do we expect to have all the information? Which boils down to, when do we expect to have the answer from the names?

Do we want to -- to accept the information we got from them -- it's going to be mid-June -- or do we want to push back on that or, heaven forbid, do we want to proceed without having heard from them?

Theoretical possibility.

But let's first discussion do we want, as the ICG, to change the time that we need from the point in time when we have all the information that we need to assemble a proposal?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Practical approach.

Russ, please.

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy.

A question that I have relative to the time line is: Now that we know we have one question to go back to two communities to resolve, how much -- do we want to try to dictate and, you know, include that in the time line? Do we want to include the possibility of other questions going back, once we get all three proposals, and then some amount of time to work through them?

Is this something that we should flag in our time line explicitly or how do we think we should handle that?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Joe, please.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. And this goes to Daniel's first question because it may impact the amount of time we need, and I would ask those who are participating in the working group -- related working groups related to names: Is there an effort in those working groups to already coordinate or at least cross-reference the existing proposals?

Because the level of divergence between the proposals at the end will require us to have more or less time.

It turned out that these two proposals were fairly much aligned except for one seeming discrepancy. If it turns out that the names proposal is going to align itself with the other proposals, then that may be a piece of information for our time line.

If that's not likely or that may not be possible because of the way in which the names proposal has to resolve conflicts and achieve consensus, then that may have a longer time period.

I don't know if that's something we can predict, but it's a factor we should consider.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Alissa, please.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you.

So I was wondering if we -- because people were talking about the time needed for the current tasks, for the proposals that we have already received, versus the rest of the time, and so I was wondering if we could actually look at the other tab of the time line because it has the -- it has the next four months on it, as opposed to what we're looking at right now, which is the post-receipt-of-names-proposal time generically.

So if we could switch the tabs, that would be useful, because I -- I do think that the first question is about the next several months and the amount of time needed to have a back-and-forth with the IETF and the protocol parameters community, knowing that we are not likely to receive a proposal from the names community, you know, in the next month or two, let's say.

So I was wondering if we have general agreement about that part. Which maybe we do and we can just confirm quickly, but to me that's -- that's sort of the first question.

And I think as Russ Mundy points out and as I was just thinking when we were talking about this, we will have to figure out, you know, the question that we just talked about putting to the communities, we will have to figure out if we want to ask them to respond within a certain time frame.

So we will -- you know, it will have to align with some timing, potentially. Or we can decide to not give them a deadline, but in any event, we need to make that decision.

So that was the -- my first point.

And then my second point, just in response to Daniel, I did want to point out that in the revised proposal that I made, the -- the time period allotted for after we receive the names proposal is actually a few months longer than in the original time line, and that was not an accident. I actually thought that now that we have, you know, some amount of experience with the community processes and how long they may take and what is involved in -- you know, in the names CWG in terms of coming to consensus and who needs to be consulted and the role of the chartering organizations and all of that, I tried to allot the time period with -- informed by that learning.

So they are -- it is a little bit of a longer time than what we had -- we had originally, I think, scheduled six months after receipt of all three proposals and now it's something more like nine months. So that's -- that's a topic for discussion related to Daniel's question.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Daniel?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Thank you, Alissa.

Just for everybody's benefit, what Alissa was referring to in her last remarks is the Excel sheet "Time Line Graphics Version 7," I believe, and the sheet after "Names."

And so we entered the discussion of do we want to change the amount of time that we originally allotted for our own work, and Alissa proposes, to just be very clear, to go from six to nine months elapsed after we have all the information.

I had said before that I'd be fine with keeping the time that we originally had but I'm violently opposed against shortening it.

Can we hear other opinions?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Sorry for the projection. It's not helping us. But you can refer to Alissa's email to the mailing list and on the sheet for the tab after "Names."

On the list is Wolf and then Mr. Arasteh.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. I -- thank you. Wolf-Ulrich speaking.

With regards to the first question of Daniel and I think that was just covered by Alissa, that is clear to me.

I appreciate this splitting of the time line in the first -- until the CWG proposal is going to be received here, and then to be more flexible afterwards.

However, then if you look to that second part of the proposed time line, right now we should not mix up fixed dates and variable dates. It means, for example, the ICANN meetings, ICANN 54 and 55, we cannot release a fixed year in the second part, because they are fixed dates and if you move, depending on the -- the incoming proposal, then we cannot shift the ICANN 55 -- 54

meeting. That's impossible.

That's one thing.

The other thing is with regards to the extension of the seven to -- or six to nine months of the second part of the time line. I tried to understand also why we need, for example, internally steps so long time, for two and a half months, for the ICG assessment of the proposal, the incoming proposal.

I think so in the time between, up until the proposal is formally delivered, there is time enough to follow and to discuss also on calls what is going to happen and to which -- or what shall be the development of the proposal, so that we don't need really two and a half months for the assessment of that.

That's my perception of it, so we could think about decrease that.

Then we should also think about, too, what is the -- how we use the ICANN meetings which shall be in between. Is it just to rediscuss the proposal, at first, or it seems to me, for example, if you -- if it was before that we use ICANN 55 -- 54 to finally discuss the proposal before we come to a complete publishment of that -- of the draft proposal.

So I don't know whether that is necessary or that is independent of the ICANN meetings to be done.

So that's -- these are my questions at first. Thanks.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Wolf.

Just to remind everyone, there's a link to the Excel sheet on -- in the Adobe Connect.

So now on the list is Mr. Arasteh, Milton, and Patrik.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. First of all, the time line that we have before us was established in Istanbul, not in London. Finalized in Istanbul.

The time line was adjusted, instead of 31st of December, being 15th of January. And we received comments from the naming community that they could not comply with that. We did not change that at that time. In one of our conference calls, we agreed, ICG together, all together, to send a note to the naming community and ask them to reply before 31st of January the time line that they need to provide the proposals, and they have

replied to that.

Now, let us take the question one by one. Do we want to react on the timeline that they have provided by saying that, no, we don't agree with June and we want earlier so we should have a basis for that unless we replace ourselves or put ourself instead of the naming communities saying what you are doing is wrong and you do not work sufficiently, push more and provide reply earlier than June.

I don't know whether we are in the position to mention that at this stage. A document is before the entire community. Having two alternatives, external and internal and each alternative are two options. And at the end of that, there are a number of questions raised. Therefore, it is important to think at this stage whether ICG is in a position to react on the timeline given -- saying that it is too long, shorten it by X months and should have some reasons. Or ICG should wait until the community looks at the proposals, which is before everybody in the ICANN52 with the number of questions raised and answer of communities. So these are the first things we have to do.

With respect to the 2 1/2 months, that is another issue. Timelines is more or less leaving document. Could be adjusted, if required, as far as the ICG internal work is concerned. If 2 1/2 months is too

long, you can do it better in two months, do it in two months. That's a separate discussion. Let's discuss the questions one by one.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Milton, please.

MILTON MUELLER: Milton Mueller. I have been looking at Alissa's revised timeline graphic, Version 7, and I think the -- first of all, the division between after-names, which is an indefinite period, is a good conceptual advance in our understanding of the timeline.

So I agree unfortunately with her decision to extend the process to nine months, instead of six months. I think looking at that, there could be a month or even two in which that is shortened. But nobody will complain if we come in ahead of schedule there. So I think it's reasonable to consider the new timeline to be nine months after receipt of the names proposal.

Of course, the big mystery in this is when we get the names proposal -- and that is completely outside of our control, so there is not much point in talking about it, although we could, in effect -- I guess we will have to say to the names community this -- the following timeline we're presenting to you is assuming that you

get us your proposal sometime in July or August, sometime before July or August of 2015 and please do everything you can to do that. Other than that, I don't see what we can do.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Patrik, please.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. In general, I agree with Daniel, that we should stay for our part of the work with what we believe that we -- the time that we need and the steps that we are talking about that we need to go through.

What confuses me a little bit, if I'm looking at timeline graphic Version 5, which is the last one that we actually agreed upon, I see different issues to different steps that we are going through and also see different lengths of each one of the steps.

And when I read -- maybe you can clarify, Alissa. But when I look at Version 7, I see a significant increase in the amount of time allocated for each one of the steps for us between Version 5 and Version 7 and that confuses me a little bit. So it is a little bit difficult to understand what has actually changed for our part of the work.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Alissa, please.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. So I will speak to that question in a moment, Patrik. I did just want to respond to a couple of the other points that have been raised.

The first one, Wolf-Ulrich pointed out that there are immoveable events listed alongside events that might shift. And I think that's a really good observation. I thought about trying to note the ICANN meeting, using a different notation or putting them across the top instead of along the side. And in kind of rushing, didn't do that. So I can certainly change that and make it more clear that those are not moveable in the same way that the dates themselves are not moveable.

I did put them in there, though, again, not really for the ICG purposes because I think we have proven that we are as a group very capable of meeting and making decisions and so forth at times other than ICANN meetings. But it is seeming to me from interpreting the timeline put forth by the CWG that those are very important demarcation points for the names community and that sometimes some things very much benefit from having the ICANN week worth of discussion and then being concluded at the end of that week or shortly thereafter. So that's why the ICANN

meetings are included and also why in some cases there is a bit of a time extension for the various colored bars in the timeline to allow for a names community discussion to perhaps conclude in the future at or shortly after an ICANN meeting.

In response to the discussion about why the various parts have changed in length, I would say, first of all, that some of what came out in what is now a generic timeline was actually reflective of where -- when it was based on starting in June where there are often holidays in the calendar. And this is, I think, not something we thought too much about in the original and also is something that if it's not starting with a June start time, then all of the holidays change in terms of where they land on the calendar.

Nevertheless, for any six-month period, we will encounter holidays that cause some of these steps, I think, to go longer than we had projected. You can see if you look back at Version 5 of the timeline, there were a couple of steps where we projected for something to require only one month -- either one month of ICG work or one month of community work. And I would say certainly during the holiday period, that is an unrealistic expectation. And we did already ruin holidays of some folks in 2014. So we might want to consider that. And I considered that in time of trying to revise this and make it more realistic.

I also think generally speaking if we think about how we have worked, it has been very difficult for either us or any of the communities to get anything done -- not to get anything done but to go from start to finish in the step of our process in a single month. I think that has proven difficult. As I said, where we're coming up on one month on our assessment of the protocol parameters approval, for example. And so that's another reason why the time lengths have changed a little bit from version 5 to Version 7.

Otherwise, in terms of the steps changing, you know, in large the steps have not changed. It is just that we published Version 5 of the timeline graphic before we had written down the proposal finalization and assembly process. And so I tried to add more detail in Version 7 of the graphic to reflect what we now have written down in terms of the steps that we intend to follow. So it wasn't meant to be inconsistent with the overall steps that we articulated originally. But it just has more detail about who's doing what and when.

And then, lastly, to Wolf-Ulrich's point about there being 2 1/2 months of ICG work in some of these phases in particular, I think he was referencing the month one, two, three or month one, two, two and a half assessment.

In this timeline what I did was -- you know, any time we're doing an assessment, there is a period where we're doing it ourselves and then there may be a period where we take something back to the community just like we discussed this morning with the protocol parameters and numbers.

And so the way that I represented our work was that our work would -- and the assessment would extend all the way until the community had come back to us and we were satisfied. There will certainly be some middle period where we're not really doing anything because we're just waiting to hear back from the community if we need to ask the community something.

But I thought it was better to reflect the whole 2 1/2 months of purple bar while we wait for the community to come back and we might have a back and forth of some sort than to make it look like we just do something for a month and then we do nothing and then that sort of comes back later. It was a little hard to think about how to represent that. So I just had our step lasting for the whole period.

Thanks.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thanks, Alissa. I think we have a follow-up from Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much for that clarification, Alissa. And many of your arguments is exactly why I want to -- why I would like to discuss our steps and how long time we need independent of calendar events, ICANN meetings, external groups, and whatnot so we can clearly see the differences in the timeline.

So, for example, that you here propose that from a realistic standpoint, you propose that we are extending the time that we need for review. That might be realistic. It might be the correct way or the correct things to do. But I think that is something that we should talk about, specifically given how hard the operational communities from names and protocols did work and deliver something to us than I see on your timeline.

It looks like from three months for us to review what they produced in 1 1/2 months, when we originally said that we were going to do that in 50% of that time, which means that that's a quite big change in the amount of how fast we think we can deliver which, once again, to me that is perfectly okay if people think that they will need that time. But that's the first discussion that I would like to have. Thanks.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: In the queue I have Wolf, myself, Michael.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks. Before I come to the second part in particular of the intervention here, just to the part before the names community is going to deliver the proposal, how we should react, the question was raised here. I'm also of the opinion, so on the one hand we were asking the names community to come up with a dedicated timeline and they came up. And to my opinion, they came up with a reasonable timeline and reasons, rationale for the timeline and making clear that it is a best-case scenario which means they are very hard conditions to achieve that goal.

So my opinion is we shouldn't push back the timeline to squeeze that, that that would not be possible, I think. But we should react in a way to say, okay, we have received that. And from my opinion, I would say we can accept it at the time being.

However, I would also raise to Milton to think about if that is going along well further on and if that is going to be extended further and further, what does it mean to us with regards to the overall process?

Second thing, I fully agree with Patrik. So I'm a fan of keeping the timeline as we had before which is seven months, or six to seven

months.

If I look how the other communities or the other working groups have been working, they used the time over the holiday season, the Christmas holiday season, and the weekends and all these things. And I'm asking myself, are we prepared to do so in working for the assembled proposal? We should really ask ourself in the IANA transition if we are willing to do so.

So we should take all measures and should show them that we are willing really to pick up their proposals immediately and even before formally the proposal is delivered to be prepared, not to start from scratch, and starting to discuss that but be prepared maybe to the major and more important items in those proposals to be discussed and to be assessed.

So for this I am sorry, Alissa, I'm not convinced to extend our own timeline. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. My personal opinion is I think it's -- we need to focus on our work and try to remove the (indiscernible) first that we have there. I think it would send a positive signal to the community that may be encouraged the naming community to just speed up their process. So that's from my side at Patrik and

wonderful comments.

For the queue I have Michael, Manal, Martin, Narelle, Paul, Joe and Daniel.

So Michael, please.

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Michael Niebel. I would just like to concur to keeping the timeline that we have originally designed for the reasons that were spelled out before. And I asked myself: Would we have this kind of discussion if the CWG had delivered on time? I'm just wondering whether that would not be the wrong signal. And also quantitatively it is a pretty large jump from six to nine months.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Manal, please.

Okay. Martin.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks very much. Martin Boyle here.

Yes, like others, let's start off on a positive note. I like the approach of looking at how long it will take us from the point of

receiving the names proposal.

But like others, I do have serious concerns of the idea that all of a sudden we go perhaps from a rather optimistic timing that we had last September to something that's looking pretty pessimistic for now when actually in between nothing has changed apart from the delays of getting the names proposal.

But I'd actually like also to remind us that we've also got to look a bit at the end date. And, currently, we are ending up with a proposal that will just miss the ICANN meeting in Dublin, which is really the opportunity we have to talk to the community about our final assembled proposal. And I see that as being really quite an important step.

The other thing I'd flag is that while we with the current proposal are extending our work schedule from six months to nine months, we've actually also dropped a consultation period. And that actually does worry me lots because my feeling is that once we've produced that first assembled program and we've discussed it with the community, we will have a lot of comments that come in that we will need to pull together and then go back out to them to make sure that we have heard them and understood them correctly.

So not only have we been -- moved from optimist to pessimist, we've moved from optimist to pessimist and dropped a few steps in being pessimistic. We are actually more pessimistic than it would seem on first glance. So I think, yeah, I would veer us trying to restrict our program, our timeline, making sure that we are trying to produce something in time for Dublin and that we are putting in that second consultation process.

Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Narelle, please.

NARELLE CLARK: Thank you, Mohamed. Narelle Clark, for the -- Narelle Clark, for the record.

I'm okay with some slippage in the time line, as I said yesterday, but I also reinforced yesterday that I think it's important that we set some realistic deadlines and stick to them, because as with -- again, as I said yesterday, this type of work is like housework. It expands to fill the time available.

So it is important that we try and take into account the realistic concerns of the community and set clear dates for them to stick

to.

I've got a couple of other concerns with the time line, in that the -- we do seem to have given ourselves -- sorry -- a little bit longer in parts and periods where I take Alissa's point that a lot people in the world are on holidays then. I'd suggest to you that this is a global community and a lot of people are not on holidays then, and we are prepared to take on that work.

So I think we've allowed some extra padding in there that doesn't really need to be in there. That should go, so that we can, indeed, meet those ICANN dates -- meeting dates, if at all possible.

The other concern I've got is with this long bar that says "Testing for Everybody Outside." I don't think that's specific enough. It just seems to be an odd coloration in the -- in the time line that's unnecessary. And also the "NTIA Review" bar, I don't understand what that's for.

I understand the NTIA will want to do some testing, but do we have some sort of set engagement piece with them? Are we having some sort of interaction with the NTIA that says, "At this point we will give them Document X or Document Y" and have an interaction from which we expect something concrete back or

not, or what?

So I don't see the point of having that.

