ICG Call #20 – Wednesday, 15 July 2015 – 19:00-21:00 UTC
Chat Transcript

Jennifer Chung: (7/16/2015 02:47) Welcome to the ICG call #20! Please note that chat sessions are being archived and follow the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior: http://www.icann.org/en/news/in-focus/accountability/expected-standards

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (02:50) Hello, I'm on the call now, using this Adobe Connect page.

Jennifer Chung: (02:50) Hello Jean-Jacques - welcome and good morning/good day!

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (02:50) Hi Jennifer!

Josh Baulch: (02:51) If anyone needs their computer microphone enabled, please let us know and we will turn it on

arasteh: (02:55) Hi jennifer

Jennifer Chung: (02:56) Hello Kavouss!

arasteh: (02:56) Pls note that you need to dial my number in Bucharest Hotel Radisson room 719

arasteh: (02:57) The no. is + 4021 311 9000

Jennifer Chung: (02:57) noted - thank you Kavouss I will ask the operator to dial out to you now.

epg (elise): (02:58) Hi, Due to a previous commitment, I will have to drop off the call in 30 minutes. My regrets. --Elise

epg (elise): (02:59) Josh,

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (02:59) Good Morning!

Russ Housley: (02:59) There is a hum on the audio

Josh Baulch: (02:59) We are working on the hum, please standby

epg (elise): (03:00) Josh, will you put me in listen only mode. I am on the computer and there is background noise. thank you.

Mary Uduma: (03:00) Good evening All

Jandyr Santos: (03:00) Hello Jennifer, could you enable my mic? Thanks

Josh Baulch: (03:00) Done Jandyr

Jari Arkko: (03:01) good evening! can someone enable my microphone as well?

Manal Ismail: (03:01) Hello everyone ..

Manal Ismail: (03:02) Jennifer can I have my mic enabled please ..

Josh Baulch: (03:02) Done

Manal Ismail: (03:02) Perfect .. Thanks Josh ..

Jennifer Chung: (03:06) @ Kavouss - the operator is not able to dial out to you with the number you provided - getting a busy signal, would you have another number with which we can reach you at?

Josh Baulch: (03:06) WE have an echo - please mute your computers or phones as needed please

arasteh: (03:06) Jenniferr

arasteh: (03:07) Pls dial my number

arasteh: (03:07) I am waiting

arasteh: (03:07) Alissa

Josh Baulch: (03:07) We have been trying, but the number does not seem to be working

arasteh: (03:07) I am waiting for call

arasteh: (03:07) Patrik I am waiting for call

Joseph Alhadeff: (03:07) joined connect...
arasteh: (03:08) + 4021 311 9000 room 719
Josh Baulch: (03:08) Trying again
Alan Barrett (NRO): (03:08) is there a PDF version of the combined proposal? the .docx file is unusable for me. attempting to open it causes my computer to be unusable for 20 minutes while libreoffice tries to load the document.
arasteh: (03:08) pls try again
arasteh: (03:08) I am waiting
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (03:09) Under A2, I suggest the question be slightly modified to read "Do they seem to point to incompatible arrangements where compatibility is considered a requirement?". This because the verb "suggest" may lead the reader to think that our questionnaire is "suggesting" something.
Jennifer Chung: (03:09) @Alan - apologies for the .docx version, it has now been switched out to .doc
https://www.dropbox.com/home/CoordinationGroup/Combined%20Proposal
Jennifer Chung: (03:10) that is the link to the subfolder - there are quite a few versions of v4 now
Josh Baulch: (03:10) Can i please remind those on the phone, to please mute if you are not speaking
Josh Baulch: (03:12) Jari - can you please speak up
Manal Ismail: (03:12) yes please .. can't hear Jari well ..
Xiaodong Lee: (03:14) voice is not good
RussMundy-SSAC: (03:15) @joe - the ietf has already said that the numbers approach is okay
Jari Arkko: (03:15) yes
Alan Barrett (NRO): (03:16) @Jennifer: I caln load the -v4-RM.doc file with no problems. -v2-*.docx was unusable.
RussMundy-SSAC: (03:16) but have we actually asked the CWG if they can agree with the numbers approach?
Lynn St.Amour: (03:17) Hi everyone,
Manal Ismail: (03:17) @Russ I think we asked them about what they have in their proposal and they said it's a placeholder and should not be considered as CWG consensus view ..
Lynn St.Amour: (03:17) apologies for joining late.
Alan Barrett (NRO): (03:19) that is notes from a meeting a week ago
Jari Arkko: (03:21) fwiw, my opinion is that communities should decide what their requirements are, and then ask the lawyers if that can be done and how; not be directed by the lawyw_er billing hours or leaving the direction to lawyers. these questions are not only legal questions.
Josh Baulch: (03:22) Yes, much better, thank you Jari
Xiaodong Lee: (03:23) Jari, +1
Jari Arkko: (03:24) +1 to kavous on not discussing lawyer hours. but i do think the topic of trademarks needs to be discussed. then again, seems like we are on the right pathin this group and have some consensus on what to say in the report.
Mohamed El Bashir: (03:30) it might be useful to get confirmations from OC (Numbers/IETF)
Josh Baulch: (03:32) Heavy breather - please mute
Manal Ismail: (03:32) background noise ..

