ICG Call #16 – Tuesday, 19 May 2015 – 21:00-23:00 UTC

Chat Transcript

Josh Baulch: (5/19/2015 16:45) Welcome to the ICG call. For those that are not on the phone, and need your computer mic option enabled, please let me know, and we will enable it.

Arasteh: (16:46) Hi Jennifer

demi getschko: (16:46) Please, enable my mic, Josh.

Arasteh: (16:47) CAN YOU PLS SEND ME THE MINTES OF 22 aPRIL

Josh Baulch: (16:47) For those that are on the phone, as a courtesy to others, please use *6 (Star six) to mute and *7 (Star 7) on your keypads to unmute. or use your Mute option on your phone. Thank you

Josh Baulch: (16:47) @ Demi - Done

demi getschko: (16:47) Thanks!

Yannis li: (16:48) @Kavouss, please find the minutes of 22 Apr at https://www.dropbox.com/s/8ogjlmm9fbozc9o/minutes-teleconference-22-april-2015-draft.docx?dl=0

Arasteh: (16:50) TKS

Keith ccNSO: (16:53) Josh can you activate my mic please ?

Josh Baulch: (16:54) done

Keith ccNSO: (16:54) cheers

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (16:54) Hi all

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (16:55) just waiting for my call-out

Paul Wilson: (16:55) Hi all.

Josh Baulch: (16:55) @ Martin - Calls will be within the next moment

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (16:56) fine: no hurry

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (16:57) I'm there now!

Mary Uduma: (16:57) Hello All

Xiaodong Lee: (16:59) hello

Xiaodong Lee: (16:59) I am on travel , bad internet connection

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (16:59) Hello All!

Manal Ismail: (16:59) Hello everyone ..

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (17:00) my ears

Mohamed EL Bashir: (17:00) Hello everyone

nigel hickson: (17:00) good evening

Xiaodong Lee: (17:01) may I ask call out

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (17:01) hello all!

Arasteh: (17:01) Good afternoon Nigel

Paul Wilson: (17:02) I am still sitting in Iana Transition panel session in LACNIC meeting in Lima. It will end shortly and I will relotace to a quiet place.

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (17:02) yes thanks

Kuo Wu: (17:02) Hi all

Milton Mueller: (17:04) Can I join the audio portion by computer?

Lynn St.Amour: (17:04) I can hear you fine

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (17:04) ditto

Keith ccNSO: (17:04) ditto

RussMundy: (17:05) Hi all - sorry to be a bit late joining

Josh Baulch: (17:05) @ milton - Yes, click on the Telephone button on the top of the adobe room

Mary Uduma: (17:05) Daniel sounds clearer

Josh Baulch: (17:05) Then select Listen Only or Computer/Microphone

Keith ccNSO: (17:07) Our newest recruit is communicating...

Jari Arkko: (17:07) community input!

Mary Uduma: (17:07) Hello Baby

Suzanne Woolf: (17:07) Nice to have that moment of real life :-)

Milton Mueller: (17:07) i joined by phone. the computer/mic option was not available

Keith Drazek: (17:07) It's about time we had input from youth....

Josh Baulch: (17:07) @ Milton - try now

Milton Mueller: (17:08) Thanks, Josh but now I am set up by phone I will stay there

Josh Baulch: (17:08) ok no prob

Russ Housley: (17:09) NTIA does not know how long they need to evaluate a proposal once we are able to send one

Xiaodong Lee: (17:12) Russ, how to discusss with NTIA, I think the community wanna know the timeline

Milton Mueller: (17:13) @Russ: That's so helpful of them (NTIA)

Keith Drazek: (17:13) The key is to establish 4 components: (1) How much time the CWG-Transition still needs, (2) How much time the ICG will need once it receives the CWG proposal, (3) How much time the CCWG Accountability needs, and (4) How much time will ICANN and the ICANN community require to IMPLEMENT all of the recommendations, once they are approved. We can't control the NTIA internal timeline and we should leave that alone.

Milton Mueller: (17:13) @Keith: and a lot depends on what we mean by "implement"

Keith Drazek: (17:13) @Milton: Very true.

