ICG Call #20 – Wednesday, 29 July 2015 – 05:00-07:00 UTC
Chat Transcript

arasteh: (7/29/2015 00:39) Hi Every body

Mike Brennan: (00:39) Hello! Welcome

Yannis li: (00:44) Welcome to the ICG call # 21! 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: (00:44) Livestreaming translations in AR and RU are not available for this call.Livestreaming translations for ZH will be available for the first 90 minutes of the call, thereafter, please join the Virtual Meeting Room for the remaining 30 minutes

Mike Brennan: (00:49) Hi Alissa, yes I see your screen

Alan Barrett (NRO): (00:49) I hear you and can see the document

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (00:51) There's a hissing sound...

Jennifer Chung: (00:53) @Jean-Jacques we are looking into this right now

Manal Ismail: (00:56) hello everyone :) !!

arasteh: (00:57) Jennifer

arasteh: (00:57) Good time

Manal Ismail: (00:57) can I have my mic enabled ..

arasteh: (00:57) Pls note that the hissing is still there

Yannis li: (00:57) Hi Manal, your mic is now enabled.

Manal Ismail: (00:57) Thanks ..

Jennifer Chung: (00:57) @Kavouss - tech is currently looking into this for us

Joseph Alhadeff: (01:00) can I also have my Mic enabled -so I can conmect via the computer? - Joe

Jennifer Chung: (01:00) @Jean-Jacques, Kavouss and all - apparently the hissing sound is when there is no speakers speaking, it should go away once the call starts

Paul Wilson: (01:01) Hi all.

Hartmut Glaser: (01:01) Hi everyone

Narelle Clark: (01:01) Hi everyone

nigel hickson: (01:02) good morning

Mary Uduma: (01:03) Good morning all

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (01:11) can see but can't read!

epg (elise): (01:11) It is very small.

Paul Wilson: (01:11) yes

Russ Housley: (01:11) Very small

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (01:11) too small

Narelle Clark: (01:11) I see it - which version is this file?

epg (elise): (01:11) better

Mary Uduma: (01:11) Yesok

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (01:11) still too small for my screen

Lynn St.Amour: (01:12) they were good edits...

Jari Arkko: (01:13) my comments were all minor. note: didn't want to disturb people's readig process, but needed a place to put my comments in rather than just talk through them here.

Kuo Wu: (01:14) Sorry to call in late

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (01:15) Good size of text Alissa! Thanks!

Jari Arkko: (01:15) I had the same comment (in the executive summary part) about the same text. It sounds a bit negative.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (01:15) @Martin +1, I'd not noticed this, but you're right, it is quite defensive.

Jari Arkko: (01:16) Agree with Martin's suggested reformulation.

Lynn St.Amour: (01:17) Also agree - this paragraph was re-purposed somewhere along the line and it is now confused as well as defensive

Jari Arkko: (01:17) Also agree with Martin on the second comment re: streamlining.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (01:17) @Martin +1.

Mary Uduma: (01:17) +1 @ Martin

Narelle Clark: (01:18) Agree and have a suggested text...

Narelle Clark: (01:18) @Martin: try "In order to appropriately reflect the existing operational model underpinning IANA, the proposal has been developed by soliciting and then bringing together discrete proposals from the three operational communities."

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (01:18) One can zoom in by pressing the middle of the three buttons on the top right of the screen Alissa is displaying.

Jari Arkko: (01:18) Furthermore, we *did* have a single process - the ICG process. Any project of significant size will need to break down into components at some level. Doesn't mean that there is no single project.

Jari Arkko: (01:18) @ Narelle + 1

Lynn St.Amour: (01:19) very good point Paul --it was based on the IAB submissin.

Lynn St.Amour: (01:19) and after community consultation

Narelle Clark: (01:19) Then delete the Furthermore in the next sentence...

