

Twenty-fourth IANA Stewardship Coordination Group (ICG) Teleconference

19:00-20:30 UTC, Thursday, 8 October 2015

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

Participants:

Alan Barrett (NRO)
Alissa Cooper (IETF)
Demi Getschko (ISOC)
James Bladel (GNSO)
Jandyr Ferreira dos Santos (GAC)
Jari Arkko (IETF)
Jean-Jacques Subrenat (ALAC)
Jon Nevett (gTLD Registries)
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)
Keith Davidson (ccNSO)
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries)

Lynn St Amour (IAB)
Manal Ismail (GAC)
Martin Boyle (ccNSO)
Michael Niebel (GAC)
Milton Mueller (GNSO)
Narelle Clark (ISOC)
Patrik Fältström (SSAC)
Paul Wilson (NRO)
Russ Housley (IAB)
Russ Mundy (SSAC)
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben (GNSO)

Liaison:

Elise Gerich (IANA Staff Liaison)

Apologies:

Daniel Karrenberg (RSSAC)
Hartmut Glaser (ASO)
Joseph Alhadeff (ICC/BASIS)
Lars-Johan Liman (RSSAC)

Mary Uduma (ccNSO)
Mohamed El Bashir (ALAC)
Kuo-Wei Wu (ICANN Board Liaison)
Thomas Schneider (GAC)
Xiaodong Lee (ccNSO)

Secretariat:

Jennifer Chung
Sherly Haristya
Yannis Li

ICANN Support Staff:

Eric Evrard

Agenda

1. Minutes approval - F2F #6 and Call #22

- Subrenat confirmed that [Action Item 4 from F2F: Day 2](#) was completed with the Secretariat.
- Cooper asked and received no objections from the ICG members, thus Cooper declared the F2F: [Days 1](#) and [2](#), and [call #22](#) minutes approved.

2. Discussion of question responses from OCs

Protocol parameters community

Arkko stated that the [response from the protocol parameters community](#) is that they are coordinating beyond the [specific question posed by the ICG](#), and will continue to do so. He added that the IETF and IAB have made prior statements that they believe in coordinating in an informal way, rather setting up new formal structures.

- Cooper stated that the ICG received a similar [response from the IAB](#) just before the call, and noted that it emphasized the IAB's role as the body that deals the external relations for IETF.
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Housley agreed with Cooper's assessment of the IAB comment.
- Cooper viewed both responses as complete answers to the question and suggested that the ICG reflect the responses in part 0. See [Action Item 2](#).

Numbers community

- Cooper stated that the ICG sent [two questions to numbers community](#), the first about commitment to coordination and the second about the registries associated with the numbers community.
- Wilson summarized the [CRISP Team's response](#) that stated they are willing to commit to coordinate with the other communities as stated in the section III. A. of the numbers proposal. For the second question, they stated that the registries associated with the numbers community should be managed and reviewed according to their proposal, and do not expect to be participating in the CSC or IFR.
- Subrenat pointed out that the [CRISP Team's response](#) states "in-addr.arpa" and "ip6.arpa" are to be excluded from CSC and IFR processes. He asked whether this exclusion means that there will be a different set of rules and whether there is a legally binding arrangement for them.
 - Wilson explained that "in-addr.arpa" and "ip6.arpa" do not occur in the root zone, but under .ARPA. He further stated that the provision of those services requires interaction with the IAB as the authority of the .ARPA registry and the not the CSC and IFR, which according to his understanding, operates at the root level.
 - Barrett added that the .ARPA domain is under the authority of the IAB, and it does not have the same management or oversight policy mechanisms as the other domains that ICANN usually deals with. From the perspective of numbers community, he said that the whole .ARPA and especially "in-addr.arpa" and "ip6.arpa" should be excluded from the oversight mechanism that the names community is looking at.
 - Subrenat asked if someone could provide a link that explains what makes the .ARPA management separate. He stated his concern about accountability and asked whether having separate or different accountability standards would fit the overall compatibility the ICG is tasked to assess.
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Barrett posted: <https://www.iab.org/documents/correspondence-reports-documents/docs2000/iab-statement-on-infrastructure-domain-and-subdomains-may-2000/>
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Housley stated that [RFC 3172](#) defines the Management Guidelines & Operational Requirements for .ARPA.
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Wilson and Clark suggested that both references from Barrett and Housley should be added to part 0.
- Cooper stated that both answers from the numbers community are very clear and will be reflected in part 0. See [Action Item 2](#).

