

ICG Call #24 – Thursday, 8 October, 2015 – 19:00-20:30 UTC

Chat Transcript

Kavouss Arasteh: (10/8/2015 14:42) Hi Jennifer

Kavouss Arasteh: (14:42) Hi interpreters

Jennifer Chung: (14:42) Hello Kavouss

Kavouss Arasteh: (14:42) Hi Icann Staff

Jennifer Chung: (14:43) Welcome to the ICG call #24! The call will begin in about 17 minutes. Please note that chat sessions are being archived and follow the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior: <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/expected-standards-2012-05-15-en>

Kavouss Arasteh: (14:43) Dear ICG mMEMBER,

Kavouss Arasteh: (14:43) i HOPE EVERYONE OF YOU IS OK

Kavouss Arasteh: (14:44) i AM VERY BUSY WITH ccwg, This week we have up to 3 calls per day,

Kavouss Arasteh: (14:44) Today I have 4 calls .This the third one.

Kavouss Arasteh: (14:44) Situation is not promising unless CCWG immediately reflects on the matter

Kavouss Arasteh: (14:44) The Transition is at risk

Jennifer Chung: (14:50) @Kavouss, the operator will dial out to you at approximately 5 minutes prior to the start of the call

Jennifer Chung: (14:50) @Michael your mic is enabled if you would like to connect and test it

Michael Niebel: (14:53) thanks Jennifer , I will try to connect also by mobile

Jennifer Chung: (14:54) Noted, if you are connecting by mobile then we will mute your AC room mike to prevent echo - please let me know what works best for you.

Michael Niebel: (14:54) jes

Jennifer Chung: (14:56) @Everyone - a reminder from our interpreters to please state your name when you speak for purpose of the transcript - thank you all!

Jennifer Chung: (14:56) purposes*

Michael Niebel: (14:58) Jennifer you can mute my AC room mike

Jennifer Chung: (14:58) Certainly Michael, it's done.

Jennifer Chung: (14:59) Michael* apologies for the typo.

Narelle Clark: (15:00) Morning all

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (15:01) Hello everyone

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (15:02) Good morning, good night, good evening, good everywhere! ;-)

James Bladel: (15:02) Good afternoon folks.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (15:02) Hello All!

Manal Ismail: (15:02) Hello everyone ..

Keith Davidson ccNSO: (15:03) Apologies for late joining - hello all

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (15:03) Sounds fine, thanks Alissa.

Manal Ismail: (15:03) Can't hear anything .. is there an audio problem or is it just me ?

Lynn St.Amour: (15:04) I have sound

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (15:04) sorry I'm late

Keith Davidson ccNSO: (15:04) Sound is good

Manal Ismail: (15:04) very strange !!

Kavouss Arasteh: (15:04) m disconnected

Kavouss Arasteh: (15:05) Jennifer pls advise to redial me

Jennifer Chung: (15:05) @Kavouss we will dial back to you right now

Kavouss Arasteh: (15:05) Alissa,

Jennifer Chung: (15:06) @Everyone this is unsynced for your review

Kavouss Arasteh: (15:06) The sound quality is poor and sometimes accompanied by background noise

Kavouss Arasteh: (15:06) Jennifer

Kavouss Arasteh: (15:06) Pls advise to dial me up again

Kavouss Arasteh: (15:07) aLISSA,

Kavouss Arasteh: (15:07) i AM NOW CONNECTED

Jennifer Chung: (15:08) @Everyone, this includes the edits suggested by Manal.

demi getschko: (15:09) (sound is unstable...)

James Bladel: (15:10) Typing...please mute

Russ Housley: (15:10) +1 .. agree with Alissa's assessment of the comment from the IAB

Milton: (15:10) can you authorize sounds via computer please?

Jennifer Chung: (15:11) @Everyone, yes this is unsynced

Jennifer Chung: (15:12) @Milton your mic is enabled - you have to also connect via your laptop/computer

Jennifer Chung: (15:13) @Paul - could you please speak a bit louder - the interpreters are having some trouble hearing you.

Paul: (15:17) Sorry I am speaking quite close to my mic. Not sure why it isn't working as normal.

Paul: (15:18) +1 Alan - this is what I was trying to express.

Alan Barrett (NRO): (15:18) <https://www.iab.org/documents/correspondence-reports-documents/docs2000/iab-statement-on-infrastructure-domain-and-subdomains-may-2000/>

Russ Housley: (15:19) RFC 3172 defines the Management Guidelines & Operational Requirements for .arpa

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (15:20) Thank you Alan and Russ H, I'll read this.