Xiaodong Lee: (01:19) Paul W. +1

Russ Housley: (01:20) Actually, it reads okay without paragraph 04

Lynn St.Amour: (01:20) @Alissasupport that approach

Manal Ismail: (01:20) +1 not being defensive, proposed text & consistency ..

Paul Wilson: (01:21) thanks alissa.+1

Alan Barrett (NRO): (01:21) agree with that approach, but perhaps rewriting the two paragraphs would be better than deleting them

arasteh: (01:21) Call is interrupted

Paul Wilson: (01:21) My apologies for being out of sync on the order of editing.I missed the suggestion to deal with the proposal and then extra parts for the Exec Summary.

arasteh: (01:21) Alissa

arasteh: (01:22) Iam disconnected from the call

arasteh: (01:22) Jennifer

Yannis li: (01:22) @Kavouss, we are redialing to you.

arasteh: (01:22)I am disconnected

Jennifer Chung: (01:22) @Kavouss - the operator is currently redialing out to you again

arasteh: (01:23) Alissa

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (01:23) Alissa, x004 contains the expression "... and essentially DELEGATED TO the threee communities": from a community perspective, DELEGATED TO seems too strong. Could we say that "...in order to properly reflect their respective functions, the 3 OCs were requested to submit their separate proposals"?

arasteh: (01:23) I raised hand but disconnected

Jari Arkko: (01:24) JJ: maybe ... submit their parts of the proposal"?

arasteh: (01:24) With resepcent to Martin Proposal ,while I agree with him I believe we must fllow the language which we put in our Chartero,

Joseph Alhadeff: (01:24) could use essentially anchored in the three communities..

Lynn St.Amour: (01:25) @JJ: s/functions/responsibilities ??

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (01:25) @Lynn: responsibilities is good.

Alan Barrett (NRO): (01:26) ICG requested OCs to develop and submit proposals for their portions of the transition

RussMundy-SSAC: (01:26) @Joseph: +1

Jari Arkko: (01:27) @Joe + 1

Paul Wilson: (01:27) +1

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (01:27) @Joe +1.

Paul Wilson: (01:27) i'm happy with that. "delegated" was not the right word.

Xiaodong Lee: (01:29) Joe +1

Paul Wilson: (01:30) I felt that "anchored" was possibly open to unpredictable interpretations.

Paul Wilson: (01:30) "assigned" works, IMHO

Jari Arkko: (01:31) FWIW, as the first one to propose an orde change, I'm fine with the current order.

Lynn St.Amour: (01:31) @Alissa - agree

Paul Wilson: (01:31) yes. ok as is.

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (01:31) fine for me

Manal Ismail: (01:31) +1 Alissa regarding the order ..

RussMundy-SSAC: (01:31) I'm fine with current order

Alan Barrett (NRO): (01:31) In the diagram in paragraph 6: Number related requests are 0.1%, not 0.001%.

Mary Uduma: (01:32) I agree to no change.

Paul Wilson: (01:32) nice one. thanks alan.:-)

Jennifer Chung: (01:32) @Alan - noted and we will make that change

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (01:32) Good catch Alan!

Paul Wilson: (01:33) agree joe

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (01:33) @Joe +1.

Lynn St.Amour: (01:37) s/provisions/reviews/

Lynn St.Amour: (01:38) and split para. into two?The 2nd would start with The proposal includes...

Xiaodong Lee: (01:38) s/service level expectations/service level requirements/

Lynn St.Amour: (01:39) @MArtin, doesn't this section only summarize proposals notqualify or valdiate them.

Joseph Alhadeff: (01:39) Just sat the review processed would focus on the names function.

Alan Barrett (NRO): (01:41) agree that CSC and IFR are intended to apply only to the names functions

Manal Ismail: (01:41) I'm fine with the proposed edits ..

Lynn St.Amour: (01:41) I support the edits as well

Lynn St.Amour: (01:46) @Joe - agree - it is just the summaries of @ proposal in this section

arasteh: (01:46) Joe+1

Manal Ismail: (01:47) agree with Joe and there is a section where we identify such conflicts..

