

# Twelfth IANA Stewardship Coordination Group (ICG) Teleconference

04:00 – 05:30 UTC, Wednesday, 25 February 2015

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

## Participants:

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)

Alissa Cooper (IETF)

Alan Barrett (NRO)

Demi Getschko (ISOC)

Keith Davidson (ccNSO)

Milton Mueller (GNSO)

Daniel Karrenberg (RSSAC)

Jean-Jacques Subrenat (ALAC)

Jari Arkko (IETF)

Joseph Alhadeff (ICC/BASIS)

Lars-Johan Liman (RSSAC)

Lynn St Amour (IAB)

Mary Uduma (ccNSO)

Michael Niebel (GAC)

Mohamed El Bashir (ALAC)

Narelle Clark (ISOC)

Paul Wilson (NRO)

Patrik Fältström (SSAC)

Russ Mundy (SSAC)

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben (GNSO)

James Bladel (GNSO)

Xiaodong Lee (ccNSO)

## Apologies:

Jandyr Ferreira dos Santos (GAC)

Jon Nevett (gTLD Registries)

Elise Gerich (IANA Staff Expert)

Manal Ismail (GAC)

Hartmut Glaser (ASO)

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries)

Kuo-wei Wu (Board Liaison)

Martin Boyle (ccNSO)

Russ Housley (IAB)

Thomas Schneider (GAC)

## Secretariat:

Jennifer Chung

Sherly Haristya

## ICANN Support Staff:

Josh Baulch

Alice Jansen

## Agenda:

### 1. Minutes approval for F2F meeting Feb 6-7

As requested by some of the ICG members in order to have more time to review the minutes, Cooper agreed to table this agenda item for the next call.

### 2. Review status of [action items](#) from previous meeting

1. Cooper noted that this action item has been completed. (See: [here](#))
2. Arkko stated that he will send his response to the internal-cg mailing list during or shortly after this call. (See: [here](#))

3. Cooper mentioned that the Secretariat has circulated the [summary of questions resolved](#) on the internal-cg list and there was some discussion on list. She noted that it was a comprehensive summary that the ICG can refer back to if needed.
4. Wilson stated that he has forwarded the questions to the CRISP team and they are currently [dealing](#) with them. He asked Arasteh if the [questions sent](#) accurately reflected what was asked during the meeting.
  - Arasteh noted a contradiction in [II.B.2 of the numbers proposal] of not “need[ing] anything on accountability”, but on the other hand having the element of NTIA oversight removed. He mentioned that he would like to see it corrected in the final reply.
  - Wilson stated that he hoped the CRISP team will clarify matters.
5. Cooper noted that this action item was completed during ICANN 52 and is scheduled for discussion as agenda item 3 in the current call.
6. Cooper stated that this has been further discussed on the internal-cg mailing list and is still in progress.
  - Arasteh noted that Ismail has sent [revised text](#) (further revisions: [here](#)) to the internal-cg mailing list. He stated that he preferred the onus of requesting a response from the communities to lie with the ICG, and not leave it up to the communities to decide whether to respond or not.
    - Alhadeff noted a confusion in the text.
    - Cooper stated that the substantive discussion on this topic should be done on the internal-cg mailing list or tabled for discussion during the next call.
7. Cooper urged the ICG members to fill out the doodle poll if they have not done so to determine the times for the following ICG calls.
  - Arasteh requested a larger time gap in scheduling between the CWG-IANA, CCWG-Accountability, and ICG teleconferences.
    - Fältström noted Arasteh’s request for more separation between the calls and stated that the main goal is to prevent any conflicting time slots.
8. Cooper stated that this action item is scheduled for discussion as agenda item 6 in the current call.
9. Cooper noted that this action item was completed during ICANN 52.

### 3. ICG timeline discussion

Cooper reintroduced the timeline graphic [version 9](#) previously discussed at the face-to-face meeting at ICANN 52. She summarized the general agreement from the face-to-face meeting that the ICG should proceed along as many steps of the original timeline while it waits for the names proposal.

Cooper mentioned that there was [no general consensus](#) on the internal-cg mailing list regarding whether or not the ICG should combine the received protocol parameters and numbers proposals into a single document and put it out for public comment.