Xiaodong Lee: (17:14) Keith +2

Xiaodong Lee: (17:14) Keith +1

Milton Mueller: (17:14) Since I am still at Syracuse, I will go orange

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (17:14) I'd say it is to when all the pieces are in place and NTIA can pass the baton

Keith Drazek: (17:14) @Xiaodong Lee: I was happy with the +2! ;-)

Manal Ismail: (17:15) Keith & Milton +1

RussMundy: (17:15) I like Keith's layout of what's needed - we might also need to ask ICANN what they mean by implementation & how long it will take

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (17:15) But the rest is a good layout, Keith

Keith Drazek: (17:16) I think the implementation question will be resolved through a collaborative engagement between the community and ICANN board/staff.

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (17:16) We need to consult (I think we need two rounds

Xiaodong Lee: (17:16) Keith, if my two hands can be counted as 2, that is what I want to support your concerns.:)

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (17:16))

Keith Drazek: (17:16) LOL thanks Xiaodong Lee

Daniel Karrenberg: (17:16) "transition plan for *after* the transition" sounds non-sensical to me ...????

Milton Mueller: (17:17) RussM: I don't think ICANN is the right entity to ask about implementation. At all. It is NTIA that has made a point about it, and will possibly accept or not accept proposals based on their implementability

Xiaodong Lee: (17:17) Martin, I wonder if we have enough time to consult, even it is very difficult to consult

Keith ccNSO: (17:17) Martin, agree - the ccNSO consulatation process will take considerable time if we are to be assured of high level of consensus in our community

Xiaodong Lee: (17:17) Milton, if ICANNN is not, which entity is right one

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (17:18) @Milton +1. We and community are accountable to NTIA, not ICANN

Milton Mueller: (17:18) @Daniel: perhaps "transition plan after the contract expiration"?

Milton Mueller: (17:18) @Xiaodong: Unfortaunetly, it is NTIA

Mohamed EL Bashir: (17:19) The extension should be to the period we think the proposal is delivered and implemented, i think it can be between 6 month to 1 year depending on the current CWG and CCWG timelines of activities

Keith Drazek: (17:19) Paul is correct. Extension with the possibility to terminate early.

Milton Mueller: (17:19) yes, 6 months

Milton Mueller: (17:19) I think a 2-year extension is a very bad sign

Jari Arkko: (17:20) +1 to Paul

Paul Wilson: (17:20) +1 Milton

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (17:20) @Paul: like that approach

Keith Drazek: (17:20) I think there's a question about whether it could be a shorter-than-2-year extension, or a 2-year extension with possibility to terminate early. I think the community has the ability to recommend our preference to NTIA.

Manal Ismail: (17:20) +1 Paul

Keith ccNSO: (17:20) I agree Milton, I think a 1 year extension would allow a realistic time for what is required ahead of us. With luck we mightbeat that deadline by a few months.

Xiaodong Lee: (17:21) Milton, that is very unfortunetly

Paul Wilson: (17:21) My understanding is that a 2-year enxtension would allow ealry termination. If not, then its a real propblem. (just as i said)

Keith Drazek: (17:21) Paul, I think your understanding is accurate.

Xiaodong Lee: (17:21) Paul, +1

Jon Nevett: (17:22) Daniel, we won't get consensus on partial implementation

Milton Mueller: (17:22) Not sure of the legalities, but if early termination of a 2-year extension is possible, wouldn't a 1-year extension also be possible?

Jari Arkko: (17:22) lets not second guess what the NTIA can do in terms of extension sizes, lets specify what we need. and i think that is short extension(s). my opinion is that 2 or even 1 year without early termination possibility is a failure

Keith ccNSO: (17:22) Paul, yes that is accurate, but if there was a 2 year extension, there could be a USA political will to draw the process out until the end of the 2 years - I think we should be seeking a 1 year extension with a right to terminate earlier

Keith Drazek: (17:22) I think NTIA has been clear they're looking for a single, complete proposal, not partial.

