DRAFT MINUTES: Ninth IANA Stewardship Coordination Group (ICG) Teleconference

11:00 UTC, Wednesday 10 December 2014

Meeting agenda and archives

Participants

Mohamed El Bashir, ALAC (Vice-chair)	Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries
	Jon Nevett, gTLD Registries
Jean-Jacques Subrenat, ALAC	Russ Housley, IAB
Hartmut Glaser, ASO	Lynn St Amour, IAB
Martin Boyle, ccNSO	Jari Arkko, IETF
Mary Uduma, ccNSO	Alissa Cooper, IETF (ICG Chair)
Jandyr Ferreira dos Santos, GAC	Demi Getschko, ISOC
Manal Ismail, GAC	Adiel Akplogan, NRO
Michael Niebel, GAC	Daniel Karrenberg, RSSAC
James Bladel, GNSO	Lars-Johan Liman, RSSAC
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, GNSO	Patrik Fältström, SSAC (Vice-chair)
Milton Mueller, GNSO	

Liaisons:
Elise Gerich, IANA Staff Expert
Kuo-Wei Wu, ICANN Board Liaison

ICG Apologies:

Keith Davidson, ccNSO	Thomas Schneider, GAC
Xiaodong Lee, ccNSO	Narelle Clark, ISOC
Joseph Alhadeff, ICC/BASIS	Paul Wilson, NRO
Kavouss Arasteh, GAC	Russ Mundy, SSAC

ICANN Support Staff:

Theresa Swinehart	Alice Jansen
Eric Evrard	Ergys Ramaj

Non-ICANN staff minuting support:
Samantha Dickinson

1. Adoption of Minutes of 26 November Call

Karrenberg noted that he had requested some edits on the internal-cg list just prior to the call. With those edits, Cooper declared the minutes approved.

Action:

1. **Following the addition of an amendment requested by Karrenberg, Jansen to publish minutes of 26 November teleconference on the ICG website.**

2. Secretariat Update

Cooper reported that some personal matters had delayed the appointment of the secretariat but hoped that more information would be available shortly.

Discussion

- Karrenberg asked if the Secretariat selection team could provide any information on when the process would be finalized.
- Subrenat, a member of the selection team, suggested that if anyone on the selection team had any personal issues with the timetable, then they could perhaps delegate to someone else to ensure the Secretariat could be appointed.
  - Cooper explained that none of the delays had anything to do with the ICG and that everyone on the ICG had been doing everything they could to ensure the process was finalized as quickly as possible.
  - Fältström explained that one of the individuals working on the procurement process had needed to take unplanned personal leave and that due to the requirements of ICANN's procurement rules, candidates for the secretariat had to be informed and the final contract signed before there could be open discussion on the secretariat. The remaining requirements were only a few days worth of work, but their completion depended on the return of the individual from leave. While the individual working on the procurement process was on personal leave, there were delays in completing these actions. To help ensure that the secretariat could be up and running as soon as the procurement process was complete, the ICG leadership, with the help of some other ICG members, had been preparing how to separate tasks between the ICG, ICANN and the incoming secretariat.
  - Akplogan added the ICANN staff member dealing with the procurement process had been on emergency leave for the past fortnight, and unfortunately, this was the only person dealing with the procurement process on the ICANN side. He explained that a pending item in the contract negotiation was mitigation of conflict of interest, which the ICG secretariat selection team had requested be added.
  - Subrenat formally requested that all selection committee members be kept up to date with any developments with the process by email as he had not been aware of the issue with the ICANN staff member. He stated that he did not find it satisfactory that he had not been informed about the status of the secretariat finalization.
    - Akplogan apologized for not keeping the rest of the committee up to date, but there had not be any action as such that he had thought needed to be forwarded. He assured Subrenat that he would forward all communication on the issue with the rest of the committee.

Action:

2. **Akplogan to forward communication related to developments and delays in the Secretariat finalization process to all members of the Secretariat selection sub-committee.**

3. Proposal Finalization Process

Cooper presented the latest draft of the document ([version 4](#)) for discussion.

