

Draft minutes: Twentieth IANA Stewardship Coordination Group (ICG) Teleconference

19:00-21:00 UTC, Wednesday, 15 July 2015

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

Participants:

Alan Barrett (NRO)
Alissa Cooper (IETF)
Daniel Karrenberg (RSSAC)
Demi Getschko (ISOC)
Jandyr Ferreira dos Santos (GAC)
Jari Arkko (IETF)
Jean-Jacques Subrenat (ALAC)
Joseph Alhadeff (ICC/BASIS)
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries)

Lynn St Amour (IAB)
Manal Ismail (GAC)
Mary Uduma (ccNSO)
Michael Niebel (GAC)
Mohamed El Bashir (ALAC)
Patrik Fältström (SSAC)
Russ Housley (IAB)
Russ Mundy (SSAC)
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben (GNSO)
Xiaodong Lee (ccNSO))

Liaison:

Elise Gerich (IANA Staff Liaison)

Apologies:

Hartmut Glaser (ASO)
James Bladel (GNSO)
Jon Nevett (gTLD Registries)
Keith Davidson (ccNSO)
Lars-Johan Liman (RSSAC)
Martin Boyle (ccNSO)

Milton Mueller (GNSO)
Narelle Clark (ISOC)
Paul Wilson (NRO)
Thomas Schneider (GAC)
Kuo-wei Wu (Board Liaison)

Secretariat:

Jennifer Chung
Sherly Haristya
Yannis Li

ICANN Support Staff:

Josh Baulch

Agenda

1. Combined proposal assessment

Cooper thanked the ICG members who submitted the assessments. She stated that for each issue the ICG discuss, the ICG has three options:

- 1) Craft a question/request back to one or more communities, if more clarification or detail is needed.
- 2) Highlight the issue in the ICG Report section of the proposal, and:
 - i. Ask for public comment on the issue specifically
 - ii. Re-evaluate the issue at a later date pending other work that is currently in process (e.g. IPR, CCWG, RZM)
- 3) Deem the issue discussed and complete.

• **Compatibility and Interoperability - IANA Intellectual Property Right (Trademark and Domain Name)**

Cooper noted that a lot of the assessments pointed to this issue and gave an overview of the current status. She stated that two of the proposals are silent on this issue and that the numbers proposal states that the IANA functions operator should not hold the trademark and domain name and suggest moving it to an

entity that is not the IANA functions operator, such as the IETF Trust. Cooper stated that the IETF Trust have said they are willing to accept that responsibility and the IETF community is okay with the outcome. Cooper reported that CWG-IANA is currently consulting with their independent legal counsel to determine how many hours legal counsel will need to investigate different potential models for the IANA IPR and there is no answer as of yet.

- Arkko stated that he was happy with the text put forward in the combined report about this topic and that he sent an updated [v4](#) to the internal-cg mailing list. He reiterated that the numbers proposal is the only one that formally specifies requirements and as long as the two other communities could accommodate that specification as part of their implementation, then the proposals are compatible.
 - Cooper confirmed that there is text in the ICG report that provides a summary of the current situation, that the ICG can move forward with public comment, and that there will be more information about this issue when the public comment period is done.
- Alhadeff stated that the main question for him is not whether the IETF trust holds the ownership but whether the other communities find the same solution to be acceptable. He suggested that the ICG could put forward the fact that there is a suggestion for a specific solution, and ask for clarification from the communities to move it forward as a consensus piece as opposed to saying that this is the default because one community has already made a specific request.
 - Cooper replied that it is what the ICG is waiting to find out from CWG-IANA – whether their position is consistent with what the numbers community has put forward, if not, then there is an issue that the communities have to work out.
- Regarding Alhadeff's follow up query on the email [sent by Wilson](#) to the internal-cg mailing list, Cooper clarified that the meeting happened before CWG-IANA asked their lawyers to give an estimate of billable hours needed. Regarding Ismail's query about a fall back scenario if the estimate exceeds the budget, Cooper responded that she does not know because that was not discussed on the CWG-IANA call last week.
- Arkko commented that the communities need to make a decision on what their requirements are rather than be directed by the lawyers. He added that the RIRs proposed a framework, but as there are multiple parties involved, implementation details still need to be worked out.
- Arasteh stated that the issue regarding CWG-IANA independent counsel billable hours does not have to be discussed on the call, that the ICG could find more information about this issue at a later point, and proposed to move to the next item on the agenda.