Names community

[Question 1 – RZM](#)

- Mueller said that he is not that satisfied with the [answers provided by the CWG](#). He stated that the CWG believes that the Verisign-ICANN proposal only addresses how to implement and test a logistical elimination of NTIA approvals at the moment of transition to minimize problems in root zone modification. He admitted that the ICG made a mistake in framing the question by including paragraph 1150 section 2 about the NTIA and cooperative agreement because the proposal is not about amending the cooperative agreement. He emphasized that the ICG's concern is about the post-transition agreement between post-transition ICANN or IANA and the RZM. He stated that CWG believes that an agreement must be in place in time of the transition but have not delved into what the arrangement will be. He noted that some in CWG view that the NTIA should design that arrangement rather than the CWG itself.
 - Cooper responded that the ICG has confirmation from the CWG that they do not consider the [existing document produced by Verisign and ICANN](#) as the 'agreement' that needs to be in place for the transition to go forward. She concluded that both CWG and ICG believe that there is an outstanding requirement regarding the RZM-IFO agreement. She said that some of Mueller's points (details of the RZM-IFO agreement and how the agreement will be determined) are important but may not under the ICG's scope because it is subject to the [parallel process as stated by the NTIA](#).
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Drazek stated: "[What was posted in August was the proposed testing plan](#), not the proposed agreement."

- Mundy, in his SSAC capacity, emphasized that the overall security and stability is crucial. He explained that there is no written agreement concerning root zone management between the IFO and RZM. He stated that the agreements that exist between the IFO and RZM are by way of NTIA, thus when NTIA and the contract for IANA functions goes away, it will take away the linkage. As a result, the root zone of the DNS of the Internet will be maintained and operated without a written agreement, unless a written agreement is put in place between the IFO and RZM.
- Cooper conveyed her understanding that the CWG has stated that the agreement needs to be worked out but not in its process. She further stated that [NTIA has said that it will launch a parallel process that would deal with the agreement](#). Given that there is an outstanding requirement, Cooper asked what the ICG action should be: to pose a question to NTIA about the parallel process; or ask ICANN and Verisign about the plan for IFO and RZM; or something else.
 - Mueller said that Cooper's interpretation is correct in terms of CWG's response. His problem with Cooper's interpretation is that if the ICG considers the missing agreement to be filled and controlled by the NTIA, then it implies that the ICG has created a process that does not execute a full transition. He stated his strong concern about how it will be perceived by the rest of the world. He stated that modification of the cooperative agreement is out of scope for the multistakeholder process, but not everything related to the RZM is out of scope. He further emphasized that CWG needs to state what the future relationship should look like between the IFO and RZM, and NTIA should modify the cooperative agreement based on that.
 - Mundy viewed that if the ICG just processes the information received at this point, then the ICG needs to very clearly identify that there is a missing implementation piece based on the original guidance the ICG received from NTIA. If ICG wants to pursue this further, Mundy suggested that a question should be sent to NTIA.
- Cooper confirmed that ICG's consensus position is the missing written agreement between the IFO and RZM is a gap that must be filled before the transition. Cooper referred to [Drazek's question on Adobe Connect chat](#), and asked the ICG to opine on whether the CWG needs to have a role in the development or assessment of the IFO-RZM agreement.
 - Mueller stated that it is not just an implementation issue because there is another issue raised by [Question 2](#): whether ICANN or PTI is fully in control of the RZM. He noted that the ICG has received public comments that oppose having ICANN hold both the IFO and RZM functions. He emphasized the need for ICG to have a statement of principle about the nature of that future relationship as a critical part of the design of the transition. He reiterated that NTIA is responsible for implementing the cooperative agreement based on what the ICG delivers from the communities.
 - Boyle stated that the names proposal states that there would be a separation between RZM and PTI/ICANN as the IFO, and that "CWG does not allow RZM to be absorbed by ICANN".
 - Arasteh stated that the ICG should proceed in a two-step process: first ask the CWG to look at the issue and indicate if there is a problem and consult with legal counsel is necessary; and then point it to the broader community to reflect on the issue.
- *Adobe Connect chat*: Drazek stated: "In the interest of full disclosure, I have NOT been engaged in, or privy to, any conversations among Verisign/NTIA/ICANN related to RZM, the Cooperative Agreement, or any anticipated successor arrangement between ICANN and Verisign."
- Cooper noted that there are still open issues and requested that ICG members send proposals to the internal-cg mailing list regarding any actions the ICG needs to take on this topic. See [Action Item 1](#).

