

ICG Call #18 – Wednesday, 10 June 2015 – 12:00-14:00 UTC
Chat Transcript

Jennifer Chung: (6/10/2015 07:43) Welcome to the ICG call #18! 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>

Jennifer Chung: (07:44) Please note that livestreaming translations in AR and PT will be available for the first 90 minutes of the call

Jennifer Chung: (07:44) For details on the additional language audio streams, please see the announcement: <https://www.ianacg.org/icg-announces-upcoming-conference-calls/>

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (07:51) Hello All!

arasteh: (07:51) HI EVERYBODY

Manal Ismail (GAC): (07:56) Hi everyone :) ..

Hartmut Glaser: (07:56) Hi Eberybody ...!

Jennifer Chung: (07:57) Hello everyone - a friendly reminder to please mute your microphone when not speaking, thank you!

Paul Wilson: (08:01) Hi all.

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (08:01) Hello all

arasteh: (08:01) HI mARTIN

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (08:03) Hi Kavouss

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (08:04) slight echo

Manal Ismail (GAC): (08:04) yes we can hear Alissa ..

Eric Evrard: (08:04) Recording initiated.

Manal Ismail (GAC): (08:04) *hear u

arasteh: (08:05) Jeninifer, My name is not appearing in the list of participants

Lynn St.Amour: (08:05) Arasteh, I can see your name

Paul Wilson: (08:05) There is an echo on the call. It would help if everyone would mute their mics.

Eric Evrard: (08:07) For those that are on AC + Bridge, please MUTE your Computer.

Eric Evrard: (08:08) your Computer sound is going in your Phone Mic hence doing Echo.

Jennifer Chung: (08:09) @Martin if there is a doc you would like me to project, please let me know - thank you!

Paul Wilson: (08:11) Martin's voice in inaudible.

Alissa Cooper: (08:11) I hear him perfectly

Daniel Karrenberg: (08:11) i can her martin well

Daniel Karrenberg: (08:11) hear

Manal Ismail (GAC): (08:11) I hear him well too

Russ Housley: (08:11) I hear him clearly

Paul Wilson: (08:11) OK, my problem.

Paul Wilson: (08:12) Broadband in Australian :-{

Daniel Karrenberg: (08:13) @Paul: you need <50kbit/s, so I guess it is not your broadband but further upstream. jsut a guesss

Eric Evrard: (08:15) Hi Paul, if the audio on the AC is really bad, i can only suggest to go through the Adigo Bridge.

Jari Arkko: (08:20) For what it is worth, I hear Alissa and Martin and everyone else very clearly. Thank you all for speaking clearly. Moving on to substance...

Daniel Karrenberg: (08:21) evacuation alarm ! ;-)

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (08:22) Please mute phones and computers if not speaking. I'm hearing an echo in addition to the alarm sound.

Russ Housley: (08:22) I hear the echo as well

Lynn St.Amour: (08:24) My audio is fine, no echo

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (08:28) Like that thinking Jari!

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (08:28) Important to decide what we want and get the lawyers to tell us how we could do this

James Bladel - GNSO: (08:29) Obviously we shouldn't let the lawyers drive the discussion, but if they spot any "red flags", we should know this as early as possible in teh process. thx.

Jari Arkko: (08:30) Agreed, james. it is a balance. But 11 lawyers should not be at the drivers seat, at least not only :-)

James Bladel - GNSO: (08:31) +1

Xiaodong Lee: (08:32) Jari, +1

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (08:34) lot of background noise

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (08:34) Someone cooking?

Joseph Alhadeff: (08:35) Sounds like someone was cooking breakfast :-)

Barrack Otieno AfTLD: (08:35) :-)

Russ Housley: (08:36) @Alan: As Alissa already said, a response to the NTIA is needed by the end of June

Lynn St.Amour: (08:36) To Paul, Alan, how do we manage to review the timeline without substantial inout from the RIR's?

Alan Barrett (NRO): (08:37) We'll try to get a more detailed response in a week.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (08:37) @Alissa +1. It would be helpful to have SOME substantive response (from CRISP) by 17 June.

Barrack Otieno AfTLD: (08:37) good question Lynn, i think the RIR's should try and send their responses earlier

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (08:37) The request came from NTIA to the ICG.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (08:38) @Paul, it should go through the ICG.

Joseph Alhadeff: (08:38) I think that we need to stress that our work is dependent on the underlying proposal authors., We can urger greater speed in response but I think we need to be realistic and work with what we have. Seems like its resolving on the call in any case.