The way it was set in some of the earlier time lines, it did come across as clear to me that we would be producing a document that would go to the NTIA and we would have an engagement with them whereby maybe they gave us some feedback or they gave the community some feedback, but -- so I think that's about all I had. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Paul, please.

PAUL WILSON: Thanks. Paul Wilson.

Yeah, I'm also really a bit confused, flustered by what seems to be a dramatic change of pace in the -- in the, you know, expressed urgency or the importance that we've put to the timing of this exercise.

I have to remind us of the work schedule of the -- of the CRISP team which completed 14 teleconferences in a five-week period from the 7th of December. That includes, you know, Christmas Day and New Year's Day and not -- not only holidays but, you

know, for the southern hemisphere a vacation period, you know. And I just think it's -- again, as I said yesterday, I think this kind of -- the -- the fact that we've got work done in two communities very productively and successfully suddenly now being put kind of on hold for what is an extended and absolutely sort of uncertain period just is going to create a lot of frustration and disappointment across communities who have done the work.

I don't -- I don't like the message that it sends to the -- to the numbers and protocol communities, and I'm -- I think it sort of paints a picture of a much less sort of urgent, much less timely, much less focused sort of -- sort of process. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thanks. Joe, please.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. I wanted to pick up on Martin's comments because I think it does make sense to have us ready for Dublin and have Dublin be a capstone where we have that final ability to have consultation.

So that does make perfect sense.

And even if we extend the time line, it shouldn't extend past then because we should be ready for then.

I think one thing which we have to factor in -- and I think to the name -- to the efficiency that was demonstrated by names and protocols, we have responded in kind by being able to discuss their proposals at this meeting, which was way shorter than we had allocated for a response to those proposals.

So I think we have demonstrated that we have taken their urgency to heart and have responded in kind.

I think we have to recognize that the names proposal is likely to generate significantly more community comments than either the numbering or the protocols have, and therefore, the time for consultation related to that may need to be richer.

Also, the time to go back to that community may need to be richer.

I also agree with Martin that second consultation should not be taken out of the works. If we're taking extra time, it's to do more consultation. Our work will not take more time, but the consultation may take more time. And I think the consultation is

essential to building consensus.

So I don't mind saying that we will extend until Dublin, but I would want to make sure that we are using the time of the extension for consultation and consensus building, not to extend the time of our work, because I think we've demonstrated that we can be somewhat efficient in our work because we, too, can finish the housework on deadline.

But I think the extended time would be useful, and let's also be frank. The extended time, if we go till Dublin, gives us a little bit of breathing room, should the names community have been overly optimistic as to when they are getting us the proposal, which may, in fact, be the case.

So I guess I would use Martin's comments as the basis for a middle ground which says we extend till Dublin, we use the time for enhanced consultation, and if we finish earlier, we will only get applause.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. I have Alissa, Mr. Arasteh, Milton, and Manal.

Maybe Alissa could respond to some of the questions raised.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes. I have been keeping a list. I will attempt to respond to all of them, maybe in reverse order, because I feel that I have heard -- on this particular question of Dublin being raised, I feel that I've heard two contradictory things.

One is that people like the generic time line which exists on the second tab of the time line v7 document. They like the idea that it is -- it starts whenever it is that we receive the names proposal and then extends for some period of time generically, with -- with the months not listed.

So that's one view.

And in that view, I don't quite understand how people are having the conclusion that it does or does not end before or after Dublin, because it doesn't have months -- specific months listed. It starts whenever we receive the proposal from names and it ends, you know, some number of months later.

So if people have some vision in mind of when that starts that backs up into Dublin, then we should talk about that, but I thought we were going down the path where we were going to specify particular months to complete the pieces that we have received, protocol parameters and numbers, and then we were going to have a generic explanation of how much time we would

need after receipt of the names proposal and not specify when -- when it is that we expect to receive that and what the names community works towards the time line that they have in front of them or whatever time line they end up following.

So I need some clarification on that point and I can -- then I can try to revise the time line on that.

I can also certainly put the second public comment period back into that section. I'm happy to do that.

And I can definitely revise the -- the piece that is specified between now and June or really between now and March, essentially, to have it go back and match what we had originally said as far as the -- the time line that we published.

I will say that, you know, in response to Joe, who said that, you know, we've -- we've proven that we can respond in a timely manner because -- because we've been talking about those two proposals, I would refer you to the time line that we put out which said that we were actually going to have this first step of the assessment done by February 13th.

I believe today is February 8th, right? Or 7th. I don't know what day it is.

[ Laughter ]

But so what that means is we get these question -- you know, the question that we said we're going to ask the communities, I think we get it out to them, get a response back, decide that we are satisfied before February 13th, which is less than a week or about a week away.

So while we have done a good job, I think, I don't think we should be congratulating ourselves too much because I think we're actually likely to miss that February 13th deadline that we had put -- or target that we had put in the proposal finalization process.

I'm happy to -- I will -- I will revert this time line to have that reflected because that's definitely what it sounds like people want to do, but, you know, people should just know that means that, you know, if we have a -- we have a target coming up for ourselves which is in a very short amount of time and might not give the communities really enough time to respond to us because it's taken us quite a while to respond to them.

A couple of other points.

This question about the testing and NTIA review, those are taken directly from the v5 of the time line graphic. We had that in there before. I did sort of -- I specified a party for the testing as to be all interested parties, which doesn't mean like, I don't know, outsiders or whatever. It means anybody who wants to do testing can do testing, including, you know, everyone that has been working on the process or not. It's just that since I had separated out the three different colors for the three different communities, I no longer had one color for communities, so I needed another color to represent who was doing testing.

I think those are all the points that I could write down and remember to respond to. Thanks.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Daniel, sorry, I dropped your name on the list.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: This is Daniel.

I would like to echo what -- and maybe bring to a very short point of what I heard many people say.

I think we should not change our plan and time line for our own work at this time. I think it would send the wrong signal, it would be confusing, and above all, I agree with Paul that it would give us a real danger of losing the communities that, indeed, in good faith and in good time, did deliver to us.

So we should just, I think, very quickly come to consensus that we will not change our plan and our time line for our work after we have all the proposals.

This also serves to make it clear that it's not us and not anybody but the CWG who is now on the spot for delivering. We didn't do anything to delay or change the process. It's the CWG who has to deliver before we can make progress. And I think that's a clear message to send, especially since ICANN week is coming up, and the clearer the message that we send, the better.

And I would ask the chair, once the list now is exhausted, to try and gauge the state of the discussion so that we can come to consensus. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. On the queue now, I have Arasteh, Milton, Manal, Jari, Wolf, and Keith, and I hope we can close it at that point.

Xiaodong added to the list, and then we can close at that point.

So Mr. Arasteh, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. Kavouss speaking.

First, in relation to whether or not we have to react on the reply received from CWG, if there is a consensus that we have to reply and ask them to be more efficient, I think the language should be invitation and encouragement, rather than urging or pushing. That is very important.

In the comments received for the first draft, there was, whatever, several areas saying that there were impositions to the community to reply, so perhaps we should not leave that impression anymore.

Second, I fully agree with Martin and Joseph in relation with the public comments and consultations with sufficient time. This is very important. The NTIA reiterate several times that the need to have the support of the community consensus, and there were some comments that time was not sufficient to the community to comment and perhaps we should not take any consultations from

the time line.

Thirdly, I at least am a little bit puzzled that the time line was changed and now immediately we come back by those who have proposed the changes. There might have been some logic why the change was proposed, and there should be some logic why that proposal is immediately withdrawn.

Fourth point, the proposals or reply from naming community is entirely different and much more complex in regard with those we receive from protocol and from numbering.

In protocol and parameters, we have heard and -- confirmations that there were no element of stewardship, there was no element of accountability required more than what exists. That means whatever currently in place is sufficient.

In numbering, we have the same thing, even though at the end of the paragraph, it mentions that, however, some stewardship and -- will be absent, they mentioned and some other colleagues said that in the remaining paragraph it is clear that there would be no difficulty. Rather, if you look into the CWG, you see they have proposed four new entities because of the oversight, because of the accountability, and because of many other things.

So I think we need more time to review that. It would not be as quick as done here and I hope that the environment and atmosphere would allow us to raise our questions freely, openly, without any restrictions, and in a good and friendly environment all colleagues allow us to comment so it is entirely different. Therefore, I don't see any reason why all of a sudden all the time should be changed and come back to the initial time frame. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Milton, please.

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah. I'm still kind of defending this nine-month time line. I understand Daniel's argument in particular that we want to basically say it's all on the CWG, we're doing the same thing, but there are some other considerations here.

First of all, a lot of you still seem to be assuming that the delivery of the CWG proposal will come at a predictable time, but the whole point of this revised time line is that we're not assuming that.

So when you talk about hitting Dublin as a target, you're assuming that CWG is going to deliver on time. Now, if they do, that's fine.

We can talk about Dublin as a target. If they don't?

All right. The second point about -- is the NTIA review cannot begin until September 30th, 2015. All right?

That's -- the NTIA cannot devote significant resources to the review of this proposal. They can sit around in these rooms and listen to us. They cannot actually do any work reviewing a proposal until September 30th, 2015. So that's the law.

Secondly, I don't understand what Daniel is talking about when he says we will lose the communities who did the work on time.

Where are they going to go to get lost? Are they going to just go into another world?

I think it's unfortunate that they did the work on time and the names community is not, but that's just tough.

[ Laughter ]

MILTON MUELLER: I mean, there's nothing that can be done about that. They're going to -- they've developed good proposals, we've processed them, and they will just have to sit and wait until the names

community gets their act together.

And I think Alissa is also right that we're taking a bit longer, even without the problems of the CWG; that things are a bit slower.

Maybe you could chop a month off of her new revised time line, if you wanted to be aggressive, but here's the deal: I -- even though I agree with Daniel that it's a bad message for us to extend our time at this point -- or rather, it's not a good message; it's not really bad -- it's also not a good message to miss another deadline.

In other words, if we say we're going to have this done six months after we get the names proposal and we don't I don't know how that looks either. So I rather be safe and I understand Narelle's argument that time can expand but I don't think we have this casual lackadaisical timeline. I think we are all committed to getting this possible. Just as yesterday we finished our meeting a few hours early, I think we could finish a few months early if things go well but I think it would be worse and I realize this is kind of a coin toss in terms of evaluating its ultimate effect on the community. But I'm still sticking with the argument that it is better to be safe and say we'll take nine months and be early than it would be to say we are going to take six months and then miss

the deadline. So there we go.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thanks, Milton. Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Mohamed. And thanks, Alissa, for the timeline. Actually, I really like the split of the two sheets that help the discussion very much and I have to admit that I changed my mind, like, five times during the discussion.

[ Laughter ]

But, again, I'm reluctant that we set a deadline like Milton mentioned and then miss it. Even if it's not our fault. But I'm equally reluctant that we ask the names community for a squeezed timeline and then provide ourselves with a more relaxed one.

So having said that, I would -- I would also stress the point that Martin mentioned regarding the second public comment period which I would like to see back into our timeline. So having said that, I would support a middle ground approach like Joe mentioned, which is maybe provide ourselves with accurate time to what we really need to accomplish but not a very relaxed time

frame, just more time to get things done. And I would stress the point that whenever the timeline is shared with the community that we provide clear message and clear justification to any extension that is being requested. Because if we say we are expecting more comments on the names proposal, might be better received by the community than if we say that it's a holiday period and things like that.

So we need to make this very clear. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Manal. Jari?

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko. So on this discussion, I don't have a specific proposal to make. I'm in favor of a strict and quick timeline as possible, underline the word "possible." But I do have to say I share Paul's frustration and other people's frustration expressed here that we -- a lot of us have put a lot of time and resources and money into going forward and we do want to go forward. So that is something that you have to take into account.

The other thing is that, of course, we must have a realistic timeline. That's sensible.

The third thing is if it is just upleveling this discussion a little bit, like we're discussing details but bringing up the big picture, I think if we look at engineering and project management wisdom, it speaks to avoiding big bang approach and supporting parallel and incremental work so I think -- and, also, at some point you have to cut your losses and move on if you can't do everything in step one.

So I would actually propose that we take a very hard look at what kinds of things we can do in the meantime, I think we can do certain things with contracts. We can do a lot of things with reviews and completing alignment. That is, I believe, the important thing. We believe, again, in the IETF on incremental continuous improvement and that is what we plan to implement at least. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Wolf?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. Jari, it is the first time I hear the word "frustration" from you. And I look to Paul and his level of frustration. But it seems to me it is not that much at the time being. And I would like to use that here and otherwise we would become more and more frustrated in this round as well to work on the right

timeline.

Coming back to what Joe was saying, I would say Dublin would be a good step for my perception in case we receive the proposal from the CWG as the best-case scenario outlined.

Otherwise, we should really separate what we would like to achieve during ICANN meetings and would like to achieve in the overall timeline.

If I look to the second part of the timeline proposal, the after names proposal, it seems to me independently of the fixed date of the ICANN meetings, that there is a reason behind that after each ICANN meeting, we are going to publish the draft complete proposal and then send it after the ICANN54, in that proposal, to the board.

We should think about -- not to link the meetings -- the ICANN meetings which shows activities because the question is really do we expect from the ICANN meetings a big new input or a big change or whatever which is impacting the proposals that we could only deliver after that? That is my first question. I don't think so.

All this work should be -- could also be done without ICANN meetings. I would say ICANN meeting is to be used for an exchange and for broader -- for broader information. So we should take that into consideration.

Otherwise, I would also agree to what was said before, that we should stick right now to the -- to our present timeline. I'm still in favor of that, not to extend the timeline as it is proposed here, rather to stay with the existing one that we had with six or seven months. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Keith, please.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Mohamed. Keith Drazek. This has been actually a really excellent and challenging conversation. I think this question of timelines is obviously a very sensitive topic and something we all need to continue to work on. I think it is worth noting, though, that the timelines are not entirely of our choosing. And I think we've talked through that.

We are very much subject to and at the mercy of the operational communities' own timelines and their own needs. And certainly I think the numbering community and the protocol parameter communities are to be commended for the timeliness of their

work.

But I want to respond to the comments, I think, made by Paul earlier and sort of caution us a little bit about suggesting -- or suggesting there might be a perception that the naming community is in some way lacking focus or urgency because that's not true. I mean, frankly, the naming community has been hard at work, just as hard at work, as the other communities. It is just a more complex problem that we're dealing with in the naming community.

You know, it is a different community. We have a different relationship. We have different needs, and we have different concerns. And, you know, I just want to just caution us against using language like, oh, you know -- and divisive language that might suggest the naming community is somehow less committed to or less focused on trying to deliver.

At the end of the process, frankly, the naming community will have conducted more work and more complex work than the others. So let's try to keep this together and not be divisive about it. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Xiaodong, please.

XIAODONG LEE: Thank you. This is Xiaodong Lee. I just want to mention two points. Firstly, I -- we have announced the timeline one time, and then we consider to postpone that. How to make sure the new timeline fits the increment of the community, we need to consider that very carefully.

Personally, I agree with the comment from Daniel. It is very critical for us, for this group.

The second point is our group is the coordination group. We didn't make the proposal. We need to rely on the community. We need to converse with the community to make sure that if we adjust the timeline, to make sure the timeline can be finished. If we postpone again, we will lose everything. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Xiaodong.

I think I would give Alissa maybe the last time to respond before we wrap up and we try to reach a conclusion here.

Alissa, please.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks, I was going to try to turn it to you and Patrik because honestly I am a little bit confused about what people want to do.

I think -- I can try with what I think the next -- a useful next step can be. So I think what I heard for the proposals that we have already received from the communities that got the proposals to us in January is that we want to stick to the original timeline and get them as far forward in the process as possible. And that means that we will conclude step one, individual assessment, later this month in about a week and we will have then one month to do the Step 2 assessment where we make sure that the two proposals are compatible with each other. Luckily, we have already done a good amount -- had a good amount of discussion about that. So hopefully that won't be complicated, and that will conclude in the middle of March. So that's what, you know, the first half of the timeline spreadsheet would look like. It would look like those steps conclude in March.

As regards to the rest, I think -- I'm not exactly sure what people want to do. It sounded like people like having the generic version that isn't tied to specific dates. It sounded like -- I heard a lot of

people --

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I think we lost connection in Adobe.

Five minutes for the coffee break to go. Not yet.

So I think we are going to take the break. 15 minutes' break and then we can come back and try to wrap up the timeline, move on on the agenda items.

We are going to return back at 11:10.

**[ BREAK ]**

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Excuse me. Can we convene back again so we can start the meeting?

Okay. I think we can start.

Okay. Let's try to wrap up the discussion on the time line in the coming, hopefully, 10 minutes.

I have Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Mohamed.

The initial time line was based on 15th of January receiving all proposals. One of the proposals would not come to us before June. Therefore, we cannot maintain the initial time line. With respect to the nine months or shorter that -- than that, I don't know, proposed by the chair of the ICG, perhaps with or without consultation with the vice chairs, I don't know. Whether holiday was counted or not counted, that also I don't know.

But it is important to recognize that the activities, work, and volume of the work and complexity of naming is completely different from that of parameters protocol and numbers. Completely different. And we have to recognize that the more

complete proposal coming from naming, more facilitating our process.

