

# Eighteenth IANA Stewardship Coordination Group (ICG) Teleconference

12:00-14:00 UTC, Wednesday, 10 June 2015

Meeting [agenda](#) and [archives](#)

## Participants:

Alan Barrett (NRO)	Lars-Johan Liman (RSSAC)
Alissa Cooper (IETF)	Lynn St Amour (IAB)
Daniel Karrenberg (RSSAC)	Manal Ismail (GAC)
Hartmut Glaser (ASO)	Martin Boyle (ccNSO)
James Bladel (GNSO)	Mary Uduma (ccNSO)
Jandyr Ferreira dos Santos (GAC)	Michael Niebel (GAC)
Jari Arkko (IETF)	Patrik Fältström (SSAC)
Jean-Jacques Subrenat (ALAC)	Paul Wilson (NRO)
Jon Nevett (gTLD Registries)	Russ Housley (IAB)
Joseph Alhadeff (ICC/BASIS)	Russ Mundy (SSAC)
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)	Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen (GNSO)
Keith Davidson (ccNSO)	Xiaodong Lee (ccNSO)
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries)	

## Apologies:

Demi Getschko (ISOC)	Mohamed El Bashir (ALAC)
Elise Gerich (IANA Staff Expert)	Narelle Clark (ISOC)
Kuo Wei Wu (ICANN Board Liaison)	Thomas Schneider (GAC)
Milton Mueller (GNSO)	

## Secretariat:

Jennifer Chung  
Sherly Haristya  
Yannis Li

## ICANN Support Staff:

Eric Evrard

## Agenda

### Minutes approval for calls #16 and #17

Cooper declared the minutes of calls #16 and #17 approved without objections.

### 1. Update on status of CWG proposal

Boyle gave a brief status update of the CWG-IANA proposal which he noted has been refined to an almost final version (open for drafting comments until 23:59 UTC June 10). He stated that the CWG-IANA chairs intend to transmit the document to the Chartering Organizations (COs) tomorrow (June 11), and subsequently the COs will go through their approval process for the proposal during ICANN week. Boyle noted that the CWG-IANA has been working on comments collected during the consultation period; that all comments were addressed and many of them are adopted in the new final document. Boyle added that it is his view that the proposal seems to have a quite good level of acceptance.

- Cooper asked whether CWG-IANA has a meeting planned at the end or shortly after the ICANN meeting to agree that they received the input from the SOs and ACs and can then submit the proposal to the ICG.
  - Boyle responded that he has not seen any finalized arrangements for accepting that all COs' input have been received. He mentioned that CWG-IANA has several sessions during ICANN week, one of which overlaps with ICG's wrap-up session on Thursday 25 June.

- Arasteh asked whether the COs' acceptance of CWG-IANA proposal is a binary decision between yes/no or if the acceptance may come with comments or questions. Second, he noted emails exchanged in GAC that included comments to CWG-IANA, and asked if these comments have been raised by GAC representatives in CWG-IANA and if these comments have been taken and considered.
  - Regarding the first question, Boyle answered that there will be opportunities for each CO to have discussions with CWG-IANA to further understand the proposal. Boyle stated that CWG-IANA is aware of the possibility receiving comments or questions from COs, but he noted that margin of being able to amend the delicately balanced consensus document at this stage is very limited. Boyle expressed hope that the COs, having being involved in the process, will be in a position to adopt the document. Regarding the second question, Boyle said there is a response for all comments received during the consultation period. Boyle added that GAC representatives have raised comments during the process, however he cannot assure how any individual comment has been dealt with.