Keith ccNSO: (17:23) definitely 1 proposal sought Keith

Xiaodong Lee: (17:23) Keith, need to +1 you again, 1year plus right to teminate

Keith Drazek: (17:23) I support Keith Davidson's suggestion of 1-year with ability to terminate early. I think that's possible.

Milton Mueller: (17:23) "1year without early termination possibility is a failure" - agree

Daniel Karrenberg: (17:24) @keith: i have carefully listened to NTIA and I have not heared that clearly

Paul Wilson: (17:24) Even if it is 1 proposal fort 1 plan, that plan can have several stages: e.g. Step 1 Protocols, 2 Numbers. 3 Names.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (17:25) I'm back on this call.

Jari Arkko: (17:25) I am opposed to asking for a long contract extension. we should ask for short (e.g., 3 mo) extension or an extension that can terminated at any time.

Daniel Karrenberg: (17:25) @paul: that is congruent with what i am starting to think about

Alan Barrett (NRO): (17:25) +1 paul

Jari Arkko: (17:25) +1 to paul

Paul Wilson: (17:25) This actually provides an important degree of stress testing, such that step 2 follows when step 1 is done, and so on.

Mohamed EL Bashir: (17:25) +1 Jari

demi getschko: (17:25) Jari + 1

Xiaodong Lee: (17:25) Jari, if it can be terminated at any time, how long is not important.

Mohamed EL Bashir: (17:26) we can ask for short term extension rounds (example of 6 month extension rounds) unil the transision is done

Alan Barrett (NRO): (17:26) I also think that a 3-month extension would be good, or multiple 3-month extensions.

Keith Drazek: (17:26) +1 Alissa, let's focus on determining how much time we need and communicate that. Obviously in cooperation with the other groups.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (17:26) why should we ask for any contract extension? We should provide a timeline (best guess)

Keith ccNSO: (17:27) I thought NTIA had been very very assertive in saying they will only accept one single consolidated proposal.

Jari Arkko: (17:27) Xiaodong: that was my point. But asking for a 1 year extension would imho put us too far beyond US political processes, and not allow us to proceed. Lets not ask for failure. Lets ask for what we want. 3 mo+ possible renewal or (any length) + early termination should do it

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (17:27) +1 Alissa

Keith Drazek: (17:27) +1 Wolf-Ulrich

Xiaodong Lee: (17:27) Jari, understood, support you

Jari Arkko: (17:28) Keith: they have been, but my guess is that it may change. More important, approve a plan vs approve execution of parts of it may be different things.

Paul Wilson: (17:28) Xiaodong: I think there is a big difference. A 3-month contract enxension will definitely end after 3 months; a 2-year contract extension may be terminated after 3 months, but it could alsogdo on for 2 years.

Paul Wilson: (17:28) +1 Jari

Milton Mueller: (17:28) symbolic effect of a 2 year extension is devastating in US environment

Milton Mueller: (17:29) people who don't really want a transition ask for a 2-year

Mohamed EL Bashir: (17:29) i am concerned that 3 month is a short period

Keith ccNSO: (17:29) Jari, I think 3 months is too short time for our community to achieve consensus. 6 months may not be enough. 12 months would likely be too much

Xiaodong Lee: (17:29) Paul, yes, we don't want to give community an indication for 2years extension, even it might be teminated at any time

demi getschko: (17:30) A short period will signal that the community wants the transition. A greater period will show we are in doubt...

Jari Arkko: (17:30) 6 months also puts you beyond practical ability of the USG to make decisions due to election schedules (IMHO)

demi getschko: (17:31) Hypothetically, multiple short renewals are better than a long renewal...

Keith ccNSO: (17:31) NTIA felt up to 12 months was not an issue for them with the US political system

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (17:31) @Kavouss +1: ICG should limit its answer to NTIA to what is within our remit, which does not include implementation.

Mohamed EL Bashir: (17:32) Jari, good point regarding the impact of USG election on the process

RussMundy: (17:32) I'd like remind folks that the current contract has two "standard options" of 2 years each. However, this is a US Govt contract that can be changed to be something else from what's currently written in the contract.