Question 2 – RZM

- Mueller summarized the response from CWG: both descriptions are correct but incomplete. The CWG stated that the existing language in paragraph 1155 about the substantial architecture and operational change is sufficient to answer the ICG's question that would be a review and ICANN board approval. However, the CWG did not answer the question about what constitutes consensus or what consultation means.

- Mundy stated that he was ‘not thrilled but ok’ with this response because the CWG did not specify in their proposal that they consider this to fall under the spectrum of what gets changed or goes to the review board for approval.

Questions 3 and 4 – ccTLDs

- Cooper summarized that both questions were about updating the text in documents relating to ccTLDs. She proposed the ICG can incorporate the text verbatim from CWG to part 0.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Boyle, Davidson and Ismail agreed. See [Action Item 2](#).

Question 5 – ccTLDs

- Cooper explained that question 5 was based on the public comment ([submission 66](#)) concerning the composition of IANA Function Review Team. She stated that the ICG has received a thorough explanation from the CWG as to why it is a mandatory seat and that the names community consensus needs to rule. She concluded that there will be no change for this part.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Ismail, Boyle, Housley, Davidson and Mundy agreed.

Question 6 – PTI

- Cooper stated the ICG received an unequivocal answer on the CWG’s commitment to cooperation in the future. She noted that this will be reflected in the ICG proposal. No objections from the ICG. See [Action Item 2](#).

Question 7 – PTI

- Cooper noted that the ICG asked whether the decision or recommendation made by IFR and special IFR would be mandatory. She viewed this as a clarification question that does not require any action from the ICG. There were no objections from the ICG.
 - Referring to [CWG’s answer](#) that states, “...the Community will be able to rely on mechanisms that the CCWG-Accountability is currently developing”, Arasteh reported that this is currently under discussion in CCWG-Accountability Working Party 2, and the output is expected at ICANN 54 Dublin.

Question 8 – PTI

- Cooper noted that the ICG suggested a minor word change in the explanatory language for the PTI board. She stated that the CWG agreed with the proposed changes suggested by the ICG and thus the ICG can reflect the change in the combined proposal. No objections from the ICG. See [Action Item 2](#).

Question 9 – PTI

- Cooper stated that the CWG answered that the ICANN board is the ultimate backstop and the CWG has suggested adding one sentence to [P1: paragraph 1113](#). Cooper confirmed that the [highlighted text](#) will be added verbatim into the combined proposal.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* St. Amour, Mueller and Clark agreed. See [Action Item 2](#).

Questions 10 to 12 – Scope

- These questions were about the clarification of the scope of application of CSC and IFR, and the term IFO. Cooper stated that the CWG has confirmed that the terms and scope of application only apply to the naming functions. She stated that this answer needs to be reflected in part 0, but no changes need to be made to the names proposal.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Mundy agreed. See [Action Item 2](#).

Question 13 – Scope

- Cooper stated that the clarification received from the CWG about the situation for .ARPA is that “[there is a place for the .ARPA domain in the CSC and the IFR processes, should .ARPA choose to participate.](#)” Cooper stated this is already written in the combined proposal and thus no further clarification needs to be made.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Housley agreed.

4. Update on CCWG

Arasteh reported that the ICANN board had questions about the sole membership model which included: the risks and consequences of the new structures; and the balance of power between governments and other stakeholders. In addition, he stated that the ICANN board was not in favor of individual director removal by the designating entity, cost of the IPR, and budget veto. He stated that the ICANN board proposed multistakeholder enforcement mechanism (MEM) model was discussed during the CCWG meeting in Los Angeles. He added that there is no consensus in the CCWG about which model to use, and is considering shifting areas without consensus to be addressed at a later stage. He stated that the CCWG is considering another public comment period, and this may impact the transition timeline. He concluded that the CCWG will have a clearer position in Dublin.

