**ICG F2F Meeting #7 – Sunday 18 October 2015**
**ICANN Dublin – 13:00-17:00 UTC+1**
**Chat Transcript**

Joseph Alhadeff: (10/17/2015 19:37) Just cofirming that we still need to dial in remotely?
Jennifer Chung: (19:54) Hi Joseph, yes, the microphones will not be enabled in the AC room.
Yannis li: (19:57) Welcome to the ICG F2F Meeting #7 Day 1. 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
Joseph Alhadeff: (20:03) Not sure how much i can join I've skyped in and there's noise on the line I guess the wifi in the lounge is not good enough for call quality.
Narelle Clark: (20:03) Evening all.
Kavouss Arasteh: (20:04) hI eVERY BODU
Kavouss Arasteh: (20:04) Hi every body
Narelle Clark: (20:05) I hear Daniel very well.
Kavouss Arasteh: (20:05) Joe Hi
Kavouss Arasteh: (20:05) We miss your physical presence
Joseph Alhadeff: (20:06) Hi Kavouss... sorry not to have joined Im on a layover between Delhi and Washington...
Narelle Clark: (20:06) I gather that is a 'your' plural, Kavouss. We miss you, too.
Kavouss Arasteh: (20:11) Iam here
Daniel Karrenberg: (20:12) for me the adigo bridge is very choppy right now, even after dialling in again. i am listening to the adobe stream which is ok.
Joseph Alhadeff: (20:13) no issues with change, am having phone problems
Daniel Karrenberg: (20:16) +1 to paul
Mohamed: (20:16) +1 agree Paul
Daniel Karrenberg: (20:19) my understanding about our dependency is 100% in line with keiths's
Daniel Karrenberg: (20:20) no paul you missed nothing afaiac
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (20:20) I think the only area of possible confusion was around PTI, but I admit I'm not 100% on top of that dynamic with regard to the numbering and protocol parameter communities.
Daniel Karrenberg: (20:24) @keith: both RIRs and IETF have said that they plan to contract with ICANN and permit ICANN to subcontract the IANA function.
Jennifer Chung: (20:26) @ Everyone, the current projected version is also available on dropbox here: https://www.dropbox.com/s/x2nbnucfpo257kj/IANA-transition-proposal-v3.docx?dl=0
Narelle Clark: (20:27) Yes, although the pagination is very different to the screen.
Milton Mueller: (20:27) Keith, would the FoI implementation be under the control of the CWG process?
Daniel Karrenberg: (20:30) sound from the room via the adigo bridge is very choppy for me. joe was 100% clear without chop. anyone else on the bridge

have that issue?
Joseph Alhadeff: (20:31) Huge chop. That's why I asked whether I was being heard. At present I'm reading interventions
Daniel Karrenberg: (20:31) @joe: you cam through loud and clear.
Keith Davidson ccNSO: (20:32) Milton - there were a number of ccTLDs who gave their approval for the Names proposal on the basis that the FOI would be implemented pre-transition. Its not at all a CWG process per se, as the ICANN Board have instructed staff to implement. But it becomes a matter for the CWG if implementation is being delayed.
Daniel Karrenberg: (20:33) FOI?
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (20:33) @Daniel and Joe, I have mentioned the audio chop problems to the technicians in the room here.
Joseph Alhadeff: (20:35) Are we considering the RZM resolution to be an ICG Proposal dependency or just an implementation dependency, the conversations in LA left me unclear...
Keith Davidson ccNSO: (20:35) Daniel - FOI = Framework of Interpretation (for ccTLD delegations and redelegations)
Daniel Karrenberg: (20:35) thaks for expanding the acronym. i know what you were talking about now.
Milton Mueller: (20:36) thanks, Keith. important. So it sounds like it should be part of the "items to be implemented" list
Keith Davidson ccNSO: (20:37) Agree Milton, but as Alissa says, this should properly arise from the CWG rather than directly from this group
Joseph Alhadeff: (20:37) To Lynn's point it would be important to highlight where there might be joint action needed to resolve some of these implementation issues in relation to cooperation and coordination...
Milton Mueller: (20:38) Well, the CWG might be looking for a signal from us that it needs to deal with it
Keith Davidson ccNSO: (20:39) I have it as an action point Milton and will raise it with the CWG chairs asap. Also am keen to have an update from IANA staff in the coming days on implementation
Joseph Alhadeff: (20:39) Daniel - there's no chop on the chat room audio...