## 2. Discussion of feedback received from communities and ICANN re time frames

### Response from IETF

- Arkko explained [the reply from IETF](#) states that the IETF is ready to take the next step – the new version of the SLA is ready to be executed. He acknowledged that the IETF is not alone in the process, and additional tasks may need to be executed before or after the transition, such as the alignment between RIRs and IETF on IANA trademarks and domains. In addition, he noted that the relationship between IETF and PTI structure (proposed by the Names community) depends on final details of the PTI plan: whether the agreements between the IETF and ICANN remain in place (IETF's preference), or if there is input required from IETF (timeline of such work cannot be set until scope is known).
- Cooper stated her understanding of the response to be that the time that the IETF will need for implementation will not be the extenuating factors for the overall implementation time frame since the IETF is essentially ready to move forward now.
- Arasteh raised a general suggestion not directly related to the IETF response. He stated that if there is any ambiguity relating to PTI or other the sub-organ of the CWG-IANA proposal that might have some legal interpretation, the ICG could discuss and ask for the opinion of the legal advisor of CWG-IANA if necessary.
  - Arkko agreed with Arasteh but phrased it differently: let the communities decide first on what they want and what direction to take, and then instruct legal experts to do what is needed as a secondary step.
    - Cooper and Boyle (Adobe Connect chat) agreed with Arkko.

### Response from CRISP Team

- Cooper asked for further clarification from Wilson or Barrett regarding the [response provided by the CRISP TEAM Chair, Izumi Okutani](#).
  - Wilson explained that the CRISP team may have misunderstood the time frame inquiry from ICG as interim progress update. He suggested that the ICG clarify a deadline for a complete response needed from CRISP Team. He briefly explained that the RIR's point of view regarding implementation is a matter of two components which are more administrative than substantive (SLA and Review Committee). He stated that the SLA has been drafted and is open for comment from all interested parties until 14 June, and the NRO will then need a month to digest the comments and publish another version of the SLA by mid-July. As for the Review Committee component, Wilson stated that it is being drafted at the moment and will follow a similar process.
  - Barrett agreed with Wilson's explanation of the current process. He stated that the CRISP team has responded that it will be able to give the ICG more details and a better estimate of its implementation time frame by end of June, and hopes the ICG can wait for that.
- Cooper explained that it would be helpful if the ICG could receive some amount of substance (referring to Wilson's brief summary) from the CRISP Team before ICANN 53. She stated that the ICG Chairs plan

to use a working session at the end of ICANN week to develop the ICG's response to NTIA which is needed by the end of June. She asked if it is reasonable to write back to Okutani asking for a substantive update by June 17.

- Wilson and Barrett agreed that it is possible to get a more detailed response from the CRISP Team in a week.