Jennifer Chung: (08:39) @ Everyone - the doc is unsynced should you wish to scroll through

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (08:40) Can we use this pause to ask everyone to mute? ;-)

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (08:40) like the person with the cough

Russ Housley: (08:43) @Kavous: It gives part of the answer (tiem to set up PTI), but not the whole thing is not given

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (08:47) what date we're expecting input from ICANN board? That might shed some more light on the issues the CWG mentioned

Alissa Cooper: (08:47) expecting info from the ICANN Board later today

RussMundy: (08:50) Thanks Martin, I really wasn't trying to 'set you up for a fall' :-)

Manal Ismail (GAC): (08:51) will other elements (other than the PTI) be implemented in parallel ?

Manal Ismail (GAC): (08:52) or is there additional time to be added to this min.?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (08:54) @Martin: there was also the suggestion I made, which was that you, Milton and Xiaodong could usefully pass on our remarks to the co-Chairs of the CWG.

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (08:54) @Joe: +1

Lynn St.Amour: (08:55) Agree with Joe's comment on PTI and it's relationship to our work.

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (08:55) @Jean-Jacques: yes - I said I'd have a word with the co-chairs

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (08:57) @Martin, thank you. Sorry I missed that remark of yours.

Russ Housley: (08:57) @joe: I agree with your point about the proposal; however, the question from NTIA that we are trying to answer is on extension to the contract.

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (08:57) But Joe is right - it is hard to see what the CWG will be able to do to give us the answer that we want.

Manal Ismail (GAC): (08:58) @Martin sorry if I have missed it either in your interevention or in the email, should additional time be considered to other implementation elements mentioned in the email or will those be done parallel ?

Xiaodong Lee: (08:58) Alissa, could you speak a little bit slowly

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (08:59) I generally support Kavouss' comments. Approval of the ICG- and CCWG-submitted proposals is separate from question of implementation. NTIA asked for input on implementation so they could determine the necessary length of a contract extension.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (08:59) I have a hard stop at 13:00 UTC; sorry I have to leave the call. See you in BA

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (09:00) To follow my earlier comment, everything could be *approved* but the contract might continue for a short time while implementation takes place.

Daniel Karrenberg: (09:01) To me the meaning of "implementation completed time" as meant in the NTIA letter to us is clear: It is the time when the new arrangements are in place and NTIA can withdraw from the current arrangements. I see no other definitions that make sense in the context. What am I missing?

Daniel Karrenberg: (09:02) Also: While we are not responsible for the implementation we *are* responsible to provide the best possible answer to NTIA.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (09:02) I think that's correct, Daniel.

RussMundy: (09:02) @alissa: I'm fine with discussing it then

Jari Arkko: (09:04) +1 to current structure

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (09:05) +1 to current structure as well.

Paul Wilson: (09:05) +1 to maintaining separate proposals, no interleaving.

Manal Ismail (GAC): (09:05) I'm fine now with the structure .. thanks for the clarifications ..

Daniel Karrenberg: (09:05) "Also:" in diplomatic language. I am of the opinion that providing the best possible answer to NTIA is definitiely within our mandate and charter.

Xiaodong Lee: (09:05) keep separate proposals

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (09:05) @Manal: good question! CCWG is the obvious case, and there has been enough exchange to understand the requirements. So that could be done in parallel

Russ Housley: (09:06) @Alissa: I think if it as a binder with a vover note at the front and then three tabs for each of the operational community proposals

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (09:06) there'll also need to be discussions with the numbering and protocol parameters

Manal Ismail (GAC): (09:07) Thanks Martin ..

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (09:07) but again those communities have been thinking about that

Joseph Alhadef 2: (09:07) recall that the "combined" proposal needs to be designed to develop consensus across the communiites that may not have been very involved to date...

RussMundy: (09:08) agree with others that the OC proposals should be seperate & in a single binder

Russ Housley: (09:09) @Daniel: +1

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (09:09) @Daniel +1

Joseph Alhadef 2: (09:11) we can achieve daniel's point by quoting the documents. too short is not useful for the braoder community that may need to be part of the consensus.

arasteh: (09:11) Alissa

Mary Uduma: (09:11) I am very sorry for coming late, was making presenatation at the IANA Stewardship Outreach program in Abuja.

arasteh: (09:11) who are the recipiants of this combined proposals

arasteh: (09:12) is it for ICGinter use or it goes outside the ICG/i

Alissa Cooper: (09:12) Kavouss, it is for outside. first we'll put it out for public comment and then in the end we will send it to NTIA.