- **Compatibility and Interoperability – Post Transition IANA (PTI)**

Cooper highlighted the PTI issue in regards to Mueller's and Clarks' points on the transfer of IANA's personnel and resources for all three functions into PTI. She asked if there is a need for any clarification or whether there are questions the ICG wants to send to the community on this topic.

- Arasteh said that the issue was partly answered in CWG-IANA's output that all staff will be moved to PTI and the question for the ICG to investigate is whether IETF and RIRs want to have a separate contract with either ICANN or PTI with respect to their related activities.
- Barrett stated that the numbers proposal is quite clear that they intend to contract with ICANN, rather than PTI. He added that if ICANN wants to subcontract to PTI, the numbers community has no problem with that.
 - Cooper asked Barrett if the ICG should highlight this in the combined proposal because the specific question about subcontracting to PTI is not addressed in the content of the numbers proposal as it was written before the notion of PTI was developed.
 - Barrett responded that the ICG should craft some text explaining how the ICG intend to assemble the combined proposal in a compatible way. He further stated that it will be useful if ICG asks IANAPLAN and CRISP Team if they intend to contract with PTI.
- Mundy stated that he does not see it as a point of confusion or incompatibility. He noted that if numbers and protocol parameters are in fact still contracted with ICANN (the parent corporation), then ICANN just has to write the contract with PTI (subsidiary of ICANN).

- Housley stated his view that this is an implementation detail, and that one contract with three subparts, or three separate contracts will not affect the results in terms of getting the job done.
 - Cooper asked whether Housley thinks the proposal as it stands is clear about the course of action or if the ICG should craft text or get clarification from the communities.
 - Housley responded that the expectation is clear enough.
- Arasteh stated that based on CWG-IANA's request, CCWG-Accountability is discussing the veto of PTI's budget which may have implication on IANA staff. He suggested that the ICG direct a question to the IETF and RIR communities on whether they will contract with ICANN or PTI.
 - Cooper responded that the two communities have been very clear that they want to continue contracting with ICANN, so there may not be any questions the ICG needs to ask on this point.

Cooper asked whether the ICG needs to include text about the PTI issue in the ICG report or whether this is already clear from the proposal. She viewed that the ICG needs to write some text highlighting this issue in the ICG report, but she noted that ICG members have different view on this.

- Arasteh suggested that the ICG clearly and formally document it in the ICG report to NTIA that the question has been raised and the IETF and RIRs want to continue contracting with ICANN. He added that CWG-IANA's proposal states if for any reason the PTI does not work, the contract with PTI will be dissolved and the IANA functions services will go to an external entity. For reasons of stability, Arasteh suggested that it is preferable for IETF and RIR to continue contracting with ICANN, and that the ICG needs to document it as such.
- El Bashir and Lee said that the ICG needs to confirm with the operational communities.
- Uduma reiterated what she posted in Adobe Connect chat, that 'since the proposal from CRISP is very clear on contracting with ICANN, it is up to ICANN to incorporate the IANA services for IETF and Numbering in the contract with PTI.'

- **Compatibility and Interoperability - Other Issues**

Alhadeff stated that the ICG needs to agree on the language used to describe the concept of completeness.

- Cooper agreed with Alhadeff. She suggested that the ICG can present its assessment and acknowledge the fact that the ICG will re-evaluate expected dependencies after the accountability pieces have been completed by CCWG-Accountability.
- Alhadeff highlighted this issue because when the ICG indicates that a proposal is incomplete, it may give the impression that the proposal did not fill in one of the elements. He stated that CWG-IANA filled in all the elements but cannot 'finalize' because they have an external dependency. Alhadeff urged the ICG to be careful because there is nuance in the language which needs to be addressed.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Mundy, Ismail, St. Amour, Arkko and Uduma agreed with Alhadeff.

Cooper concluded the discussion on Compatibility and Interoperability by suggesting [Decisions Taken 1](#).

- **Accountability – CWG-IANA's proposal dependencies with CCWG-Accountability's work**

Cooper noted that this issue received the most attention in the combined proposal assessments. She re-confirmed the agreed process to highlight the ICG's parallel public consultation process with CCWG-Accountability; CWG-IANA's dependencies to work stream 1; point people to the CCWG-Accountability public consultation where applicable, and seek confirmation from CWG-IANA once the CCWG-Accountability proposal has been sent to the chartering organizations for approval.

