

# Thirteenth IANA Stewardship Coordination Group (ICG) Teleconference

12:00 – 13:00 UTC, Wednesday, 11 March 2015

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

## Participants:

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Alan Barrett (NRO)               | Lars-Johan Liman (RSSAC)                 |
| Demi Getschko (ISOC)             | Lynn St Amour (IAB)                      |
| Daniel Karrenberg (RSSAC)        | Manal Ismail (GAC)                       |
| Jean-Jacques Subrenat (ALAC)     | Mary Uduma (ccNSO)                       |
| Jari Arkko (IETF)                | Michael Niebel (GAC)                     |
| James Bladel (GNSO)              | Mohamed El Bashir (ALAC)(ICG Vice-chair) |
| Jandyr Ferreira dos Santos (GAC) | Russ Mundy (SSAC)                        |
| Jon Nevett (gTLD Registries)     | Russ Housley (IAB)                       |
| Joseph Alhadeff (ICC/BASIS)      | Thomas Schneider (GAC)                   |
| Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)            | Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen (GNSO)               |

## Liaisons:

Elise Gerich (IANA Staff Expert)

## Apologies:

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Alissa Cooper (IETF)(ICG Chair) | Milton Mueller (GNSO)                   |
| Hartmut Richard Glaser (ASO)    | Kuo Wei Wu (ICANN Board Liaison)        |
| Keith Davidson (ccNSO)          | Narelle Clark (ISOC)                    |
| Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries)  | Patrik Fältström (SSAC)(ICG Vice-chair) |
| Lars-Johan Liman (RSSAC)        | Paul Wilson (NRO)                       |
| Martin Boyle (ccNSO)            | Xiaodong Lee (ccNSO)                    |

## Secretariat:

Jennifer Chung  
Yannis Li  
Sherly Haristya

## ICANN Support Staff:

Eric Evrard  
Alice Jansen

## Agenda

### 1. Minutes approval and review of action items for:

#### 1.1. 25 Feb 2015 teleconference call

El Bashir noted there were no objections to approving the minutes for the 25 February 2015 teleconference call, thus he declared the minutes approved.

**Action Item 1: Approval of the 25 February 2015 teleconference call minutes.**

## 1.2. 6 and 7 Feb 2015 face to face meeting

El Bashir noted the completion of the action item regarding the timeline (Action item 5).

- Karrenberg requested to defer approval of the ICG face-to-face meeting 4 (Feb 6-7) since both Wilson and Mueller (in relation to the red-line edits) are not present for this call.
  - *Adobe Connect chat:* St. Amour, Ismail and Arkko agreed with Karrenberg's request to defer.

El Bashir agreed to table the approval of the minutes for the ICG face-to-face meeting 4 (Feb 6-7) for the next call.

### Discussion:

- Arasteh enquired regarding the status of the diagram indicating the current and post-transition accountability hierarchy and mechanisms in the protocol parameters community. He mentioned that Arkko had [indicated](#) on the internal-cg mailing list that it is being worked on.
  - Arkko confirmed that he has agreed to produce a diagram to be sent to the internal-cg mailing list by the end of this week. He noted that this is an existing and well-documented systems with mechanisms to account for IANA functions failures as well as deal with policy failures.

### **Action Item 2: Arkko to provide further information (diagram) to the internal-cg mailing list about the IETF's current overall internal accountability and oversight system related to IANA interaction by the end of this week.**

- Arasteh reiterated his request to clarify the jurisdiction issue regarding the current IETF-ICANN MoU. He further requested clarification on the management of the coordination of the three operational communities as referenced in the protocol parameters proposal ([pg 13, section IV](#)).
  - Regarding Arasteh's first point, Arkko stated that it was his recollection that the jurisdiction issue was resolved during the face-to-face meeting, and that it was clarified by Arkko and Housley that IAB is the final arbiter for any issues between ICANN and IETF. Arkko stated that the ICG agreed (and have sent) a question to the operational communities relating to the IPR (domain names and trademarks of iana.org).
  - Regarding Arasteh's second point, Arkko stated that coordination between the three communities in the IETF process is described in various RFCs and has been a point-to-point coordination between the communities that has occurred many times without issue.
    - Arasteh requested that Arkko put the above explanation in writing for clarification and discussion. Arasteh further emphasized that the jurisdiction issue is a legal issue that should be properly addressed, and the current answer of 'IAB' is insufficient in his view.
    - Arkko stated that the IETF community has produced a proposal that explains the IETF process, including accountability mechanisms, and that the community's opinion is clearly reflected in the document. Arkko offered to provide further information in an email to the internal-cg mailing list regarding practicalities of coordination between the operational communities (referred to in the protocol parameters proposal), but emphasized that he cannot change the protocol parameters' proposal itself.

