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

21:00 – 22:30 UTC, Tuesday, 16 May 2015

Meeting agenda and archives

Participants:
Alan Barrett (NRO)
Alissa Cooper (IETF)
Daniel Karrenberg (RSSAC)
Demi Getschko (ISOC)
Jari Arkko (IETF)
Jean-Jacques Subrenat (ALAC)
Jon Nevett (gTLD Registries)
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)
Keith Davidson (ccNSO)
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries)
Lars-Johan Liman (RSSAC)
Lynn St. Amour (IAB)
Manal Ismail (GAC)
Martin Boyle (ccNSO)
Mary Uduma (ccNSO)
Milton Mueller (GNSO)
Mohamed El Bashir (ALAC)
Patrik Fältström (SSAC)
Paul Wilson (NRO)
Russ Housley (IAB)
Russ Mundy (SSAC)
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben (GNSO)
Xiaodong Lee (ccNSO)

Liaison:
Elise Gerich (IANA Staff Expert)
Kuo Wei Wu (ICANN Board Liaison)

Apologies:
Hartmut Glaser (ASO)
Jandyr Ferreira dos Santos (GAC)
James Bladel (GNSO)
Joseph Alhadeff (ICC/BASIS)
Michael Niebel (GAC)
Narelle Clark (ISOC)
Thomas Schneider (GAC)

Secretariat:
Jennifer Chung
Yannis Li
Sherly Haristya

ICANN Support Staff:
Josh Baulch
Mike Brennan

Agenda

1. Letter to the ICG from the NTIA

Cooper stated that the ICG received a letter from the NTIA seeking more information on the status of the transition plan and timeframe. Cooper mentioned discussion on the internal-cg mailing list regarding ICG members collecting input from their respective communities on the timeframe issue.

Fältström noted that the timeframe includes three parts:

(1) The finalization of the proposal,
(2) The NTIA/USG assessment, and
(3) The implementation by the operational communities.

Fältström mentioned that there has been discussion on the internal-cg mailing list regarding needing some extension of the NTIA contract if all three parts cannot be completed by 30 September 2015.

Discussion:

For additional detailed discussion on implementation and contract extension, please refer to the Chat Transcript.

- Knoben stated that the NTIA sent two letters, one to the ICG, one to CCWG-Accountability, and asked for clarification whether the ICG is answering the NTIA's questions on behalf of CWG-IANA, CRISP and IANA WORKPLAN.
  - Fältström stated that ICG's response need to take into account the time needed for all three operational communities for implementation.
- Cooper suggested that the ICG target getting a response back to the NTIA shortly after ICANN 53, and in the meantime obtain input on implementation timeframes from the operational communities and bring that back to the ICG to discuss during the face-to-face meeting.
- *Adobe Connect chat:* Drazek stated that 'the key is to establish 4 components: (1) How much time the CWG-Transition still needs, (2) How much time the ICG will need once it receives the CWG proposal, (3) How much time the CCWG Accountability needs, and (4) How much time will ICANN and the ICANN community require to [implement] all of the recommendations, once they are approved. We can't control the NTIA internal timeline and we should leave that alone.'
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: Mundy agreed with Drazek and suggested that [the ICG] may 'also need to ask ICANN what they mean by implementation [and] how long it will take.'
    - *Adobe Connect chat*: Drazek stated that he thinks 'the implementation question will be resolved through a collaborative engagement between the community and ICANN board/staff'.
    - *Adobe Connect chat*: Mueller stated that he '[does not] think that ICANN is the right entity to ask about what is meant by implementation' and 'it is NTIA that has made a point about it and will possibly accept or not accept proposals based on their 'implementability''.
- Knoben stated a key question is clarifying the level of implementation which has to be in the proposal sent to NTIA. He stated that the CWG-IANA proposal that is out for public comment talks about a transition framework that has to be developed into a fully functional transition plan after the transition.
- Fältström agreed that the points Knoben raised is important to discuss within the ICG, however he stated that his interpretation of the NTIA letter is for the ICG to be able to respond if a contract extension is needed, and whether it is for 2 years or shorter.
- Wilson stated that the extension of exactly 2 years is not in line with general expectation (if it implies that the contract must continue for that entire period). Wilson stated his understanding that any extension would still allow for early termination, and that this is essential. He also noted discussions on the possibility of shorter-term extensions for 3 months, which would be preferable to a 2-year extension even with an early termination option.
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: Arkko, Boyle, Ismail and Lee agreed with Wilson.
  - *Please see Chat Transcript for further discussion on contract extension.*
- Karrenberg expressed concern regarding detractors of the ICG's bottom-up multistakeholder governance model when the ICG does not make the proposal deadline. He asked if the ICG will consider a partial or staged implementation and transition to show tangible progress, given that two of the communities are much further along in their work and have implementation plans in place.
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: Nevett responded that 'we won't get consensus on partial implementation'**.**
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: Drazek stated and Davidson agreed that 'NTIA has been clear they're looking for a single, complete proposal, not partial'.