Cooper reiterated Fältström’s framing of the discussion that the ICG has two sets of decisions to make, namely: what the ICG can do before it receives the names proposal, and what the ICG will do afterwards. Cooper invited further discussion based on these two questions:

## Discussion:

- *Adobe Connect chat:* Arkko stated that the ICG should do as much as it can as soon as it can, and be prepared to run more comment periods later.
  - *Adobe Connect chat:* Clark, Uduma, and St. Amour agreed with Arkko.
- Arasteh noted that the current timeline graphic ([version 9, optimized timeline tab 4](#)) shows two public comment periods for the protocol parameters and numbers proposals, while the combined final proposal (with the input of the names proposal) will only have one. He suggested two ways of resolving this issue:
  1. Provide a longer public comment period for the final combined proposal, or
  2. Treat all proposals equally by having two public comment periods for all.

Arasteh requested for clarification as to why the names proposal (containing potentially more complex issues) only gets one public comment period. He also emphasized that the two week public comment periods as scheduled are too short.

- Cooper explained that optimized timeline was created with 15 September 2015 as a target, and to fit in all the steps ICG can take given the projected timeline for CWG-IANA. She noted that the same rationale was applied to keeping the public comment periods to two weeks. She agreed that these neither conditions are ideal. She stated that it was fine with her if the ICG decides that there be no public comment period before all the three proposals are received.
- Bladel and Mueller agreed with Arasteh that the two week public comment periods are too short.
- *Adobe Connect chat:* Davidson stated that he would rather see some slippage of the timeline and include a good public comment period during ICANN Dublin, given that the NTIA cannot begin their process until after September 2015 and given that CWG-IANA and CCWG-Accountability are under pressure to meet these deadlines.
- Bladel asked what the ICG will put out on the initial public comment period upon receiving names proposal – just the received proposals, or the initial draft of the ICG analysis of the received proposals. He noted that the CWG-IANA will have public comment periods for the names proposal before it is submitted to the ICG, and suggested that this might save one ICG public comment period if no further ICG analysis is being made.
  - Cooper explained that the ICG will undergo its [established assessment process](#) after receiving the names proposal. She stated that the subsequent ICG draft proposal to be produced after the satisfaction of the assessment steps will be put out for public comment. Cooper suggested that the ICG need not answer questions of how long and how many public comments are needed during the call, but rather focus on whether the ICG has agreement to carry forward as much work as it can on the received proposals, and determine the ICG timeline post-receipt of the names proposal.
    - Bladel suggested that the ICG could ask questions during the final public comment period of the draft names proposal before it is submitted to the ICG.
- *Adobe Connect chat:* Arasteh noted that this optimized timeline is ‘impossible to implement’.
  - *Adobe Connect chat:* Davidson agreed with Arasteh and added that while the ICG needs to keep forward momentum, it also needs to be realistic in its expectations.

- Mueller opposed the idea of having a separate public comment period for the numbers and protocol parameters proposals because he stated that the ICG needs to submit a single final proposal to the NTIA and that is the proposal that should be put before the public, not a partial proposal. He further stated that the two received proposals have already gone through comprehensive vetting by the ICG and the respective communities, and questioned what the ICG could accomplish by placing two well-known proposals up for public comment.
  - Arasteh agreed with Mueller regarding having one combined proposal (input from all three communities) for public comment.
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: El Bashir and Mundy agreed with Mueller. Mundy also stated that ICG does not need to formally ask via a public comment period.
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: Arkko disagreed with Mueller, noting that the ICG found an issue regarding the two received proposals. He stated that it would be appropriate for the ICG to hold a public comment period for these two proposals even if there may not be many substantial changes.
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: Clark noted that the ICG will run another public comment period, and that having one with the two proposals may reduce work if issues are identified and may also help the names community. She further stated that any two-thirds proposal must be clearly marked with supporting text.
- Alhadeff agreed with Mueller that putting forth two-thirds of a proposal may create misperceptions. He suggested that the ICG members engage in informal consultations with their respective stakeholder groups to help bridge the gap and keep their respective communities apprised of the situation.
  - Mueller, Arkko, Arasteh and Cooper agreed with Alhadeff. *Adobe Connect chat*: Mundy and El Bashir also agreed with Alhadeff.
  - Arasteh proposed to label Alhadeff's suggestion as the 'incremental and provisional commentary process'.
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: Mueller noted a procedural issue regarding whether the ICG sets a deadline for the receipt of these comments.
- Karrenberg reiterated his position that the ICG should do as much work as it can with the two proposals received. He cautioned that if the ICG decides not to combine the protocol parameters and numbers proposal for a public comment period, that the ICG may miss an opportunity to address possible substantive public comments when there was ample time.
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: Arkko and Clark expressed similar ideas.
- Arkko agreed with Alhadeff's suggestion to have informal communications. In addition, he stated that progressing ICG's overall work involves multiple steps. He suggested that the ICG can evaluate compatibility of parts even though not all the components are complete. Arkko clarified that the most important thing was to have a broad interactive communication process, instead of labelling it as formal or informal.
- Mueller agreed with Alhadeff's proposal as a compromise. Mueller suggested that the ICG not force itself to fulfil the 30 September 2015 deadline. He further suggested that the ICG should plan on the possibility for an extended timeline which means the NTIA may need to extend the contract for at least 6 months.