Joseph Alhadeff: (20:39) I meant the adobe connect audio
Daniel Karrenberg: (20:40) sorry for the feedback, i am listening to the adobe room because the bridge audio from the room is unintelligeble.
Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (20:41) How about:
Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (20:41) "Implementation of any mechanisms identified by the CWG as required to be in plavce before stewardship transition"
Narelle Clark: (20:42) Sorry - is this spreadsheet on the dropbox?
Lynn St.Amour: (20:43) @Narelle, I sent to ICG list, in my haste I did not post to the dropbox, but perhaps the scretariat did. If not, I will
Joseph Alhadeff: (20:44) Can we keep the trigger point the same - the contract expiry? Are transition and ontract exipry the same?
Jennifer Chung: (20:44) @Lynn and everyone I can upload the spread sheet to dropbox
Jennifer Chung: (20:44) the spreadsheet is available on the email sent to the ICG list here: http://mm.ianacg.org/pipermail/internal-cg_ianacg.org/2015-October/001881.html
Daniel Karrenberg: (20:45) the room has left from the bridge, cannot talk
Mohamed: (20:45) some implementation tasks is expect to take longer time,

as long its agreed to be implemented, clearly tasks we should not link the full implementation to the stewardship transision
Alissa Cooper: (20:46) Suggested edits: "Implementation of any enhanced ICANN accountability mechanisms identified by the CWG as required to be in place before the expiry of the NTIA contract"
Joseph Alhadeff: (20:47) @ DAniel, except to the extent that there is any dependency with names proposal?
Lynn St.Amour: (20:47) "new" accountability mechanisms
Joseph Alhadeff: (20:49) can we add grid lines, it might help readability...
Yannis li: (20:49) Please note that the technical team will switch off the adigo bridge and dial back in to fix the audio issue. Please listen in to the adobe room for audio for a few minute for the time being.
Yannis li: (20:50) That is a note for ICG members that are dialed in to the phone bridge.
Joseph Alhadeff: (20:50) Thank you please let us know when you are available again, those of us dialing in will type questions
Daniel Karrenberg: (20:50) i am trying to privately chat to "RP - Tech" about bridge audio
Yannis li: (20:50) @Joesph, will let everyone know when it is up again
Russ Housley: (20:51) Annex is fine with me
Daniel Karrenberg: (20:51) can we postpone deciding about adding the spreadsheet later?
Joseph Alhadeff: (20:51) unless we provide the interim detail Lynn was suggesting, yes we should. With additonal detail, can go either way.
Daniel Karrenberg: (20:52) audio is back on bridge and without chop
Xiaodong Lee/ccNSO: (20:53) the audio is not good
Narelle Clark: (20:54) Thank you I would appreciate more time.
Narelle Clark: (20:54) With the spreadsheet.
Daniel Karrenberg: (20:54) thursday is fine!
Daniel Karrenberg: (20:57) "88 In the public comment period, however ..." ?
Daniel Karrenberg: (21:01) +1 to Martin: Let us delete the penultimate sentence in 88 completely.
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (21:05) The CWG confirmed that the RZM issuee and process was out of scope and they do not intend to insert themselves in the parallel process. As such, we should be very cautious about the language used by the ICG here. I support Martin's suggestion.
demi getschko: (21:09) +1 to Martin
Narelle Clark: (21:12) Sorry Daniel it is very difficult to tell which sentence you want deleted, given the quantity of deletia. DO you mean the last sentence? ie "The ICG believes that if it is to be legitimate and consistent with the multistakeholder process, this parallel process must be conducted transparently with opportunities for review by the CWG and broader public input, and that the written agreement between the IFO and RZM establishing each party’s role must be in place by the time of the expiry of the NTIA contract.
Daniel Karrenberg: (21:12) my bad! i meant the final sentence!
Narelle Clark: (21:12) Thank you.
Daniel Karrenberg: (21:12) th last one. delete: "The ICG believes that if it is to be legitimate and consistent with the multistakeholder process, this parallel process must be conducted transparently with opportunities for review by the

CWG and broader public input, and that the written agreement between the IFO and RZM establishing each party's role must be in place by the time of the expiry of the NTIA contract."