Jennifer Chung: (15:20) @Jean-Jacques, a request from the interpreters if you could please speak closer to your microphone for them to translate properly - thank you!

Paul: (15:20) Perhaps we should include those references (from Russ and Alan) in the document?

Jennifer Chung: (15:20) @Everyone - this is unsynced for your review, everyone has scroll control.

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (15:20) milton for rzm?

Narelle Clark: (15:21) Those references would fit well in the doc also.

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (15:21) i always mispronounce the z!

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (15:21) We hear you fine Milton, at least for now.

Keith Davidson ccNSO: (15:22) No Martin, you pronounce the Z correctlu, its just not the way the USA pronounces it!

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (15:25) i've lost my line

Milton: (15:25) I can't hear anything any more

Milton: (15:25) now i can

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (15:25) lousy hotel-room connectivity

RussMundy-SSAC: (15:26) grr, I'

Milton: (15:26) yes

RussMundy-SSAC: (15:26) I'm on the phone bridge & was speaking but didn't seem to work

RussMundy-SSAC: (15:27) in general, the RZM first question was not answered in any useful way

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (15:27) @Jennifer & Interpreters: sorry, will speak closer to mic. next time.

Milton: (15:28) disagree.

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (15:28) sounded right to me

Milton: (15:28) NTIA parallel process should not be designing PTI-RZM relations

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (15:29) iirc ntia said they would launch a parallel process. ie it is not cwg. we just need to find the interface

Milton: (15:29) agree with Russ M

elise: (15:30) Sorry for being delayed in joining this call.

Milton: (15:31) Nail on the head

Narelle Clark: (15:31) @Russ is spot on. This is a serious issue.

Russ Housley: (15:32) CWG seems to be telling us that the agreement will be worked out as part of implementation (in the parallel process)

Narelle Clark: (15:32) We should ask the Board at least at this stage who/where is this parallel process.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (15:33) The expectation is there will be a written agreement between ICANN/IFO and Verisign/RZM at some point. I think the question at hand is, "Will (or should) the CWG assess and affirm that future agreement, or is that the role of the broader community, or another group? Is there a linkage between the CWG's role and the eventual/anticipated agreement between IFO and RZM?"

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (15:35) @Milton + 1, strongly.

Russ Housley: (15:36) @Milton: I do not hear CWG as saying that NTIA will have oversight of that agreement. Rather, I am hearing that the agreement will be worked as part of implementation.

Narelle Clark: (15:36) @KeithDrazek - can you investigate Verisign's expectation? Or is that a CoI for you?

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (15:36) What was posted in August was the proposed testing plan, not the proposed agreement.

Milton: (15:36) Russ H: I do hear CWG as saying that NTIA will do it.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (15:37) @Narelle, would not asking Verisign be a CoI, in itself?

Narelle Clark: (15:37) @JJS They would have a public position, surely.

Jennifer Chung: (15:38) @Kavouss you are unmuted on the phone bridge if you would like to get back into the queue to speak?

Russ Housley: (15:38) @Alissa: Agree there is a gap. The question is who will review it.

Milton: (15:38) Yes

Kavouss Arasteh: (15:38) The answer is yes but in two steps

Kavouss Arasteh: (15:38) Step 1 cwg

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (15:39) review, yes

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (15:39) @Narelle: if they have a published position, fine; if not, I would object to any member of the ICG going to ask them.

Kavouss Arasteh: (15:39) Step 2 Boarder community

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (15:39) not sure about designing it

RussMundy-SSAC: (15:39) I would support that the CWG should at least review the proposed approach

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (15:39) @Narelle: not because they are Verisign, but because of possible, or perceived, CoI.

Narelle Clark: (15:39) I have a suspicion the CCWG would not be a timely route to resolve this...

RussMundy-SSAC: (15:39) both operational & what the agreements are

Keith Davidson ccNSO: (15:40) I don't know that we *have* to be involved, but we can pass on some agreed first principles..

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (15:40) Perhaps the ICG should send a clarifying question to NTIA/ICANN/Verisign. I have no problem relaying a question to my employer, but Verisign currently serves at the pleasure of NTIA and would presumably be counter-party to an agreement with ICANN, so I don't think it should only be asked of Verisign. Happy to assist the ICG regardless.