- *Adobe Connect chat:* Mundy and Housley agreed with Arkko regarding his view that the ICG members cannot change the community proposal.
- El Bashir suggested that the ICG continue discussion of this matter on the internal-cg mailing list

**Action Item 3: The ICG to continue discussing on the internal cg-mailing list about: 1) jurisdiction issue of the current ICANN-IETF MoU; 2) the practicalities of coordination between the operational communities (referred to in the protocol parameters proposal and referenced RFCs).**

## 2. Figure out for any outstanding matter related to the protocol & numbers response on IANA IP/domain

El Bashir noted that there was no indication from any ICG members on the call that there needed to be further discussion on this agenda item.

## 3. Status of names proposal progress (update from members involved in CWG-IANA)

El Bashir noted that there will be a face-to-face meeting for CWG-IANA in Istanbul ([26-27 March](#)) and also that an independent law firm ([Sidley Austin LLP](#)) has been identified by the client committee to provide legal advice to the CWG-IANA.

- Uduma gave a brief update on the CWG-IANA progress. She noted there has been two 2-hour calls every week since ICANN Singapore. She stated that [Design Teams \(DT\) A-N have been created](#), with a focus on the first three design teams: DT A on the SLA; DT B on Appeal Mechanism for ccTLD Delegations/Redelegations; and DT C on the CSC.
- Uduma summarized a hybrid proposal ([Integrated Model](#)) presented to the CWG-IANA by Avri Doria. Uduma stated that the hybrid proposal proposed that each of the three operational communities nominate members to a [community board](#) that will be overseeing the IANA functions. Uduma further stated that the hybrid proposal also proposed that IANA functions should be separated from ICANN either as subsidiary model or a membership shared services arrangement between the three operational communities in Post Transition IANA.
- Uduma stated that CWG-IANA will have a face-to-face meeting in Istanbul ([26-27 March](#)) and that a template proposal to be submitted to ICG has been developed and will be worked on then.
- Uduma further noted that an independent law firm ([Sidley Austin LLP](#)) has been retained for CWG-IANA by ICANN, and will be present at the Istanbul meeting.
- Uduma raised the fact that meeting the current timeline by the CWG, might be a challenge, going by the volume of work to be covered by the Group.
- Uduma noted that the finalization of the CWG Principles Document is being led by Boyle (see threads: [here](#) and [here](#)).

## 4. Status of ICANN accountability track progress (update from members involved in CCWG-Accountability)

- Arasteh gave a brief update on the progress of CCWG-Accountability. He stated that Working Party 1 (review and redress) has been divided into different committees and panels. Arasteh stated that the current discussions focus on how GAC decisions are made. He noted that the legal issue discussion is still at the working level and have not been brought to the main CCWG yet, however it is expected that a document will be published for public comment in April.

Arasteh stated that the CCWG-Accountability will have a face-to-face meeting ([23-24 March](#)) in Istanbul and the discussions will be progressed and clearer by then.

- Arasteh summarized that Working Party 2 deals with empowering the community to take action regarding the ICANN board – to revert decisions of or disband the board entirely.
- Arasteh added three further updates on CCWG-Accountability:
  - i. The process of merging the Affirmation of Commitments into the ICANN Bylaws and provide an updated version (which may include other additions) have begun.
  - ii. 25 stress tests have been identified and are being discussed.
  - iii. Discussions are currently underway regarding whether or not to retain the same law firm identified by CWG-IANA for legal aspects arising in the CCWG-Accountability work.

#### **Discussion:**

- Uduma asked whether there are difficulties meeting the proposed timelines of the CCWG-Accountability and CWG-IANA tracks. She asked Arasteh whether CCWG-Accountability has considered the interdependencies of the two groups and whether their input to the CWG-IANA will allow the CWG-IANA to meet the timeline of delivering the Names proposal to the ICG.
  - Arasteh responded that the activity of the CWG-IANA will finish with the transition (including any CCWG-Accountability input relating to the transition), and all accountability matters beyond the transition is dealt with by the CCWG.
  - El Bashir clarified that the CWG-IANA and CCWG-Accountability are coordinating on their work on transition accountability.