Joseph Alhadef 2: (09:13) Stronly oppose this concept of a fractured proposal. They need to come out at the same time. This adds confusion.

arasteh: (09:13) Then I have a comment to make

Jari Arkko: (09:13) @Daniel + 1 for minimal new text and referring to existing material. But I think the preface/summary still needs to explain completeness, consistency, etc.Hopefully mostly with references to the rest rather than new text, but still.

James Bladel - GNSO: (09:14) Anyone who has been following this process even casually knows that September tareget will not be met.

Lynn St.Amour: (09:14) +1 to Jari, and it also needs to clearly state how (all together) it meets the NTIA criteria

Manal Ismail (GAC): (09:14) +1 Jari

arasteh: (09:14) I TOTALLY DISAGREE WITH POAUL

Jandyr Santos: (09:14) +1 Joe

Lynn St.Amour: (09:15) MARTin's note to the list covered all this very well

Manal Ismail (GAC): (09:15) +1 Joe

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (09:16) @Kavouss +1

arasteh: (09:17) I DO NOT UNDERSTAND PAUL,S SUGGESTION IN SAYING THAT TRANSITION COULD TAKE PLACE PARTIALLY

arasteh: (09:17) IT IS IN TOTAL CONTRADICTION WITH OUR CHARTER

Jon Nevett: (09:18) This fractured proposal idea has been raised in the past and there has been a strong reaction against it every time. Could we agree that it won't get consensus and not worth raising again?

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (09:19) @Jon: that's a fair reading!

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (09:19) Let me suggest we follow the suggestion by our chair Alissa and discuss this issue separately when we have time?

Xiaodong Lee: (09:20) +1 Patrik

Manal Ismail (GAC): (09:20) Jean-Jacques +1

James Bladel - GNSO: (09:20) +1 Jon.

Manal Ismail (GAC): (09:21) +1 Jon

James Bladel - GNSO: (09:21) We discussed this very scenario in the early days of our forming in Lodon. The relationship with the Names community is very messy and will be much further behind other communities.

Paul Wilson: (09:23) Of course, the ICG must produce a single proposal for a single transition plan, in accordance with our charter.

Paul Wilson: (09:24) My point is that very few plans attempt to achieve everything in one single step.

Paul Wilson: (09:24) it is normal for a plan to have multiple steps, and it would be possible for the ICG's plan to include a number of steps which are taken in order to achieve the transition.

Paul Wilson: (09:25) eg step 1, protocols; step 2, numbers; step 3, names.

Jari Arkko: (09:25) single plan. implementations might actually involve several steps and stretch out for some time. that's fine. project management 101.

Lynn St.Amour: (09:25) Kavouss, all three will be inserted and go to public comment

Russ Housley: (09:25) @Kavous: One proposal with three parts will go to public comment

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (09:25) It's a working draft. Nothing more.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (09:26) We're not initiating a public comment until all 3 components are received and processed.

Jennifer Chung: (09:26) @Everyone - The AR and PT livestreaming will stop in 4 minutes. All other languages and of course the Adobe Connect room will continue.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (09:27) It's for outside public comment ONLY when complete with all 3 components.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (09:27) As the (probably) oldest person in this room, I would respectfully ask all colleagues to avoid using an aggressive tone, whether to our Chair or anyone else.

Lynn St.Amour: (09:27) Kavouss, the Chair had proposed (and it was accepted) that we not discuss Paul's "proposal" just now.

Alan Barrett (NRO): (09:27) Paul did not say that

Lynn St.Amour: (09:28) +1 to Jean-Jacques

Ghislain: (09:28) +1 to JJ

Xiaodong Lee: (09:31) if we just put three proposals together and add necessary preface, and then to get comments , the comments need to be limited to preface or they could comment the proposal itself again?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (09:31) @Xiaodong, good question...

Russ Housley: (09:32) @Joe: You are right that there will be more than one audience for the document, but I hope that we can deliver the more complete text to NTIA so that the people watching do not feel a "bait and switch"

Lynn St.Amour: (09:32) strongly agree with Joe -- the public comment period has a different purpose than the final submission to the NTIA

Mary Uduma: (09:32) +1 Xiaodong

arasteh: (09:34) The structure of the document may change when the third proposal is received e. g. Table of content.

Joseph Alhadef 2: (09:34) Russ, Agree but we might just want to provide the other information in an NTIA annex under outreach/consensus building...

arasteh: (09:35) having said that I DO NOT SEE any logic to spend more time on this combined doc. due to the fact that when the third proposal is received the structure may change and moreover we have to examine their consistencies pursuant to our charter

arasteh: (09:36) We need to explicitly act in accordance with our charter.

arasteh: (09:37) I do not see any logic to rush in preparing something which may be inconsistent with the third part still awaiting

Joseph Alhadef 2: (09:37) Fine with Daniel's approach as long as we make sure we have outreach documents. they need not be unitary.