- Arasteh provided an update that CCWG-Accountability is almost done with reviewing the community empowerment mechanisms (single membership/multiple membership or designator/quasi-designator/volunteer designator); and noted that they are also discussing the Independent Panel Review Process and community council. He noted that these issues will be discussed at the CCWG Paris meeting (17-18 July) and stated that the options will become clearer by 28 July as there will be a final report issued in early August. He offered to raise any questions the ICG may have at the CCWG-Accountability Paris meeting and bring it back to the next ICG call.
- Mundy thanked [Alhadeff for providing documents and legal analysis](#) on dependencies between CWG-IANA and CCWG-Accountability's work. Mundy stated that he is satisfied that the [list of seven](#)

[dependencies](#) summarizes the dependencies referenced throughout CWG-IANA's proposal. He asked if any ICG members had concerns regarding this issue.

- Alhadeff agreed with Mundy that there are no major concerns. He stated that some of the dependencies identified by the CWG-IANA proposal may not be related to the structural elements of the transition, but affect operations that occur over time. Alhadeff concluded that these outlier views are beyond the ICG's remit in regards to the IANA transition.
- Given that the ICG will go to public comment before finalization of the CCWG pieces, Alhadeff asked whether the ICG will make a statement asking the public to assume that if all elements in the proposal are accepted, then the ICG believes that the proposal is compatible.
 - Cooper responded that the ICG report can include language to that affect, and if the elements are not met, then the ICG will re-evaluate.
 - Arasteh agreed that theoretically the ICG can indicate that there are no transition problems provided that all CWG-IANA requirements are met and properly addressed by CCWG-Accountability.

- **Accountability – Root Zone Maintainer**

Cooper highlighted that there are details to be worked out on the arrangement of the root zone maintainer especially between PTI and ICANN. She noted that St Amour raised this issue on her combined proposal assessment. Cooper further noted that the [next agenda item](#) will discuss Mundy's suggested text regarding this issue.

- Arasteh stated there are questions raised but remain unanswered in the CWG-IANA discussion on the root zone maintainer. He stated that answers are needed as this impacts the ICG's decision.

- **Accountability - Other Issues**

Uduma expressed concern that if the ICG puts the transition proposal out for public comment during the finalization process of the CCWG-Accountability work, and the ICG talks about dependencies between the two processes, new stakeholders will be confused. She suggested that the ICG should rethink its timeline.

- Cooper explained that the ICG and CCWG-Accountability's processes are parallel and envisaged to end at the same time. She stated that if the ICG does not go for public comment until after the finalization of CCWG-Accountability's proposal, then it will cause a 3-4 month delay and will shift both the ICG's and NTIA's timelines. She suggested that the ICG could put a lot of resources to clearly explain the ICG combined proposal to ensure that newcomers to the process understand what they are being asked to comment on.
- Alhadeff agreed with Cooper that the ICG cannot afford to wait. He stated there is language addressing Uduma's concern in the executive summary draft that he will circulate to the internal-cg mailing list after this call.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* ICG members agreed to keep the ICG timeline and move forward.

Cooper concluded that ICG will move forward with its timeline, and noted Uduma's concern to ensure that newcomers can clearly understand the parallel ICG and CCWG-Accountability processes and what they are being asked to comment on. She further concluded that language will need to be added to the ICG report on the Accountability topic. (See [Action Item 4](#)).

- **Workability – ccTLDs and NTIA criteria**

Cooper summarized the general assessment was that the proposal components are workable. Cooper invited discussion on the point raised by Clark about ccTLDs namely whether the text in CWG-IANA's proposal about ccTLDs raises an incompatibility issue with the NTIA criteria.

- St. Amour did not view it as an issue of incompatibility. She explained that Clark's issue relates to governments' roles and responsibilities in Internet governance matters, but the primary notion is sovereignty. She offered to cite specific language and share it on the internal-cg mailing list. (See [Action Item 1](#)).

- Mundy thought it is not an incompatibility issue because the interaction between ccs and ICANN is raised in the CWG-IANA proposal. He further noted that the Framework of Interpretation recommendations is currently awaiting action by the ICANN Board.
- Alhadeff also did not view it as incompatibility because there is a difference between governments participating as a stakeholder and governments having an exclusive role.

Cooper concluded that there is a general agreement that it is not an issue against the NTIA criteria.