## **5. ICG future awareness/infographics/media messages**

El Bashir stated that he has circulated an [email](#) to the internal-cg mailing list about the possibility of the ICANN communication team supporting the ICG outreach process regarding the assembly of the final proposal. He noted that some ICG members support this approach. He also noted that Mueller has [raised concerns](#). El Bashir emphasized that any materials produced from this process will be driven and approved by the ICG (including how the materials are disseminated).

#### **Discussion:**

- Karrenberg stated that the ICG should do its own messaging, and that the ICG has a Secretariat to assist with this. He emphasized that it is important that the ICG actively communicates its processes and future plans for completing its work.
  - *Adobe Connect chat:* Subrenat agreed with Karrenberg. St. Amour agreed with Karrenberg and Subrenat.
- Mundy restated [his views as sent to the mailing list](#), that it would be most appropriate for ICANN to do the communications for the full set of transition activities because the original NTIA request was directed to ICANN to convene this entire process in a multistakeholder way, and ICANN is also expected to deliver the official response to this request. Mundy further stated that if the ICG as a separate entity wants to develop communications, then the ICG should use its own Secretariat.
- St Amour fully supported more accessible communication. She cautioned that this is a nuanced area, and the ICG should avoid influence from ICANN or other entities with respect to these messages. She noted that the ICG process was put together by the community, and significantly different from the initial process set by ICANN. She emphasized that communication efforts are helpful and valuable, but need to be done from within the ICG. She suggested that an ICG

working group be formed to consider this process, and expressed hope that there will be funding available if more resources are needed.

- *Adobe Connect chat:* Subrenat, Arkko and El Bashir agreed with St. Amour.
- *Adobe Connect chat:* Subrenat expressed interest to engage in efforts within the ICG regarding the outreach process. El Bashir noted Subrenat's interest.
- Ismail agreed that ICG should be in charge of its external communication. She asked whether the ICG or the Secretariat capable of doing this task, or if the ICG will be outsourcing this process. She stated that if the ICG in charge of the content, she did not see any harm on relying on ICANN resources. She requested for clarification on the expectation of this process before taking a solid position on the matter.
  - El Bashir confirmed that the intention is for the ICG to drive the content and ICANN to produce the materials. He reiterated that it is up to the ICG on how and where the material is disseminated. In addition, he expressed reservations as to whether this function was requested in the Secretariat RFP, thus he expressed concerns with asking the Secretariat to perform this task.
- Arasteh stated that everyone should do their own work based on their responsibility and mandate. He further stated that the ICG should not get involved with ICANN activities and that ICANN should not be allowed to say something on behalf of ICG that does not reflect ICG's view.
- Uduma asked if ICG can actually detach completely from ICANN. She noted that ICANN is providing support for ICG's work and questioned whether the ICG is completely independent of ICANN. She further stated that if ICANN agreed to produce communication and media materials for the ICG (for ICG's use), then it is her position that the ICG should not reject it.
  - Subrenat stated that the ICG needs to distinguish between material help and principles:
    - In regards to material help, he stated that it facilitates ICG work and alleviates the burden of looking for a set budget.
    - In regards to principles, he stated that the ICG was expected by the communities to act independently.
  - Subrenat emphasized that he saw no contradictions between the two elements. He concluded that the ICG is realistic in receiving practical help from ICANN, but in regards to expressing positions and reflecting the opinions from the communities, the ICG needs to be independent.
    - *Adobe Connect chat:* St. Amour agreed with Subrenat and stated that 'the entire ICG process is the community's process defined by the community and approved by the communities.'

El Bashir suggested that the ICG Chairs check the possibility of the Secretariat to take on the communication processes as preferred by many ICG members on the call.

- *Adobe Connect chat:* St. Amour, Mundy and Ismail agreed with El Bashir's approach.

**Action Item 4: ICG Chairs to check the possibility of using ICG Secretariat to develop the required messaging/infographs as first preference and report back to the ICG.**

### **Action Items:**

1. **Approval of the 25 February teleconference call minutes.**

- 2. Arkko to provide further information (diagram) to the internal-cg mailing list about the IETF's current overall internal accountability and oversight system related to IANA interaction by the end of this week.**
- 3. The ICG to continue discussing on the internal cg-mailing list about: 1) jurisdiction issue of the current ICANN-IETF MoU; 2) the practicalities of coordination between the operation communities (referred to in the protocol parameters proposal and referenced RFCs).**
- 4. ICG Chairs to check the possibility of using ICG Secretariat to develop the required messaging/infographs as first preference and report back to the ICG.**