We should take that into account and establish a tradeoff between the two.

So we should be very careful, not immediately after a few comments, to revise the time line and go back to initial time line which was based on 31st of January or 15th of January.

Now we have June for naming and that is an important element.

The next point I would like to mention, that whatever goes from the ICG to the NTIA should be a complete proposal of all three communities but not partial one. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Kavouss. Patrik?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. Let me tell the other people here in the room, the ICG members, that I spent the coffee break talking on the phone with Alissa, and we tried to summarize and tried to understand together where we are in the discussion in this room, and let me try to summarize where we -- where we -- where Alissa

and myself together think we have -- I would not call it confusion because it sounds too pessimistic, but try to untangle the various issues we are talking about.

First of all, the number of -- the steps that we have in the finalization process is what we have described and agreed to in the proposal finalization process Version 5 document. Okay?

Those are the steps that we have been talking about, and each one of those steps are marked with dates.

It's also the case that -- yes. They are marked with dates.

That said, just like Kavouss just pointed out, those dates and those steps did rely on all proposals arriving at the same point in time in January.

Now, we do -- we did not receive all those proposals, which means that we have started a process, the proposals out of sync with each other, and we are -- and the various things that we're mixing up at the moment is, for example, that we have not yet talked about how far we can walk down the path of our process before we have to wait and basically stop until we get the CWG names.

So what Alissa and I think that we have to do are two things. Or actually more than two, but two important things, that unfortunately I'm a little bit nervous that we cannot do today at the face-to-face meeting because it will need some preparation work to help you all to move forward.

The first one is to review the finalization process in more detail and see which one of the steps can be taken for each one of the proposals independent of each other, which means try to identify what we actually can do now with the names and numbering proposals and which ones we cannot do just because we have to wait for -- for the -- for the names to -- for the names -- yeah, sorry, for the -- what steps can we move forward with now, given the protocols and numbers and what steps do we have to wait with for the names proposal to arrive, whenever it arrives.

The second thing we have to do is that each one of these steps -- for example, let's see, Step III, "Review of Draft Proposal" from 13 March to 19 of June, the first thing we can do easily is to say, "Okay, that's a certain amount of calendar time," but how much work time did we -- did we expect?

And it's also the case that inside that Step III, we talk about public comments, and one thing we are sort of discussing here is what do we mean by "public comment"? Like how long time is it, blah,

blah, blah, blah, blah. So we have a lot of sub-steps in each one of those steps that we might have to discuss how long time that is, one or two, like, public comments, et cetera.

And that is something that Alissa also started to do by splitting each one of these steps into, like, more detailed steps in what she has done. So she already started to do this.

So we need to see what can -- what step --

Once again, first work item is to see what can we do independent of -- for each one of the proposals.

Second one, in much more detail than the finalization process, what steps are we actually going through.

Given that we have all of that, then we can have a discussion on Daniel's question: Should we still have the time line for the steps of work that ICG is doing. Okay? Was that time line too aggressive from the beginning and should it be more realistic? Alissa added some time for that, just because of holidays and whatever. Some people in the room, including Daniel and Paul a few others, said, "No, we in ICG should keep our aggressive time line for the steps that we are responsible for."

That's a discussion that we have not really been able to have yet.

The last thing we can do, of course, is to take the input that we have got from the CWG names on their optimistic time line and the pessimistic time line of their work, and then we can do simple mathematics of adding up the time they take and add the time that we need and we can get some kind of preliminary time line for the whole conclusion of the whole process.

So we are sort of mixing up their time line with our time line with the time line for the whole process, and it's a little bit difficult to talk about all of that at the same time.

So Alissa and myself will go back and try to look in the details in the proposal finalization process, with the help of the secretariat, and come back with something which is a sort of a little bit more detailed plan than what Alissa had in her graphics, and independent of calendar and other kind of things to identify which one of these work items are things for us, and we have to come back to you when that is done. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Thank you, Mohamed. I think I compliment what Patrik said, Alissa, Patrik and Mohamed, but not you and Alissa only. There are three.

CCWG working very well because there is a good coordination among all three co-chairs. Very good. In addition, CCWG benefit from the very friendly constructive environment.

The most disagreement question will be submitted in a most agreeable way. That is why there is so much progress admired by everybody, and we need to learn that.

I have no problem with what you propose, Patrik, you, Alissa, and Mohamed getting together, but two consultations with sufficient time. We are not going to compromise in number of consultations. Sorry. Public comments. Should be two with sufficient time, but not one week. With sufficient time. These are unchangeable.

The remaining, yes, you look at the matter to see where we can do independent from each other and so on and so forth.

So agreement with what you said with these provisions: Two public comments and sufficient time not less than 21 days.

Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Patrik, please.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yeah. Kavouss, let me -- let me clarify why I mentioned my name and Alissa.

Yes, absolutely, when the chair is acting, all three of us, of course, are synchronizing.

In this specific time, just because I had a conversation with Alissa that I presented to the group that the group might disagree with as a path forward, I wanted to disclose that that proposal of mine I had not had time to synchronize and talk with Mohamed yet. So I wanted to give him the ability to be able to speak up. But it was just for this specific proposal that I laid forward I wanted to be very explicit that I had not talked to Mohamed to give him the ability to -- in this room, to also object and come up with suggestions to what I just proposed.

But yes, of course, when we chairs are later proposing something to this group, we will absolutely have synchronized, Alissa, myself, and Mohamed, because -- before we lay something forward to

the ICG as a whole.

So it was a transparency indication to you and other people that are listening. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Thank you.

I have Mary and Paul, Wolf, Joe, Martin, Keith, and Jari.

So Mary, please?

MARY UDUMA: Thank you.

I want to say that some of the things I wrote down here Patrik has mentioned, but in addition to the work that the chairs will be doing, I think I want the chairs to take into consideration the experience we have had since we started, the criticisms we had when we had aggressive time line, the fact that we need the public consultations and public comments, and, as Kavouss said, two public comments would be okay. And I think minimum, two public comments.

The third thing is that we cannot submit a partial proposal, like the name -- the protocol and numbers that have moved forward. We can only move forward to a point and stop and wait until we do that of the naming.

And I like the -- the spread of the two proposals that Alissa has done, and the second one which -- which is review of -- after the submission of naming. I think it is a -- it is -- well, I will not say -- I think it's optimistic and not pessimistic, as people have been looking at it.

We have two holidays. We have the summer holiday and the -- and the year-end holidays. So if we put that into consideration, so consider our experience, map it with what we had done -- were originally proposed, make provision for the comment -- two comment period or consultation period, and then put into consideration the criticisms that we have received so far in the process, and I think whatever we come out with will be fine. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. I would like to close the queue after Jari, so currently Wolf-Ulrich. Yes.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Mohamed.

First, in general, I'm also convinced that the coordination within our ICG is in good hands with the leadership of the three co-chairs, and I'm very confident that synchronization is going to happen in a good way.

So to the proposal of what you -- what you phrased, Patrik, so from -- coming from your conversation with Alissa, I fully support that.

I would like to stress a point when you go into a discussion about the different steps and sub-steps, I would say that you have to make a difference between what is -- let me say what kind of activities behind that are not in our direct hands. That means consultation, input, waiting for input, and all these things. That is a different part rather than what we have to work out by ourselves, so -- the assessment.

So I wouldn't like to see any -- conceding any additional time to what we have to do internally for ourselves. Thanks.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Joe, please.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: And my last question is: Did you -- did you think about when you will be prepared, well, to come up with a proposal? Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Patrik?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yeah. I think that -- I hope this will only take a -- take like a day or two, so -- so -- because Alissa already did some work and I'm already starting to go through the finalization process document myself, so -- now, so we're not talking about a long time, but unfortunately with it will not be done today so we can probably not discuss it at this face to face meeting.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Joe, please.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. In terms of -- I think you've heard a lot of emphasis on keeping the second consultation period.

I think as you look at the calendar, especially as far as I think what was the second part of your exercise, we should consider the fact that the names proposal is likely to generate substantially more comment and probably require a more iterative process than

either the protocol or numbering, and therefore, we should make sure that the time frame has built that potential need for iteration into the process.

I think in terms of the first part of your proposal, we should work collaboratively with the two communities to make sure we can progress their work as much as possible as it relies on us during that.

Obviously there are some things that will require all three proposals to be in before we can work on those issues, but we should work on whatever issues are possible to move ahead for them in light of the fact that they have timely completed the requested work.

And the last thing I would say, Patrik, which would be useful, because we are now looking at a fluid rather than calendar-based solution, is to perhaps discuss with the secretariat what is the possibility and feasibility based on cost and logistics of meeting outside of an ICANN meeting, because we may need a meeting that is not timed to ICANN to progress our work and the -- I know that in the past, there were concerns, because of the need for translation and other things, as to how feasible it was to meet outside of those circumstances.

So a discussion of that would be helpful going into the process as well.

Lastly, to the extent that you and Alissa can come up with a proposal, I would suggest that if we could all perhaps look at it and turn around any absolute thoughts as quickly as possible, this issue is likely to come up in the session on Monday and it would be good if we could at least have a framework of a response, even if we don't have a document we can send to the response, but it would be useful if the people on stage have something they can say about the time frame.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Martin, please.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks, Mohamed. I welcome the input from Patrik and Alissa. I think that is useful and I will certainly support Joe's assessment that with the names proposal, we are likely to see a lot more comments coming in.

But one of the things that has sort of occurred -- or keeps on occurring to me is the fact that we are a coordination group and it seems to me that if we exercise some of our role as a coordination group, we can make sure that some of the more

obvious things that we need to predict, that we need to address have already been predicted or we've already asked the questions.

I'd actually also flag that when the names proposal comes in, I think we are going to see something that is a pretty finely balanced compromise. It will have gone through a lot of discussions, and we are going to have to be very careful that we're not at that stage to our terrible surprise asking questions that then upset that compromise.

So I think for me, we have got the input from the protocols and the numbers proposals, and we should look at those proposals in the light of are there specific questions that we should put back to the cross-community working group working on the names functions, that we would like them to address.

Secondly, I think there are certainly a number of us who are following, shall I say, attentively the discussions in the cross-community working group on name functions. And, I guess, that between now and the finalization by that community of its proposals, we should be at least as a group thinking about what is being discussed in that forum might give us reason for questions and make sure that we are asking for the clarifications that we think are necessary so that when they come up with their

proposal, A, it doesn't come as a surprise to us and, B, the things that we are most concerned about have been addressed there and then.

And I think if we do that and are very much more a coordination group, then we stand a very much better chance of being able to turn around in a timely way and in a way that doesn't destabilize the process when the names community comes in with their proposal with luck in time for the Buenos Aires meeting. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Mohamed. Keith Drazek. Yes, I think I would like to just briefly build on what Joe and Martin and a few others have said. First, let me just say thank you to Patrik and Alissa for the recommendation. I support your suggestion as a path forward. I've also typed into Adobe chat just sort of my reaction to this discussion. So I'll refer people to that and not necessarily repeat it.

But I think one of the benefits of sort of the messiness of the naming community is that whatever we receive will have been put

through the ringer. It will have gone through extensive discussion and review. And my hope, my hope, aspirational, but my hope is that what we receive may actually be in a condition that does not require, you know, maybe as substantial work as some might be fearing.

I do agree with Joe that there will be the need for multiple comment periods or, you know, the opportunity for things to be fleshed out. But I guess where I'm at is that I think there may be opportunities for the ICG to look for efficiencies in our own work stream and our own work requirements and where we may be able to compress what we have previously laid out and find opportunities to work more quickly and to deliver on time.

I think if we take the date of June that has been provided to us by the CWG naming and build from there, I'm still hopeful that we can actually make the dates that we had originally laid out. I would prefer that we do not simply extend the dates or go beyond what we had previously put out because we may find that we can actually meet the original deadlines once we see what comes in from the naming community.

Thanks.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thanks. Jari, please.

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko. I think I'm mostly agreeing with what everyone has been saying. First of all, I agree with Patrik's proposal. I think it is a good proposal. And in particular, I like the idea that we can try to analyze what is it that we actually need to do and have a little bit more incremental approach. There are some things we can do beforehand and there's some things that we have to leave for later. That I think is literally important that we don't get stuck in a waterfall model, that we try to have an incremental approach.

I think we can do that, and that analysis has to be done. I understand if it is not possible to do that today, that's fine.

The other thing that I wanted to agree on with Joe and others, that the community feedback periods are really, really important. I'd also urge us to think which ones of those are such that we can do them only at the end versus a little bit more spread through time.

And then finally I just want to agree with what Keith had said before the break, that everyone's working very hard on this and some communities have even more work than others. We're trying to do this together. We are trying to work very hard and

we are, and that is appreciated. If there is any frustration, I hope that's not taken as criticism on anyone's part. It's more like an eagerness to move forward as soon as possible. I think the plan Patrik outlined is a good one for that. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you very much. I think we can conclude now on the discussion on the timeline. Last comments from Michael, please.

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Thank you, Mohamed.

Just three things. I agree with the proposal by Alissa and Patrik. I also share the view of Keith that things might be through the ringer and almost perfect. But implicit in our discussion is now that this group is not feeling that it should put pressure on the CWG to compress its timeline, if that is correct. I just wanted to have this as an implicit result of this discussion.

And the third thing is, is basically about communication. That is, we are now doing this exercise. There's going to be a panel on Monday. It would be nice to have a line to take: What is this group thinking? And what is going to happen in the rest of the week? And is there something more than the end of today at the end of next week or at the end of Monday? And what do we

expect?

So I'd like to have that communicated because that's very important because that's what the community will discuss.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Mohamed. I have some difficulty with the proposal of Keith Drazek. From logical point of view, you cannot have the same timeline when one community instead of 31st of January or 15th of January postpone it to June. It is not logical. We don't have any explanation to provide to the people. What happened that one proposal is postponed by 5 1/2 months but we maintain the initial timeline? People would say that perhaps we were not very serious at the beginning when we had that timeline. So I do not agree with that proposal, Keith. I'm sorry.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Kavouss. I think I'll be able to maybe sum up. Personally, I'm in agreement with the proposals from Alissa and Patrik. And we'll work together to come back to you with a revised timeline after reviewing the process finalization document as well to see where we can squeeze things and have that

reflected in the timeline. So I think it's -- two to three days should be good to come back to you with a new revised timeline.

I think by this, we can conclude this agenda item and move forward to the discussion on handling community comments. And that's -- Manal will take the lead on the discussion for this agenda item. And we'll continue until 12:45 for the lunch.

Manal, please.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Mohamed. So just very quickly, I had an informal discussion with Daniel yesterday along with Mary and Hartmut. And we have agreed that we should not really take a long time debating this issue. So we would quickly present the status quo and where we stand just for those who are not able to follow the discussion on the mailing list and then we will leave it to the room to decide on a way forward.

So just very quickly -- and, please, Daniel, interrupt me if you feel that I'm misinterpreting what we discussed yesterday. So I think what we have almost agreed upon so far is that we should respect the operational communities' agreed processes. We should also respect the operational communities' output and not try to replace their output with our own judgment. And we should

avoid giving the impression that we are acting as an appeals panel. And, finally, we should avoid getting dragged into a real complex process.

So with this in mind and given that we have already agreed to receive comments directly from the community, the question now is how are we going to handle those comments?

Again, the two approaches that were discussed on the mailing list are either we consistently forward those comments to the relevant operational communities or just rely on having the ICG forum publicly available for the operational communities and for the wider community to follow up and, of course, if the operational communities wish to reply.

So I was in favor of the first approach. I'll speak to the pros and cons of this and will hand over to Daniel for the second approach.

I feel that the process should be consistent and predictable to all the comments received. So if we just forward the comments we received and bring them to the attention of the relevant operational communities, this would be a fair process for all comments and a predictable way of handling them, especially that we have agreed to receive them directly.

I also think that this would, again, be handled within the community and we can then follow the discussion and take this into consideration in our assembled proposal.

I leave it here and hand over to Daniel with Mohamed's permission, of course.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Okay. On the mailing list, I'm still opposed to have any procedure dealing with comments that we receive in the forum or otherwise, any set procedure. The reason is that once we receive the names proposal, we'll receive many more comments than we have so far received. And many people around the room have already said that, sort of with tongue in cheek or not.

But more importantly, there is a distinct possibility that we will receive dozens, if not hundreds, of comments that are intended to either delay, derail, or discredit our process and they might not have no other aim than this, not make comments but delay, derail or discredit our process.

If we set any specific way of dealing with all -- I mean, each and every comment, we increase considerably the attack surface on our process. So we shouldn't do that.

And I think there's also no need for us to have a set procedure to deal with comments because our mandate is not -- our remit is not to respond to comments, to run an appeals process, or to, in fact, respond to any comment.

Our remit is to produce a document at the end of the day that is acceptable to the main actors and to the community in general.

So that -- also let me respond to what Jean-Jacques and others have said on the mailing list. That is why I felt that it is proper to raise this. My general objections to any procedure while we had agreed that Manal was going to draw up a procedure because -- so I wasn't specifically proposing something different for when Manal was finished. But I was proposing not to do it at all. And I think that was, in my opinion -- or in my view, a proper thing to do. And I realize -- and one final thing, I'm very sympathetic to the idea of thanking people for their contributions to try to proactively involve the relevant communities and to make sure that we don't overlook anything. We can do all those things with our current process.