Manal Ismail: (01:48) Doesn't it go without saying that each OC proposal applies only to this specific OC?

Lynn St.Amour: (01:48) The PTI is described as an affiliate in the proposal

arasteh: (01:48) aLISSA+1

Manal Ismail: (01:48) and that th eproposal is not in conflict unless we explicitly mention that?

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (01:48) Add (subsidiary)?

Daniel Karrenberg: (01:49) Hello colloeagues, I am on the road with spotty connectivity. I'll try to follow as well as i can but voice interventions will likely be a pain for all. So I will write here if at all.

Mary Uduma: (01:49) True @ Lynn

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (01:55) FWIW: one thing SSAC has pointed out related to this "standing committee" is that if it is not implemented correctly, it might be a conflict between it andthe fact ICANN Board is said to take formal advice from ACs into account. But SSAC did see this as an implementation issue.

Alan Barrett (NRO): (01:55) yes, cross references are helpful.this might not be the only sentence that would benefit from them.

arasteh: (01:56) Again I SUPPORT JOE,S PROPOSAL

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (01:58) @Joe +1.

RussMundy-SSAC: (01:58) I do have a couple of problems with inserting the diagram in the document

Michael Niebel: (02:01) "not replicated" is clearer

Manal Ismail: (02:01) I think it's quoted from the CWG proposal para 148 ..

Manal Ismail: (02:02) here is the quote "In relation to the Root Zone Management Process Administrator role that is currently performed by NTIA, the CWG-Stewardship recommends that this role be discontinued post-transition."

RussMundy-SSAC: (02:02) I think that the existing proposal text is better than modifying it in our summary

Xiaodong Lee: (02:03) RM-SSAC, +1

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (02:05) FWIW: I must leave Adobe Connect now, but will stay on the phone.

Mary Uduma: (02:09) +1 Alissa

arasteh: (02:10) Alissa

arasteh: (02:10) it is about 1h 15 mits and we have just reviewed two out of several pages

Lynn St.Amour: (02:10) I also think the diagram also helps significantly

Daniel Karrenberg: (02:11) How about changing the caption from "15   A visual summary of the combined proposal appears below." by inserting "oversight" in there?

arasteh: (02:11)pls accelerate the review

Jari Arkko: (02:11) I agree that pictures are important. I also think that we should keep it as high-level as possible.

Manal Ismail: (02:11) +1 to resolving issues and keeping the diagram as I feel it would be helpful ..

Lynn St.Amour: (02:11) clarity of key points is important -- vs. alot of detail

Daniel Karrenberg: (02:12) I agree with Russ that it is incomplete on the names side.

Lynn St.Amour: (02:12) this diagram also draws on each community's own diagrams

Daniel Karrenberg: (02:12) "15   A visual summary of the oversight components of the combined proposal appears below."

arasteh: (02:13) Alissa

Lynn St.Amour: (02:13) @DAniel, like that title

Manal Ismail: (02:13) +1 Daniel

arasteh: (02:13)the digram is sufficiently representative and high level

arasteh: (02:13)pls keep it without change

demi getschko: (02:13) + 1 to Daniel's title proposal

arasteh: (02:14) but whatever you add must remained high level

Mary Uduma: (02:14) Clearer @ Daniel

Alissa Cooper: (02:15) do people see weird white boxes on the screen?

epg (elise): (02:15) yes2 weird white boxes

Jandyr Santos Jr: (02:16) i see the weird white boxes

Daniel Karrenberg: (02:17) i also see the boxes, but my connectivity is so flakey that i hear people only intermittently

Lynn St.Amour: (02:19) like that ALissa

Narelle Clark: (02:19) My quality is excellent but for 1-2s very occasional drop outs. No boxes. Mind you, my microphone wouldn't work when I tested it prior to starting the call.

Narelle Clark: (02:21) Now I see boxes...