Josh Baulch: (03:32) Kavouss - we needed to mute you for too mute noise.
epg (elise): (03:34) My apology. I must drop off for a previous commitment.
Mary Uduma: (03:35) Since the proposal from CRISP is very clear on contracting with ICANN, it is up to ICANN to incoporate the IANA services for IETF and Numbering in the contract with PTI
Jari Arkko: (03:36) Alissa is correct.
Xiaodong Lee: (03:36) I wanna second Mohamed, why not confirmed from them
Jari Arkko: (03:37) the timeline response from the IETF for instance indicated that we would like to stay contracting with ICANN, not the internal components
Mohamed El Bashir: (03:38) maybe muted
Josh Baulch: (03:38) Select *7 to unmute
Josh Baulch: (03:38) Star 7
RussMundy-SSAC: (03:38) I agree that it would be reasonable for the ICG to note in our report that the IETF & CRISP will continue to contract with ICANN
Josh Baulch: (03:39) Are you on the phone bridge Mohamed?
Josh Baulch: (03:39) we dont see you
Mohamed El Bashir: (03:40) using adobeconnect only, it seems i need to dail-in to phone bridge
Josh Baulch: (03:40) Oh you do not have a mic connected, shall I enable your Mic?
Mohamed El Bashir: (03:41) i support confirming this from both communities as the proposed structural seperation in CWG proposal might effect them, a confirmation will document this in the final proposal
Josh Baulch: (03:43) @ Mary - can you mute your microphone please. . . just click on the mic button at the top
Josh Baulch: (03:43) of adobe connect
Josh Baulch: (03:43) thank you!
Jari Arkko: (03:44) From the timeline response from IETF: "In addition, the names community has proposed the creation of a 'Post Transition IANA' (PTI). If the existing agreements between the IETF and ICANN remain in place and the SLAs discussed above are not affected, the IETF transition would take place as described above. That is our preference."
RussMundy-SSAC: (03:46) @Joe: +11
Manal Ismail: (03:46) +1 Joe
Lynn St.Amour: (03:46) +1 to Joe's point
Jari Arkko: (03:46) I _agree with joe_. I dislike the use of the "is _incomplete" term. Is complete under the assumption that X will happen, and X can be checked for having happened."
Mary Uduma: (03:46) +1 to the last intervention.
Mary Uduma: (03:46) I mean Jeo
Xiaodong Lee: (03:46) Jari, if IANA dept move to new body, how ICANN could ensure the service for IETF?
Russ Housley: (03:48) I recognize that this was previously discussed in Buenos Aires. In the hope of getting a stronger demonstration of consensus, I'd like to see if there is a way to get the chartering SOs and ACs to make such a statement instead of the CWG-Stewardship.
Mary Uduma: (03:53) Thanks Kavouss. The uncertainities are far too many for any statement from ICG sying that the proposal from naming community is