### Response from CWG-IANA

- Arasteh stated that he thought the [response from CWG-IANA](#) does not provide a direct answer of timing to ICG's question.
- Cooper interpreted that the minimum implementation time period for CWG-IANA is 3 or 4 months (setting up PTI) and could potentially be longer based on extenuating circumstances. She asked for comments from ICG members, in particular those involved in the CWG-IANA process.
- Subrenat gave two remarks. First, he agreed with Arasteh's comment that the response from CWG-IANA is vague regarding the time line, even though it provides a rationale as to why. Second, he stated that it is unfortunate that the response underline the responsibility of the independent counsel to the CWG-IANA. He recommended that the ICG liaisons to CWG-IANA follow up with the CWG-IANA Co-Chairs and ask for a more detailed response. Lastly, he asked ICG members if the 3 or 4 months period as estimated by CWG-IANA is compatible to ICG's overall timeframe.
  - Cooper responded that a minimum of 3 or 4 months means it could take longer. She noted that the response is primarily focused on implementation (which theoretically will not take place until after the proposal is sent to and approved by the NTIA) so this does not coincide with ICG's timeline. She added that based on Boyle's earlier update, the ICG has a good understanding of proposal finalization timing from CWG-IANA's standpoint.
- Mundy stated his full agreement with Cooper, Subrenat, and Arasteh about the lack of precise answer. Mundy raised a new issue - that it is completely unclear how, who, and what would be the approving entity for the articles of incorporation and legal documentation that needs to be put in place between ICANN and new PTI structure. He highlighted his concern that the aspect of approval of the PTI is fully undefined and could require multiple months for approving the legal documentation.
  - Boyle agreed that there is lot of unknown elements, such as ICANN's input to the process, and the reiterations to get to the final CWG-IANA proposal. He added that getting to a final CWG-IANA proposal includes the steps of prescribing a process that will produce necessary implementation documents. He agreed that Mundy is correct in that the process will have to be an approval process that would involve negotiation with ICANN Legal, thus he cannot predict how long that may take. However, Boyle stated that as long as everyone feels comfortable with the operational solution, then the legal input, preparation of various documents, and negotiation with ICANN can go ahead in parallel with ICG's process and CWG-IANA's consultation. Boyle offered to have an exchange with CWG-IANA Co-Chairs regarding the parallelization of the implementation steps and the ICG's work.
    - *Adobe Connect chat:* Ismail asked if 'elements (other than the PTI) [will] be implemented in parallel or if there is additional time to be added to [the minimum estimate of 3-4 months]'.
      - *Adobe Connect chat:* Boyle responded that CCWG is the obvious case, and there has been enough exchange to understand the requirements, so that could be done in parallel.
- Alhadeff said that the incorporation of PTI is the most complex thing in the CWG-IANA proposal in terms of structure, functionality, and contractual relationship with ICANN. He shared concerns raised regarding the lack of information in CWG-IANA's response, however he also stated that he does not think CWG-IANA can be more precise on the time frame for that specific element. He stated that the PTI in its relationship with ICANN does not necessarily prevent the ICG from going through its proposal assembly process. He further noted that there needs to be a lot of community socializing before the PTI is a given; that the broader community will weigh in and ICANN will not be silent as to the PTI's form or function.
  - Cooper agreed with Alhadeff. *Adobe Connect chat:* Boyle and St. Amour also agreed with Alhadeff.

- Arasteh agreed with previous comments, particularly from Alhadeff and Mundy. In addition, he reiterated his issue raised during previous calls regarding the meaning of implementation: that the plan for transition should be distinguished from its implementation. He stated that ICG may not be in a position to provide any precise information for implementation, but rather ICG needs to assess whether the transition plan works. He reported that the legal advisers to CCWG-Accountability mentioned that ‘they need time to implement [...] all activities require to in place or committed before the transition takes place’ and may not be aware of how long this will take. He suggested that the ICG consider raising this question of implementation to CWG-IANA, CCWG-Accountability, and ICANN Board Liaison to get feedback.
  - Cooper replied that it is a good point to keep in mind the difference between the transition plan and implementation. She stated that the ICG was asked by NTIA for input on implementation timeframe which is reason for the discussion now. She added there is also a question about implementation timeframe in the proposal - but these details will be up to the communities and ICANN to finalize.
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: Drazek stated his general support for Arasteh’s comments and added that ‘approval of the ICG- and CCWG-submitted proposals is separate from [the] question of implementation. NTIA asked for input on implementation so they could determine the necessary length of a contract extension.’
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: Karrenberg stated that to him, the meaning of “implementation completed time” in the NTIA letter is ‘the time [when] the new arrangements are in place and NTIA can withdraw from the current arrangements’. He added that while the ICG is not responsible for the implementation, the ICG is responsible to provide the best possible answer to NTIA.
    - *Adobe Connect chat*: Drazek agreed with Karrenberg.
- Cooper summarized the discussion and highlighted Boyle’s action item to follow up the CWG-IANA Co-Chairs regarding parallelizing the implementation steps and the rest of ICG’s work. Cooper asked if Boyle could also follow up to get further clarification in terms of overall timeframe.
- Mundy asked if the ICG should take an active role and ask the RIRs and IETF if they see an impact from the creation of different legal entity (PTI).
  - Cooper replied that the question will come up when the ICG does its assessment of the combined proposal after the Names proposal is officially submitted, and the ICG should raise questions if they see any issues. She added that both the RIR and IETF communities provided input to CWG-IANA during their public comment period, and her understanding of those comments is that the proposals seem workable at first glance.