Discussion:

- Ismail suggested merging bullets a) and b) in section 4 ("Proposal submissions 17 Jul 2015 to 31 July 2015") into a single bullet.
  - Subrenat supported this, as did Karrenberg, with some additional wordsmithing.
- Ismail suggested adding the following text to the beginning of bullet c): "as communicated by the ICANN Board".
  - Subrenat stated that he had issues with the existing text saying "ICANN Board shall", as ICG could not stipulate what other parties should do but could only encourage other parties to take certain actions. Therefore, he supported Ismail's edit.
  - Karrenberg suggested that bullet c) could include text stating that the ICG expects the ICANN Board to participate in all parts of the proposal development process, along with other parts of the community. He stated that he thought it important to state that last-minute comments by the Board should not raise new issues. He explained that his proposed text aimed, not to impose actions on others, but to explain what the ICG expected to happen, as well as the motivation behind it.
- In response to a query by Mueller regarding bullet b) (previously bullet c)), Cooper suggested adding the text, "as the ICANN Board has explained to the ICG".
  - Boyle was not sure the ICANN Board had "explained" and suggested "confirmed" instead as it carried the suggestion of a stronger commitment that the Board would follow the process.

Cooper stated that she would incorporate the suggestions made by Karrenberg. She suggested that the ICG have a few more days to allow any further edits via the internal-cg mailing list.

Fältström noted that some ICG members who had not dialed into the call were experiencing problems using audio in the Webex room, so the ICG needed to be careful not to interpret silence as assent to the proposed changes to the document.

Fältström reported that in the Webex chat, Wu had written, "Board will participate in a timely manner. Also on chat, Mueller suggested added to end of Wu's text, "to avoid any last minute contention". Cooper suggested finalizing the text on the internal-cg list.

Cooper asked ICG members to go back to the beginning of the proposal finalization document.

Discussion on step 1, "Individual process & proposal assessment"

- Arkko noted that different communities had different ways of developing consensus (for example, IETF has a specific process for developing consensus) and, to reflect this, suggested a reference to "obtained consensus" be changed to "obtain consensus as defined in that community's process".
    - o Fältström reported that in Webex chat, Mueller suggested, "obtained sufficient support".
- With regard to completeness of proposals, Knoben asked if the ICG had criteria for defining what is complete.
    - o Cooper replied that in the RFP, the ICG had stated that the ICG needed to include information on the level of support each proposal had obtained. Therefore, it could be useful to be consistent in the finalization document. She explained that she had been thinking of first bullet in b) as a mechanical check (all sections included, etc.) rather than a check about completeness of content.
        - ▪ Mueller agreed with Cooper on the mechanical nature of the check in this bullet point.
        - ▪ Ismail shared Knoben's concern that "incomplete" could be difficult to evaluate. She appreciated Cooper's comments, but if its inclusion could confuse the public, then she preferred to have it removed.
        - ▪ Cooper replied that in response to the feedback, she had deleted the word "incomplete".
- Ismail noted that she had [sent comments](#) to the internal-cg mailing list and summarized them for the call.
- Knoben noted that he had a comment about timeliness in bullet b). She suggested that any questions about the timing of the submission of proposals should be as soon as possible.
    - o Cooper agreed, noting that the ICG was already aware that one community, the names community, would be submitting its proposal a couple of weeks later than the ICG's target date of 15 January. She stated that she was not particularly concerned with this case, and that she was impressed with the dedication of all communities in working to meet the ICG's deadline as close as was possible.
- Akplogan pointed out that one of the RFP requirements was that the proposals be submitted before the deadline. He suggested that the finalization process should contain some information about how the ICG

would handle proposals that were submitted after the deadline. In response to a question from Cooper, Akplogan confirmed that he was proposing text that would state that late proposals would be handled in the same way as proposals received before the deadline.