Cooper noted that there was agreement that resonated with [Ismail's suggestion](#) on the internal-cg mailing list. She summarized the way forward as follows:

- Progress the two received proposals as far as possible.
- ICG members to engage respective stakeholder groups and communities in informal communication and feedback regarding the two received proposals.
- Monitor CWG-IANA'S progress closely and flag any issues.
- Refine reminder of the timeline once ICG has more information on when the names proposal will be submitted.
- Publish an explanatory update with the last published timeline document to reflect the current discussion and progress.

**Action Item 1: Cooper and ICG chairs to coordinate with Ismail to draft explanatory text to be published with the [published timeline document](#) as an update and send to the internal-cg mailing list for ICG's review.**

#### 4. Discussion of responses to question posed to IETF and RIRs

Cooper summarized that the protocol parameters and numbers communities did not perceive any incompatibility between the two proposals and they offered additional details on what they would be willing to do in respect to the IETF trust and IANA intellectual property matters.

##### Discussion:

- Arasteh asked whether the ICG should provide information about this specific clarification process between the ICG and communities in the final proposal to be put out for public comment.
- Karrenberg asked whether the ICG would encourage the protocol parameters and numbers communities to submit amended responses to the ICG to clarify this issue.
  - Arkko responded that the IANA-PLAN working group did not want to change their proposal. He thought that providing additional explanation through an ICG document or FAQs will be possible, but not a proposal update at this point.
    - Arasteh agreed with Arkko. He suggested that the ICG should handle the responses according its charter, and cautioned the ICG against asking for amended proposals, noting that it would be difficult and time-consuming to process.
  - Wilson stated that he was not sure that the CRISP team intended to amend the proposal in order to reflect their answer to the ICG's question. However, he noted the need to consolidate the latest information about the proposals in one place. He stated that he will ask the CRISP Team to give this matter further thought.
  - Barrett responded in his capacity as a CRISP team member and stated that updating the numbers proposal would be difficult, as it involves lengthy community discussions, and in his opinion not needed for this matter. He stated that the CRISP team can provide additional answers in a document. As an ICG member, Barrett noted that coordination resolving different issues between the proposals is an ICG task, and stated that the ICG should include in its combined proposal a description of how this issue was resolved.
    - *Adobe Connect chat:* Mueller, Arkko, St. Amour, Subrenat, Getschko, and Uduma agreed with Barrett.

- Mundy commented on the response by the numbers community and noted (with a caveat that he has not closely reviewed the numbers proposal again) that it lacks detail on implementation. He stated he would like to hear the ICG's view on the implementation aspects.

Cooper concluded that there was support for the ICG to consolidate the information accrued during the assessment process in an ICG report to be published together with the combined proposal as a centralized public information resource.

**Action Item 2: ICG to discuss and call for volunteer/pen holder on the internal-cg mailing list to consolidate information collected during the assessment process of the operational communities' proposals in an ICG report that can be published together with the final proposal.**

## 5. Begin Step 2 assessment of IETF and RIR proposals in combination

Cooper mentioned that the ICG is currently in the step 2 of assessment process that deals with the compatibility of the received proposals, overall accountability mechanisms, and workability. She mentioned the [discussion](#) on the internal-cg mailing list, and noted in particular [points raised by Knob](#)  
[regarding implementation](#).