RussMundy: (09:38) @Daniel: +1 (except for the alarm tone :-)

arasteh: (09:39) Still I am not convinced the usefulness of what we are doing

Russ Housley: (09:39) @Alissa: We should recognize that there is more than one audience, and the changes made to the document after the public comment period should be based on the comments that come in

arasteh: (09:40) From the very beginning , some people in ICG were pushing to go ahead with incomplete documentation.

arasteh: (09:41) It is not productive

Jari Arkko: (09:41) I agree with Daniel, although I think in most cases we will be able to reference material that should satisfy multiple audiences. I'm sure the NTIA doesn't have to read about what this IANA thing is :-)

arasteh: (09:42) Daniel and Joe +1

Xiaodong Lee: (09:42) +1, Daniel

Lynn St.Amour: (09:42) +1 Daniel and Joe

Mary Uduma: (09:44) +1 Daniel

Daniel Karrenberg: (09:47) Given the different interpretations of what Paul said in this chat it appears to me that it would be good if Paul sent a note to the list with a summary of what he was saying. This way we have a fighting chance not to waste time at the f2f meeting discussing things he might not have said or meant.

Daniel Karrenberg: (09:47) sorry for the english: german roots ;-)

Lynn St.Amour: (09:48) good idea Daniel

Joseph Alhadeff 2: (09:48) Paul: what was the timing for your proposal? After the creation of proposal, after it's submission? after its acceptance? Wasn't clear from the intervention...

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (09:50) To add on to what Alissa answer @kavouss: we must because of this have a pretty solid agenda so that everyone know WHEN each topic is to be discussed. We (as chairs) are trying to really minimize the number of surprises.

Jennifer Chung: (09:50) @ICG members who will not be in Buenos Aires - if you could please let the Secretariat know so we can ensure your seamless remote participation for all the ICG scheduled sessions. Thank you!

Daniel Karrenberg: (09:51) I will not be there and I have asked for remote participation also for the working session.

Jennifer Chung: (09:51) noted Daniel

Mary Uduma: (09:51) Noted Jennifer.

Lynn St.Amour: (09:52) agree - we need to be careful re boundaries

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (09:52) Agree with Alissa. No need to get into the weeds of CCWG, but 30 minutes is reasonable for a high-level overview and update.

Daniel Karrenberg: (09:52) I wish I could make it, but had to make a hard decision about priorities for those days.

Joseph Alhadeff 2: (09:52) I will only be able to join remotely.

Lynn St.Amour: (09:52) thanks Alissa

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (09:52) that sounds right to me Alissa

Mary Uduma: (09:52) I

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (09:52) As the ICG liaisons to the CCWG, Kavouss and I can work together to help prep for that agenda item.

Daniel Karrenberg: (09:53) agree with the amount of time reserved for ccwg-acctblty

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (09:53) I guess I should

Lynn St.Amour: (09:53) excellent - thanks Keith and Kavouss

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (09:53) W-U I assume will continue look at it too

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (09:54) Patrik's audio gone silent...

Xiaodong Lee: (09:54) +1, alissa

RussMundy: (09:54) yes, what Patrik said

Eric Evrard: (09:55) Patrik, i think we lost you for a bit.

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (09:55) if you lost me: SSAC is doing a formal evaluation of the CWG Names proposal, simply because we must as a chartering organization.

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (09:55) We hope that might also help the work ICG and others do. And we might do similar evaluation of the other OC proposals. But, we must do it for CWG Names.

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (09:56) Lost phone line

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (09:57) not worth getting back in - i can hear

Jennifer Chung: (09:58) @ ICG members: Doodle for July-Oct Calls:

<http://doodle.com/pacmww63ks6848bk>

Jennifer Chung: (09:59) Please fill it out if you haven't already indicated your availability - thank you!

Manal Ismail: (10:00) Just to note that availability recorded may change slightly as call durations are settled, particularly for farther calls ..

Daniel Karrenberg: (10:00) tahnks alissa!

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (10:00) Thanks very much Alissa.

Lynn St.Amour: (10:00) Thank you Alissa - and at such an early time too

Paul Wilson: (10:00) thanks and bye

Ghislain: (10:00) Thanks

Mary Uduma: (10:00) bye all

Manal Ismail: (10:00) Many thanks Alissa and everyone .. Bye and see you in BA ..

Barrack Otieno AfTLD: (10:00) bye

Jennifer Chung: (10:01) Thank you all, ICG Call 18 is now closed.