• **Workability – Other Issues**

Alhadeff reiterated the issue he raised during [ICG face-to-face meeting 4](#) regarding the numbers proposal and the ability of RIRs to switch operators. He explained that the way it is drafted allows each RIR to retain the ability to switch operators independently which then may lead to multiple operators. He asked whether the ICG needs to consider this from a workability perspective – would multiple operators increase complexity and lead to a potential fragmentation?

- Barrett stated that it is not intended for different RIRs to select different IANA numbering operators.
 - Alhadeff responded that he could take the discussion to the internal-cg mailing list to point out which part of the Numbers proposal may be problematic. He noted that the draft framework of the SLA is out and stated he will look at that as well.
- Arasteh pointed out that there could have been a workability issue in the CWG-IANA proposal. He summarized that the CWG-IANA proposal states that the PTI's activities will be monitored by Customer Standing Committee (CSC), and if there is difficulty, then it could be escalated to the IANA Function Review (IFR). For the ccTLDs, Arasteh stated that the CWG-IANA proposal clearly mentions that the IPR will not be dealing with ccTLD issues and it is up to the ccTLD community to resolve those issues.
 - Cooper asked and Arasteh confirmed that it is documented so the ICG does not need to raise it as workability issue.
- Alhadeff said the names proposal is the only community proposal looking to create new mechanisms, and due to the dependencies with CCWG-Accountability's work has not been finalized ([see discussion on dependencies](#)). He suggested that the ICG needs to state that any changes to the names proposal should be thoroughly tested for workability to assist the ICG review.
- Uduma asked if there is a workability issue regarding multiple reviews mechanisms each community has proposed for the post transition IANA (PTI).
 - Cooper stated that IANA is already subject to multiple performance reviews from different communities, and the question is whether adding more reviews create a workability issue.
 - Subrenat agreed that Uduma's point is important. He added another consideration to that concern in relation to ICANN's increasing multiple review mechanisms of itself, and noted this may lead to concerns of resource allocation.
- Arasteh stated that the ICG needs to mention that due to the many proposed new entities and the interrelation of these entities with community empowerment mechanisms, there may be workability issues particularly at the beginning of the transition. He stated that it is impossible at this stage to say that there will be no workability issues.
- Mundy agreed with Uduma and Subrenat, and added that it could be a workability issue in terms of the workload of current staff in relation to their resources.

Cooper proposed that the ICG to draft text from the workability discussion on Call 20 and combined proposal assessment and include it into the ICG report. She suggested that the text could state that the ICG sees the proposals altogether as seemingly workable but also highlight some challenging parts that may arise during implementation. There was no objection from the ICG members to the proposed way forward.

Cooper concluded that the ICG has resolved and concluded its combined proposal assessment. See [Decisions Taken 2](#).

2. [ICG report in the combined proposal](#)

Cooper briefly explained the five sections of the combined proposal: the executive summary, the ICG report, and the three community proposals, and gave an overview of the subsections in the ICG report.

Cooper invited further discussion on the direction of the ICG report and whether additional sections or substantive topics should be added.

- Barrett suggested adding clarification for points where an incompatibility might be perceived, and gave the interaction of the numbers and the protocol parameters' with the PTI as an example.
 - Cooper agreed that the PTI discussion should be added to the section on compatibility.
- Uduma raised a point regarding the last sentence of paragraph 17 that states "The IANAPLAN working group and the ICG both considered process concerns that the ICG received and concluded that the IANAPLAN process was open and inclusive and that it achieved consensus as defined by the protocol parameters community." Uduma noted that the ICG did not draw this conclusion in the other two proposals and asked whether there is any reason why this is.
 - Cooper responded that it may have been removed during editing. She suggested removing that section, because all of the text in the ICG report reflects the ICG's conclusion. Uduma agreed.
 - Mundy asked whether or not the ICG believes a statement about the framework of interpretation working group report is necessary or appropriate to show a broader incorporation of views because the ccTLD interactions with the ICANN PTI structure is not clear. (See [Action Item 2](#)).
- Cooper asked ICG members to send in any edits to the existing ICG report in the combined proposal to the internal-cg mailing list by Sunday, 19 July 23:59 UTC. (See [Action Item 3](#)).
- Ismail asked what the ICG intends to put in section VI labeled 'Next steps and implementation'.
 - Cooper said if ICG members could give further elaboration on that section then they will keep it, otherwise she suggested that the ICG delete it. Cooper asked if Ismail could draft and fill in the placeholders on accountability and workability assessment, and list of implementation steps. Ismail agreed. (See [Action Item 4](#)).
- Cooper asked whether the ICG needs to keep the executive summary since the ICG report already contains short summaries of the proposals and process.
 - Arasteh noted that the ICG has previously agreed to include an executive summary.
 - Subrenat stated that the executive summary will be useful and said that in a long report with many technical parts, an executive summary would contain a digest of proposals, findings and recommendations. For the ICG's work, Subrenat noted that recommendations would not be included, but the rest should be condensed into half-a-page to one page.
 - Alhadeff offered to start re-drafting the executive summary after Ismail finishes filling the placeholders in the ICG report, to ensure that all sections are captured in a neutral manner. (See [Action Item 5](#) and [Action Item 6](#)).
 - Cooper suggested that Alhadeff also refer to the [draft public comment web site text](#) when drafting the executive summary.