Daniel Karrenberg: (21:13) i plead temporary loss of english proficiency due to being miserable from cold.
Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (21:14) I just wanted to be clear Daniel
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (21:15) How about "The ICG believes that a written agreement between IFO and RZM establishing each party's role must be in place by the time of the expiry of the NTIA contract, and that agreement should be made available for public review prior to execution."?
Narelle Clark: (21:15) The sentence is very cumbersome. It should be broken up, but the need for it came through from the comments.
Narelle Clark: (21:15) The need for the sentiment, that is.
Patrik Fältström: (21:16) The sentence contains two parts. 1) Transparency etc etc 2) That contract exists at time of termination of the NTIA contract
Daniel Karrenberg: (21:17) I can live with what Keith proposes.
Narelle Clark: (21:17) @Keith - Good, but it should be two sentences.
Jon Nevett: (21:17) review and input
Jon Nevett: (21:17) not just review
Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (21:18) @Keith text is good for me
Narelle Clark: (21:18) I prefer: "The ICG believes that a written agreement between IFO and RZM establishing each party's role must be in place by the time of the expiry of the NTIA contract. That agreement should be made available for public review prior to execution."
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (21:19) No objection to Kavouss' suggestions, nor Narelle's.
Jon Nevett: (21:20) Keith, do you object to "public review and input" vs. "public review"?
Kavouss Arasteh: (21:21) Consistent with multistakeholder process,The parallel process needs to beconducted in a transparent .....( replacing the begining of the text under discussion
Alissa Cooper: (21:22) http://www.ntia.doc.gov/other-publication/2014/iana-functions-and-related-root-zone-management-transition-questions-and-answ
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (21:22) @Jon, chronologically should it not be "public input and review"?
Milton Mueller: (21:22) Here is the URL for the announcwment Russ M just mentioned http://www.ntia.doc.gov/other-publication/2014/iana-functions-and-related-root-zone-management-transition-questions-and-answ
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (21:22) No objection to including "input." The community should have the opportunity to comment.
Patrik Fältström: (21:23) From the FAQ: "Aspects of the IANA functions contract are inextricably intertwined with the VeriSign cooperative agreement (i.e., authoritative root zone file management), which would require that NTIA coordinate a related and parallel transition in these responsibilities."
Kavouss Arasteh: (21:23) Keith ,we need to refer to Parallel Process and then repolace "must" with needs to
Kavouss Arasteh: (21:24) kEITH
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (21:24) Agreed Kavouss, I accepted your suggestion above.
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (21:24) scroll up

Kavouss Arasteh: (21:24) mAY YOU KINDLY DRAFT AND POUYT INTOI THECHAT THE ENTIRE TEXT WITH THE POROPOOSED AMENDMENTS
Jon Nevett: (21:24) Jean-Jacques, I believe it should be review and input, as the review occurs prior to the input
Daniel Karrenberg: (21:25) can live with that.
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (21:26) @Jon, I thought you/we meant that the public could input elements which would then be reveiwed...
Daniel Karrenberg: (21:26) an yes narelle gets points for "plain english". ;-)
Daniel Karrenberg: (21:28) nodnod
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (21:28) "considers"
Manal Ismail: (21:29) Did we iterate this before in writing ?
Daniel Karrenberg: (21:30) we are not re-iterating because this is our first iteration on this, bleive it or not! ;-) ;-) ;-)
demi getschko: (21:32) Martin + 1
demi getschko: (21:34) We are not RE-iterating... (as Daniel pointed)
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (21:35) @Joe +1, good solution...
Narelle Clark: (21:35) As long as it has been "iterated" previously it can be re-iterated. This is hair splitting.
Joseph Alhadeff: (21:37) The issue we have never iterated it in public :-) conversation amongourselves don't count towards a public document... I personally don't care either way cause no one will notice except us...
Milton Mueller: (21:37) Wrong Daniel, we said in the previous part 0 that a written agreement was required
Daniel Karrenberg: (21:40) @ not the one that went out for public comment, right?
Daniel Karrenberg: (21:40) our internal iterations, while transparent, are internal.
Manal Ismail: (21:44) Will need to leave shortly for GAC discussions on ICANN accountability .. apologies for that ..