Narelle Clark: (15:40) @JJS Yes, there are always at least two parties to a contract.

Narelle Clark: (15:40) @KeithDrazek Exactly.

Russ Housley: (15:41) @Milton: We do not to say in Part 0 that the comments tell us that there is no support for combining the RZM and IFO _ever_

RussMundy-SSAC: (15:41) @Keith: I agree with the joint posing of a question

Milton: (15:42) Russ H: I did not say there was "no support" but there are comments that oppose collapsing the roles

Milton: (15:42) and frankly, the outcome of CWG's Design Team F came very close to making that a principle.

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (15:42) sorry: I can hear you for the moment

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (15:43) was trying to say CWG does not allow rzm to be absorbed by icann

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (15:44) In the interest of full disclosure, I have NOT been engaged in, or privy to, any conversations among Verisign/NTIA/ICANN related to RZM, the Cooperative Agreement, or any anticipated successor arrangement between ICANN and Verisign.

Milton: (15:44) The problem with CWG's answer is that ICANN board appoints the "Standing Review Committee" and ICANN board approves the change, so there is literally no serious check on ICANN here.

Milton: (15:45) And they did not say "consultation" means "consensus"

Narelle Clark: (15:45) @KeithDrazek - that should be minuted.

Jennifer Chung: (15:46) @Keith Drazek and Narelle, we will minute the chat items as well.

Milton: (15:47) I think the mandate for us "doing something" is that the proposal is not complete unless these questions are resolved

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (15:47) i though it clear, too

Lynn St.Amour: (15:47) I support that proposal

Narelle Clark: (15:48) @Lynn which proposal are you supporting? Ambiguous.

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (15:48) sorry - line connected but no content through the pipe!

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (15:48) agree

Keith Davidson ccNSO: (15:48) agree

Lynn St.Amour: (15:48) Allisa's suggested next steps.

Manal Ismail: (15:48) agree

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (15:49) again i agree

Russ Housley: (15:49) +1

Keith Davidson ccNSO: (15:49) agree

Manal Ismail: (15:49) agree

RussMundy-SSAC: (15:49) agree

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (15:50) fine

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (15:51) nope, that's right

Lynn St.Amour: (15:54) good addition.

Milton: (15:54) perfect

Narelle Clark: (15:55) Agree re addition from Q9 response.

RussMundy-SSAC: (15:56) +1

Russ Housley: (15:59) seems clear enough without any changes

Milton: (15:59) The ARIn meeting has resumed and I need to get into it

Russ Housley: (16:06) Isn't the already scheduled townhall session with CCWG a good place to cover that?

Allisa Cooper: (16:07) we have split the town hall into two separate sessions

Alissa Cooper: (16:07) given that we are in different places with our respective bodies of work

Jennifer Chung: (16:09) @Everyone, this is email Keith Drazek just referred to - this has been sent to the ICG list a few minutes ago.

Jennifer Chung: (16:09) http://mm.ianacg.org/pipermail/internal-cg_ianacg.org/2015-October/001833.html

Jari Arkko: (16:10) thank you very much for those summaries. keith's email was excellent.

Lynn St.Amour: (16:11) agree,thank you Keith and Kavouss - and for all your work in this area

Michael Niebel: (16:11) Agree, many thanks

Russ Housley: (16:13) Yes, it seems there has been far more heat than light in the discussion in the last few weeks

Manal Ismail: (16:13) Adding my thanks to Kavouss and Keith ..

James Bladel: (16:14) Two questions: What CAN ICG do, and what SHOULD ICG do?

Jari Arkko: (16:15) I agree that communication has been difficult, and people are rising stakes more than getting to do the actual work that should be done.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (16:15) The CCWG needs to keep to its process and procedures. Public comments have been submitted and they must be assessed and addressed. The public comments, including the Board's, will point the way forward. There will need to be compromise to find consensus, without sacrificing the goals and without sacrificing the key dependencies of the CWG.

Keith Davidson ccNSO: (16:16) I don't think that would be helpful Alissa. I think CCWG needs to go through its own processes...

Jandyr Santos: (16:17) Agree with Keith and Kavouss

James Bladel: (16:17) I don't think there's a path for us to win on this.

Keith Davidson ccNSO: (16:18) It is outside of our scope - at most we could stress the importance of CCWG achieving an outcome, but they are already extremely sensitive to that

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (16:19) Agree Keith. I think adding another voice to the animated discussion could be counter-productive

Jennifer Chung: (16:19) @Paul, request from the interpreters if you could please speak a bit closer to your microphone?