The thing I'm objecting to is any sort of algorithmic or codified way of dealing with comments because there's a very real possibility that the intention and the sheer amount of comments that we receive will be -- have a very negative impact on our

work.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Paul.

PAUL WILSON: I agree with Daniel. I don't believe we have extra protocols. I think message passing in an email world is kind of unnecessary and the niceties of thanking people is also really -- can be dispensed with for the sake of clean communications.

I'm showing my ignorance here. But the IGC -- the ICG forum list used to be something that one couldn't subscribe to. I don't know if we fixed that or not. It used to be just something was a mailing address that created an email mailing list archive, which meant that you had to go back to it every day to see if something new had been written.

That's how it was at the beginning. There was a suggestion I made that I think you should be able to subscribe for ICG forum so you could actually be notified of emails coming in. And I think that's kind of important if we are asking people to actually track that mailing address rather than having them going back to a Web page every -- a Web page archive every day. So that would be my other suggestion, to make sure that people who are tracking that

ICG forum mailing list can actually subscribe to it and be notified by email of new messages.

Thanks.

MILTON MUELLER: Well, as you probably know -- this is Milton Mueller -- I don't agree with Daniel.

I think, you know, it took Daniel basically -- I don't know -- five minutes to say that he thinks we should just ignore comments. I know that's kind of a provocative way to put it, but -- but he's saying we are not going to acknowledge that these comments will have any impact on what we do and we will not establish a procedure for them. And that, to me, means we're not taking the comments seriously.

So what is so terrible --

I mean, maybe this process could be made more efficient. Maybe we don't need to individually acknowledge each message. But I don't understand this business about attack surfaces and so on.

I think that we --

First of all, the names community is going to be definitely contentious, but nobody is going to view the ICG as something that is going to undo or alter such an incredibly complex political calculation, whereas this is more the case with these much more narrowly focused protocols and numbers. You know, people would tend to say, "Oh, they did something wrong and they're have very close-knit community and I'm appealing to you, ICG, to -- to somehow give me some credibility or voice in this process."

But with names, you know, everybody has a voice. The possibility of one group dominating the entire process is nil. It just -- unless there's some massive coup d'etat among a small group which would be obvious in which we should intervene -- if we get a brunch of comments from, you know, 50 people saying there was a massive coup d'etat, we should definitely be in a position to say "Hey, what's going on here?"

But I just think that the message that's sent to the community by this idea that we -- we don't care about comments or that we don't have any kind of process for handling them, I just can't understand it. I don't understand the downside of having a very simple procedure and I don't understand the threat that is posed by having this procedure.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Thank you.

Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I think Joseph was before me.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. So Joe is happy that you can take...

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Joseph.

I was also on the mailing list and -- proposing a course of action rather than a procedure, taking a middle ground.

I agree with Milton that we should not be indifferent with respect to comments made. It is in our charter. Perhaps we may not need to individually acknowledge receipt of those comments. We should reflect that in the summary of our discussions, for instance, today that ICG receives comments, and then allow me to stop here and go to the course of action that I propose.

I suggest for consideration of distinguished colleagues that we, ICG, forward the comments received to the community in

question in wording as follows. I gave exact wording to Manal. That ICG received comments from -- put the person or community or individual who sent the comments -- put whatever comment made in quotation marks and in italics, close in quotation mark, and sending that to the community in question and asking to provide clarification and/or answer, with a copy to ICG for information.

On one hand, we have applied the open, inclusive, and democratic way and in accordance with our charter.

On the other hand, we do not act as an appeal board or appeal panel, we do not make individual acknowledgment in order not to be received avalanche of comments, but we mention that the comments received and send it to community for clarification and/or answers, with a copy to ICG for information.

I think that is something between the two courses of action that was suggested. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Kavouss, for the proposal.

Joe, please.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. I guess I'm closer to Manal's proposal than to Daniel's, although I think if we want to reply to an incoming message, that can be done in an automated process by just having a receipt sent for a message that came in so no one actually has to interpose anything. You can just set it up as an automatic confirmation of receipt.

I think if we want to avoid the hassle of forwarding individual emails, we should just make sure the communities then are committing to review the mailbox or the threads on a regular basis, to pick up whatever comments are coming in. Otherwise, I think we have an obligation to forward.

If the communities are willing to step up to the plate and say, "No, no, don't bother forwarding, we have a person who's keeping an eye on these things and will respond as needed to things that come in" -- because Daniel is right, some of these may come in as nuisance things that may not qualify for a response from the community, but to the extent that the community is willing to step up to the plate, then we can avoid the forwarding.

The part of the process I think is important is our internal part of the process, which is -- I don't think Daniel was suggesting we weren't going to be looking at the comments. We were obviously

going to be looking at the comments internally.

I think the part of the process I'm most concerned with is some of the comments may raise a question that we would seek clarification for and we may not have noticed ourselves, and so that if we -- you know, one of the comments may highlight "The proposal is incomplete because," or we may have a concern raised to us about whether there truly was a consensus because of something that is raised credibly in a comment.

I think the process should be our internal review of these things in order for us to generate the ICG comment back, because we have committed to the communities to, in real time as soon as possible, address our concerns to them.

In terms of responding to the comment, it is up to the community to determine how to respond to a specific comment of an individual or an organization, but it is up to us to determine how they need to respond to our comments.

But some of our comments may actually be generated by external comments which we are reviewing.

So I think that's where I see the intersection of these processes. So it's a little bit of Daniel and a little bit of Manal's process put

together, but with that internal focus being the really critical part that we have to make sure that we have a procedure for that.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Martin, please.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thank you, Mohamed. Martin Boyle here.

I have a certain sympathy with the idea that we need to beware of overengineering a process, but I also feel very nervous about something that looks like we are just going to ignore the comments that come in.

And I think it is our responsibility to show some form of due diligence to that which we receive.

In other words, we do need to react, and more importantly, we need to be seen to react to the comments that have come in.

And so at a very minimum, I think we do need to ask the community to look at the comments that have come in and to give them the right of reply to those comments, and then we will have that duty to the people who have submitted comments to look and see whether the response from the community has

actually answered, to our satisfaction, that which has been said.

And if not, we do have to go back and then ask the community again to be a little bit more clear.

But certainly I would see the importance in -- and I find it difficult to imagine one where it wouldn't be the case that it is the community that you would go back to ask to respond to it, as if it were us that was asking the question.

And then the most important thing is that we do need to document the output. I don't think necessarily we need to respond to the person who put the comment in, but I do think that we should use secretariat resources to pull together a report of the comments that were received and the responses that we received to those comments.

I'd then add just one little thing that I -- well, add one little thing -- one rather major thing that does concern me, and that is, essentially people who were putting -- who were involved in a process who didn't get their preferred outcome from that process and are now looking to us to overturn that process. And I think that is something we do need to beware of, which is why I think always we need to turn back to the community and seek the community's response to, you know, "Well, what have they done

to try and reach that consensus position," so that you don't get, from both sides "The people who didn't get their preferred first choice are coming in and overturning the whole thing."

So documentation, seen to be reacting, absolutely really, really important. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Alissa, please.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. So a couple of responses to things that people have said, and just some general observations.

From --

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Alissa, can you please raise your voice?

ALISSA COOPER: I don't think people have --

Yeah. Can you hear me now?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yes, better.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. I don't think people are looking at the forum of their own initiatives. I think if we all think to ourselves, "How many times did I look at the forum last year," it will probably not be very many, and I think we're having this discussion now because a couple of us looked at the forum because we remembered to do it, and forwarded some messages around.

So I don't think it's sufficient to, with no further ado, assume that everyone concerned in this process (indiscernible) communities is following the forum.

I very much like (indiscernible) proposal that in terms of keeping the communities informed of the comments that come in, that we can ask them for their preference of whether they are, indeed, looking at the forum and don't need to be reminded to do so or whether they would like to have comments directed towards their community explicitly forwarded to them.

I would be a little concerned about the proposal put forward by Paul that sounds to me like essentially turning the forum into a mailing list because the communities have mailing lists and the point is not for it to become a discussion forum. It is supposed to

be an intake for the ICG to receive comments that, for whatever reason, people felt they could not submit through the community processes.

And with respect to that, I'd like for people to remember what we said in the RFP, which I posted into the Adobe chat for reference, which is that when we actually solicited the comments originally, we said, "Commenters should be aware that the ICG will direct comments received to the relevant operational communities, if appropriate. The ICG will review comments received as time and resources permit and in accordance with the overall time line for the transition. That is, comments received about specific proposals may not be reviewed until those proposals have been submitted to the ICG. The ICG may establish defined public comment periods about specific topics in the future." And it goes for a little while longer.

So we actually did say that we would direct comments to the operational communities. If we are not going to do that, then I think we need to revise what we've said. And then we said some other things about how we would -- how we would treat those comments, and again, I think if we are going to do something different, then we at least need to state that we're going to do something different.

I think we also have a good -- another good piece of language that we could possibly reuse here, which is the message that we sent to the IETF and the RIR communities regarding the few comments that were received in the last few weeks when we told them that they should treat those comments as if they were received inside their own process and deal with them accordingly, and that if we had specific questions, we would follow up directly.

I think that is a much better model than asking for a response for every single comment, because I agree with those who have said that that is a, you know, potential denial of service on the communities and, you know, could very well lead to a reconsideration of many issues that have already been taken up in the community, and so I would much prefer that we set up a mechanism where the communities either check for themselves or we forward -- we forward the comments with the understanding that they be dealt with within the communities as they normally would be dealt with, and if we as the ICG have a point to follow up on, then we will explicitly follow up, you know, perhaps after receipt of many comments or perhaps independently, but not ask for a response to every comment. Thanks.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thanks, Alissa, for the reference.

Wolf?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks, Mohamed. I think, if I may, I saw Lynn on the list before me. Is that --

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: On the speakers queue?

No, I have you, Lynn, Daniel, Russ, and Alan.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. Okay. Thank you.

Well, I'm a friend of taking care of this forum, so we call it -- as I said before once, we call it the ICG forum. ICG forum. So it's related to us. And if I would come to a forum which I see a name on it which is called ICG, or whatever, forum, I think this is related to that name and I expect the reaction of -- when I get to that -- to that forum from that.

So that is my perception of that.

So the question -- the only question is then what kind of reaction that should be.

And I'm also a friend of -- of small and very -- well, small processes, not having a complicated process for that, and I'm confident, well, you started, both Daniel and Manal, to discuss that, and I think a compromise of that could be done. But there should be a reaction also from our side in any -- in any forum.

I don't expect too -- let me say too many negative comments. So you phrase that in that way more, Daniel. So I expect comments which I am -- I would go to handle and then categorize in a way.

These are comments and we can discuss whether they are substantive with regards to what the meaning of the ICG forum is, but we shouldn't treat it and expect, well, it is just negative, whatever is coming in. And so -- and if it turns out only that we come to a result that there is only a few of them that are substantive, then it's okay. That is okay. That's good for. And we should really take some very diligently and find an answer to that.

So I'm on the way -- I would like to suggest that Manal is taking these documents and trying, well, to come up with a more -- not a formal process, and I saw that you're on the way on that, and I

would appreciate the follow-on. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Lynn, please. Thank you for joining us remotely.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: No, no, thank you. Lynn St. Amour for the record. One of the good things I think about being so late in the queue is that much of what one might have wanted to say has already been said.

But I would like to thank Manal, Kavouss, and Daniel for kicking off a discussion that I think has been helpful for helping us progress the work overall.

I also think that Joe and Alissa did a good job of kind of wrapping some of the conversation up and suggesting a way forward where the notification to the operating community will ---.

But I want to come back to what Martin said because I think the more difficult -- probably the more important role is the ICG reflecting on the comments and being very thoughtful about which ones we think we need to engage in more deeply than simply forwarding on and then sharing the way the attention was put to it from the operating community.

And, you know, I volunteered on the list earlier tonight to work on the knowledge in terms of moving this to the next stage should the ICG agree it was important to develop -- I actually didn't see this as a procedure. I more saw this kind of a set of operating practices or something which I think we should document and put out there so the community understands what we're committing to do and knows in turn how they should act themselves and what to expect.

So just to summarize, I think I would like to, I guess, hear a little more discussion and maybe there is no time for that left here in the call. But with respect to what the ICG sees their role as in terms of evaluating the comments and responding to them appropriately which may mean in some cases we do very little at all and others need to be more engaged. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Lynn.

Daniel, please.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Okay. Daniel here. Just to make it absolutely clear, I have never suggested to ignore comments like Milton was insinuating.

I just suggested that we do treat them according to our existing process, which we have used this morning. We have agreed to formally ask, I believe, one question of both the numbers and the protocol parameters community. We have spent a lot of time yesterday solving factual questions, and the record of that is in our minutes. And the people who made comments in that direction can refer to the minutes and see that we took their input seriously. So I never suggested to ignore comments, period.

Second, just a side note, as Narelle noted here as well, the name "ICG forum" is not one we chose. It's one that was chosen for us by the then-secretariat. And at the time I think in the discussion, several of us said they would have preferred "ICG comments" or something like that. But that's just a side note.

Now, coming back to those who said they didn't understand my argument about attack surface and attack vector and what the risks are, let me come back to a discussion we had just a couple of minutes ago where we heard, I think, at least two people around the table say we have to be careful that once we receive the CWG proposal, we have to be cognizant of the fact that it may be a very delicate compromise and we should be careful going forward not to upset the compromise by asking certain questions.

Yet, we have heard Kavouss suggest a procedures that forwards any question that we receive directly to the CWG in this case with an explicit request from us for an answer.

Now, if that isn't an attack vector, I don't know what is, right? So just to make my point.

Now to move the discussion forward, I think Joseph was going in a good direction and Alissa as well, and I think we should look for a solution in that space they were spanning. Actually, Manal was in the same space. So I don't want to exclude her. I just don't want the attack vectors. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you.

Russ, please.

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy for the record.

I have followed the discussion carefully, though, I haven't really participated on the list. And in general I'm more inclined towards Daniel's proposal and I think the modifications suggested by Joe

and Alissa are going in the right direction very much.

The concern I had with the way that we started -- and Manal's suggestion -- one of the big problems we have is the unknown. We really truly do not have any idea how many and what type of inputs and comments that we'll get. They may be few. They may be massive. People around the table today have said that they expect more comments but then some other folks have said, gee, it may be so finely crafted that there may not be any. we truly don't know.

So I think whatever we put in place needs to be able to flexibly accommodate either massive perhaps disruptive comments and comments that are intended to be possibly disruptive.

And the other end of the spectrum is if we don't get any or one or two -- I personally think that's unlikely, but it is a possibility. And so in my view, what we need to try to craft is something that I think is based upon our previous statements about how we intend to handle and go forward with these things which I think is what Daniel's underlying point was to begin with. We already have a lot of process. We have a lot of things that we've said we're going to do.

I would be very opposed to any kind of automated forwarding or even as somebody looks at it first and every comment gets forwarded to the operational community. I think that would be a serious mistake. We need to craft something in the middle. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. If there is no further, I mean, comment -- Joe and Kavouss, followed by Kavouss. Please.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Just to pick up the points that Martin had made and also that Lynn had made on kind of the need for the person who commented to feel like they have been heard, which I think is an important concept. Rather than doing that in an individualized fashion, we might be able to do that in a digest fashion. So to have the secretariat put down the nature of the comments that were received and then to have the community put down a summary of their responsive action to those comments, so it is not individualized but it is saying we received these comments. To these types of comments, we have responded in this fashion. To these, we have responded in this so that you can have a digest in which someone can feel that they have been acknowledged without having to have it be individualized to every comment. That would then address the attack vectors that Daniel is

concerned about because you're not doing individualized process. But it would also allow people to feel that they can find themselves somewhere on the Web site related to something they've asked and a process by which it has been answered. And then they can look to the formal questions we asked to understand which we've taken on board as things we want to follow up on. And then I think you cover the basis with as much lack of individual response as possible.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Mohamed.

I think we have to follow what is in our charter. Comments should be welcomed. We should not discourage the people that don't make any comment because we are not going to send them to anywhere. You would not receive any reply at all even if your comment is relevant. On one hand, we don't want to get into the detail examination of comment. On the other hand, Russ mentioned that we make a selection.

I don't think we should make any selection at all. Comments received. We send it to the community for reply. And we should

have a copy of that reply.

If as Martin mentioned the reply is not convincing, we may take follow-up actions. So I don't think that we should ignore the comment, and we should react in an appropriate manner, not individually acknowledging but acknowledging in a more general way. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Kavouss.

So I would like to suggest that if Manal with the support of Lynn and Kavouss could continue working on the document with suggestions currently been put forward from different ICG members and present the outcome to us. What do you think, Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL: I'm a bit confused now because the draft was suggesting that we forward each and every message if it is not spam. And I think there's a compromised way forward to just acknowledge them in a digest format. So I think we need to decide on this point first before agreeing whether we're going to go through the draft again because this is a different approach. Or have I overlooked

something?

