

Fifth IANA Stewardship Coordination Group (ICG) Face-to-Face Meeting – Day 1

09:00 – 17:00 ART / 12:00 - 20:00 UTC, Thursday, 18 June 2015

Meeting agenda and [archives](#)

Buenos Aires ICG Participants

Alan Barrett (NRO)
Alissa Cooper (IETF)(ICG Chair)
Demi Getschko (ISOC)
Hartmut Glaser (ASO)
James Bladel (GNSO)
Jandyr Ferreira dos Santos (GAC)
Jari Arkko (IETF)
Jean-Jacques Subrenat (ALAC)
Jon Nevett (gTLD Registries)
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)
Keith Davidson (ccNSO)
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries)
Lynn St. Amour (IAB)

Manal Ismail (GAC)
Martin Boyle (ccNSO)
Michael Niebel (GAC)
Milton Mueller (GNSO)
Mohamed El Bashir (ALAC)(ICG Vice chair)
Narelle Clark (ISOC)
Patrik Fältström (SSAC)(ICG Vice-chair)
Russ Housley (IAB)
Russ Mundy (SSAC)
Thomas Schneider (GAC)
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben (GNSO)
Xiaodong Lee (ccNSO)

Remote ICG participants:

Daniel Karrenberg (RSSAC)
Joseph Alhadeff (ICC/BASIS)

Mary Uduma (ccNSO)
Paul Wilson (NRO)

Liaisons:

Elise Gerich (IANA Staff Liaison Expert)
Kuo-Wei Wu (ICANN Board Liaison)

ICG Apologies:

Lars-Johan Liman (RSSAC)

Secretariat:

Jennifer Chung
Yannis Li
Sherly Haristya

ICANN Support:

ICANN Technical Staff

1. Agenda review

Cooper welcomed everyone to the ICG's fifth face-to-face meeting and gave an overview of the agenda. There were no objections or additions to the proposed agenda, thus the ICG proceeded with it.

2. CWG names proposal assessment and combined proposal assessment

Fältström stated that the CWG-IANA has sent the Names proposal to their Chartering Organizations (COs) for approvals and comment until 25 June. For efficiency, he suggested that the ICG should begin a

pre-assessment on this version, as was done previously with the Numbers and the Protocol Parameters proposals.

Fältström gave a summary of the processes and methods used by the SSAC on their evaluation on the CWG-IANA proposal so far. He stated that the final response from SSAC will be ready on Thursday 25 June, and is basing their recommendations on [SAC 069](#). ([Slides](#) as circulated on the internal-cg mailing list).

Regarding questions directed to the SSAC assessment, Fältström confirmed that what is currently under consideration is approval by the COs and not an open consultation/public comment period. He also confirmed that SSAC is looking at the Names proposal to ensure that the change in the root zone authorization and maintenance process remains stable, functioning and of high-quality.

Discussion:

- Arasteh raised a process issue regarding responses CWG-IANA may receive from the COs, and enquired what steps would be taken if COs opted for support with comments or objected.
- Cooper reminded the ICG that CO's consideration of the CWG is explicitly conditioned on the output of CCWG work steam 1, and similarly the ICG's assessment should be based upon this consideration
- Mueller, Arkko, and Barrett pointed out an incompatibility with regard to the IANA trademark intellectual property issue in which the Names proposal proposes to grant an exclusive license of the IANA trademark to the PTI. Arkko highlighted that all three communities have a need to use this trademark, and it will be point of coordination that the ICG must facilitate. Barrett suggested that the ICG ask the Names community to consider revising the proposal to make it consistent with the other two proposals. Mueller mentioned that currently there is no consensus within the names community on the issue of the IANA trademark. Arkko added that the Names proposal only mentions the IANA trademark, but not the iana.org domain name.
- As supported by the ICG members, Cooper summarized that the ICG Chairs will draft a question to the operational communities regarding the IANA trademark issue for discussion and finalization during the second day of Meeting 5. Volunteers were taken for Names proposal assessment (see [Decisions Taken 1](#)) and also for the Combined Proposal assessment (see [Decisions Taken 2](#)).

Action Item 1: ICG Chairs to draft a question to go to the communities regarding the IANA trademark and domain name, send to the internal-cg mailing list and discuss and finalize during Day 2 of the Face-to-Face meeting.

3. Multi-step implementation

This agenda item was [previously raised by Wilson during ICG Call 18](#) and further elucidated by [Wilson's email](#) to the internal-cg mailing list.

Fältström framed the discussion by emphasizing that the ICG that it is still waiting for responses from all the operational communities and still has to go through [ICG's own assessment process steps](#) before submission to NTIA. He stated there seems to be confusion in prior discussions regarding ICG activities leading to the submission to NTIA; post-delivery activities before the transition; and the actual transition. He also noted similar confusion regarding what each of the operational communities can or should do before, during, and after the transition.