Jennifer Chung: (16:19) thank you Paul!

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (16:20) Work Stream 1 was designed to provide the ICANN community confidence that future Work Stream 2 reforms could be implemented over ICAN Board resistance. WS1 was not limited to the IANA transition requirements alone. That said, there is an ongoing and active review of where that line needs to be drawn.

Russ Housley: (16:21) @Keith: That is clear, and I personally hope that everyone can find a place for that line that lets the transition move forward promptly

James Bladel: (16:22) Even a seemingly benign statement like that could be taken by some as endorsing one side or the other. I urge caution here.

Keith Davidson ccNSO: (16:23) Agree with James - lets leave it to the people who are empowered to act

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (16:23) We in SSAC have heard "too many" parties requesting lots of things in WS1 just because WS2 might not happen. I think that is the wrong view, and we all must work towards convincing people WS2 will happen. And then ensure WS1 is prep for that (and cover IANA Transition).

Lynn St.Amour: (16:24) I like Keith D's comment: Work Stream 1 was designed to provide the ICANN community confidence that future Work Stream 2 reforms could be implemented over ICAN Board resistance. WS1 was not limited to the IANA transition requirements alone. That said, there is an ongoing and active review of where that line needs to be drawn.

Russ Housley: (16:24) @James: I agree that emotions are high, and so any step must be taken with great thought and care

Narelle Clark: (16:25) Could the typist please mute?

Kavouss Arasteh: (16:25) But the ICANN comments which just made one day before the deadline established by CCWG is very important and must be duly considered

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (16:26) Can people please mute that is not speaking.

Russ Housley: (16:26) @Keith: Thanks for this insight. Your words are encouraging

Kavouss Arasteh: (16:26) There is a promising path proposed by ZDA

Michael Niebel: (16:26) Keith+1

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: (16:27) I think "co-ordination" is a bit more than wait and see. A point could be reached for ICG to intervene in case the entire process appears to be really endangered. We should sometimes reflect on whether this point is achieved. To me at the time being there is still common willingness to achieve the overall target.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (16:27) I should note that the CCWG is not unified behind promoting the Sole Member reference model at any/all cost; there is willingness to adjust and refine and compromise to find consensus. There are not two warring parties. Rather, there is a lot more work needed and a commitment to do it.

Lynn St.Amour: (16:27) @Kavouss: ZDA??

Kavouss Arasteh: (16:28) Zuck, Delbianco .Arasteh ZDA

Jari Arkko: (16:28) I agree that there is willingness to work and find a solution, and compromise and all the good things. That's good. I'm still worried.

Lynn St.Amour: (16:28) ah, ok, hadn't heard it referred to that way..

demi getschko: (16:29) +1 to Narelle

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (16:29) +1 Jari. Nothing is guaranteed at this point.

Kavouss Arasteh: (16:29) jARI, i AM ALSO WORRIED BUT LET US CROSS THE FINGER THAT ccwg HARDLINER SHOWS DEGREE OF TOLERANCE

Keith Davidson ccNSO: (16:30) I think we are all worried Jari - but its hard for us to do anything from our relatively uninformed position on the specialist nature of the topic

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (16:30) @Kavouss: If there are hard-liners, they are not limited to the CCWG.

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (16:30) thanks

elise: (16:30) bye

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (16:30) See you in Dublin!

Lynn St.Amour: (16:30) Thanks all,

Paul: (16:30) Thanks!

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (16:30) Bye

Jari Arkko: (16:30) Keith(s), you have convinced me. thanks.

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (16:30) safe travels

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: (16:30) Thanks Alissa

Jon Nevett: (16:30) thanks!

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (16:30) Compromise will be needed from all sides.

Keith Davidson ccNSO: (16:30) Cheers all

Narelle Clark: (16:30) I echo the deep concern at this stage. There needs to be compromise and careful analysis of comments on the part of the CCWG and all stakeholders.

RussMundy-SSAC: (16:30) thanks to all - good call

Manal Ismail: (16:30) Thanks .. Bye ..

Kavouss Arasteh: (16:30) KEITH dAVIDSON, yES IT IS VERY COMPLEX MUCH MORE COMPLEX THAN THOSE WE WERE THINKING

Narelle Clark: (16:30) bye

Jennifer Chung: (16:31) Thank you everyone, ICG Call 24 is now concluded.