Mary Uduma: (02:21) @ Alan and other colleagues from number community, could you explain whether the diagram fully depicted your proposal.Is it that you would not have any relationship with PTI? There are not dotted lines between Numbers and PTI

Alan Barrett (NRO): (02:22) The numbers community expects to have a contract/SLA with ICANN, not with PTI.

Daniel Karrenberg: (02:23) Agree with Paul. This cannot be over-emphasised. Too may people forget that "small" thing.

Narelle Clark: (02:25) manal's comment is correct, however. Para 43 (commencing VerisSign currently...) should read: "Since there is currently no formal agreement between the Root Zone Maintainer..." wherever the paragraph lands.

Daniel Karrenberg: (02:26) Completeness fits better.

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (02:26) +1 Alissa

Narelle Clark: (02:29) Minor nit - the words "VeriSign" and "Verisign" appear - while Verisign itself uses both, we should be consistent and use "Verisign".

Manal Ismail: (02:29) +1 Michael

Daniel Karrenberg: (02:30) +1 Michael

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (02:31) @Michael +1.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (02:31) Yes, please use Verisign not VeriSign. Thanks Narelle!

Daniel Karrenberg: (02:31) Strong: This needs to be removed. It is an invitation for fishing trips!

Lynn St.Amour: (02:32) I think this section is necessary.What about adding: In addition, the CCWG-Accountability is proposing under the "Community Mechanism as a Sole Member Model" that the community segments (Advisory Communities (AC's) and Supporting Organizations (SO's)) each have equal votes.There are 7 SO/AC's in total and if the GAC chooses to participate, it would be simply one segment out of 5 (or 7 if all the AC's choose to participate).The CCWG-Accountability group is also proposing incorporating the Affirmation of Commitments into the Bylaws, including requirements for higher voting thresholds to minimize the ability in the future to modify these obligations.

Lynn St.Amour: (02:32) could we have a FAQ

Alan Barrett (NRO): (02:32) that sentence with "Furthermore ... are time limited and selected ..." is hard to read.adding a comma and an extra word would help: "... are time limited COMMA[, and ARE selected ..."

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (02:33) All true, thanks Lynn. The proposed voting distribution discussed in the CCWG is not finalized, but the latest proposal is as you described. It will be subject to further public comment.

Lynn St.Amour: (02:37) @ALissa, all I can support your proposal given the state of the CCWG proposal

arasteh: (02:38) Please add the following at appropriate part of the text

Manal Ismail: (02:39) sorry was not paying attention to the chat .. Thanks Lynn ..

Paul Wilson: (02:40) yay!

Daniel Karrenberg: (02:40) i am patting the dog who has patiently sat through this ;-)

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (02:41) @Jennifer, loud and clear.

arasteh: (02:41) It is worth mentionining that that the Cross Community Working Group (CCWG) dealing with ICANN Enhanced Accountabilitry in cluding Community empowerment and Independent Review Processis being completed and published for for public comment at the same that ICG publishing its proposal for public comments

arasteh: (02:43) ALL issues relating to the interdependency of the CWG and CCWG are adequately covered in the CCWG second proposal put to public comments as referred to above

Daniel Karrenberg: (02:43) @joe: spot on!

Paul Wilson: (02:43) "comments" is better than "opinions".

Daniel Karrenberg: (02:43) @joe: sorry for not responding on the list.

RussMundy-SSAC: (02:44) I support Joe's suggested use of "comment"

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (02:44) +1 to Joe's suggestion.

Manal Ismail: (02:44) +1 Joe ..

Paul Wilson: (02:45) looks good.

Paul Wilson: (02:46) agree with Narelle that some extra line/paragraph breaks would be good.

Xiaodong Lee: (02:46) Joe, +1

Narelle Clark: (02:46) Re web site: I made some minor comments on the list.