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Sorry. Kavouss speaking.

I don't think that this is a difficulty. When we send the comments received to the community, it is a sort of an acknowledgment and the people, they will see that, that their comment has been forwarded to the concerned community. So there is no difficulty on that. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Russ, please.

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy again. One of the concerns I have with the forwarding of all the comments and, more or less, do everything towards the community is what happens if we don't get a response from the community? What happens if the response we get from the community doesn't bear any relevance to the question that was asked? Is this introducing a way for those that if they would like to slow down or stop or derail a process to actually do so and are we introducing by having, more or less, this

move everything out to the communities as it comes to us, are we introducing another dependency in our timeline, in our processing to reaching completion of our job?

This is one of the concerns that I've had for the sending everything to the community, is we know that the communities -- the two communities we've already had proposals from worked very hard to get those through and, in fact, did it on a much shorter timeline than normal.

How can we expect them to continue to respond in a similar sort of manner for what might be nuisance questions? I don't know. That's one of my concerns with this.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Manal, please.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. If I may suggest, first of all, let's not confuse two different processes. The ICG questions to the operational communities which were what we were discussing yesterday and what might come up from our reading of the comments. So this is ICG questions to the operational communities.

Then the comments received to the ICG may be a compromised way forward like Joe mentioned and Alissa also supported, that we can make it public and convey this to the operational communities, that we are going to have, like, a digest of the received comments and the received responses periodically. I'm not sure how long should this period be, so that they -- first of all, the community knows that we are keeping track of the comments received and keeping track of the responses received without getting into a process of individual forwarding and getting stuck or waiting for individual responses.

So we -- okay. I will leave it there.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I will take Milton, Alissa, Kavouss, and Joe and Russ again.

MILTON MUELLER: There are very clear answers to your questions and concerns, Russ. On the procedure, we forward. We acknowledge. It could be automated. We forward. It could be bundled or indexed.

And you say, oh, my God, what if they don't answer? And my answer to that is: Then they don't answer. If we think that the comment is substantive and it hasn't been addressed, then it becomes part of our evaluation process. But I suspect that if 90%

of the comments are people saying: You didn't do what I wanted you to do, we don't care if they answer or not. Or if they answer, they just say, yeah, tough luck, you didn't win in this process. So, sorry. But if there's a real process problem, then we follow up.

So I just don't understand this panic about handling public comments. There will be public comments. We don't know how extensive they will be, but I think the document that I have in front of me from Manal once I've accepted all the changes and can actually read it, it looks very reasonable. And just a few days ago, the same critics were telling us that if we made any decisions about these comments, that we would be getting ourselves into trouble, that that would be an attack surface. Now we are saying, okay, we won't be making any decisions. We will send them. We will acknowledge them in a very mechanical way. And then we'll decide according to our own process just as we just did twice now with two proposals whether we have any questions based on that.

So I think we're just making a big deal out of nothing here. I don't understand why we're stuck on this. It seems to me to be very straightforward, very simple.

The only things I can see us discussing is the way to optimize the efficiency and minimize the burdens of this process. But to be

afraid of terrible things happening because of this, I just don't get it.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Alissa, please.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. I agree with everything that are Milton just said. I wanted to point out the part of what Joe said that I thought other people were supporting -- or what I thought he said, which is that as far as how the community gets informed, we ask them for their preference. We can either forward them every comment individually, or they can take it upon themselves to check the forum. I didn't hear anything about a digest, and that seems like excess work to me on the part of someone, probably the secretariat. So that would be my -- as far as the transparency aspect and informing the communities or the communities being aware of comments received, I would suggest that we ask them for their preference. Do they want us to forward each comment, or do they want to check for themselves?

And assuming we are operating under the paradigm that is reflected in that document and that a few of us have put forward, which is that we don't expect a specific response to every single comment but we will inform the community if we have a question

for them that is based on comments received, then it's not -- it's not putting a heavy burden on the communities. Because even if they receive many individual comments, they can decide for themselves whether they warrant discussion or not. Thanks.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Maybe we can get an opinion from the operating communities about what their preferences are. Are they able to look at the comments, or they need us to submit that to them? Maybe Jari or Paul or Alan could give us a sense what preference they would like, reviewing comments received by themselves or ICG submitting comments to them.

Alan, please.

ALAN BARRETT: Alan Barrett. So I can't really speak for the CRISP team, but just my personal opinion as a member of the CRISP team, I think we're ready to respond to any substantive comments. It would -- we'd probably prefer to receive each substantive comment only once. If a hundred people all say the same thing or if one person keeps on repeating the same thing over and over, we would like to address that only once, but if it's difficult for the ICG to perform that sort of filtering, then we're able to do it ourselves.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Jari?

JARI ARKKO: I'm not sure I have a strong opinion on that. I think we've seen, to some extent in the process that we already went through, that there's a danger for repetition of the same arguments coming multiple times during the different stages of the process.

I think blindless forwarding is maybe a bad idea, but, you know, if that's managed properly, then, you know, maybe that's also acceptable.

I think in any case, someone can monitor a forum and pick comments, if needed, or they can be sent directly.

Personally, I don't -- do not have a strong opinion.

Just realize that whatever we do, there is some chance of, you know, overflow of comments and repetition and we have to deal with that. The specific mechanics of how stuff gets shown is kind of a detail, in some sense, and the actual denial of service attack resistance comes from more intelligent operations of, you know, "We recognize that this is already dealt with" or "This isn't really an appropriate comment to begin with."

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. I think with -- with the support of the secretariat, we can be able to do that, address them forward to the communities.

I have Kavouss and Joe, Russ, and Lynn.

Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Mohamed. From the beginning of the ICG, I was not in favor of any adjectives for any actions. I heard "substantive." What is substantive, what is not substantive? What is substantive for you may not be substantive for me. So please do not introduce any adjectives.

We don't need to send acknowledgment. If the record of the ICG shows that we send the comments to the community, it is automatic acknowledgment. We don't need to send acknowledgment.

We send it to the community. Community would reply. But they have to give us a copy of the reply. If, in our view, the reply is totally irrelevant, we have the right to come back and ask the reply is irrelevant. If it is relevant, we don't take action.

That is why I suggested a copy to the ICG for information and any follow-up action where necessary. That's all.

We complicate a very simple issue. I don't understand that. I'm surprised. The issue is quite simple. Comment coming in. We have to send it to the community to reply. And I don't think that if the same people repeat the same question, the community reply, then that -- there is no new element in your new questions. Reply was already given.

So I don't think that the people are seeking to --

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: -- to repeat something without any reasons, so I don't know why the people they're afraid to send the comment to the communities.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah. Thank you, Kavouss. Thank you --

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: -- for the message there. Thank you.

Joe?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. I just thought I'd clarify what I'd said since there seems to be some confusion as to what the content of it was.

One, I think we provide the option to the communities, if they wish, to just receive them. We can forward them. If they wish to actually be their own management agent, then they can come to the forum and look at them, but that would require a letter from the community saying, "We are, in fact, going to be" -- it's a pull versus a push system at that point.

I think it's dangerous for us to be selective as to what gets forwarded or not forwarded. We are not the editor of the comments. They either get all from -- if it's a push system, they're going to get all of them. If it's a pull system, they get to decide what they pull.

In terms of the digest, the word that was missing was "summary," because I think that's the place where we do the editing, to say, "We had these types of questions, these were the answers to this type of question," because we don't have to repeat every single question that was there.

But I think in the archive of how we came to our decision and how we dealt with comments that were directed to a process that we run, that summary is helpful to us and it's helpful to people who made the comments to see their decision-making in that comment, but it is a summary nature of a digest, not an itemized nature of a digest, and I think in that case we -- we deal with Milton's concerns -- I mean, Martin's concerns about does the person see themselves in the process, and we also deal with the concerns of the -- the groups having picked up ideas.

And then finally, those issues which we think are relevant, we will deal with as a question that we then directly raise to the community because that is an issue that -- the only other thing that might improve things is if we ask the name of the community to be in the subject header because perhaps the protocol and parameters have already dealt with -- I mean, protocols and numbering have already dealt with their questions and they don't necessarily have to go through every name question that comes

down the pike in the "pull" method.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I'd like to close the queue on Russ and Lynn, and please try to be brief.

RUSS MUNDY: So interestingly enough, after this discussion, it frankly sounds to me like there is a very large amount of agreement what we should be doing here.

The thing that was very unclear to me prior to this discussion is that when things were forwarded by the ICG to the respective communities, that there was no need or no particular expectation that we would get any response to those from the operational communities.

If that's the case -- and I'm not a hundred percent certain that that was the case, but that's my current understanding -- I think -- you know, I have absolutely no objection to just, you know, doing the automated forwarding.

I think the point that Joe made earlier that the most important aspect is what we do internally when we see things that come in in the comments that are relevant to what our remit and tasking

is, that we select and act on those, as appropriate, and I don't think that that got much emphasis at all in what was being discussed on the earlier mailing list things.

And honestly, this is what I think -- and Daniel, I know, will correct me if I'm wrong, but I think this was a great deal of his perception in saying, "We already have processes for identifying. We're going to look at the forum, we're going to pull out the things. We're going to do what we're supposed to do. We'll do our job." But that wasn't really being discussed much.

So I think we are actually quite close on what we're going to do here, and honestly, after this discussion, I think it makes a lot more sense to just do an automated acknowledgment, an automated forwarding, and if we get responses from the communities, fine. If we don't, fine. But we need to make that clear that we don't necessarily expect a response from the communities of these things being forwarded.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Lynn, please.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Thank you. Lynn St. Amour.

Much of this discussion is actually focused on solving for the negative, maybe even imaginary problems, rather than I think playing to the sort of principles and the strengths we all espouse as part of the multistakeholder bottom-up, et cetera, sort of process.

It's a little surprising, because I think we actually have the means to handle and respond, if we are overwhelmed by questions from the naming proposal. And I think we can do that by setting expectations up front.

Maybe one of the things we could do is ask specifically the communities to appoint a person to monitor the forum, but also (indiscernible) principles about where the work should be done, so that they are charged with -- and that's not quite the right term, but charged with monitoring the forum for their own responses.

Maybe the role of the ICG is to monitor the forum closely enough so that we ensure that the comments that are coming into the forum are being taken into account, are being responded to -- which is probably appropriately in quotes there as well -- because if we feel that things aren't being addressed adequately enough to give us confidence as we, you know, do our coordination role,

then I think we would need to engage more deeply at that point.

And I -- so I agree with the comments. I think we perhaps haven't addressed that enough in Manal's initial proposal, but I think that's because it wasn't -- it was not what she was actually chartered to do. I do think this is maybe an additional piece of work that needs a little bit more fleshing out. But if we step back a little bit from the arguments and just think about the process we've all run, I think the confidence we have in those processes and our abilities to adapt if the process starts to get away from us or we start to get overrun, then I think our focus should really be doing -- should be on doing the right thing, which is ensuring that the comments are being attended to, addressed, and I actually do think a summary would be a useful thing, to the degree the discussion starts heating up. We sort of said we were going to do that earlier when we had the protocol discussion, given the comments that came in through the assessment process.

I like the CWG document that came out earlier today because it summarized an awful lot of work and actually said very clearly, "Here's what we're doing, here are some of the arguments, here's the different proposals, here's what our next steps are."

I think that will be very useful to people that aren't so deeply embedded in this work in this community, and frankly a lot of this

will be tried in that court of opinion rather than, you know, the 30 of us or the thousand people with ICANN that are paying attention to it.

So maybe if we just take a step back and say "Well, what's the right way to drive this process, what should we do given our principles and our beliefs," we can get to a higher-level state of, I guess, directional statements that we can put out, and then maybe a few of us can go away and work some of the details a little more in the background. That's all. Thank you.

Thank you, Mohamed.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you.

I think, Manal, now you have clarity about how we're going to proceed and maybe you can conclude this part, if you would like.

MANAL ISMAIL: Okay. I will try to reflect the discussion into the steps. I won't call it a process or a procedure. The steps we have.

I hope -- again, I depend on the help of colleagues who have made constructive proposals. I mean, Joe, Lynn, and others. And we

can work this online, definitely. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you very much.

Now we have a break and we need to get back. It's a working lunch as well. So we need to get back at 1:00.

Feel free to bring your lunch here to the table because we're going to continue on the proposal for finalization processes.

Manal?

MANAL ISMAIL: Of course this is in addition to the initial drafting team, Mr. Arasteh and Jean-Jacques and, of course, Daniel and others are most welcome.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. And Lynn actually volunteered. Yeah.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yeah. I said Lynn and Joe.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Sure.

MANAL ISMAIL: Those in addition to anyone else. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Sure. Okay. It's break time, and lunch. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Yeah. One thing, a reminder for people in the room. The box lunch is for ICG members, secretariat, and -- let's see. It's for the ICG members, the secretariat, and the interpreters. Thank you.

**[ BREAK ]**

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. We are back. You can see the agenda in front of you just to refresh where we are through the day. So the next item should be the proposal finalization process and the questions that are filed. And this is for everyone. And we have accountability. We need to finish that at 1:45. And then the future teleconferences and face-to-face meeting schedules.

So we can start by the process finalization.

Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Regarding the finalization process, I'm working together with the secretariat to create a new version of the finalization process document that is more split up on the various steps within each one of the major steps that we had. And we also started to produce a flowchart that shows more explicitly what kind of actions are taken, by whom, what are ICG internal, external.

And my conclusion from the discussion we have had earlier today is that there is a -- there is a -- until we get more data, it seems to be the case that the consensus of ICG is to stay with the various steps that we have -- that we have planned to take, which means that I don't see any interest from ICG members to discuss at this point in time any changes in the finalization the process unless we can -- we as chairs together with the secretariat are giving you more data and then we can discuss the finalization process, whether we are going to optimize any of the steps, whether we can do various things in parallel, for example, given that we have not got the names proposal yet, et cetera.

So I suggest that we are -- my suggestion is that the consensus of ICG at the moment is that the finalization proposal is like before, and we are opening up a discussion again when we have more data for the timeline, which hopefully will be arriving to you this week.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. So with that, I can suggest that we can move to the next agenda, accountability, if there is no objection.

So for the accountability, I'm sure you are all following the work of the cross-community working group for accountability and governance, which is -- they are currently working hard to achieve their objectives. And they identified work stream 1 which is ICANN accountability related to the transition which is linked to our work in terms of the final proposal.

And we as well as ICG in the RFP, Section B, requested the communities to provide details about pretransition and post-transition accountability and any suggestions that they would like to see or changes in terms of accountability. And we receive the responses of the proposals currently from the two communities.

So with that, I'll open the floor for the discussion and I would like to focus on accountability related to the transition of work stream

1 or accountability within the proposals. Thank you.

Keith, please.

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Mohamed. Keith Drazek. Since nobody else is speaking up in discussions of the accountability process, you know, I think it's just important to note that -- I think I mentioned this also yesterday at the beginning of our session, that the accountability CCWG is hard at work and they are in contact at the co-chairs level with the CWG transition group.

And I think there is a lot of work that will take place this week, both working group level work on accountability. And there are subteams I think Kavouss mentioned yesterday. There are actually multiple different efforts and working groups and working teams focused on different areas. There are working sessions this week, and there will be community engagement sessions this week. So a tremendous amount of work is ongoing on the accountability front. And it's really building on the work that was done in Frankfurt within the last two weeks in a two-day face-to-face session where significant progress was made. So just to tee up the discussion to see if there are any questions or comments. Thanks.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Joe, please.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I guess just because there are people that are ICG members who are participating directly in some of this work at all of the levels that you were describing, it would just be useful to ask them to come back to us if they see anything in that work which they think would somehow impact the work we're doing so that we can make sure to be best coordinated with that.

I think from the two proposals, the communities didn't necessarily find in the proposals that were submitted a direct accountability impact per se at the moment. But if one develops, we should be apprised of it as soon as possible.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Kavouss speaking. As I mentioned yesterday, apart from work stream 1 and work stream 2, there are work area 1, 2, 3, and 4. Work area 1 relating to the accountability, currently exists. Work area 2, comments received for that accountability. Work area 3 relating to the CWG. And work area 4, contingencies. Apart from that, two new working parties have been established.

One is dealing with the review and redress. The other dealing with the empowerment of the community to take necessary action with respect to any decisions which were made by the board and by law and so on and so forth.

And these two working parties are now very active. The first face-to-face meeting of the working party 1 will have -- will occur this afternoon at 3:00 in room (saying name) and level. So people here may wish to observe or attend that.

And in reply to Joe, yes, certainly, if there is anything that we have to report to the ICG getting the advice, we will do that certainly without any delay. Thank you.

I follow all the activities of that within three to four hours every day. I spend four hours every day on the CCWG. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Thank you, Kavouss.

So in absence of any further comments about accountability and as Joe said, the proposal didn't have any necessarily substantial issues related to accountability -- yeah, sorry. I'm saying that in absence of any further comments regarding accountability, as Joe mentioned, the proposals are very clear in terms of -- the received

proposals in terms of accountability, and there are no changes proposed.

So I suggest we can move to the next agenda item if there is no objection. Okay. The next agenda item is the future teleconferences and face-to-face meeting schedules.