by any means complete
Mary Uduma: (03:53) saying*
Manal Ismail: (03:55) @Russ, I think the CWG gives an additional level of confirmation taking into consideration all bits and pieces of the proposal ..
Lynn St.Amour: (03:56) @RUss H said "In the hope of getting a stronger demonstration of consensus, I'd like to see if there is a way to get the chartering SOs and ACs to make such a statement instead of the CWG-Stewardship...." I think this changes one of our basic operating principles.--and that is each OC runs its own process and calls it's own consensus
Lynn St.Amour: (03:57) so I would prefer to stay with our current process
Daniel Karrenberg: (03:57) I support that we proceed as Alissa suggests: "We can finalise our deliverable without CCWG finalising theirs by calling out the dependencies."
Russ Housley: (03:58) @Manal: Since the chartering SOs and ACs approved the CWG-Stewardship prooposal, this is the source of the power. That said, I understand your point that CWG-Stewardship has greater insight into the proposal itself.
Lynn St.Amour: (03:58) I think Russ M and SSAC have covered it well, just thought it should be noted in teh assessment as well
Manal Ismail: (04:00) @Russ H yes I meant to say it's additional and not alternative, also the point Lynn raised, we don't have open channels with all Sos/ACs, only the 3 OCs ..
RussMundy-SSAC: (04:02) Could someone summarize Mary's statement, I was not able to understand her
Jari Arkko: (04:02) i would absolutely support going to public comment now, while documenting the dependencies.
Lynn St.Amour: (04:03) I support keeping out current timetable and simply noting the expectations that teh dependencies will be addressed.
RussMundy-SSAC: (04:03) thanks, Alissa, very helpful summary
Mary Uduma: (04:03) That's right Alissa. that's what I said
Russ Housley: (04:04) @Manal @Lynn: Yes. I do understand the process point. It would be ideal for the SOs and ACs to confirm their assessment that the CCWG-Accountability result meets the CWG-Stewardship regirements at the time that they vote. This way, the CWG-Stewardship has a strong measure of consensus to make a statement to the ICG.
Xiaodong Lee: (04:05) Russ Housley, +1
Lynn St.Amour: (04:05) @Russ, that would be something our liaisons could take back as a point of discussion/
Lynn St.Amour: (04:06) with them but we stay with the CWG- Stewardship conifrmation that their needs were met
Manal Ismail: (04:07) @Russ H thanks .. it's more clear to me now .. we can convey this through the liaisons as suggested by Lynn .. Does this address your point?
Mary Uduma: (04:07) I am saying that the ICG has a great work of communicating clearly what the dependicies are for the public to have good understanding of what they would be commenting on, especially the new comers
RussMundy-SSAC: (04:08) as one of the SSAC ICG reps, I'm not sure what SSAC will be able to say about 'meeting our requirements' but will raise the issue