### Discussion:

- Arasteh mentioned that the current accountability system of the IETF is described in a complex manner and thus difficult to follow. He requested for the IETF to provide a diagram indicating its current accountability flow. He also asked whether it is possible to seek information from the NTIA on whether or not they have oversight regarding the IETF.
  - Arkko pointed to a [blog post](#) that describes the IETF accountability mechanisms. He agreed that it was a good suggestion to provide a diagram. To Arasteh's second question, Arkko replied that the reality today is that the NTIA has not done anything in terms of controlling the protocol parameters assignments - the community that runs that.

**Action Item 3: Arkko to provide further information (diagram) to the internal-cg mailing list regarding the IETF's current overall internal accountability including oversight system related to IANA interaction.**

- Cooper asked for the ICG members' impression of the current assessment status: whether the ICG has completed the step 2 assessment for the protocol parameters and numbers proposals, or if further work needs to be done (in small groups as was done for step 1).
  - Mueller stated he thought that the ICG has successfully gone through step 2 of the protocol parameters and numbers proposal. He noted that the ICG still needs to do the 'incremental provisional consultation process' as discussed earlier in the call.
    - *Adobe Connect chat:* St. Amour, Fältström, Karrenberg, and Alhadeff agreed with Mueller.

**Action Item 4: Cooper to confirm with ICG members on the internal-cg mailing list that the ICG has completed [Step 2 of the finalization process](#) for the protocol parameters and numbers proposals.**

- In regards to the implementation issue brought up by Strickling during ICANN 52, Knoblen stated that he started the [discussion](#) on the internal-cg mailing list, and wanted the ICG, during the current step 2 assessment process, to consider this issue. He noted that [Arkko had previously said](#) that the implementation details might not be the ICG's task. However, Knoblen suggested that the ICG should come up with a guideline to frame the communities' discussion on implementation.
- In reply to Arasteh, Cooper explained that the implementation being discussed is in regards to effectuating the three communities' proposals, such as how much detail about the new mechanisms needs to be in the proposal that goes to the ICG and in turn the NTIA.
- Mueller stated that the ICG cannot make implementation a new criterion to add to the NTIA's criteria. He also stated that the implementation issue is to be decided by the operational communities, and that the ICG is not in the position to specify the level of implementation detail except in terms of 'workability'.
- Karrenberg stated that the ICG needs to be prepared for questions from the CWG-IANA on the level of detail that the ICG might require. Whether the ICG answers generally, whether the ICG defers to NTIA, Karrenberg stated that the ICG has to create a combined proposal and the ultimate goal is to have it acceptable to the NTIA.
- Alhadef considered himself in between Karrenberg and Mueller's views, and stated that the question needs to be asked for the completeness of the proposal the ICG is sending to the NTIA. He stated that it is up to the communities to determine the substance, not the ICG, and it is up to the NTIA to determine whether the implementation is sufficient.
- Knoblen stated that as the ICG is going through step 2, the ICG has to set equal framework for all proposals. He noted that the new entities contemplated by the communities in their proposals lead to implementation questions. Knoblen stated that the ICG should be prepared for these questions from the NTIA.

Cooper agreed that all of the posed questions were good and needed to be continued on the internal-cg mailing list and on the next call.

## 6. ICG Face-to-Face meeting in Buenos Aires

Fältström stated that the current status has not changed from what he [posted](#). He stated that he is waiting for local host to confirm availability for Thursday and Friday (18-19 June). He acknowledged strong comments on the internal-cg mailing list that the ICG meeting cannot go past lunch on Saturday (20 June). He reiterated that the current goal is for the ICG to end their meeting on Friday evening (19 June).

## 7. A.O.B.

- Cooper announced that 25 Feb 2015 is her last working day before her maternity leave. She will be away from ICG duties until April. Fältström and El Bashir will be handling the co-chairing duties during this time.
- Wilson announced that the upcoming APNIC meeting in that will have an [IANA transition session focusing on numbers](#) on Monday 2 March, and invited everyone interested to attend.

## Summary of action items:

1. Cooper and ICG chairs to coordinate with Ismail to draft explanatory text to be published with the [published timeline document](#) as an update and send to the internal-cg mailing list for ICG's review.
2. ICG to discuss and call for volunteer/pen holder on the internal-cg mailing list to consolidate information collected during the assessment process of the operational communities' proposals in an ICG report that can be published together with the final proposal.
3. 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.
4. Cooper to confirm with ICG members on the internal-cg mailing list that the ICG has completed [Step 2 of the finalization process](#) for the protocol parameters and numbers proposals.