I hand it to Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. Just to say, first of all, I would like to confirm that the ICG wants to continue with the rotating time for the telephone conferences. Alternatively, we are changing that to something else. Let me open up that question first.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Narelle.

NARELLE CLARK: I suggest the rotating schedule teleconferences is just fine. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Keith?

KEITH DAVIDSON: +1.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So let's stay with the rotating schedule.

The next question I have is how many telephone conferences you would like me to schedule. For a while, we scheduled we had one every week because we sort of had that -- we had so much to talk about. And then we unfortunately cancelled one on very late notice which is our fault as chairs to not coordinate early enough.

What we could do is, for example, to schedule -- I feel that we -- because of discussion of the timeline, we probably need to have a telephone conference really soon after this ICANN meeting, like already not the next week but the week after the ICANN meeting or two weeks after the ICANN meeting. Maybe we should schedule every second week and then we decide, let's say, on the Monday of the week of the telephone conference whether we are going to cancel it or not.

So my suggestion is to start second Wednesday after the ICANN meeting and then schedule a telephone conference every second week.

So, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, thank you. I think no problem what you suggest. But perhaps if you allow the people who are active in two groups to have the possibility to participate in the ICG teleconference, i.e., should not be at the same time as the teleconference of CCWG at least. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I take on the task of communicating with the -- with both the accountability CCWG and the name CWG and get information on their teleconference schedule before I propose a schedule to the ICG. I feel that at the moment, I have a feeling that we are waiting on those two groups so I should gather information from them and then we should try to adopt to their schedule instead of the other direction. That's what I hear, and I see many people in the room nodding.

Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: In addition to that, I'm just curious as to why you think we have an urgent need to meet after this meeting because it seems to me

we're still kind of in waiting for names mode.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: The reason why -- the reason why I want us to meet in a telephone conference is to discuss the finalization and timeline. I feel that is -- I would like to finalize that because I want us to -- we will not get the data ready. The secretariat is not ready with the background material yet. So, unfortunately, we're not really done yet. I don't know from the finalization document, for example, that we have, what steps we can do in parallel because we are working on identifying that, for example, so we need to know how far can we move forward with the names and numbers before we are basically blocked because of non-delivery -- sorry, with the protocols and numbers because we are blocked by names.

MILTON MUELLER: In that case, I was assuming that we would finish the timeline and make a pronouncement today. If that's not the case, then I agree with you, that we need to meet immediately after.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Good. Then you and I are in sync.

Joseph?

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. Excuse me. Apart from -- Joseph Alhadeff. Apart from the issue of the timeline which will need to be addressed, there may be things that come up on Monday which we may want to talk about further as well. So I think it's a good time to have a meeting following what could be a lot of interaction both in formal sessions as well as in the hallways.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Patrik.

May I request you kindly to clarify why we need the regular meeting? Meeting should arrange when and if necessary. Why we need to have every week? If we don't have anything to discuss, why we need to have that one? Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So far we have separated the scheduling of potential telephone conferences with the decision to have a meeting. And the only thing we talked about was to do the scheduling so we know at what time the telephone conference will be given that we need one. So I agree with you that we should not have a meeting unless we need it. The task that we as chairs have failed at least

once is to cancel -- to decide and inform the ICG that there will not be any discussion at the allocated time slot and that is something that we as chairs have taken on as a task that we must do that no later than, let's say, three days before the allocated time slot.

Okay. The next question has to do with a face-to-face meeting schedule. And let me start with what I hope is the easiest to discuss, that has to do with a face-to-face meeting at our next ICANN meeting. I presume we do believe we need to have a face-to-face meeting adjacent to that ICANN meeting. And we had at the previous meeting two days after, and this time we have two days before the ICANN meeting. I don't really know what is the best and preferred for the ICG. I know I personally prefer before because I cannot stay after, but I would to hear what you ICG members say.

Liman.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: There is at least for me a motivation to have it after the meeting. That is it is easier to stay awake because we end up in strange time zones. And if I've had a week to adjust, I can pay better attention.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: And I hope that what you said was strange time zones for people not living in that specific time zone where the ICANN meeting is, right?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I can only suspect that other people have the same problem.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK: Thank you, Patrik. I think for the ICG face-to-face meetings around an ICANN meeting, I think it is helpful for us to have the conversations before the ICANN meeting because it gives us the ability to do our work and then engage with the community following our work as opposed to waiting until the end to conduct our business.

So, I mean, for scheduling purposes, it is easier for me I think to come early rather than stay late or at least that's my personal preference. But I think from a workflow perspective, it makes sense for us to do our work on the front end of the meeting if we're going to be dealing with an ICANN crowd. Thanks.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes, Patrik. Kavouss speaking. If we reach very rapid consensus to do it before, yes. If not, I do not recommend that we discuss half an hour or 45 minutes because 30 persons have 30 different agendas and so on and so forth. So let us take it. Either we agree pre or you establish to do it and go according to that. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Michael.

MICHAEL NIEBEL: Agree with the argument of Keith.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Narelle?

NARELLE CLARK: Narelle Clark. I'm just thinking about what is likely to have occurred -- or to occur at the next ICANN meeting. Do we want to try and inject some material into the processes that take place within the ICANN meeting? Or do we want to take the work from the ICANN meeting, distill it and produce something at the end of that? So that is my thinking insofar as whether or not our meetings should be at the beginning or at the end of the next

meeting.

My thinking at the moment is that we need to take the communities' outputs from the next meeting, the BA meeting, and turn it into something which we then press on with.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Patrik. Kavouss speaking.

I have not talked with my colleagues in the GAC, but at least as far as GAC is concerned, our preference is before that because we could inject the outcome of the ICG into GAC meeting and get some advice and some instructions. Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you. Russ Mundy.

RUSS MUNDY: Russ Mundy.

I have been thinking that it could go either way, but I believe it's most effective if we meet and do our work beforehand because

with the public session that we have during the meeting, we can get further inputs, and if we need to do something immediately after it, just like we're setting a telecon this following week after the meeting, we can do that, and that seems to be the most effective approach.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Daniel?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: I don't want to make -- Daniel here.

What's going to happen, if I'm not mistaken, the CWG promised to give us input before the next -- or at the next ICANN meeting, so that's something we should probably take into account when -- because there is a major work item coming and the question is, what can we do, should we do, should we listen to them during the meeting first, things like that. Because that's the event that's going to define our next meeting then.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So if I understand you correctly, Daniel, your suggestion is that we have our next meeting the week after we get the proposal from the CWG names.

[ Laughter ]

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Actually, excellent idea. I support that wholeheartedly. And we can -- and we can work on the numbers and protocol parameters via teleconferences.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Okay. So go back to a little bit more serious discussion.

Yes, I understand. You're absolutely correct that the indication we got was that they were going to deliver around the next ICANN meeting. The question, of course, is whether they deliver just before or -- or during the meeting, and that is something -- if the request is that we should communicate with them before we move this discussion further, that would be -- then I -- then we take on the task of talking to them.

On the other hand, the input so far seems to be that people think that in general terms it's better for us to do our work and inject things into the ICANN meeting, but that there are arguments to do it the other way around.

Milton and then Jari and I think the other flags were taken down, right?

Otherwise, please flag again.

Milton and then Jari.

MILTON MUELLER: Just somebody who's pretty familiar with the way the names community works, it's inconceivable to me that they would finish their proposal at an ICANN meeting. It would be something that they would have going into an ICANN meeting and they would start seeking public comment on it or it's something that they would have a bunch of meetings at the ICANN meeting and then finish it afterwards, but it's literally inconceivable to me that they would finish it at an ICANN meeting.

You have the GNSO meeting, you have the GAC meeting separately. Everything is going on, the normal business of ICANN.

I'm not sure that the CWG -- but I could be wrong, and we should check with the schedule that the CWG gave us to find out what -- whether their deadline corresponds to an ICANN meeting or after it or just before it.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Daniel, did you have a quick comment on that?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Yeah. I have this thing before me and if the secretariat could project ICD-CWG-CCWG time line, ta-dah, ta-dah, ta-dah, ta-dah, we got from them. But I have it in front of me and it suggests that -- with a red dashed arrow that they would give us this before the next ICANN meeting.

No. The dot is behind the red dashed arrow.

[ Laughter ]

It's to the right. Excuse me. It's to the right. And the time line goes from left to right. It's to the right of the red dashed arrow.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Jari?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: So I read it like we should expect their input before the ICANN meeting. Just --

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Jari?

JARI ARKKO: Jari Arkko.

I think it's a little bit silly to predict on a day accuracy events several months in advance, so I think we should plan, as suggested, that it makes sense from our perspective to meet before the ICANN and then we can prepare for the discussions during the meeting, and as the proposals keep coming -- coming to us or input keeps coming to us, I think it doesn't happen like, you know, "This is the instant, that is the day, that is the hour that it's delivered."

But hopefully it's like built on -- you know, earlier on prepared, so we have lots of prewarning and versions and such.

So I'm not worried about the exact date this is delivered. I'd arrange things so that it makes practical sense.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So I'll give the floor to Mohamed and then I'll close this discussion item.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah. I agree with Jari. I think it's -- in principle, let's have our meetings before the ICANN meeting and then evaluate the situation as we go. It's very difficult to predict things now.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you. The next thing that I would like to -- just to bring up is that we as -- sorry. Alissa. Sorry about that. Sorry.

ALISSA COOPER: Sorry. So I'm going to provide a contrary view to the last two people who spoke because -- just because I had -- and I think, Patrik and Mohamed, you were involved in some of these conversations as well with the names CWG.

Part of the thinking with the time line there that you can see, if anybody else is looking at it in front of them, is that their proposal would go to the chartering organizations ahead of it coming to us, and my understanding is that for some of the chartering organizations, approving something at an ICANN meeting is a useful thing to do. That is the way -- or the mode of operation that they often work in. And so while I agree that trying to predict down to the day of when the proposal is received and so forth is not very useful, I would say that it's -- it's probably -- if we want to have the proposal before we meet, there's a better chance of that happening if we meet at the end than at the beginning.

So just some food for thought.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Kavouss?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Kavouss speaking.

On one hand, Alissa is right. On the other hand, suppose that CWG give -- gives the proposal to the chartering organization and there is no answer from chartering organizations. So we do nothing?

So let's not tie it up exactly to that.

ALISSA COOPER: If that's the case -- sorry. I mean, that could also be true if the proposal is not even finished, right? Like we have to plan -- to plan this meeting and this travel several months in advance, to accommodate people's schedules. It's possible that we will not have anything on the agenda. You know, this time we planned for two full days and we're not going to meet for two full days. It happens.

I think we have to schedule time to meet, but it's not necessarily the case that we will use all the time or any of the time, but I think it's much more prudent to schedule time to meet than not to.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Michael?

MICHAEL NIEBEL: I'm just wondering also in the sense of, Jari, is it not really thinkable that there's some kind of parallel processing and that the drafts that go into these chartering organizations are also available to us so everybody can have a look and discuss? Because this is -- I mean, we will not have this really consecutive planning that will work out.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much.

I think we, as chairs, have got enough information, enough input, to be able to look at the logistics and the -- excuse me. Manal?

Ah, okay. Lynn. Sorry. I don't -- I don't see what's on the screen from here. I'm sorry.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: That's fine. Thank you, Patrik. It's Lynn St. Amour. I do think that the point Alissa brought up is important. In any case, whether it had been approved or not, we'd have the best possible information because I'm sure the proposals will have been significantly formed by the ICANN meeting. So I think I would agree with afterwards as well.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Okay. What we will do and what I suggest is that we, as chairs, take this -- this -- what you have said as input, we look at the logistics, we look at our own time line discussion, and we have to come back to you with suggestions on how to -- with a suggested conclusion on how to handle the next ICANN meeting, after also talking to the CWG and the CCWG, to talk about the details, about the coordination between our three groups.

Another thing I would like to inform you about is that we are -- we are in discussion with ICANN regarding budget and other issues, and we have been flagging for the need for a face-to-face meeting in between the ICANN meeting, if that is needed.

So I just encourage the ICG members to keep that in mind, that if it is the case when you look at the time line, when you see what's happening in the other communities, if it is the case that you detect that it might be the case that we, for example, need to

have or should have a meeting in between ICANN meetings just because that would make our work more efficient, in that case don't hesitate suggesting that, so we can take that up for discussion.

Of course that needs to be done in -- sort of in due time for logistic reasons and whatnot, but I want to remind all of us that that is still a possibility.

So with that, I hand over to Mohamed.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you very much, Patrik.

I think we're just waiting for a list of action items as an outcome of the meeting from the secretariat, hopefully in a minute, so we can at least -- we will be all on the same page and we know what's the action items on our side.

Yeah. Wolf, please.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Excuse me. Wolf-Ulrich speaking.

Just a question in between, you know, for the agenda. So I'm wondering whether we have time to talk about the -- the Monday session.

So -- the Monday session. The Monday session we'll have at the ICANN meeting.

So Michael raised the question with regards to any statements or any positions we will take on that, so I am wondering whether we have time now to discuss that and when. Thanks.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Daniel, please.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Daniel here.

I fully agree with Wolf-Ulrich that we need to discuss this. We will be asked what our plan is on Monday morning. It would be really bad if we had -- didn't have an agreed position on that question, and I think we should take the time to really agree on a statement here and now.

Sorry. Yeah. Jet lag. And there is -- in the chatroom, I made a proposal, and Keith Drazek suggested an addition to it, and it's

pretty simple, so it might be a way to move forward.

KEITH DRAZEK: So this is Keith. I just re-added it to the Adobe chat, so it should be at the bottom now.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Keith.

So maybe you can look at Keith's submission.

Keith, please.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you, Mohamed.

Why don't I read to for everybody.

So Daniel suggested earlier, in the Adobe chat, that we come together around a statement that says, "Our plans are currently unchanged. Expect result six months after we receive the response from the CWG."

Okay. Of course that -- you know, if you add six months to June, we're looking at the end of the year, well past the September

target date that we had originally had.

My concern is that, you know, we want to I think keep open the possibility that we could accelerate our processes if we find that the CWG proposal is noncontroversial or, you know, streamlined.

So I would suggest that we add, "Once the ICG receives the CWG proposal, we will look for any opportunities to accelerate our work while ensuring a predictable process and the necessary public consultations," just to sort of keep that opportunity or that option open without simply saying "At the current time frame, it's going to be December, at best."

Thanks.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Jari and Paul.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah. First, I think it would be useful to project the text that is being proposed on the screen here.

Secondly, I think I'm agreeing what is being said, but I -- I think it would be good to be able to say something about, you know, incremental process, that we're proceeding as fast as possible

with regards to the input that we have or something along those lines.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Paul, please.

PAUL WILSON: Yeah. I hope we can see it projected as well.

If we're saying that -- if we're announcing that a result is expected, then can we be clear what that result is? I mean, is that, for instance, a final proposal ready to be submitted to the U.S. Government? If so, we should probably say that.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Mohamed. Kavouss speaking.

I think we have discussed half an hour ago that chairs and co-chairs or vice chairs will discuss the issue of the time line and consult the ICG either through the call or any other way, and now we want to bypass everything and have some statement, so it is difficult to agree of any statement, and the last thing, it is very

difficult to what Paul suggests. Thank you. To agree with that.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Joe, please.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. If we make the statement that's being suggested now, then it seems that we're not going to bother with our consultation because our consultation was to deal with exactly those issues.

I think it is possible to make a statement that says, "We have been in communication with the names community. We have a time line from them related to their proposal. We are re-architecting our proposal in light of that. We believe that the time frame that we had related to our consideration is still appropriate but we are going through these following three elements," and highlight the process that the chair outlined, and then we are in an appropriate position of making a factual statement of exactly where we are.

We don't -- we think the time frame that we had laid out initially is still appropriate in terms of the amount of time it will take to consider the proposal, but that we are going through a process of making sure that we're getting it right.

Otherwise, if we make a statement now and we make a different statement in a week, then we're going to look crazy.

So, you know, I -- I think we should at least indicate we're going through a process and, you know, to Keith's point, we could -- we could indicate that it may be a shorter amount of time than -- than the amount of time we had considered, but I do think we have to highlight the fact that there's a process and we're going to be making a final statement.

Otherwise, I don't understand why we're bothering to go through the process.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Milton?

MILTON MUELLER: Sort of seconding what Joe just said, I'd be careful about too hasty a statement here, but I also think if we're going to make a statement like that, we need to modify it to leave open the possibility of an incremental change that would actually meet the original deadline.

In other words, if we submitted the numbers and protocols proposals separately from the names proposal, we might actually

be able to conform to the original deadline of September 30th, 2015, and we might want to signal that we're considering that.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Patrik, please.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I hear people are using the term "statement." Of course, there is no real difference between statement and what we are actually are discussing as everything that we are sort of talking about in the mailing list anyways because of the transparency which we all think is positive.

That said, I don't really think that we need any real statement, but I think we need to agree on what the current situation is. So more like speaking points or call it whatever you want, a little bit more softer, a little bit more soft.