Narelle Clark: (02:47) Glad to see a web form, that's great. For accessibility a the captcha should go

Narelle Clark: (02:47) Also should have a plain word doc version for screen readers.

Daniel Karrenberg: (02:48) @mary: we already got rid of "opinions"

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (02:48) "comments rather than opinions". +1.

Alan Barrett (NRO): (02:50) there are supposed to be accessible versions of captcha.e.g. http://simplyaccessible.com/article/googles-no-captcha/

Narelle Clark: (02:51) @Alan - indeed. My org has got them to do that...

Russ Housley: (02:51) The last question is: 11)   Do you have any general comments for the ICG about the proposal?

Daniel Karrenberg: (02:51) connectivity issues for me are getting too painful. i will leave the meeting now. see you next time.

Joseph Alhadeff: (02:53) We just need to make sure that the boxes are extensible in the downloadable form...

Xiaodong Lee: (02:53) see you Daniel

Paul Wilson: (02:54) +1manal

Manal Ismail: (02:55) Thanks ..

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (02:57) @Joe +1 for a comment box, not their opinion.

Paul Wilson: (02:57) makes sense.

Manal Ismail: (02:57) ok with me Joe .. Happy with anything that gives the option for commenting on Part zero

Narelle Clark: (02:57) Q6 Suggest amendment: "...If not please list the aspects of the proposal which do notand what proposal modifications you believe are necessary."

Paul Wilson: (02:57) agree it is better to use ISO 2-letter code.

Alan Barrett (NRO): (02:58) or both, e,g, "AF - Afghanistan", sorted by code

Paul Wilson: (02:58) and better to have "Country/Economy" instead of "Country"

Joseph Alhadeff: (02:59) Compromise - order them by ISO code with the country name near the ISO code

Xiaodong Lee: (02:59) yes, Paul W,

Manal Ismail: (03:00) sorry but I can't hesr Xiaodong clearly ..

Mary Uduma: (03:00) +1 Joe

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (03:00) ISO country code might pose a problem, example for Taiwan, because the list says "Taiwan, Province of China": that's the Beijing view, but not that of Taiwan...

Xiaodong Lee: (03:00) Manal, I mean we just follow the stanadard of ISO3166 with the terms

Xiaodong Lee: (03:01) it will be better for us to deal with issues.

Joseph Alhadeff: (03:01) Policitically correct proposal to say country /economy...

Manal Ismail: (03:02) I see .. apologies Xiaodong I didn't get your proposal right at the beginning ..

Paul Wilson: (03:03) I support solution from Alissa.it is a standard approach.

Paul Wilson: (03:03) ie we use "Country/Economy" and ISO code.

Xiaodong Lee: (03:04) Paul Wilson, +1

demi getschko: (03:04) Have to leave now (keep following via e-mail list). See you. Bye to all...

Mary Uduma: (03:04) +1@ Paul

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (03:05) Alissa, Paul: I prefer Country/Economy and ISO code, rather than ISO code alone.

Lynn St.Amour: (03:05) @Alissa, I scanned most of it and it looked good.

Narelle Clark: (03:05) I'm going to have to go...

epg (elise): (03:07) My apology.I must leave the call at this time.

Manal Ismail: (03:08) me too .. I'm 10 min. late for a meeting that I have to attend ..

Lynn St.Amour: (03:11) for the record/minutes, can we recognize and formally thank the secretariat for all their outstanding work and support!

Mary Uduma: (03:11) Thanks and bye everyone

Paul Wilson: (03:11) Thanks to you Alissa!!!

Paul Wilson: (03:11) and Secretariat!

Paul Wilson: (03:12) bye

Lynn St.Amour: (03:12) thank you ALissa'

Russ Housley: (03:12) Thanks to all

RussMundy-SSAC: (03:12) thanks all - bye

nigel hickson: (03:12) great call; thanks

Jandyr Santos Jr: (03:12) thanks to all

Yannis li: (03:12) Thanks everyone for joining. ICG Call #21 is now concluded.