#### Action Items:

1. **Cooper to write back to the CRISP Team to ask for a substantive update regarding implementation timeline by 17 June (before ICG Face-to-Face Meeting 5).**
2. **Boyle to follow up with the CWG-IANA co-chairs re parallelizing the implementation steps, and any further clarification in terms of overall timeframe.**

### 3. Combined IETF/RIRs proposal and preface

Cooper explained that the Chairs have asked the Secretariat to put together the [combined proposal containing the protocol parameters and numbers components](#) in order to be ready for the public comment period soon after the ICG receives the names proposal. The two components are currently appended each other as separate parts. She noted that there was discussion on the internal-cg mailing list on whether to keep the current structure or to [interleave it](#). She invited further discussion on the structure of the combined proposal.

- *Adobe Connect chat*: Arkko, Drazek, Wilson, Ismail, and Lee supported the combined proposal structure as it is. Wilson added his support for ‘no interleaving’ of the proposals.
- Cooper stated that the ICG needs to talk about the language to be added to the beginning of the document, which could be in form of executive summary, introduction, or preface. She highlighted the

[discussion on the internal-cg mailing list](#) about a list of elements that should be in this section. She particularly noted [the email from Boyle](#) that an executive summary can be lengthier and include different elements: such as a summary of the proposal; context-setting; explanation about IANA; assessment criteria; and the compatibility, workability, and accountability of the three component proposals.

- Karrenberg started with a high-level remark: that the ICG should try to avoid generating new language that describes the context. He explained that it is not necessary, can take a lot of work and time, and will not add anything substantial. He agreed to describe the ICG's process based on the [ICG Charter](#) in short factual manner, and add the ICG's assessment.
  - Cooper and Subrenat agreed. *Adobe Connect chat*: Housley and Boyle agreed.
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: Arkko agreed with Karrenberg regarding minimal new text but added that the 'preface/summary still needs to explain completeness, consistency [...] with references'.
    - *Adobe Connect chat*: Ismail and Santos agreed with Arkko. St. Amour agreed and added that it 'also needs to clearly state how (all together) it meets the NTIA criteria'.
- Wilson reiterated an idea that he has previously raised on the chat of [ICG Call 16](#) that received some support, and stated it can be seen as a value-add that the ICG can provide to the process. Wilson stated that the ICG is asked to produce a single plan; however he suggested that the plan can involve multiple stages in which these stages could help to provide stress testing or risk mitigation. He mentioned that two out of the three operational communities are ready or will be ready in September, therefore he suggested that the ICG could propose a two or three step process to advocate for a transition that could release the two communities from the NTIA contractual obligations. He stated his concern that having nothing in September could be seen as a failure of the multistakeholder process, and this sequential multi-step implementation could show some components of IANA being in transition by the deadline.
  - Cooper acknowledged that there are [strong opinions](#) toward Wilson's suggestion. However, she suggested holding responses to Wilson's suggestion to clear other agenda items on the present call first.
- In regards to the added value ICG can bring to the process that [Subrenat initially mentioned on the internal-cg mailing list](#), he explained that he did not suggest the ICG should invent ideas or language out of nothing. Conversely, he stated that it is the ICG's duty to make the most of received comments and clarification is in itself an added value. In addition, Subrenat also noted a lack of clarity in the ICG members' suggestions between what can be considered essential and what can be added as attachments. He suggested the following structure: 1. A summary of the proposal; 2. A brief explanation about process based on ICG charter; 3. A brief explanation about IANA; and 4. The ICG assessment. He concluded that further details for 2 to 4 could be placed in attachments to the combined proposal as necessary.
  - Cooper agreed with Subrenat's proposed structure. *Adobe Connect chat*: Ismail agreed with Subrenat.
- Arasteh asked for clarification on why the Numbers and Protocol Parameters proposals have been put together. Arasteh also stated a strong objection to Wilson's proposal of a multi-stage implementation of the transition.
  - Cooper clarified that the combined proposals as received have been done as an ICG internal step to agree on formatting, to allow the translation work to begin, as well as start the discussion on the preface of the combined proposal. She emphasized that the combined proposal will go to public comment only after the Names proposal have been received and added to the document, as well as any executive summary and necessary appendices.
- Barrett reminded that group that the ICG also has a coordinating role to resolve items that need more coordination, for example the responses from the three operational communities regarding trademark.