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (21:45) I suggest deleting "incredible"
Lynn St.Amour: (21:46) happy to delete incredible --
Daniel Karrenberg: (21:46) i have agreed with you before milton! ;-)
Daniel Karrenberg: (21:47) i also agree with you about tuning down the enthousiasm of the language a bit.
Lynn St.Amour: (21:47) I believe (some of) this info. is very useful - not everyone is as familoar as we all are. And many Annexes are never read.
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (21:48) I could live with Martin's suggestion to put this text further up.
Jari Arkko: (21:48) I agree with Martin's position. The main paragraph needs to stay. (FWIW, I migh have wanted to live with just that main text and nothing else, but I don't object to the rest)
demi getschko: (21:49) JJ +1 -> just drop "incredible"...
Daniel Karrenberg: (21:52) Agree with Martin: in the proposal we should say "Coordination between the OCs is needed. During the development of the proposal the OCs have committed to continued coordination among themselves concerning the IANA. For a description of historic and current coordination mechanisms please see Annex C."
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (21:53) @Kavouss, I think Mary's reasons are strong, so that this text should be brought further up, and not in an annex which most of the public don't read.

Jari Arkko: (21:54) agree with joe
Daniel Karrenberg: (21:54) In the proposal we should say: "Coordination between the OCs needs tocontinue. During the development of the proposal the OCs have committedto continued coordination among themselves concerning the IANA. The ICGbelieves that no additional mechanisms for coordination are not needed.For a description of historic and current coordination mechanisms pleasesee Annex C."
Alan Barrett (NRO): (21:55) Not only "coordination is needed" and "OC's are committed to coordination in future", but also "OCs have a historical record of coordination" should be in the main document. Examples and details may be in an annex.
Milton Mueller: (21:55) well put Alan
Yannis li: (21:57) We will now take a 30min break and come back at 3:30pm local time. Thank you.
Yannis li: (22:30) @Everyone, we will be resuming in 1 minute
Narelle Clark: (22:33) *snore*
Yannis li: (22:33) We are now on the agenda item on Role of ICG during Implementation Phase
Narelle Clark: (22:34) just dialing back in
Milton Mueller: (22:43) Patrick: clearinghouse
Alissa Cooper: (22:43) if folks could put their hands down unless you want to get back in the queue that would be good
Milton Mueller: (22:44) We have a duty to the general public as well. E.g., if there are Congressional hearings in the U.S. on the status of the transition
Milton Mueller: (22:44) but certainly the OCs are responsible for implementation
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (22:47) I could see the benefit of continued ICG coordination. There is strenth in numbers and the OCs might want to communicate and collaborate to ensure their respective implementations are secured as anticipated.
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (22:48) But we should not be making that decision unilaterally without stated interest from the OCs themselves.
Milton Mueller: (22:50) "substituing ourselves for them" is a completely inaccurate representation of what NArelle is talking about
Keith Davidson ccNSO: (22:53) +1 Martin!!!
Alissa Cooper: (22:55) To the people who have said our role should be invited by the OCs: do you want us to affirmatively ask the OCs if there is some useful role they see us having during implementation? Or do you want us to just wait for them to ask?
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (22:55) I would support affirmatively asking the OCs.
Jari Arkko: (22:56) I agree that CWG should have a central role in their implementation effort. Also, for what it is worth, i'm heading an OC, and I feel we r quite capable of implementing as planned (and raising issues or even public concern, should something go wrong). I believe the same is true of other communities._
Narelle Clark: (22:58) **Thank you @RussMundy for capturing what I was proposing very well.**
Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (22:58) @Alissa: happy for us to ask. We are encouraging them to think about their implementation plan and we can then

be seen as supportive, if we are needed
Manal Ismail: (22:59) Good question Alisssa .. I support posing the question to the OC .. I believe our coordinating role mndates on us asking the right question at the right time ..
Jari Arkko: (23:00) yes we are already coordinating on IANA IPR
Daniel Karrenberg: (23:01) As I said earlier we need "concrete language for a revisedcharter. This language should describe and limit the proposed purviewand actions of the group ..."
Jari Arkko: (23:06) Milton, your version of what you are suggesting sounds reasonable, and I see no problem with that. And certainly not harmful. However, I guess there's a question of whether it is useful enough that warrants the effort.
