Tenth IANA Stewardship Coordination Group (ICG) Teleconference

20:00 UTC, Wednesday, 14 January 2015

Meeting agenda and archives

Participants:

Adiel Akplogan (NRO)

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)

Jari Arkko (IETF)

James Bladel (GNSO)

Narelle Clark (ISOC)

Alissa Cooper (IETF)(ICG Chair)

Keith Davidson (ccNSO)

Jandyr Ferreira dos Santos (GAC)

Keith Drazek (gTLD registries)

Patrik Fältström (SSAC)(ICG Vice-chair)

Demi Getschko (ISOC)

Hartmut Glaser (ASO)

Russ Housley (IAB)

Manal Ismail (GAC)

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben (GNSO)

Lars-Johan Liman (RSSAC)

Milton Mueller (GNSO)

Russ Mundy (SSAC)

Michael Niebel (GAC)

Thomas Schneider (GAC)

Lynn St Amour (IAB)

Jean-Jacques Subrenat (ALAC)

Mary Uduma (ccNSO)

Liaisons:

Elise Gerich (IANA Staff Expert)

ICG Apologies:

Joseph Alhadeff (ICC/Basis)

Martin Boyle (ccNSO)

Mohamed El Bashir (ALAC)(ICG Vice-chair)

Daniel Karrenberg (RSSAC)

Xiaodong Lee (ccNSO)

Jon Nevett (gTLD Registries)

Paul Wilson (NRO)

Kuo-Wei Wu (ICANN Board Liaison)

Secretariat:

Jennifer Chung

Yannis Li

ICANN Support Staff:

Josh Baulch

Alice Jansen

Ergys Ramaj

Theresa Swinehart

1. Secretariat update

Cooper confirmed the completion of the Secretariat contracting process, noted that while the process took longer than expected, transition to the new Secretariat was well underway. Cooper announced that the ISOC Singapore Chapter is the Secretariat Contractor. Cooper expressed thanks to the ICG, the Secretariat Selection sub-committee, ICANN and everyone involved in the process and introduced members of the Secretariat team: Jennifer Chung and Yannis Li. Chung and Li introduced themselves and noted that they are based in New Jersey, USA, and Singapore/Hong Kong respectively.

Cooper added that the ICG will continue to rely on ICANN for services such as travel support, interpretation and translation, and the ICG leadership will follow up with the full ICG with further information and details regarding division of responsibilities.

Discussion:

- Subrenat congratulated the selected Secretariat, noted that the delay in finalizing the selection was due to understandable private reasons within the ICANN contracting process, and not due to any omission by the Secretariat Selection sub-committee. He pointed out that, whenever the Secretariat or ICANN Staff are tasked with an action item, there must be a back-up person, so that if the designated person is absent or unavailable, the task assigned to her/him can nonetheless be carried out. Subrenat stated the expectation for the new Secretariat to be fully operational as of today
- Fältström emphasized that the details of practical items will be forthcoming to the ICG, explicitly noted that the ICG website domain name as well as the email addresses for the ICG mailing lists will change, and asked ICG members to look out for the email containing that information.
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: Subrenat suggested that the ICG chairs use the members of the Selection sub-committee for the practical arrangements with Secretariat as well.

Action:

1. **ICG co-chairs to follow up on the internal-cg mailing list regarding the further division of responsibility of Secretariat functions.**

2. December 10 call minutes approval

- Cooper noted that the draft minutes for the 10 December meeting was shared on the internal-cg mailing list not too long ago, and asked for any objections as to approving the minutes today. Subrenat requested 5 or 10 minutes to go through the report. At the end of the call, Cooper declared the minutes approved.

Action:

2. **Approval of the 10 December 2014 minutes.**

3. Proposal assembly and finalization — review volunteers, process, timeline

Cooper noted that the proposal assembly and finalization process has been agreed upon, and the discussion is now on how to conduct the reviews. Cooper mentioned that most ICG members wanted multiple reviewers for each submission. Cooper summarized the two approaches as follows:

i.   One lead reviewer to conduct a thorough review of the step 1 requirements, complete assessment sheet, and share back to the ICG. Other reviewers may also conduct an in-depth review and complete assessment sheet, or just send comments.

ii.   Designate sub-groups of 3-5 people to conduct an in-depth review using the assessment sheet and share back to the ICG.

Cooper stated that anyone is welcome to do the assessments, however there should be a minimum number of people checking that all assessment criteria set forth by the ICG have been met.