- Cooper confirmed that it is the plan when the ICG assess the combined proposal. She further confirmed that the ICG will use its [published process](#) to resolve inconsistencies by going back to the operational communities and working with them to reach a solution.
- Alhadeff agreed with Karrenberg regarding the use of existing language, but took exception to the need to be as brief as possible. Alhadeff explained that part of this document is an outreach and consensus building instrument and needs to be accessible to people. He explained that this public comment-proposal may have a slightly different need for context than the proposal that is delivered to NTIA, and the meat of the document will be the same, but the prefatory elements might have a different purpose.
  - Cooper stated that that it is likely that the surrounding material will change between the public-comment proposal and the one to be sent to NTIA, and also that the need of context explanation will be different.
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: St. Amour stated her strong agreement with Alhadeff. Housley agreed with Alhadeff regarding having ‘more than one audience for the document’ and stated his ‘hope that [ICG] can deliver the more complete text to NTIA so that the people watching do not feel a “bait and switch”’.
- Lee asked whether the ICG public comment period will be limited only to the preface or if the public can also comment on the combined proposal. He noted that each of the three operational communities have undergone a public comment process and if the ICG just puts the three proposals together to form the combined proposal he wonders what if the ICG is just asking for comments on the preface since the essential content of the proposals have not changed.
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: Subrenat and Uduma agreed with Lee.
  - Cooper assured that Lee’s comment is well taken. She further noted that this topic is on the Face-to-Face agenda for ICG discuss further questions that will be put out for the public comment period.
- Karrenberg stated that the ICG should produce the document it is chartered to produce to audience the ICG is chartered to produce it for – the NTIA. For the wider public, Karrenberg suggested that the ICG could use additional documents like infographics that explain the context and essence of the ICG’s product in more accessible way. He cautioned against producing different forms of the document stated that it that will add confusion.
  - Cooper stated her understanding of the previous discussion to be that the introductory part of the document may change (and ICG should reserve the right to edit) between the version for the public comment and the version to be submitted to the NTIA. She agreed that having different versions of the document is not a good idea.
  - Karrenberg further explained that his concern is of the real product that is chartered to ICG. He stated that the ICG members need to agree on the ICG output, and he advocated to keep it as minimal as possible.
    - *Adobe Connect chat*: Arkko, Arasteh and Lee agreed with Karrenburg.
  - Alhadeff highlighted another reason why Karrenberg’s approach makes more sense. He stated that the ICG should allow people to comment on every aspect of the document that the ICG is proposing to send to NTIA, including the prefatory element. He agreed that the ICG can produce an explanatory document based on previous materials that provide context for the wider public. He stated that if the ICG creates new language after the public comment process, it is unclear that is consensus commentary if the ICG has not had comment on it before.
    - Cooper and Arasteh (Adobe Connect chat) agreed with Alhadeff.
- Cooper stated that she will circulate a draft of the combined proposal preface to ICG members who have agreed to volunteer for the drafting team before the ICG Face-to-Face Meeting 5. She noted that this will be done bearing in mind any gaps due to not having received the Names proposal yet.

**Action Item:**

3. **Cooper to circulate the outline of the combined proposal preface (noting that there will be missing pieces due to not having received the Names proposal yet) to the drafting team before ICG Face-to-Face Meeting 5.**