I have myself been thinking about speaking points, which is not only one -- which is more than a statement. It is more like a question and an answer thing. And where I am at the moment which I was thinking of circulating to all of you anyways -- and this was a good point in time, I just sent it to you in the mailing list. You can look at there are actually four questions with some text

around it that you can have a look at.

And let me just read the examples. Does the ICG think that there is a realistic chance to reach the original target date? Has the ICG revised its timeline? When will that happen? Will there be any more clarity at the end of the ICANN week? What is the new target date? Has the ICG approached the CWG in order to explore whether the CWG could compress its timeline and why not?

I think we will all of us as individuals be asked these questions. And I think because of that, not as a statement but I think -- I don't mind working around the room or on the mailing list or in combination having us discuss in terms of those kind of questions and answers instead of thinking about statements because statements feels like we are going to carve something in stone and then we're done.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Manal, please.

MANAL ISMAIL: Yes. Just to support what Patrik and Mr. Arasteh said regarding we don't need an official statement and also to support what Joe suggested that we should not haste into committing some concrete timeline, especially that we have already agreed to have

a conference call immediately after the meeting here to agree and to discuss things further.

So probably we need to be factual. Of course, agree on what to be said in reply to each question. But, again, being factual on what has actually happened and where we stand would be the most appropriate in my view. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Manal.

Alissa.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. Yeah. So I agree with Manal and Joe and also with the notion of having talking points and not formulating some sort of statement. I think what we need here is talking points for when people get asked questions. But I think honesty is the best policy, and honesty is that we are reviewing the timeline. We have a timeline that we published some months ago and refined more recently with the finalization process. We have new information from the CWG, and it is under review. There is nothing wrong with telling the truth, and I think that's as much as we can say given everything we discussed in the last -- yesterday and today.

If we had come to some sort of conclusion in particular about this six-month thing, then I think we could talk about it. But I don't think we really can say anything definitively or give people the impression that we have agreed on a way forward given that we spent a lot of time discussing it but didn't actually finish the discussion yet. So I see no problem with telling people it is under consideration and that we expect to have an answer in a few weeks.

I don't think it's pressing in the sense that, like, we need to rush and say something that we haven't agreed to on Monday just because we have a session on Monday.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. Kavouss speaking. I suggest those who answer the question should not be specific, should be very general, saying that as soon as the reply or the response from the naming community is received, ICG make every possible effort to accelerate the process. Very general statement. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Narelle?

NARELLE CLARK: Narelle Clark for the record. I think there's another question that needs to go on the table. And I'm hesitant at putting it on the table. So I'm going to flag a question. I'm not going to pose it. I'm just going to say there is another question, I think. And that is I'm sure I'm going to be asked in the next week: Does the ICG think -- well, is it satisfied that the two proposals it has received so far are without any glaring errors or omissions for want of a better phrase? I think that is another question in there.

If that -- because that I think also flags this next phase that we have in our timeline. Perhaps that could be compressed if there is no major issue to be dealt with in these two proposals. I'm just flagging. I know I'm going to be asked that. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Daniel, please.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: This is Daniel. I think what Narelle just brought up is quite important, but let's get the other stuff out of the way first. And I appreciate that you not pose the question.

I am very happy with what Patrik wrote up as talking points. And I just want to be clear that what I suggested in the chatroom and earlier in my earlier intervention wasn't to make a statement per se but to be of one mind about what we're going to communicate. And I think, Patrik, what you wrote serves that very extremely well. And I think it reflects the consensus around the table as far as it exists.

I have one slight remark here on the second point, whether the last sentence that basically promises there may be a result during the week or there may not be, whether it is actually useful or the statement would be as valuable without actually making that because it's kind of a -- first of all, semantically it is a (indiscernible) almost. And, second, quite frankly, I don't see how we could come to consensus during this week without actually physically meeting. So if we just delete that sentence, this is perfect.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Noted.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Jari, please.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah, I think I'm agreeing with lots of people who spoke before me. Patrik's words about talking points were really good. Milton's points about "incremental" were really important as well.

I think -- and Kavouss was right, that we need to be generic.

I do want to say something, however. This is not only about we'll just wait until the last community completes and then proceed as fast as possible. I think this is more nuanced than that. So we will be able to use parallel processing and incremental approach as well. And that needs to be noted as well, even though if you say it in generic fashion.

I'd say the three points from my perspective are, yes, we are aware of the change situation with regards to timing of our inputs. Yes, we are reconsidering what that means for our overall timeline. And, yes, we are thinking if we have -- if we can compress or change the timeline that we need for our own process and, yes, we will see if we can use parallel and incremental processes to move forward with the two proposals that we already have to the extent that we can and leaving it fairly open.

So, I mean, minor things -- or going from minor things all the way up to let's deliver a partial proposal, I think we should leave it

open at the moment and not bind ourselves to a particular answer. And it could actually be a good thing to hear from the community on this situation.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thanks, Jari. I think we are already in agreement about the talking points. And Patrik has already taken the lead on this.

Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: I just sent some wording to the list regarding the incremental change. So in response to the question, does the ICG think there is a realistic chance to reach the original target date? I would propose we could say for, yes, numbers and protocol parameters proposals, this is possible. Other than that, I like the way Jari answered those questions. We are aware of the changed situation, et cetera.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Joe, please.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I guess I'm a little concerned with the phrasing Milton has introduced only because I think we agreed of the concept of a

unified proposal and the need to consider all three proposals in order to develop a unified proposal. So while theoretically possible, I don't think that's indicating a likely path of direction.

I think Jari's construction of that is seeing what incremental steps we can accomplish for the communities that have actively submitted proposals and how we can progress them as far as possible is perhaps a more factual statement of what we are looking at. And we will be likely to be able to progress up until the point of needing to assemble the common proposal. At that point, I think we're a little bit bereft of how to move forward.

So I guess I'm a little concerned that Milton's phrasing may give an impression that we are submitting something that I don't think has been the basis of a consensus discussion yet.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Jari, please.

JARI ARKKO: A quick response. So I was basically leaving it a little bit more open, all the way up to what Milton said. So, I mean, if that's acceptable, basically we are considering what to do now and leaving it a little bit more open would be my recommendation.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: This is a new arrangement, "incremental changes," incremental process. I don't understand it at all. We should act in accordance with our charter, and our charter enrollment mentioned -- sorry -- assembling and submitting a complete proposal. Are we changing our charter? How? I don't understand what we are doing.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: No, we are not changing anything. I think it is just the idea of we are doing some work, and we need just to at least have some wording that we're progressing our work while waiting for the third proposal.

Mary, please.

MARY UDUMA: Mary Uduma here. I know some communities, some participants might be interested to know what the ICG is going to do with the proposals it has received, the two proposals. And it is good for us to determine or to agree on what we want to do and as Jari has said and Milton.

The fact remains that we cannot submit a partial proposal until everything is complete. I don't think anybody is proposing that we submit a partial proposal. And how would NTIA look at it if we are going to submit a partial proposal?

So I think we should try to ask that if anybody asks us what ICG is going to do with the proposal will receive. I think we should articulate what to answer. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Milton, you already commented in the chat about Joe's proposal. You think it's safer? Can we close this?

MILTON MUELLER: I just want to say I don't think -- I don't understand that there's any bar, any clear and explicit statement preventing us from submitting -- it is not a partial proposal. Let's just call it a proposal extended in time, that there are parts of the proposal that might be implementable before others. So we're not withdrawing from our mandate to say you can do these two parts before you do that part. I don't think that's a -- that's why we mean incremental. The word "incremental" is maybe a good one. But I don't see anything stopping us from doing that.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Jari, please.

JARI ARKKO: Yes, what Milton said. And I'll just add that I think we should really work for the Internet, for the Internet users, and for the benefit of the Internet and not necessarily look to specific instructions that we may have gotten from any particular organization. I think we should try to do the right thing, whatever makes sense. And everything is, as always, negotiable.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Manal. Please.

MANAL ISMAIL: I'm sorry. Actually I tend to disagree with the incremental proposal thing. I mean, we could be incremental in implementation like Milton said, but the proposal I think is one unity. It's not incremental.

And, again, I don't see any problem in being factual in replying to such questions. We have received two proposals. We will do the most possible working on those two proposals as far as we can evaluate them separately, and we will stop at the point where we need to receive the names proposal as well because we also said we are going to identify gaps, overlaps. So I cannot really see how

we can proceed with two and then identify gaps and overlaps. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Joe, please.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yes, thank you. I have got no problem if people want to put a topic for discussion when we have our call as to whether or not we want to consider the potential of a bifurcated proposal. But that is not something we have discussed, and I would have very great discomfort on providing any indication that it is something we are contemplating when it hasn't been a topic of discussion.

I have got no problem saying we will work diligently to make sure we can progress the two proposals we have received as far as we possibly can. But that is different than suggesting that we will provide the proposal in an iterative fashion.

An iterative work on the proposals we have received to the extent possible is fine because names -- the numbers and protocols communities have done their job on a timely basis, and we owe it to them to progress their proposals in as timely a basis as we can. So just because names might not come in until June doesn't mean the commitments we've made to them to finish in March for their

work we shouldn't honor. That's different than saying we are looking at an iterative proposal. If that's something people want to talk about, I have got no opposition to the conversation. But I do have an opposition of raising the concept before we've had the conversation.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Joe.

Alissa, please.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. So, yeah, I was going to say a little bit of what Joe said. I think we have gotten really far away from what we were trying to decide. And I think in the short amount of time that we were supposed to be ending the meeting three minutes ago, which is what are the talking points that the 30 people in this group can agree to on short order for a meeting on Monday. And I continue to believe that the things we can agree to are the facts that already exist which are that we -- our timeline that we published, that whenever the last time was that we updated it is the existing timeline. We haven't changed it yet. It is under review. We are aware of the timetable that has been published by the CWG, and we are taking it under consideration.

And I sincerely doubt that this group is going to agree to more than that for talking points for Monday. So that's what I suggest that we go with.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Daniel.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Daniel here. The meeting was not supposed to end because we are in the parking lot or in the contingency time. So I think we have all the time, and I think we should make an effort to agree on talking points, and we are actually making good progress.

This is all about -- this is an ICANN multistakeholder process and it is all about communicating that we are still at it and that we're making progress and to do it in a consistent way, so not to speak with different tongues.

I think it is extremely important we get our communication right just before the ICANN week starts in earnest. So I think we should keep at it for maybe another 20 minutes or so and personally I think we have a good chance to agree on talking points.

I personally suggested one more addition on the mailing list that I hope is not contentious, and I might read it to you. The question

is, "Is the ICG working on the proposals from the communities which it has received so far?"

And the answer is: "Yes, the ICG has started on the evaluation of the proposals from the protocol parameters and numbers communities. We have made considerable progress during our recent meeting and have asked one formal question to both communities so far."

And the intention here is to be (a) nice to the communities that did deliver and acknowledge and tell them -- reassure them that we are taking their input seriously and we're not sitting on it right now; and the second intention is to make -- to prevent any impression that our process is totally blocked by the lack of receiving something from the CWG.

And Martin isn't agreeing.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Patrik and Jari.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Okay. Now I remember what I was going to say. First of all, I agree with Daniel that I see that we are actually very close to actually have consensus on these, and we talk about speaking

points here, so I also think that your last suggested question and answer is good, so it should be added.

Regarding work on the proposals, to continue what Manal was talking about, yes, there are a lot of things that we can do, and yesterday we got -- we chairs got a suggestion from the secretariat that they already now start to produce a matrix of the content of these two proposals so we can start to do a gap analysis between them. And I think just the mechanical work of coming up with the tools that we need to do the comparison will take quite a long -- might take quite a long time and that is something we can do before we get the material from the CW names.

And we could even do a gap analysis between the two proposals we have, just to see whether -- just to understand that we are using a mechanism that we -- that we feel comfortable with, and then we'll restart that process but with the tools and processes we know about when we got the third proposal. And that's one way of saving time.

So when we talk about compressing time, it doesn't have to mean that we spend less time, which might be working in -- what do you call it in English? -- in haste, that you are like running too fast. We might still spend the same amount of time but it will save

calendar time when we get the third proposal.

So yes, I do think there is -- and that's why we're doing this analysis, with the help of the secretariat. What kind of things in the finalization process can we do before we -- like Manal said, how far can we go before we are blocked? Because there are certain steps where we will be blocked.

But I think also I agree with Manal, there's -- we can do much more now than what we have done so far.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Jari, please.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah. I very much agree with Daniel's point and Alissa's point that we need to get back to agreeing on the talking points, and I -- that agreement actually is really important.

I agree also with the words that Daniel used.

I think we got a little bit off to the wrong track earlier when we were talking about the incremental. It's very important we talk about that and we are open about that, but this isn't about a

specific proposal that we will, you know, do X or not do X.

What I was trying to say, that we should leave it open and, you know, the range of possible actions, I mean, this is -- this is the work that Patrik and others will be doing, and the rest of us.

We have to make an analysis. The right words, I think, are that we -- we try to make as much progress as we can with the -- you know, the input that we have so far.

We'll take it as far as possible. And that, you know, potentially could range, depending on the analysis, from, you know, me taking a six-month vacation right now or -- you know, all the way to handling the proposal to Larry this afternoon, and anything in between.

[ Laughter ]

But I don't think we should go there.

UNIDENTIFY SPEAKER: Optimist.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Xiaodong, please.

UNIDENTIFY SPEAKER: Very well said. Everyone else was sleeping.

XIAODONG LEE: This is Xiaodong Lee speaking.

I think I support the comment from Daniel, and also Patrik gave a very constructive proposal. I just want to support that. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So I feel that we do think that the talking points are relatively okay. Alissa in the chatroom said that she objected to the first -- to the answer to the first question. Can we get that back on screen, please? And I see that Alissa has her hand up, so Alissa, please.

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah. So I guess maybe I wasn't expressing this clearly before, but I think when we know that we are sort of actively looking at the

existing time lines to try and figure out what to do with it, I think it is deceptive to say that our plans are currently unchanged when they might change in a week.

So I would suggest not deceiving people about the fact that we are having it under consideration, because that's what it is.

And I also disagree that we will not look to accelerate the process until we've received the CWG proposal. We might well do that beforehand. We could -- we could do it next week.

So that's why I -- I don't really agree with the answer to the first question.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Can you please suggest -- I don't really understand what you want the answer to be.

Okay. Milton understands. Then he can explain to me. And I'm sorry for being tired. I'm sorry, Alissa.

MILTON MUELLER: She wants you to delete the first sentence about unchanged plans, and she wants to you delete the first phrase of the second

sentence, "Once the ICG receives the CWG proposal."

We can just say flat, "We look" -- "We will look for any opportunities to accelerate our work," yes.

MILTON MUELLER: So we don't need the "Once the ICG receives the CWG proposal."

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much, everyone, for helping me.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Yeah. Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Excuse me. Up to what time you want to continue? Because you announced a time line yesterday and there are some other arrangements and this morning you approved the agenda.

If you approved the agenda and are changing the agenda, it is not appropriate. If you approve the charter and changing the charter, also it is not appropriate. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: We're currently on track. This is any other business, and we started this by discussing what we're going to talk about in our Monday session, so I don't think we're outside that.

And how long it will take us? I think we are almost reaching consensus and there you have the questions here, so we're reviewing your inputs so we can conclude it as soon as possible. Paul?

PAUL WILSON: Just to repeat what I suggested earlier, that the result that's referred to there is not clear, so I think we should clearly say "expect a result in the form of a final proposal ready for submission," if that's what we -- if that's what we mean.

I mean, the result isn't, for instance, the first draft. The result is, I think, the final proposal ready for submission.

Can we add that to the text? Thanks.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Joe, please.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. When we discussed that we were going to go through the consultation process, I -- I wasn't clear that we had agreed that six months was the biblical statement of the amount of time it would take us to complete this.

I think perhaps a more factual way of responding to that question would say, "Our ability to meet the existing deadline is dependent on when we receive the CWG proposal and ways we can find in which we can accelerate our work."

Because it is, in some ways, dependent. I mean, if the CWG -- if we get a proposal in May instead of June, then our chances are significantly improved if, by some miracle, their process is even more optimistic.

If their process is less optimistic, it's not. But I -- I'm a little concerned about the six months because I thought that was one of the things we were going to be discussing.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Jari, please.

JARI ARKKO: So I'm not sure who's actually holding the pen but now the part about, yes, this is a realistic possibility got removed and then

there's absolutely no mention about incremental process anywhere. I think that's wrong.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Milton?

MILTON MUELLER: Yes. I asked to have the second part removed because it was too bald of a statement and would have caused trouble.

So we do need some -- perhaps in addition to saying "We will look for any opportunities to accelerate our work," blah, blah, blah, "We will also look for any opportunities to make incremental progress."

With the proposals that we have, yes. Exactly.

JARI ARKKO: Right. That works for me.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Alissa, please.

ALISSA COOPER: I don't know if this matters, but the -- the changes that were -- I mean, the answer to the first question is repeated in the answer to the second question except that the changes that were made in the first question have not been carried forward.

I know they're just talking points, but if we're going to trim them down, they should be trimmed down everywhere.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Mary, please.

MARY UDUMA: Mary Uduma.