Jari Arkko: (17:33) +1 to RussM

nigel hickson: (17:35) Jennifer; my line dropped; could I be called agian?; thanks

Xiaodong Lee: (17:35) +1 Russ Mundy

Russ Housley: (17:36) @Martin: Don't you think the CWG proposal will provide the timeline to implement it?

Alissa Cooper: (17:36) +1 Martin

Jari Arkko: (17:37) +1 to Martin re: we are the coordination group

Xiaodong Lee: (17:37) Martin, +1

Daniel Karrenberg: (17:37) @martin: I have heered several government reps and journalists already touting how the bootowm up self-governance is failing. so i was not dissing any colleagues. i agree that we shoudl tout the success. my argiment is to also propose to a staged implementation so that we can point to actual progress rather than just a good process. again: i have not heard clearly that this is out of the question from NTIA and even if there are signals in that direction we can send our own signals

Jari Arkko: (17:39) +1 to Daniel. of course NTIA is saying now that they cannot do staged proposals. But again, approval of a plan and whether all of it gets immplemented at the same instant in time are two different things. And if the process drags on, they may *later* be looking for an opportunity to show *some* actual progress. Lets build for that possibility.

Keith Drazek: (17:40) The ICG needs to engage with the CWG Naming to develop our response to the NTIA letter. That's our next step.

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (17:40) that some governments diss us is inevitable. I was just trying to say that we should be saying what has been achieved

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (17:40) @Keith: yes

Xiaodong Lee: (17:40) +1, Keith D,

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (17:40) yes, Milton

Keith Drazek: (17:41) +1 Milton

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (17:41) I am now closing the queue.

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (17:41) Xiaodong is the last speaker

Mohamed EL Bashir: (17:41) @Keith, all communities represented in ICG can provide their communities feedback on the response to NTIA

Russ Housley: (17:41) I am hearing a lot of support for an extension beyond Sept. 30, but I do not think 2 years is needed, and in fact such a long extension would be harmful to the overall process

Keith Drazek: (17:41) Also, in parallel, the same letter was sent from NTIA to the CCWG Accountability. That group is also working on an amended timeline. Both CWG and CCWG will need to augment their current work to include predictions on implementation.

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (17:42) I'd also still like to see a second consultation process from us

RussMundy: (17:42) My belief is that NTIA has clearly asked for a single proposal but I do not think that there is any requirement for a "single, integrated implementation" - I think an incremental IMPLEMENTATION would be okay

Lynn St.Amour: (17:42) I also believe a shorter extension is most helpful/appropriate.

Keith Drazek: (17:42) @Milton, we need to work with the CWG to develop the amended/updated timeline, to include implementation.

Lynn St.Amour: (17:43) I have had connectivity problems (hotel difficulties) so apologies for coming in late.

Keith Drazek: (17:43) +1 Alissa

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (17:43) @RussM: yes, that might work, but we do need to show that we have the complete plan and that these bits can be phase 1 transition

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (17:44) But that shows a roadmap

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (17:45) J-J: the queue is closed...can you explain why you really need to speak up, I will give you time anyways.

Daniel Karrenberg: (17:45) alissa sums it up very nicely. i completely agree that we should obtain info on when the proposal will likely be ready and how long it will take to implement it. we should ask the communities. ccwg is out of scope for us.

RussMundy: (17:45) @Martin: I can say from personal experience that much of the USG likes to have "roadmaps"

Jari Arkko: (17:45) +1 to alissa and daniel

Lynn St.Amour: (17:46) Ithink that is a good approach Alissa.

Xiaodong Lee: (17:46) +1 , Alissa

Russ Housley: (17:48) +1, but we should point out that NTIA eval and much of the implementation can go in parallel

Keith Drazek: (17:48) +1 Russ

Xiaodong Lee: (17:48) +1 , Russ H, good point, some works could be start parallelly

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (17:48) @Patrik, I wish to address exactly the point about "implementation".