#### 4. **Agenda for F2F meeting in Buenos Aires**

- Cooper noted the suggestion raised by Wilson about multi-step implementation, and stated that the Chairs will schedule it into the agenda of ICG Face-to-Face meeting 5.
- Alhadeff asked if the ICG will plan to have specific time during their Face-to-Face meeting to prepare any talking points for ICANN week.
  - Cooper said she does not know of any specific session at the ICANN meeting week where the ICG perspective will be requested, but she expected it will happen organically. She agreed that it is useful to add Alhadeff's suggestion to the agenda.
- Arasteh asked if it is possible to avoid the full-day conflict on 19 June with CCWG-Accountability.
  - Cooper responded that unfortunately this was a conflict that was known for a while and could not be avoided.
- St. Amour wondered if it might be worthwhile to review the CCWG-Accountability work in more detail to see if there might be any implication to the ICG's work.
  - Cooper clarified that the idea behind the CCWG-Accountability work update agenda at a high level. She is hesitant to do a formal assessment of the CCWG-Accountability output since it is outside of the ICG's remit. She suggested that the ICG members talk about that whether they want to do this or not.
  - *Adobe Connect* chat: Drazek and Boyle agreed with Cooper.
- Cooper asked for comments on the Names proposal pre-assessment before the ICG Face-to-Face meeting 5.
  - Fältström replied that the SSAC is currently formally doing a pre-assessment of the Names proposal. He stated that it is possible for him and Mundy as representatives of SSAC to give some input on the evaluation to the ICG.
  - Cooper said that it will be helpful if Fältström and Mundy to be able to share their pre-assessment of the names proposal to the internal-cg mailing list next week.
- Cooper asked the ICG members to consider volunteering for assessing the Names proposal and the combined proposals and indicate their interest on the internal-cg mailing list before the ICG Face-to-Face meeting. She confirmed that the assessment itself will start once the ICG receives the Names proposal.
- Cooper referred to Lee's earlier comment, and said that she will draft questions for ICG public comment period and share it to the internal-cg mailing list before ICG Face-to-Face Meeting 5.

#### **Action Items:**

4. **ICG Chairs, with assistance from the Secretariat, to add to the ICG Face-to-Face Meeting 5 agenda a discussion time slot for the ICG to further discuss Wilson's proposal for a multi-step implementation of the final combined proposal.**
5. **ICG Chairs to add to the ICG Face-to-Face Meeting 5 agenda a discussion time slot to discuss possible ICG talking points at ICANN sessions.**
6. **Fältström and Mundy, as the representatives of SSAC, to share their pre-assessment of the Names Proposal to the internal-cg mailing list next week.**
7. **Cooper to draft questions and send more information regarding the ICG public comment period and circulate to the internal-cg mailing list before ICG Face-to-Face Meeting 5.**

#### 5. **Post-ICANN 53 call/meeting schedule**

- Cooper reminded the ICG members to fill in the doodle poll for the calls in July – October 2015.
- Cooper stated, as [mentioned on the internal-cg mailing list](#), that the ICG is looking to have a face-to-face meeting in September. She stated that the logistics and details are still being worked out.

## Summary of Decisions Taken:

1. Secretariat to publish approved minutes for ICG Call 16 and 17.

## Summary of Action Items:

1. Cooper to write back to the CRISP Team to ask for a substantive update regarding implementation timeline by 17 June (before ICG Face-to-Face Meeting 5).
2. Boyle to follow up with the CWG-IANA co-chairs re parallelizing the implementation steps, and any further clarification in terms of overall timeframe.
3. Cooper to circulate the outline of the combined proposal preface (noting that there will be missing pieces due to not having received the Names proposal yet) to the drafting team before ICG Face-to-Face Meeting 5.
4. ICG Chairs, with assistance from the Secretariat, to add to the ICG Face-to-Face Meeting 5 agenda a discussion time slot for the ICG to further discuss Wilson's proposal for a multi-step implementation of the final combined proposal.
5. ICG Chairs to add to the ICG Face-to-Face Meeting 5 agenda a discussion time slot to discuss possible ICG talking points at ICANN sessions.
6. Fältström and Mundy, as the representatives of SSAC, to share their pre-assessment of the Names Proposal to the internal-cg mailing list next week.
7. Cooper to draft questions and send more information regarding the ICG public comment period and circulate to the internal-cg mailing list before ICG Face-to-Face Meeting 5.