Discussion:

There was a shared question among the ICG members regarding Wilson specifying the 30 September deadline as the transition date. Cooper and many others noted that it does not look feasible that ICG can get a proposal to NTIA before 30 September, let alone that the NTIA could approve it by then. There was general agreement that the ICG will be submitting one consolidated proposal to the NTIA.

- Boyle and Alhadeff noted that the concept of phased implementation should be looked at by the ICG as long as a coherence is maintained between the three different proposal implementation lines. Boyle further suggested and received support for the ICG to ask the operational communities to look at, from their proposals, what steps can be done before an NTIA final agreement.
- Arkko, Housley and Alhadeff suggested that the ICG to provide a potential roadmap of the three communities' proposed implementation and the dependencies amongst them.
- Arasteh suggested that the ICG to form a sub-group to discuss the pros and cons of the multi-step implementation. Subrenat supported this idea and volunteered to part of the sub-group if formed. Arasteh also asked Wilson how the Numbers community would be affected if implementation is not phased.
- Regarding the possible interpretation of Wilson's suggestion that two of the communities be exempted from the NTIA contract ahead of the third, Mundy pointed out that US government contracts are extremely complex to change - requiring large public comment time, thus it is impractical to consider any formal change to the existing contract.

Wilson acknowledged that the ICG will be producing a single proposal to the NTIA, and noted that his suggestion to have a phased implementation of the single plan is shared by the ICG. He stated that he did not recognize that the ICG has abandoned the 30 September deadline, noting that the ICG timeline has undergone several iterations. In response to Arasteh, Wilson noted that the abandonment of 30 September could be seen as a failure by some, and frustration stemming from an indeterminate timeline extension is a valid concern shared in the Numbers community. In response to Mundy, Wilson stated his understanding that the renewal of the NTIA contract could be for shorter terms and may provide an opportunity to progressively release components.

- Gerich stated that resources available to the IANA department may not allow everything to be implemented in parallel, and further stated that from an operational standpoint, most things are phased and some may have to be sequential.

Cooper summarized the general agreement in the discussion as follows:

1. The ICG will submit a single unified proposal.
2. Not all implementation steps need to be taken at the same time. Phased implementation may be useful.
3. The communities and ICANN can take preparatory steps towards implementation while the proposal is being finalized by the ICG and evaluated by the US Government after it gets submitted. Parallelization is good.

Cooper stated that ICG's charter is to deliver a transition proposal. She stated that she does not see a role of the ICG after the transmission of the proposal, as implementation is specific to each community and the details are for ICANN, NTIA and the operational communities to work out. Cooper suggested that the ICG could discuss adding an explanation about implementation into the introductory text of the transition proposal that the ICG is drafting.

4. Public comment period planning

Executive summary and introductory material discussion:

Cooper gave an overview of the draft for the executive summary of the combined proposal as [circulated to the internal-cg mailing list](#) that contains placeholders for summaries of (i) the process; (ii) the proposal; (iii) the ICG assessment against ICG criteria; and (iv) the assessment against NTIA criteria. She explained that the framework was based on views expressed on the [internal-cg mailing list](#) to use text from the [published ICG documents](#) and [NTIA announcement](#), and to keep it short and succinct.

- Mueller pointed to language sent to the [internal-cg mailing list](#) suggested that the ICG can append a detailed breakdown of the process summary on the ICG web site. Alternatively, he stated that if the ICG need to summarize the process within the combined proposal document, then the current summary was too short.
 - Mundy supported the idea of placing details regarding process on the ICG web site, but expressed general concerns regarding the stability of web sites. He stated that the executive summary should relate to answering the NTIA questions; and suggested that the Secretariat assemble a separate document to describe the processes followed.
 - Karrenberg, Subrenat, Ismail and Arasteh supported keeping the process summary in the combined proposal. Subrenat further suggested appending details on the processes as annexes. Boyle and Lee suggested pointing to or extracting text from the different sections within the operational communities' proposals that describe the processes followed.
- Boyle referred to the earlier discussion on implementation and suggested that the ICG identify 'next steps' (as a chart or narrative) in the executive summary.
- Nevett referred to [Larry Strickling's blog](#) and highlighted ICG's crucial role to 'build a public record for [NTIA] on how the three customer group submissions tie together in a manner that ensures NTIA's [criteria](#) are met and institutionalized over the long term.' He suggested that the ICG look into getting expert advice or hiring a professional staffer to get the public record into a manner the NTIA is accustomed to reviewing.