Discussion:

- Arasteh stated that people involved with writing the report should not be the only ones approving it, and assessment should be done collectively by a team of reviewers.
    - *Adobe Connect chat:* Subrenat, Uduma, and Bladel indicated their agreement with Arasteh.
- Liman agreed with Arasteh, and stated his support for the proposal on the internal-cg mailing list to have four reviewers for each proposal, namely:
    - One reviewer who was intimately involved in the proposal development to explain any conflicts or misunderstandings to the sub-group.
    - One reviewer who is familiar with the processes of that operational community but not actively involved with the proposal development.
    - Two reviewers that were not involved with developing the proposal.
- Mueller proposed that as many people who can and want to review each of the three proposals should do so. Mueller stated that while he could understand the need for one person to compile the inputs from the ICG members, he questioned why the ICG would want to limit the number of reviewers.
    - Cooper explained that she wanted to ensure a minimum number of reviewers for each proposal, and also agreed with Mueller that there should be no limitations on the number of reviewers. Cooper stated that she wanted to get people from different parts of the community to do the reviews if that is what the ICG wants. She also proposed to set a deadline so that the assessment can contribute to the ICG's discussions.
- Ismail agreed with Mueller while also noting Cooper's point of trying to secure a minimum number of reviewers. Based on that, she encouraged all ICG members to review the three proposals, and noted that the different perspectives, levels of engagement, and backgrounds are all necessary in the evaluation process.
    - *Adobe Connect chat:* Subrenat and Knoben agreed with Ismail.
- Arkko noted that there is agreement to the minimal requirement for there to be both involved and non-involved people in the review team. He emphasized that the key issue is to have enough people in the team, and it should be up to the team to decide amongst themselves who will take the pen.
    - *Adobe Connect chat:* Mundy agreed with Arkko. Subrenat also agreed with Arkko and added that it depends on the willingness of each member of the ICG.

- Arasteh stated he agreed with the previous speakers to have a minimum team of three including both involved and non-involved reviewers, without limiting wider participation.
- Cooper concluded that there was agreement. She stated that there was a minimum team who have already volunteered for reviewing the protocols parameter proposal: Subrenat, Mueller, Arkko, and Drazek.
  - *Adobe Connect chat:* Drazek indicated his assent. Knoben noted that he has also volunteered to review either the parameter or numbers proposals. Bladel offered to review the numbers proposal.
- Cooper suggested a deadline of 26 January 2015 for substantive feedback from the protocol parameter reviewers in time for the 28 January 2015 ICG Call #12.

4. ICANN 52 planning

Fältström stated that there will be more information in the next few days on the internal-cg mailing list including:

- The proposed agenda for the Friday, 6 February 2015 and Saturday, 7 February 2015 face-to-face meetings, and
- Information regarding the ICG session scheduled for Monday, 9 February 2015 after the ICANN opening session.

Discussion:

ICG working session – 6-7 February 2015

- Arasteh requested if the ICG could agree in advance to have extended working hours on the first day (Friday, 6 February 2015) to avoid pushing everything to the second day.
  - Fältström agreed with Arasteh's proposal, encouraged ICG members to block off time, and noted that further work could be accomplished in sub-groups, but that work done as the full ICG will remain between the scheduled 09:00 – 17:00 local time for both days.
    - *Adobe Connect chat:* Drazek agreed Fältström and added while not everyone will be able to attend the entire ICG session, work can still be maximized.
- Bladel also agreed with Arasteh's proposal regarding the extended hours. He suggested that the request be passed on to ICANN planning staff and ICG Secretariat to arrange for relevant logistics including refreshments, so the ICG members can stay in the room and work through.
  - Fältström confirmed that food, coffee, and tea will be available.
- Cooper pointed out the availability of the interpreters, remote participation facilities, and room need to be confirmed if ICG's working hours are extended. She also emphasized the importance of keeping the manner of work done by the ICG in the evening the same as any work the ICG does during the day.
  - Fältström affirmed that the official ICG working session will likely remain between 09.00 – 17.00 local time. He noted the possible logistic constraints that will limit the working procedures of ICG in regards to transparency and outreach, and confirmed the ICG will check for infrastructure availability before extending the working hours.

ICG session: 9 February 2015

- Fältström proposed to divide the session into four timeslots of 30-45 minutes each. One timeslot for each of the three operational communities, and the fourth timeslot to be used for the three operational communities altogether with the ICG to moderate an open Q&A session.
- Fältström noted that due to the logistics of the stage, there will only be space for 10 people on the stage, and suggested for ICG members to be seated close to microphones from the floor to answer questions.
- Bladel questioned if there will be a session, equivalent to the one held at ICANN 51 Los Angeles, where the ICG will have open interaction with the ICANN community.
  - o Fältström responded that the ICG has not requested for a second session. The current proposal is to have 25% of the Monday session to be open microphone where the ICG shares the stage with the three operational communities. Fältström stated that he anticipates that many questions will be about the proposals, thus having the operational communities present on stage to answer directly is practical.

Action:

3. **Fältström to follow up on the internal-cg mailing list regarding the logistics of working late on the first day (Friday, 6 February 2015) of the face-to-face meetings in Singapore.**

5. Community process updates

Discussions:

Protocol parameters

- Cooper noted that the ICG has received the protocol parameters proposal (submitted on 6 January 2015).

Numbers

- Akplogan provided a brief update, noted that the numbers community had made significant progress in developing their proposal, and the process was pushed through to meet the deadline. He stated that the latest draft is being finalized and expected to be submitted to the ICG tomorrow.