3. Public comment period duration

Cooper reiterated that the ICG plans to hold a public comment period of 40 days from 31 July – 8 September. She asked if there were any final objections from ICG members with going forward with the plan. There were no objections. (See [Decisions Taken 3](#)).

4. Public comment web site material - see [link](#)

Arasteh noted that a difficulty CWG-IANA and CCWG-Accountability encountered during their respective public comment periods was the lack of clarity in the questions asked – the community found the questions vague and thus difficult to answer. Arasteh asked whether the ICG has checked if its public comment questions were sufficiently clear.

- Cooper replied that the ICG needs to discuss this agenda item on the internal-cg mailing list, as there was not enough time on the call. (See [Decisions Taken 4](#)).

5. Review of upcoming ICG commitments and schedule

- Cooper stated that:

- The ICG report text (including the new parts from Ismail and Alhadeff); public comment web site materials; and webinar materials needs to be further reviewed on the internal-cg mailing list and finalized on the 29 July call in time for the public comment period.
 - St. Amour has agreed to shepherd the finalization of public comment web materials on internal-cg mailing list next week. (See [Action Item 7](#)).
 - The webinar material will be circulated on the internal-cg mailing list for ICG review. (See [Decisions Taken 5](#)).
- Karrenberg asked the secretariat to maintain a list of most recent documents and supporting materials in one place. (See [Action Item 8](#)).

6. Minutes approval: F2F #5 days 1, 2, and wrap-up session

Cooper stated that the minutes approval will be taken to the internal-cg mailing list. See [Decisions Taken 6](#).

Summary of Action Items:

1. St. Amour to send a clarifying response on the internal-cg mailing list to Clark's assessment point regarding to the possible incompatibility of the handling of ccTLDs (RFC 1591 vs. WSIS plan of action Dec 2003) against NTIA criteria.
2. Mundy to formulate and send to the internal-cg mailing list questions regarding interactions with ICANN-PTI structure by next week.
3. ICG members to send any edits to existing text of ICG report to the internal-cg mailing list by no later than Sunday, July 19, 23:59 UTC.
4. Ismail to synthesize and consolidate all of the combined proposal assessments (compatibility, accountability and workability), list of implementation steps as well as other missing text into the ICG report and sent to the internal-cg mailing list for further discussion by Friday, July 17.
5. Alhadeff to redraft Executive Summary after Ismail has finished Action Item#4, and include digest as suggested by Subrenat.
6. Alhadeff to circulate to the internal-cg mailing list current drafted text of Executive Summary to see if material can be used for a public comment period cover note or supporting material by Friday, July 17.
7. St. Amour to shepherd the finalization of public comment web materials on internal-cg mailing list next week.
8. Secretariat to consolidate latest version of all items relating to the public comment launch for ICG review in a Dropbox folder.

Summary of Decisions Taken:

1. ICG to look at ICG Report to see if it clearly describes the IETF and RIR communities wanting to contract with ICANN, or if text needs to be added. ICG to discuss on internal-cg mailing list to confirm whether any questions for clarification needs to go to the IETF and RIR regarding this issue.
2. ICG has concluded its combined proposal assessment during Call 20.
3. ICG to proceed as planned to put the proposal to transition the stewardship of the IANA functions out for public comment approximately from July 31 to September 8.
4. ICG to further discuss on the internal-cg mailing list regarding the clarity of questions and other supporting material for the upcoming public comment period.
5. ICG to review webinar materials that will be circulated next week on the internal-cg mailing list.
6. Call for approval for the minutes of the F2F Meeting #5 days 1, 2, and wrap-up session to be taken to the internal-cg mailing list between now and ICG Call 21.