Public comment questions and web site content discussion:

Cooper gave an overview of the [web site materials](#) and opened the floor for discussion:

- Arasteh suggested rephrasing the question 4 (under NTIA criteria), because whether there is broad community support is for the ICG to conclude, not the respondents. He further suggested that the questions be separated into two categories: 1. Operational community proposals; 2. Overall proposal.
 - Cooper and Mundy agreed with Arasteh's first point regarding careful drafting of the questions. Fältström stated that the ICG need to refer to its charter while drafting the questions to stay within the scope of its remit.
 - Alhadeff suggested asking questions on the operational communities' processes rather than the substance of the proposals. He suggested and received support regarding structuring the questions into a form to allow for easier analysis and synthesis of responses.
 - Mueller stated his objection to overly format the public comment input. He further stated that the point of public comments is to get the opinion of the public, and not to conform to whatever makes the ICG's job easy.

- Arasteh urged the ICG to learn from the public comment periods from CWG-IANA and CCWG-Accountability, specifically noting the long periods of time it took to process the public comments.
- It was decided that the same drafting team for the introductory material will also look at drafting the public comment questions (see [Decision Taken 3](#)).

5. Update on CCWG-Accountability work

Arasteh and Drazek as the ICG Liaisons to CCWG-Accountability provided a summary of the CCWG-Accountability work, a brief re-introduction of the different work streams (work stream 1 deals with accountability that needs to be in place prior to transition) and key areas that are under discussion right now: community empowerment (membership model), bylaw changes (fundamental bylaw), issues relating to the Affirmation of Commitments, independent review panel.

- CCWG-Accountability currently compiling all the comments received during its first public comment period to develop a second draft proposal following ICANN 53. This second draft will be put out for the second public comment period targeted for July 2015. After that, CCWG-Accountability aims to have its proposal reviewed and approved by the COs at ICANN 54.
- The key concern was that there are the dependencies between CWG-IANA and CCWG-Accountability's proposals. The link between the two working groups indirectly involves the ICG and thus impacts ICG's timeline discussion.
- In regards to whether CCWG-Accountability output adequately addresses the aspects CWG-IANA is looking for, Drazek explained an expectation that the CWG-IANA COs will approve the Names proposal this week and when the CCWG-Accountability output is available, the COs will have to confirm that it meets the threshold built into the Names proposal.
- Mueller reminded the ICG that the [DOTCOM Act of 2015](#) currently before the US Senate means that the US Congress will require NTIA to impose work stream 1 completion upon the transition process.
- Cooper suggested that when CCWG-Accountability sends their proposal to the COs for approval at the end of September, the ICG can plan to ask CWG-IANA whether CCWG-Accountability's proposal meets CWG-IANA's requirements. Arasteh and Mueller supported the idea.
- Volunteer group to closely track the CCWG-Accountability work was formed (see [Decisions Taken 4](#)).

6. Time frame discussion (ICG timeline and response to NTIA letter)

Cooper explained several things about the ICG's response to [NTIA letter](#):

- Proposal finalization timeline ([timeline graphic v11](#)): Cooper stated that the plan has not changed to update the timeline once the ICG receives the Names proposal. However, if the ICG does not receive it by 25 June, then the ICG will incorporate that fact in its response to NTIA and explain that the dates will be confirmed when the ICG receives the names proposal.
- Implementation timeline: Cooper summarized the input received from the communities and ICANN.
 - IETF:
 - Ready to transition now.
 - If SLA is affected by further PTI details, more time may be required.
 - RIRs:
 - Ready to transition by September 30, 2015
 - CWG:
 - 3-4 months needed for PTI implementation.
 - Implementation of bylaws-related items is incorporated into CCWG timeline.
 - ICANN Board:
 - IETF and RIRs: several weeks required.

- PTI: several months required.
 - Premature to determine timeline for CCWG Accountability items.
 - Expect to use normal ICANN process for bylaws changes.
- Structure of the response: Cooper explained that it will contain the proposal finalization timeline up to ICANN 54 based on the received input from the communities and ICANN. Cooper invited further discussion on whether the ICG needs to also provide analysis about implementation timeline.
 - Drazek and Arasteh stated that CCWG-Accountability will also be coming out with its response to NTIA and strongly suggested that the ICG take this into account as well.
 - Boyle suggested factoring the interdependencies between the CCWG-Accountability, CWG-IANA, ICG's works and timeline.
 - Gerich acknowledged that requests contained within the proposals that could potentially change the systems, tools and processes the IANA department currently uses, and thus will place demands on the IANA department team and its operational responsibilities. She reiterated her earlier statement that from an operational standpoint, implementation may have to be phased or interleaved rather than have everything run in parallel.
 - Boyle suggested that the ICG try to find out when the communities can start preparatory work on implementation. Karrenberg responded that the [IETF](#) and [RIRs](#) have included this information in their responses to the ICG. Cooper concurred with Karrenberg, and suggested that the ICG try to informally gather this information from CWG-IANA during ICANN 53.