Drazek gave an overview of the CCWG developments: public comment period (closed Sept 12) and face-to-face meeting (25-26 Sept). Drazek stated that the ICANN board made it clear that they do not support the recommended implementation model that was put out for public comment, and pointed to [his summary of ICANN board's views](#). He highlighted a significant difference of opinion between the CCWG (which is not unified behind any one proposal) and the ICANN board. He stated that the CCWG is currently going through all the public comments and the first phase of analysis is due on Oct 12. Thereafter, the CCWG will do its assessments and start working on the necessary adjustments to the proposal – which, Drazek noted, may be substantial. He reiterated that there is a good possibility that the CCWG will need another public comment period coming out of the Dublin meeting. He further stated that if things go as expected, there is a target to deliver CCWG work to NTIA by the end of this year.

Discussion: (additional detailed discussion in Adobe Connect chat, [see transcript](#))

- Cooper asked if there is any way for the ICG as a coordinating body to help make the process successful. She acknowledged the linkage (via the CWG proposal) of the parallel but separate ICG and CCWG processes, and stated that if the latter does not produce an end result that can be sent to the NTIA, then the ICG proposal will be in a questionable state. She viewed that there is a breakdown of the 'level of heat' of the conversation within the CCWG and between CCWG and the ICANN board. She asked whether the ICG thinks there is a message that the ICG needs to send.
 - Arasteh stated that the ICG as a coordinating group has agreed to not take a position in detailed accountability discussions. However, he stated that the ICG needs to reiterate its position and confirm that the CWG's requirements are fully met.
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Davidson stated that "it is outside of [ICG's] scope - at most [ICG] could stress the importance of CCWG achieving an outcome, but they are already extremely sensitive to that".
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Boyle agreed with Davidson and noted that "adding another voice to the animated discussion could be counter-productive."
 - Wilson stated that ICG's mission is threatened by the current situation, and warned that a delay of several years will effectively require the whole process to be restarted and efforts will have been wasted. He viewed that the ICG cannot make a statement that has implications about behaviors or motivations, but can provide an objective reminder of what is at stake and a suggestion to maintain the distinction between Work Stream (WS) 1 and 2, specifically what is achievable in WS1.
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Drazek stated: "Work Stream 1 was designed to provide the ICANN community confidence that future Work Stream 2 reforms could be implemented over ICANN Board resistance. WS1 was not limited to the IANA transition requirements alone. That said, there is an ongoing and active review of where that line needs to be drawn."
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Housley and St. Amour agreed with Drazek.
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Bladel urged caution, stating that "even a seemingly benign statement like that could be taken by some as endorsing one side or the other." Davidson agreed.
 - Arasteh said the ICG only needs to be concerned with WS1 because it deals with the mechanisms that needs to be in place or committed to be in place before the transition. He

reiterated that WS2 is related to the overall long term accountability of ICANN, does not impact the transition, and should be left for CCWG and ICANN to discuss.

- Arkko stated that the ICG needs to be very clear where the dependencies are. He also stated that it is not the ICG's role to prescribe details on how to solve things. However, he perceived that it could be the ICG's role to characterize the current situation; remind people of the principles on how the communities should be operating; and remind people of how much is riding on this process: the proposal; the transition going forward, and community trust.
- Drazek stated that the CCWG is not unified behind promoting the sole member reference model at all costs. He conveyed that there is a willingness to find a way forward guided by the public comments, and that there are no two opposing camps within the CCWG. He emphasized that there is a strong commitment in the CCWG to adjust, refine and compromise in order to find consensus and the right implementation model that still delivers on the community's goals.
- Mundy stated that there is no active and direct ICG involvement in the CCWG's work. He further stated that if something needs to be published, then the ICG can only refer to the relationship between the (CCWG-CWG-ICG) pieces and that the ICG is waiting the pieces to complete.
- Clark stated that the ICG should wait and let the CCWG work through the public comments. She flagged the [proposal she sent to the internal-cg list](#) for further discussion, and suggested that if the ICG were to play some role during the implementation phase, it can give some confidence to the communities regarding the transition.

Cooper confirmed that the ICG will get updates from the CCWG and also further discuss the implementation topic at the ICG face-to-face meetings in Dublin.

Summary of Action Items:

1. ICG members to send suggestions regarding ICG action on the names community's responses re RZM to the internal-cg mailing list by 23:59 UTC, 9 October.
2. Cooper to reflect responses from protocol parameters, numbers, and names communities in the combined proposal.