Names

- Arasteh requested an addition to the agenda: a brief report from the liaisons of CWG-IANA and CCWG-Accountability.
  - o Cooper confirmed the addition.
- Arasteh requested a brief report regarding CWG-IANA on status and whether they will meet the deadline.
- Arasteh outlined criticism heard regarding the 15 January 2015 deadline. He requested that the ICG issue a statement in response stating that the ICG has not imposed any deadline, but

worked backwards from the 15 September 2015 deadline from the NTIA announcement, and thus any deadline is by the process.

- o Cooper agreed with Arasteh on the issues related to timeline. Cooper relayed hearing discussion within CWG-IANA that both the original 15 January 2015 deadline and the further 30 January 2015 target deadline is difficult for them meet. She confirmed that this is an active discussion topic between the ICG co-chairs and the CWG-IANA co-chairs, and that CWG-IANA is working on quantifying a reasonable timeframe to deliver their proposal to the ICG. Cooper suggested that the ICG discuss the impact after it receives more detailed information from the CWG-IANA.

- Arasteh stated that the whole process according to NTIA is for the accountability to be clear prior to the transition and asked if Cooper has made a declaration that the ICG has no expectation from CCWG-Accountability.

- o Cooper explained that the 'no' response she made was to the question if the ICG is expecting a transition proposal from CCWG-Accountability on 15 January 2015. Cooper further clarified that the ICG is expecting a proposal from the CWG-IANA after it is complete and has received community consensus.

- Knoben stated that timeline is critical for both CWG-IANA and CCWG-Accountability. He mentioned that the CWG-IANA co-chairs' statement from 11 January 2015 showed how they intend to coordinate between the accountability part and the names proposal. Knoben then proposed that the ICG should reach out regarding the timeline issue, instead of waiting for information from CWG-IANA.

- Drazek provided a brief update on developments on CCWG-Accountability, and noted that both Arasteh and he are liaisons to that group. He emphasized that the ICG is focused on the operational communities' proposals for the IANA functions stewardship transition. He explained that the ICG should be expecting a proposal from the CWG-IANA, but not from the CCWG-Accountability, who will be submitting their recommendations to the ICANN Board and NTIA. He further explained that the two groups are working together to see whether there are overlaps or co-dependencies, and that CCWG-Accountability will feed Work Stream-1 input into the ICG via CWG-IANA.

- o *Adobe Connect chat:* St. Amour asked Drazek what tasks he would see for the ICG in regards to the accountability work.

  - ➢ *Adobe Connect chat:* Drazek responded that *'the ICG should review any* [Work Stream-1] *accountability work that is submitted by* [CWG-IANA]*, following the interaction between* [CWG-IANA and CCWG-Accountability]*'*.

  - ➢ *Adobe Connect chat:* Knoben noted that '*all IANA related accountability items are in Work Stream-1*' and asserted '*if both CWG-IANA and CCWG-Accountability are contributing to this the ICG will have to coordinate*'.

- Bladel agreed with Drazek's explanation of the difference between the two work-tracks. He also conveyed that CCWG-Accountability will meet in Frankfurt next week to push through an accelerated timetable. Bladel questioned if the ICG should establish a date to receive all three completed proposals from the operational communities in order to meet the targets in ICG's work plan, and beyond such date, the ICG would have to publish a revised timeframe.

- o *Adobe Connect chat:* Knoben agreed with Bladel's suggestion.

- o Cooper agreed that Bladel's suggestion is a first step and suggested further discussion on the internal-cg mailing list.
- Arasteh re-emphasized that CCWG-Accountability has two Work Streams, of which Work Stream-1 relates to accountability that must happen before the IANA transition. He warned against rushing the situation with the names proposal and restated that the ICG should expect something from CCWG-Accountability Work Stream-1.
    - o *Adobe Connect chat:* Bladel noted that Arasteh raised an important point about [public] comments that will add '*a minimum of 4 weeks - after- the report is published*'.
- Cooper stated that the ICG has specified a full process spanning many months, from receiving the operational communities' proposals to delivering a final product to the NTIA. She observed that all the proposals articulate the transition plan and indicate some future work that needs to be accomplished in order to effectuate it. She explained that CWG-IANA will be the group to submit the names proposal to the ICG, and such proposal may link to CCWG-Accountability's work to accurately reflect the names community's consensus. Cooper pointed out that the ICG can send the proposal back to the operational community to deal with any issues during the March – July feedback timeframe.
- Cooper confirmed Knoben's proposal to reach out to CWG-IANA regarding the timeline and suggested further discussion on the internal-cg mailing list.
    - o *Adobe Connect chat:* Davidson agreed, and noted the importance of Knoben's suggestion.

Action:

4. **Cooper to follow up with a note to the internal-cg mailing list on whether the ICG should follow up with CWG-IANA regarding the timeline issue.**

Summary of Action Items:

1. **ICG co-chairs to follow up on the internal-cg mailing list regarding the further division of responsibility of Secretariat functions.**

2. **Approval of the 10 December 2014 minutes.**

3. **Fältström to follow up on the internal-cg mailing list regarding the logistics of working late on the first day (Friday, 6 February 2015) of the face-to-face meetings in Singapore.**

4. **Cooper to follow up with a note to the internal-cg mailing list on whether the ICG should follow up with the CWG-IANA regarding the timeline issue.**