It was clarified during the discussion that:

- The ICG will give a detailed timeline for the proposal finalization process. The ICG will try to provide an indication and estimate for the implementation time frame.
- The ICG's response to NTIA will take note of possible contingencies that may impact the ICG's timeline, in particular the possibility of having a second public comment period.

The ICG also discussed a statement on the ICANN Board's reply that the ICANN Board expects to use their normal process for bylaw changes.

- Mueller asked Wu as the ICANN Board Liaison to the ICG if it is possible for ICANN legal to work with CWG-IANA and CCWG-Accountability in ensuring the actual language of the bylaw changes is drafted by the working groups in a way that ICANN legal would not object to going forward.
 - Wu responded that the ICANN Board will respond to CWG-IANA or CCWG-Accountability if they send this request to ICANN, however the ICANN board will need legal advice regarding the complexity and implementation of bylaw changes.
- Fältström asked ICG's Liaisons to CCWG-Accountability whether the bylaw changes will involve a word by word modification or just the intention behind the bylaw change.
 - Wu reminded the ICG that the ICANN Board will be working on the CEO search committee to find the next CEO, thus there will be tension in timing.
 - Arasteh and Drazek responded that it will require a word by word modification to delve into the details.
 - Drazek stated the need to ask back to the Chairs of CCWG-Accountability regarding at which point of time the process of bylaw changes will take place. Drazek pointed out that the CCWG-Accountability during its working session on 19 June will be discussing its response to NTIA regarding the timeline. This information then could be incorporated into the ICG and CWG-IANA's timeline.

Cooper concluded the discussion that:

- Arasteh and Drazek as the ICG Liaisons to the CCWG-Accountability have an action item to get more information from the CCWG-Accountability about its plan on the bylaw changes text.

- The ICG Chairs will be incorporating the following items in the response to NTIA: references to ICG timeline, inputs from the communities, contingencies, and resources for the NTIA team. This draft will be discussed on Day 2 of the face-to-face meeting.

Action Item 2: ICG Liaisons to CCWG-Accountability to go back to the CCWG to find out when the bylaw changes will take place in the CCWG process, specifically when the actual text is to be produced, and bring this information back to the ICG.

Action Item 3: ICG Chairs to draft a response to the NTIA letter (including references to the ICG timeline and contingencies, input received from the three operational communities, and resources for the IANA team), send to the internal-cg mailing list for discussion on Day 2 of the Face-to-Face meeting.

7. Wrap up

The summaries of decisions taken and actions items were reviewed and agreed upon. Cooper noted that there are two follow-up items for Day 2, namely the question to the communities about IANA trademark and domain name, and a draft response to NTIA letter.

Summary of Decisions Taken:

1. **Volunteer group to complete individual assessment of the Names proposal by 7 July, in time for discussion on the ICG call on 8 July.**
Volunteer list: Housley, Mundy, Barrett, Davidson, Boyle, Uduma, Getschko.
2. **Volunteer group to complete individual assessment of the combined proposal by 14 July, in time for discussion on the ICG call on 15 July.**
Volunteer list: St. Amour, Mueller, Ismail, Drazek, Housley, Alhadeff, Wilson, Clark, Lee.
3. **Volunteer group to look at formulating public comment questions to be the same volunteer drafting team for the combined proposal preface/introduction/executive summary.**
Volunteer list: Cooper, Subrenat, Mueller, St. Amour, Boyle, Housley, Ismail, Alhadeff, Arasteh, Karrenberg.
4. **Volunteer group (including liaisons) to continue to flag issues in CCWG-Accountability that may impact ICG's assessment process. Volunteer group to look into how CCWG-Accountability's work may impact the CWG-IANA proposal and final combined proposal.**
Volunteer list: St. Amour, Mueller, Arasteh (ICG Liaison to CCWG), Drazek (ICG Liaison to CCWG), Niebel, Ismail.

Summary of Action Items:

1. **ICG Chairs to draft a question to go to the communities regarding the IANA trademark and domain name, send to the internal-cg mailing list and discuss and finalize during Day 2 of the Face-to-Face meeting.**
2. **ICG Liaisons to CCWG-Accountability to go back to the CCWG to find out when the bylaw changes will take place in the CCWG process, specifically when the actual text is to be produced, and bring this information back to the ICG.**
3. **ICG Chairs to draft a response to the NTIA letter (including references to the ICG timeline and contingencies, input received from the three operational communities, and resources for the IANA team), send to the internal-cg mailing list for discussion on Day 2 of the Face-to-Face meeting.**