Alissa Cooper: (17:49) @Manal, the RFP asks for timeline and interim milestones for implementation

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (17:49) J-J: understood

RussMundy: (17:49) @Kavos: I think that we're in agreement, I did not hear you mention accountability in your earlier intervention

Manal Ismail: (17:51) Thanks Alissa for the reminder .. Thanks Patrik for your reponse ..

Keith Drazek: (17:53) I think the timelines for both CWG Transition and CCWG Accountability will become much more clear in the coming weeks. Both public comment periods are due to close in the next 2 weeks, and intensive work is planned in both groups leading in to the Buenos Aires meeting.

Milton Mueller: (17:54) +1 JJS

Xiaodong Lee: (17:54) I must leave earlier on couple of minutes, sorry for that

Kuo Wu: (17:55) echo?

Arasteh: (17:56) Alissa

Daniel Karrenberg: (17:56) :@xiaodong: what you said makes much sense, take care.

Jari Arkko: (17:56) adding one to what JJS said: there's parts of the implementation in different stages of the plan. how long does it take for us in IETF to ready our process? i'd claim zero days, because we can not do more before the contract goes away. how long does NTI A need? their

probleem. how much do we need after/during the contract is removed? maybe a month, to sign the new SLAs etc

Arasteh: (17:56) That discussion need to be physical and not by call

Daniel Karrenberg: (17:56) no echo here

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (17:56) Someone tyoing is not muted...

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (17:57) @Alissa, I'm keen to read your draft response, and willing to help if necessary. The idea is to make a clear distinction between what community needs for implementation, and what USG needs because of its own constraints.

Milton Mueller: (17:57) Yes I think definition of implementation is something we need to put on the list, it is complex and needs to draw on specific examples from OCs

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (17:57) @Milton +1.

Janvier Ngnoulaye: (17:58) +1 @Milton

Josh Baulch: (18:03) Everyone is in control

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (18:04) I'm back on this call.

Milton Mueller: (18:04) Things seem out of control for me, otherwise why am i on this call on a lovely May evening?

Keith ccNSO: (18:08) lol@ Milton

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (18:08) Milton, I'm luckier than thou, as it's 8 minutes past midnight here ;-)

Russ Housley: (18:18) Just send an ack

Arasteh: (18:19) no echo

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (18:19) @Daniel +1

Alan Barrett (NRO): (18:19) ack and thanks

Jari Arkko: (18:19) +1 to daniel

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (18:19) +1

Jon Nevett: (18:19) +1

Manal Ismail: (18:19) +1

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (18:19) @Alissa +1.

Manal Ismail: (18:23) Is the 25th session still on?

Jennifer Chung: (18:23) @All, apologies, yes Alissa you are correct - it is Thursday 25, for the ICG session

Josh Baulch: (18:26) Yes you will :D

Lars-Johan Liman (RSSAC): (18:27) I support Daniel! It's _much_ easier to rip something out of my calendar last minute, than to put something in last minute.

Lars-Johan Liman (RSSAC): (18:28) Just roll out a large set of calls, and cancel as they're not needed.

RussMundy: (18:28) +1

Paul Wilson: (18:28) My audio is very bad so I cannot follow this exchange. Please can the proposed dates can be circulated asap after ths meeting.

Lars-Johan Liman (RSSAC): (18:29) Paul, Daniels proposal is to schedule a string of calls in preparation.

Milton Mueller: (18:29) bye all

Jari Arkko: (18:29) thanks all

elise gerich (epg): (18:29) bye

Kuo Wu: (18:29) bye

Manal Ismail: (18:29) Thanks .. Bye ..

Keith ccNSO: (18:29) thanks and bye

Paul Wilson: (18:29) Thanks

Mohamed EL Bashir: (18:29) Thanks, Bye

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (18:29) thanks, ye

Daniel Karrenberg: (18:29) bye

Lynn St.Amour: (18:29) Thanks

Russ Housley: (18:29) Thanks tp the chairs, and bye

RussMundy: (18:30) bye

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (18:30) bye

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (18:30) thanks+bye

Techno Cat: (18:30) Hmmmmmm

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (18:30) Bye All!

Jennifer Chung: (18:30) Thank you all, ICG Call #16 is now closed.