I think Joe made a good proposition. I am also a bit worried about stating six months, because if we state six months and we -- we are not meeting it, so we come back here to talk about. So if we make general statement as Joe formulated, I think we will be safer and we have flexibility to maneuver, if we are not meeting the deadline or if we are meeting faster than the deadline. I think so. Even though that will give us some push to work harder, but I think general -- putting a general statement would be better. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Keith, please.

KEITH DRAZEK: Okay. Thank you, Mohamed.

Yeah, I would like to, I think, reinforce what Joe and Mary have just said about the specificity of six months.

I think if we refer to six months from the receipt of the CWG proposal, and -- it's not hard for people to put two and two together and say the headline coming out of our session would be "ICG says December 2015 is the new target date." Because the latest communication that we've received from the CWG is June. Add the months, and that -- I'm afraid that the new -- the headline or the assumption would be that we're saying that September 2015 is unobtainable, and I don't know that that's a message that we want to send.

I think we need to keep our flexibility open, or keep our -- our ability to evaluate our own processes, to find if there are efficiencies, for being able to expedite our work while having a thorough, predictable process that has all of the necessary public comment periods.

So I think it's a matter of making sure that we don't say something that we don't intend and have that be misinterpreted. Thanks.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thanks. Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Mohamed. I am more in favor of proposal of Joe, not mentioning six months but making the link between the proposal from CWG and ICG and saying that our progress is depending on the reply that we receive. We don't know whether it will be six months, whether it will be how long, so perhaps we should not talk about that and not making any -- any deadline that this is -- we have not discussed, we have to discuss it later, and one hour ago we talk about time line and we have to stick on that. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Paul, please.

PAUL WILSON: Look, I'm not -- I'm not worried about six months at all. I actually assumed that six months came from our original time line that we were going to have the CWG's input by the end of January and we were going to submit it on to the -- to the USG six months later at

the end of July. I mean, I might have had those dates wrong, but since it comes across as an arbitrary length of time, I suggest can't we just remove it and change to "ASAP," for instance? As soon as practicable, according to, you know, the published time line?

JARI ARKKO: Yeah. I think we are in agreement that. Yes. Let's remove the six months, yeah.

Milton, please.

MILTON MUELLER: Was I recognized?

Okay. Sorry. So I want to engage with Keith about the -- the -- so the headline, yeah, people will put two and two together, they'll say the whole thing has been pushed back. And in some ways, that's true, isn't it?

I mean, we're probably not going to get anything from the CWG before June and we're probably not going to be able to finish what we do with them.

So could we soften the blow a bit here, or maybe make it appear as if we're not being evasive by saying -- at the beginning of that

first question, just say, "It depends on when we get a result from the CWG"?

And then we could say "Expect results in the form of a final proposal ready for submission at least" -- or "at maximum, six months in the form of a final proposal."

We can have another debate about whether it's going to be six months, but I think, again, we look evasive if we're not saying -- if we say things like "real soon now" or "as soon as possible." I think that doesn't come across as very credible. We think we know how long it will take us to do this, and we think it's about -- somewhere between six and nine months, so -- so this sort of leaves the door open and puts the onus on the CWG.

I think it would be a good idea for us to say once we get it -- I would like Keith's original wording sort of saying, "Once we get it, our plan is pretty much the same." I would like to be able to say that.

If others are uncomfortable about that, we can have that conversation, but --

And then the -- we've got -- we need the additional clause about incremental progress, which I see is still not up. Oh, there it is.

Yeah. With the proposals received.

So I think that says what we want to say, pretty much.

I mean, if we want to, we could add a paragraph that says, "The fact that CWG is taking longer than originally planned doesn't mean that the process is derailed or seriously damaged. It just means that the names situation is complicated and requires consensus." Which everybody --

You know, nobody is really -- has a problem with that. There's people in the U.S. Congress that are saying, "Slow it down." There's people in the community who are saying, "Slow it down."

So now we're just admitting that it's been slowed down.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. I will put myself in the queue before Joe and Keith.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I'd just point out Daniel has had his flag up for a while.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Daniel, go ahead, please.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Yeah. I like Milton's first sentence. The second one I think is a judgment on our part which we shouldn't make. Whether -- whether anybody has a harder task than anybody else doesn't serve -- us making a judgment about that doesn't serve anything. It's actually -- yeah.

So the first one is fine.

And I think as a note, the second sentence of the whole answer is -- is a tautology. Yeah. But, you know, I'm -- I have no objection of leaving it, but it looks kind of silly.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Daniel said some of the words I will be saying.

It's not really helpful to have that sentence.

Joe, it's your turn.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Yeah. Thank you. Yeah, I would say strike the second sentence because it's completely meaningless at this point, but I -- I think

what I had tried to do in my initial comment was link two concepts, because those are our dependencies.

The two dependencies are the date that we receive the actual proposal and our ability to accelerate our process. And I think our ability to deliver a proposal in the -- in the time originally proposed is dependent upon the date of receipt and our ability to accelerate our processes or find ways to accelerate our processes.

I think we need to have a linkage between those two concepts because they are a codependency of our ability to finish in that amount of time.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Mohamed.

I am not in favor of the language used in the second paragraph, "seriously damage" or "derailed," so on and so forth. The fact that the CWG is taking longer than the original plan does not necessarily mean that. But we would not use "damage," we would not use "derailed," it's just that the process is postponed or is slowed down, using some other words rather than "damaged"

and -- but I'm in favor of deleting the whole paragraph, too. It's not necessary, that paragraph. We don't need to go to that much detail.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I think with the comment with Daniel and Joe, we can remove that whole paragraph, if no one objects.

Okay? Let's remove that whole paragraph from the fact.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: I think just to be clear, I was making a reference to the second sentence of the first paragraph with the tautology sentence. I wasn't making any reference at all to the second paragraph just to clarify what my intervention was.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: So we have the comment from Daniel. Jari, please.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah, I have a couple of comments on the text. First, I agree with Kavouss that the last paragraph is kind of negatively framed. I like "slowed down" or "postponed." You can even add something positive that says about how we want to ensure that we have the

best possible answer for this important topic in Internet matters.

And the other comment was that if we remove -- well, first of all, the last sentence of the first paragraph I think you should add, "with the proposals already received" because I think that was what we were trying to do.

And, secondly, if you remove the middle sentence, then you have to fix the beginning of the last sentence to say something like "in any case, people look for any opportunities" or something like that.

(off microphone).

JARI ARKKO: That's right.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Daniel.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: Just to say the same thing that Joe said. I think Joe and I were both referring to the "expect results in a form of a final proposal ready for submission once we receive the response from the CWG." That has some semantics but not much. I mean, it's like -- yes, once we get something from the CWG, we will -- one can

expect results. But it says nothing. So this can go away, and the rest is consistent. Because this is an artifact because there was a time frame in there, the six months. We decided to get rid of the six months so we can get rid of the whole sentence.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Mohamed. One by one, first you are on the first paragraph. I am also in favor of deleting the last part of that, "We also will look for any opportunity to make incremental progress with the proposals already received." This is not necessary. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Jari, please.

Milton?

MILTON MUELLER: I think you need that second sentence and you need to put back in the fact that we are able to process a names proposal in something close to the time that we original planned. I think that tells people what they need to hear, which is, okay, from the time

we get a proposal from CWG, there will be X number of months that they will see the final result that incorporates all three proposals.

If we don't say that, we sound extremely evasive. Is there a realistic chance we reach our target? It depends on when we get a result from the CWG. Will look for any opportunities to accelerate our work. Blah, blah, blah. I think that sounds evasive. I think we just need to assert that we are capable of and will process the names proposal in basically the same amount of time that we originally planned.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Mohamed. Kavouss speaking. There is a difference between saying we will process the proposal as received versus incremental. I am not in favor of losing "incremental approach." But we say that the ICG will process the proposal as received. And we are, in fact, doing that but not any reference to the incremental, which is a term that I am not in favor of. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Joe, maybe you can suggest alternative wording.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Perhaps instead of using the word "incremental" what about: We will continue to work with the communities on the proposals already received? Because then we are continuing to work to progress them. That work is actually incremental by definition, but we won't use the word "incremental" because it may be misinterpreted perhaps by some.

As to Milton's addition, I think if we want to be really clear and really truthful and really factual, then we bring up the fact we are working on the timeline and that we are evaluating the processes to make sure we are factual.

We did not, in fact, say or agree that we can absolutely do this in the same amount of time. We may be able to do it in less. It may take more depending on public consultations. That is the purpose of the conversation we are about to engage in. To prejudge the outcome of that conversation seems premature.

We are saying something to that effect in the answer to 2. Let's just make our answers parallel and factual.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: As you said, we are covering that in 2.

Jari, please.

JARI ARKKO: Yes, I'm not wedded to the word "incremental." But, of course, the whole process that we have involves a number of steps and we're doing things before we have all the inputs, right? So the fact that we have "incremental" there on the screen doesn't mean that we will, for instance, necessarily deliver something to NTIA that will be partial. Far from it.

So I think "incremental" is exactly right. And we do have to emphasize the fact that we will work on this proposal that we already have and go forward with those as far as we can. So I'm at least -- that's from my perspective a very, very important thing that we make clear in any communication that we have.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. I think we should -- I think we end up in a problem here where I see that the more text we had, the less agreement we get on the wording. And we should remember

that the question we've got was -- the question proposed to us: Does the ICG think there is a realistic chance to reach the original target date? The first thing we should remember is, of course, people will never ask us exactly that question. Okay. Which means if you write a precise answer, we will never have the opportunity to say that answer because we will never be asked that question.

So what we should do then is maybe just to -- just like Manal said earlier, we should just speak to the truth. It is like, okay. So what has happened? Well, oops, we had a timeline and we got some information from the CWG names that they would not deliver as expected in January and we are reevaluating our timeline. Okay? Isn't that basically where we are sort of? Yeah.

So I think we are spending quite a lot of time to engineer a document, editing on the screen text that we will never use, and I think we don't have to spend too much time on this.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Martin.

MARTIN BOYLE: Thanks, Chair. Martin Boyle here. Yeah, I actually do rather agree with Patrik. I think it is quite reasonable for us to say that we are

reexamining our time scale in the light of current -- the current position but that we are still looking to -- or we are still based on this six months, if we really need to say that.

The other bit, though -- and that I put my flag up for was on this word "incremental" because as the word's being used around this table, I've heard at least two different ways in which that is being interpreted.

So either we need to spell it out, and I would hope in that case we would spell it out in the way that Jari has used the term. Perhaps the other way of assessing it would be to look back at our role as a coordination group and start talking about the fact that we will continue to work with the communities on their proposals so not just proposals that we've received but also the work in hand in the cross-community working group so that we get the coherence between the different strands. That's the bit that I find the most concerning, that we end up by not paying attention to the different strands having different approaches completely to some quite basic things when perhaps there wasn't actually a real need for them to come to different conclusions or requiring us to go back and ask them questions: Does this solution, does this approach, is it going to be acceptable to you? And I think that will waste us time once we receive all the proposals in. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thanks, Martin.

Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Mohamed.

I think it is better we concentrate on one paragraph first without going to -- before going to the second paragraph.

Now, on the first paragraph, I am in favor of the suggestion made by Martin, not to talk about "incremental," talking about processing the proposals in hand.

Once again, not in favor of "incremental." Has different meaning for different people. Connotation of "incremental" is step-wise. And there might be another connotation, other interpretation. But the way that Martin put it, I fully agree with that. Process the proposals in hand. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I think even we have the previous text. I think Joe will continue to work with the communities.

On the queue, Alissa and then Jari. Alissa please.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks. I fully support what Patrik said. I do not think working on paragraphs of text in this group is going to be productive. I think they're called talking points for a reason, because they're usually short bullet points that aren't even full sentences. And I think what we can do for Monday is have bullet points of those which are the facts, which are that we have a published timeline, that was published some time ago. We have received new information from the CWG. And we are actively evaluating it. Just because somebody asks you a question doesn't mean you have to make up an answer that you don't have. I think this conversation reveals quite quickly we do not have a consensus answer to a lot of these proposed questions.

So I would suggest as Patrik did that we do not continue to seek to live edit paragraph of text in a group. I think we should stick with the bullet point facts that we have that we can all speak to because they are the truth. So that's my proposal. And I think the bullet points are we have an existing timeline that we published. We can say when we published it. I just don't have it off the top of my head. We have received new information from the CWG about what they think their timeline is and we are actively evaluating it to determine its impact on the rest of the work of the

transition. Thanks.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you, Alissa. Personally, I support Alissa's suggestions.

Jari, please.

JARI ARKKO: Yeah, so I think we have a duty to move forward with the necessary changes that I at least see or our communities see in this IANA space as fast as possible and in the best possible fashion. I think that clearly includes progress on the parts that we already have received to the extent that we can. You know, of course, limited by whatever constraints we have between the proposals and such.

And maybe you were right that we don't actually have to agree on specific wording. This is indeed talking points.

I personally plan to use the word "incremental." I plan to say that we will pursue our proposal as far as possible. We'll do everything we can to move it forward. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Thank you. Manal, please.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Mohamed. I was just going to suggest as Alissa mentioned that maybe bullet points on whatever we have agreed and then -- because like Patrik said, we will never be asked the same question. And if we are asked the same question, we can never rehearse and repeat exactly the same text without -- or else we are going to be reading it out. So the real drafting is not really necessary.

So maybe that we have extensively discussed this timeline here during our face-to-face meeting, we have engaged with the communities and are engaging with them. We have scheduled a conference call immediately after this meeting to have this fine-tuned. We will do our best to work effectively on the proposals that we have already received, and we will work again to our best with the domain -- with the names community in anything that we can do meanwhile we receive -- so just keywords, if we agree to them. Maybe the drafting thing is not necessary. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I think we can try to save time. I think there is agreement that realtime drafting is not helping us currently. So can we take that task of producing the bullet points and then sending that to you on the mailing list? Then we have Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you, Mohamed. I wish to make a concrete proposal. Delete all these paragraphs, mention that the timeline for the process is what was published and currently in force. This timeline was based on the deadline of receiving proposal on 15th of January, 2015. However, since one community has delayed, ICG at this time is considering to update the timelines. Full stop. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: I see some heads were nodding, not accepting the proposal.

So there is someone in favor of the proposal. Maybe you can talk about it before we move. Patrik, please?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I think we have enough data. We have the minutes taken. We have the input from what people have said, and I think we have enough data to produce a bulleted list that will be sent to all of you. And I think that is enough for us to move forward. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. So we finish that. And if there is not any other business, we only have the last item which is basically we are going to list

the action -- the outcome of the meeting, the action items.

So if you want to have any updates, please correct us. I think it would be useful for the secretariat to display the list of action items on the screen as well.

While we're waiting, I can just start listing them. Action item 1, approval of the minutes of 28 January teleconference. Secretariat to summarize questions and answers resolving about the protocol parameters proposal and numbers proposal discussed.

Jari to compile a list of the information requested from the protocol parameters community regarding jurisdiction, NTIA oversight, and send to the ICG list.

Milton to refine questions to be sent to the protocol parameters community and numbers community based on ICG discussion and send to internal ICG list.

Paul to request clarification from CRISP team, questions -- further questions put for the by Kavouss regarding Section IIB2 and IIIA on the numbers community proposals.

ICG chairs to review details of the proposal finalization process and refine ICG timeline with assistance from secretariat.

Manal, Kavouss, Lynn, and Joe to continue working together on the community process document with suggestions put forward from other ICG members.

ICG to discuss and decide talking points for Monday's session. I think this will be the chairs to submit the updated talking points in a bullet point format.

Patrik to communicate to CWG and CCWG to coordinate our future teleconferences and face-to-face meeting.

Any comments on those? Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much. First of all, I -- the minutes of the 28 January was approved. That was part of the agenda yesterday.

We also have an action item on us chairs to send a bulleted list, a summary of the last discussion. That should be added.

We also have -- yeah. That's what I see. Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Daniel?

DANIEL KARRENBERG: I object to the words "community process" in Point 7. It should say "comment handling" or something like that, but not "community process."

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Milton?

MILTON MUELLER: I think Number 4 is done. It's been done on the list.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: It is noted later as completed.

Kavouss and Manal.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you. For Point 8, I suggest that "ICG to continue to discuss and agree on the bullet points that may be phrased or submitted on Monday session." We have to agree on the bullet points.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL: So on 7, it could be "community comments handling," and the initial drafting team also included Jean-Jacques. I don't want to volunteer him, but again, I don't want to exclude him, so it's up to him again, but he was part of the initial drafting team, so...

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. Daniel, please.

DANIEL KARRENBERG: "Community comment handling" is acceptable to me.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Excuse me, Mohamed. I forgot to mention in Number 8, after ICG list, "based on the discussions took place at the meeting and suggestion by Alissa." Thank you.

MOHAMED EL BASHIR: Okay. That's fine.

Okay. If there is no further comments, that will be updated and be sent to the mailing list.

So I think with that, we conclude the meeting and thank you very much for your patience and hard work. Thank you.

Yeah, and we should give a big thanks to the translators. They have been --

[ Applause ]

Secretariat and also staff for supporting us.

[ Applause ]

**[ END OF TRANSCRIPT ]**