Dear All,

1) The draft ICG charter published in 17 July is still a draft, as  it has not been formally agreed by the entire ICG .it therefore considered provisional  until it is formally approved by ICG in its formal first f2f meeting on 06 September ,due to the fact that    
there has been no ICG-approved charter  yet  Consequently it is subject to further comments and modifications.

2) Thus it appears that the ICG should take decisions regarding the process taking into account community  
comments.  ICG should therefore make proposals regarding the process and to submit them for public comment before deciding on any thing .

3) As far as I can understand the proposed process calls for proposals from only the 3 customer communities of IANA – representing Names, Numbers and  Protocol Parameters - which addresses certain aspects of their own individual community requirements/arrangements. Thus it is some sort of self-commenting and self-evaluation by limited community .The principle of global multistakeholder that IANA indicated in its announcement is not observed v  
I don't  see why those three communities should be the only commented which comment

4) At Netmundial, at least four distinct categories of community were identified

Governments, Private Sector, Civil Society, Technical Community/ Academia, At some point of time there was another category added / referred to ; as USERS .Although users could be people associated with any of the above-mentioned four categories

In my view, the issue should also be approached globally, through a proposal that covers all three elements (names, numbers, and protocol parameters), as well as  other entities .

5) As for ICANN’s accountably. I also recognize that the issue of ICANN's accountability is not in the scope of the ICG, but the ICG could note the relation between a proposal regarding IANA Stewardship and ICANN accountability.  
Thus, if the process  is outlined by Alice is the only way to submit proposals, then I also think that it is too restrictive and will unduly reduce  the breadth and scope of the proposals.

6) Further, I too don’t think that the process itself is broad enough, because not all members of the global multi-stakeholder community are members of the 3 communities mentioned above.  Thus they are not familiar with the processes used in those communities.  
They should be therefore asked to comment separately and directly .Asking them to contribute through those communities narrows the scope for inputs and, in my view also , impoverishes the discussion.

7)  I also believe that NTIA did not ask ICANN to convene discussions within just the Internet community.  It asked ICANN to also consult the global multi-stakeholder community. What process is exactly would in place to do so ? yet to be identified   
  
8)  I also think that we just disagree about the above. As no notion of “membership” prevents anyone from participating, and also that anyone who needs help participating can get it. The IETF certainly does not have membership. We should find a proper way who the process is performed

Regards

K.ARASTEH