        - *Adobe Connect chat*: Karrenberg stated that he proposed a staged implementation to point to actual progress and that he had not 'heard clearly that this is out of the question [for] NTIA and even if there are signals in that direction [the ICG] can send [its] own signals'.
        - *Adobe Connect chat*: Arkko agreed with Karrenberg.
        - *Adobe Connect chat*: Mundy stated that the NTIA has clearly asked for a single proposal but he does not think there is any requirement for a 'single, integrated implementation'.
- Ismail asked if the implementation timeline would map one-to-one to the extension period.
- Cooper explained that there are three phases to pass through before the contract will expire: (1) the proposal needs to be finalized and sent to NTIA, (2) the US government needs to evaluate it, and (3) the proposal needs to be implemented. She stated that the ICG needs to focus on the two phases that the community has control over ((1) and (3)), and respond to the NTIA with that input.
- Arasteh stated that the question from the NTIA contains two parts: How long it takes to (1) finalize the transition plan, and (2) implement it. He stated that transition plan is something that the ICG would be in a good position to answer. For the implementation plan, he thought that the ICG has no role to estimate because it depends on CCWG-Accountability and CWG-IANA. He thus proposed that the ICG only talk about the timing of transition plan in its response to the NTIA and indicate that the implementation plan depends on those two entities.
    - *Adobe Connect chat*: Subrenat agreed with Arasteh and stated that 'ICG should limit its answer to NTIA to what is within [its] remit, which does not include implementation'.
- Housley stated that the ICG timeline document v9 mentions that implementation testing will begin as soon as the proposal is submitted [to the ICG] and will run in parallel, except for the root zone approval process which cannot be altered until the NTIA contract ends. He stated that the ICG needs to explain that waterfall process in any response sent to NTIA.
- Boyle responded to an earlier comment regarding 'failure' and remarked that 'it is entirely wrong as a message'. He urged the ICG to talk about the success of the process, bearing in mind the amount of work and outreach done in all the communities. In reference to the 'staged transition', Boyle noted that 'the NTIA has stated clearly that it is not an option [for] them'. Boyle disagreed with the idea that the ICG should not asking communities (including ICANN) about their implementation scales. He stated that the ICG is a coordination group, and should be reaching out to the communities.
    - *Adobe Connect chat*: Cooper, Arkko and Lee agreed with Boyle.
- Mundy responded to Arasteh in regards to his intervention on implementation. Mundy stated that there will be implementation details from the other operational communities that also need to be considered, and that the ICG's job is to gather input from all operational communities on this issue. Mundy concluded that the ICG only needs to give a best estimate of the timeline and let the NTIA decide on the contract aspect.
    - Arasteh clarified that he did not say that the ICG could not talk about implementation, rather that the ICG should not get involved in 'any accountability implementation which is outside of the ICG's control', and that CWG-IANA's plan requires accountability parts which depends on the output of CCWG-Accountability.
- Mueller noted the discussion on contract extension in the Adobe Connect chat and stated that NTIA did not ask the ICG for input on contract extension, but rather for input on the revised timeline and then NTIA will decide what extension is needed. Mueller also noted that the ICG ignored one important aspect which is the possibility that there will not be consensus during the August 2015 public comment period (timeline graphic v10), and further noted that one month for revision of the proposal after this period may be optimistic for the Names community. He stated his concern with what the ICG should tell NTIA given that the ICG is not in control of this timeline.

- Cooper agreed with Boyle and stated that the ICG is the recipient of the NTIA letter and as a coordinating body is capable of gathering input from the operational communities. Cooper also agreed with Mundy that input from all operational communities needs to be reflected back to NTIA as well. In response to Mueller, Cooper stated that the ICG should estimate and give NTIA a range of the time needed both for the finalization process (timeline graphic v10, 4 months from receipt of the Names proposal) and the implementation part (with input from the communities).
    - *Adobe Connect chat*: Drazek and Karrenberg agreed with Cooper.
- Ismail asked two questions: (1) Whether the final proposal needs to include all implementation details or such details are more of internal working plans of the operational communities, and (2) given that CWG-IANA is dependent on output from CCWG-Accountability, will CWG-IANA be able to respond with the needed implementation time prior to the CCWG-Accountability submitting their final proposal?
    - In response to Ismail's second question, Fältström noted that the ICG needs to interact informally with operational communities for input on the matter.
- Lee stated that it is ICG's duty to gather input from the operational communities regarding implementation. He noted concerns on the implementation timeframe and stated that the ICG cannot make the decision, but can forward the information collected to the US Government.
- Subrenat highlighted an ambiguity of the use of the word 'implementation' in the NTIA letter. He noted that there are two implementation timeframes: one by the operational communities, the second by NTIA/US Government. He suggested that the Chairs in their response to the NTIA should point out this ambiguity, and that the ICG can only answer the first part, and should not answer the second.
    - *Adobe Connect chat*: Mueller agreed with Subrenat.