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (23:09) Perhaps we should just keep the ICG email list active as a communications/coordination tool during the implementation phase. I don't see the need for further formal meetings with translation and secretariat support, etc. We could continue this role in a less formal capacity.
Milton Mueller: (23:10) Agree, Keith
demi getschko: (23:12) Paul +1 (on what Elise said about transition)
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (23:12) I agree with Paul
Milton Mueller: (23:12) +1 Paul
Mohamed: (23:15) + Paul, Articulated an important point
Milton Mueller: (23:16) +1 Niebel - I think approval by USG is a point at which we can agree to end our collective life
Russ Housley: (23:17) I do think we need to be around to answer questions from the NTIA. The question is about the time beteen NTIA approval and the completion of implementation.
Milton Mueller: (23:17) and if ICG continues too long, we may all want to end our life anyway...;-)
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (23:17) Agree Milton and Russ
Milton Mueller: (23:19) I like Paul's comment that ICANN cannot be alone in the role of keeping tabs on the transition
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (23:20) +1
Jari Arkko: (23:21) Milton, Paul: I don't think ICANN *should* be keeping tabs in any way. That is why community, or CWG needs to be in charge of their implementation process. But I do not see a major or even minor prioritisation problem between the three OCs.
Milton Mueller: (23:22) Jari: CWG is very much dependent on ICANN staff and ICANNmeetings
Lynn St.Amour: (23:25) @Milton, they needn't be. Names is a community as well. :-)
Lynn St.Amour: (23:25) Names is not synonomous with ICANN.
joseph alhadeff: (23:26) At a minimum should be when NTIA accepts propsoal. Beyond that I think we need at least consultation on the role.
Lynn St.Amour: (23:26) Reverse may not be true. :)
Lynn St.Amour: (23:26) Possible compromise? ICG stays in place until proposal is approved. Mailing list stays open. Spreadsheet is monitored publicly. Communities work together to close implementation items - ICG steps in and helps (as last resort)?
joseph alhadeff: (23:27) We don't really know if NTIA palns to have any reole

related to implementation before the contract expires.  Will theybe monioring and approving?
Daniel Karrenberg: (23:30) hear hear! to MArtin's fear!
Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (23:32) @Lynn - I could agree so long as there is a clear direction forward
Lynn St.Amour: (23:33) @MArtin, agree and I identify with your fear as well.
Jari Arkko: (23:36) Milton: The CWG needs to assert their remit on this topic, and if they ever were yielding to parties_____ that should not have that remit, stop doing that :-) And yes, CWG depends on ICANN, but it is like the organisation is for the community, not that the community is for the organisation. Ok, maybe I am starting to say the obvious things. But if the mindset isn't that the community is in charge of their direction, no amount of CWG/CCWG structures will help.
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (23:37) @Jari: Milton had to leave the room and  isn't in AC at  the  moment. Just FYI
Lynn St.Amour: (23:39) +1 Jari...
Daniel Karrenberg: (23:40) @joe: of course the OCs would coordinate their answers to us, so getting three different answers is unlikely. ;-)
Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (23:40) @Daniel :-D
Daniel Karrenberg: (23:41) Jari, yu are saying obvious things but it is good that you said them.
joseph alhadeff: (23:41) I could see 2 out of three OCs having different view and ICANN would be a totoally different answer :-)
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (23:41) @Joe: agree re the relation to the NTIA role on implementation
Daniel Karrenberg: (23:43) i was intending to speak.
joseph alhadeff: (23:43) Daniel were you saying your hand was up?
Alissa Cooper: (23:43) oh sorry
Alissa Cooper: (23:43) you will be next
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (23:49) For the record, I kindly ask Secretariat to note my point that, in contemplating any future role, we remain in the same formation, including ALAC, and not only 3 OCs.
joseph alhadeff: (23:50) All the stakeholders :-)
Narelle Clark: (23:51) Good night all, thank you for the discussion. So 9am Dublin time tomorrow.
joseph alhadeff: (23:52) I hear there are pubs in Dublin...  :-)
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (23:52) @Joseph, the exact same composition as the initial/current ICG.
Mohamed El Bashir: (23:53) thanks
Daniel Karrenberg: (23:53) bye
Mohamed El Bashir: (23:53) Bye
Yannis li: (23:54) Thank you everyone for joining. The meeting is concluded.