Mary Uduma: (04:08) I am not syaing we move our time line. Please.
Lynn St.Amour: (04:10) sure
Manal Ismail: (04:12) Like Lynn, Russ 7 Joe I also don't see this as an incompitability ..
Manal Ismail: (04:12) *&
Jari Arkko: (04:12) I also agree that it is not an issue wrt NTIA critea.
demi getschko: (04:14) +1 to Jary and Russ
Alan Barrett (NRO): (04:18) joe, please point out the problematic text, either to me or to ianaxfer@nro.net mailing list
Jennifer Chung: (04:18) @Xiaodong - apologies we will add it back into the matrix
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (04:22) Go ahead Mary.
Manal Ismail: (04:22) we can hear you Mary ..
Jari Arkko: (04:26) I think we have running code on all three communities about performance reviews. Adding some IMHO is useful although I proibably wouldn't have done it at the same time as the transition... but it is no workability issue.
RussMundy-SSAC: (04:32) +1 on Alissa's proposal
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (04:32) @Alissa: perhaps in the Introduction or Conclusions, we could just make the point that under Workability, the ongoing review obligations taken on in the ICANN eco-system might constitute additional stress...
RussMundy-SSAC: (04:34) maybe that's why Alan had such a hard time opening
Jennifer Chung: (04:36) @Russ and Alan and all - the buggy document has been removed, the new v4 should be stable - if this isn't stable please let me know and I will recheck and fix - thanks!
Jari Arkko: (04:40) feel comfortable
Manal Ismail: (04:40) Structure looks good to me ..
Jari Arkko: (04:40) i will need to exit the call soon. if anybody feels that I could help work in any specific part of the text, feel free to sign me up.
Jari Arkko: (04:41) +1 to alan
Manal Ismail: (04:42) though not clear what needs to go in the 'Next Steps' vs 'Implementation' ..
Lynn St.Amour: (04:42) I feel comfortable and also note that we will have the opportunity thru FAQ's etc to help highlight expected or common questions
Josh Baulch: (04:42) Please speak up Mary
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (04:43) MARY, PLEASE SPEAK CLOSER TO YOUR MIC.
Manal Ismail: (04:43) Can't hear Mary ..
Alan Barrett (NRO): (04:46) my main point is, instead of "here are three sub-proposals, and we decided that they are compatible", we say "here are three sub-proposals, and here's how the ICG thinks they can all work together"
Mary Uduma: (04:48) I am very sorry Manal. I commented on Paragraph 17, where the report stated that ICG concluded that IANAPLA process was inclusive and that it achieved consensus , while we did not draw such conclusions in the other OCs' proposals.
Manal Ismail: (04:48) Got it .. Thanks Mary ..
Lynn St.Amour: (04:50) Voluntold :-)
Manal Ismail: (04:50) :) :) ..

RussMundy-SSAC: (04:54) __I think Joe said earlier that he was going to send his draft exec sum text to the list - I think that would be very helpful
demi getschko: (04:55) Have to leave now. Thanks to all of you. Bye
Lynn St.Amour: (04:55) +1 to JJ: I also think an Exec. Summary would be useful
Mohamed El Bashir: (04:56) +1 JJS
Lynn St.Amour: (04:57) It would allow us to emphasize how the IANA functions are supported today and why the 3 OC's were tapped to drive the proposal.
Lynn St.Amour: (04:57) this is still a point of confusion for many
Mary Uduma: (04:57) +1 1 JJ
Daniel Karrenberg: (04:57) agree that we *need* an executive summary.
Alissa Cooper: (04:57) JJ are you in the queue again?
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (04:58) @Alissa, I've lowered hand.
Alissa Cooper: (04:58) thanks
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (04:58) @Joe +1.
Jennifer Chung: (04:58) @Manal - this v4 may not contain Russ Mundy's additional text - if you are going to be working on a new update I will make sure you have the latest and most complete copy to work off of.
Daniel Karrenberg: (04:58) we should produce the executive summary LAST
Lynn St.Amour: (04:58) probably two separate docs. - Exec, Summary and a public comment period cover note
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (04:58) @JAlhadeff +1 about not "inventing" or opining.
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (05:00) @Daniel: we can nevertheless start now, and update the Exec Summary towards the end of our work.
Lynn St.Amour: (05:00) support 40 days!
Manal Ismail: (05:00) Sorry got disconnected during JJ's intervention and just got conncted again ..
Manal Ismail: (05:01) @Jennifer yes please thank you ..
Jennifer Chung: (05:01) @Manal - of course, you are very welcome!
Lynn St.Amour: (05:02) Incentive is a shorter ICG meeting :-)
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (05:02) Joe: I'd be glad to help for the Exec. Summary.
Lynn St.Amour: (05:05) Good call, thanks!
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (05:05) Minutes approval: have sent little changes to Jennifer.
Manal Ismail: (05:05) Thanks .. bye ..
Mary Uduma: (05:06) Thanks and bye.
Jennifer Chung: (05:06) Thank you all - ICG Call 20 is now concluded.