Cooper summarized that there is general agreement that the ICG and operational communities will require time beyond the September 2015 deadline. She noted support for ICG members to reach out to their communities and collect input on implementation timeframes. She also noted that the ICG needs more discussion to clarify the concept of implementation on the internal-cg mailing list before taking it to the operational communities. Cooper flagged the timeline of the proposal finalization process for discussion on the internal-cg mailing list and on the next call.

2. CWG pre-assessment

Knoben explained the basis of the pre-assessment is to use the time during the public comment period to assess whether the Names proposal can meet NTIA's requirements once it is finalized. He stated that the target of the pre-assessment is not to judge the content, but rather it is to see if the proposal can meet the ICG assessment criteria and identify possible questions that the ICG may have for CWG-IANA. He noted that some questions on the assessment sheet could not be answered because the Names proposal is still in progress.

Knoben highlighted that his main concern is related to the level of detail about implementation which needs be covered in the proposal before it could be sent to NTIA.

- Mueller asked for clarification on the meaning of the answer to B.2.c: "The registries at the beginning of the proposal development process were *declined* to keep the status quo with no big structural changes." (Emphasis added).
    - Knoben stated that it should read 'inclined' instead of 'declined'.
    - Mueller noted that there were number of ccTLDs that supported Contract Co. and thought there was a lot of debate over this matter. He proposed to continue discussion of edits on the internal-cg mailing list.

- Cooper asked for clarification on B (3) regarding what the 'transition plan' refers to, and asked whether it is the plan to transition away from the PTI (Post Transition IANA)?
    - Knoben answered that chapter (3) of the Names proposal only outlines a framework for the transition to the successor IANA Functions Operator (PTI), and the framework needs further development and may need an estimated 18 months. Knoben reiterated his main concern regarding the level of detail needed about the implementation plan.

- Arasteh stated that this assessment was done based on the Names proposal out for public comment. He suggested that this review be repeated after the public comment period closes so the reviewer can take into account public views and not [just] their 'own personal judgement'.

3. Response from Steve Crocker regarding ICG statement on contracts

Cooper asked if the ICG members needed any discussion in regards to the response from Steve Crocker to the 12 May letter sent by the ICG to the ICANN Board Chair.

- Karrenberg stated that the response from Steve Crocker is a straightforward and good answer, and the ICG should thank the ICANN Board.
    - *Adobe Connect chat*: Housley, Barrett, Arkko, Fältström, Nevett, Ismail, and Subrenat agreed.

Action item 1: Cooper to acknowledge ICANN Board Chair, Steve Crocker's response regarding ICG statement on contracts.

4. Approval of minutes from April 22 call

There were no objections to approving the minutes from the April 22 ICG Call #15. Cooper requested that the Secretariat publish the approved minutes.

5. Future teleconference and meeting schedule

Cooper confirmed that there will be two more calls (May 27 and June 10) before the ICG face-to-face meeting (June 18-19). She also confirmed that there will be an ICG wrap-up session during ICANN meeting on June 25. After ICANN 53, there will be a longer call on July 8 to discuss the Names proposal.

- Arasteh stated that everything after ICANN 53 is provisional subject to need and further revision.
- Karrenberg asked for (and received confirmation from ICANN tech) remote participation for the June 25 ICG wrap-up session. He suggested that the ICG book time slots now for calls beyond July 8 to allow ICG members to schedule their calendars accordingly.

Action item 2: Fältström to work with Secretariat to schedule ICG Calls for July and August 2015.

Summary of Decisions Taken:

1. **ICG to further discuss and refine the concept of implementation on internal-cg mailing list, and collect input from their respective operational communities regarding implementation timeframes.**
2. **ICG to discuss how much time is needed for the proposal finalization process on the internal-cg mailing list and following call.**
3. **Mueller to propose and discuss edits to Knoben's pre-assessment of the Names proposal on the internal-cg mailing list.**
4. **Secretariat to publish the approved minutes for the 22 April ICG Call #15.**

Summary of Action Items:

1. **Cooper to acknowledge ICANN Board Chair, Steve Crocker's response regarding ICG statement on contracts.**
2. **Fältström to work with Secretariat to schedule ICG Calls for July and August 2015.**