- o Ismail suggest that such text perhaps be stated in positive way, urging communities to meet deadline, rather than seeming to be giving a negative message about not meeting the deadline.
- o Cooper stated she would draft some text based on the discussion and post it to the mailing list.

Discussion on step 2, "Draft proposal production 15 February 2015 to 13 March 2015":

- Arkko suggested changing "not compatible with each other" to "not compatible with each other, but need to be" to reflect the fact that not all elements of the three proposals needed to be compatible with each other.
  - o Fältström noted that in chat, Mueller supported Arkko's suggestion.
- Knoben noted that the was first meeting of the CCWG on ICANN accountability had held its first meeting the previous day, and that their work had implications for section 2b), "accountability". He explained that the CCWG work stream 1 was supposed to be finalized in June 2015 and asked how the ICG would integrate that with its own work on the final IANA proposal. He stated that he could liaise with the CCWG regarding the timeline of the two processes, but suggested that other ICG members could support in liaising.
- Fältström noted that in chat, Bladel asked to change "overlap" to "interdependencies" to make the text clearer.
- Ismail suggested switching the text in the first paragraph of step 2, "according to ICG charter", to put the text about the ICG's role first, then what isn't the role second.
- Ismail suggested for 2a), changing "possibly conflicting overlaps" to "any conflicting overlaps".
  - o Fältström noted that in chat, Mueller supported "interdependencies and/or conflicts" as being clearer.
  - o Cooper explained that the word "overlaps" came from the ICG's original RFP and had been included in the finalization document for consistency. She suggested that if ICG members could live with reusing words from the RFP, that would be preferable, as it would help the community understand that the ICG was evaluating the same thing that the ICG asked for in the accountability section of the RFP.
- Ismail asked whether, if the ICG identified any gaps in accountability between the proposals submitted by operational communities, the ICG would go back to the communities themselves or also go back to the accountability CCWG.
  - o Cooper noted that it was possible that the CWG IANA producing the names proposal could refer to the CCWG accountability work. She also noted that the ICG had two liaisons to the CCWG (Kavouss

and Drazek), who would keep the ICG up to date with the CCWG's progress, but believe that ICG should stick to its earlier decision to have the operational communities be the points of contact with the ICG.

- Also regarding 2b) Gerich also asked if "supporting independent accountability mechanisms" presupposed the outcome of the accountability process as accountability mechanisms could be overlapping as well as independent.
    - Cooper replied that the accountability text came directly from the ICG's charter, and agreed that the word "independent" was ambiguous. However, she was not sure what to do with the text, given it was copied from the charter.

[Fältström left the call at 12:03 UTC]

Ismail noted she had [sent an email](#) to the mailing list asking for clarity of the meaning of "components" in the Step 3 sentence, "The ICG will coordinate with the operational communities to have public comments addressed within their components before assembling an interim final proposal".

Cooper stated that ICG members had made a lot of progress on the call and suggested the remaining issues could be resolved on the mailing list. She asked members to send any more comments they had to the mailing list list by the end of the day so finalization document could be published in a few day's time if possible.

4. Any Other Business

Cooper reminded ICG members that Fältström would follow up on the mailing list about the meeting schedule shortly.

Cooper stated that she hoped the ICG could have one more teleconference before the proposals from the operational communities began to be submitted.

[Teleconference ended 12:06 UTC]

Summary of Action Items

1. **Following the incorporation of an amendment requested by Karrenberg, Jansen to publish minutes of 26 November teleconference on the ICG website.**
2. **Akplogan to forward communication related to developments and delays in the process of finalizing the ICG Secretariat to all members of the Secretariat selection sub-committee.**
3. **Cooper to update latest version of Proposal Finalization Process document (proposal-finalization-process-v4-wuk.docx) based on feedback on the teleconference. 4. ICG members to provide any**

further comments on the Proposal Finalization Process document on the internal-cg mailing list within the next day with the aim of enabling the document to be finalized and published within the following few days.