

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

2:01 UTC, Wednesday 26 November 2014

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

Participants

Jean-Jacques Subrenat, ALAC
Hartmut Glaser, ASO
Martin Boyle, ccNSO
Keith Davidson, ccNSO
Xiaodong Lee, ccNSO
Mary Uduma, ccNSO
Jandyr Ferreira dos Santos, GAC
Manal Ismail, GAC
James Bladel, GNSO

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, GNSO
Jon Nevett, gTLD Registries
Russ Housley, IAB
Joseph Alhadef, ICC/BASIS
Alissa Cooper, IETF (ICG Chair)
Narelle Clark, ISOC
Daniel Karrenberg, RSSAC
Lars-Johan Liman, RSSAC

Liaisons:

Kuo-Wei Wu, ICANN Board Liaison

ICG Apologies:

Mohamed El Bashir, ALAC (Vice-chair)
Kavouss Arasteh, GAC
Michael Niebel, GAC
Thomas Schneider, GAC
Milton Mueller, GNSO
Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries

Lynn St Amour, IAB
Jari Arkko, IETF
Demi Getschko, ISOC
Adiel Akplogan, NRO
Paul Wilson, NRO
Patrik Fältström, SSAC (Vice-chair)
Russ Mundy, SSAC

Liaison Apologies:

Elise Gerich, IANA Staff Expert

ICANN Support Staff:

Theresa Swinehart
Josh Baulch

Alice Jansen
Ergys Ramaj

Non-ICANN staff minuting support:

Samantha Dickinson

1. Welcome

Cooper welcomed ICG members to the eighth teleconference.

Subrenat noted that Jennifer Chung was on the call and asked if there was any status on the Secretariat. Cooper said she did not have any information on that issue, that there was no public notice on the secretariat, so the teleconference was to proceed as normal.

2. Discussion of proposal submission expectations

Cooper noted there had not been much discussion on the mailing list on the [document](#) for a while. She asked ICG members to look at Step 4, "Proposal submission, 17 July – 31 July 2015".

- Karrenberg stated that he preferred only including the text under a), b) and c) and not having specific mention of ICANN Board because it was inappropriate for the ICG to pre-empt decisions by another governance body.
- Alhadeff said that the current draft was giving ICANN Board a special status that it did not warrant, but that the document could instead include text noting that the Board was expected to participate in the comments process along with anyone else. By participating in the process, the Board would then be able to pass on the proposal in the final stage without needing to make any amendments, with all its comments having been considered during the process of finalizing the proposal.
- Boyle agreed with Karrenberg and Alhadeff: the current text almost appeared to give the Board a veto over the ICG's work. He noted that the ICG had liaisons from Board and IANA. Their role is to flag where there are difficulties and issues. If there were still issues still being raised after 17 July 2015, then he questioned whether the liaisons would have performed their duty. He suggested that if the Board had specific concerns, then those concerns should have been raised by the liaisons at time the proposal was put together (that is, around the Singapore meeting timeframe).
- Bladel noted that it was not the ICG proposal finalization process text that was granting the ICANN Board special status. Rather, it was the NTIA's original outline of the process. Despite this, he noted that the current text could be amended by removing the second paragraph of c) and adding text about the proposal being published publicly and expecting liaisons to transmitting any concerns by date [X].
- Wu reported that the ICANN Board had discussed ICG the previous week. At that call, it was decided that the only issue that Board will look at would be any legal issues related to the proposal and nothing else in the ICG's final report. Wu stated that the Board would not modify a single word in final ICG report. If Board did have any legal concerns, it would submit those as separate document alongside the ICG's report. The Board was also looking at the possibility to set up meeting with the ICG. Any such meeting would be a public meeting, not a private one.
 - Cooper asked Wu what kind of issues the Board meant by "legal issues". Wu explained that as ICANN was based in California, the Board needed to ensure the proposal follows California law. If the Board were to meet with the ICG in Singapore, then the Board could describe any possible legal issues in more detail. Wu stressed that the Board believed that modifying the final report would not good behavior.
 - Alhadeff asked how the final proposal could have any relationship with California non-profit law. He stated that if the proposal did have any relationship with such law, then the ICANN Board needed to

- inform the ICG earlier than the Singapore meeting so the ICG could incorporate that impact in its proposal collation process.
- Wu stated that he would transmit to the Board the ICG's concerns about raising any possible legal concerns as soon as possible. He explained that the Board had formed a subgroup to engage in the stewardship transition process as early as possible and not wait to the end of the proposal process.
 - Cooper suggested to Wu that it would be good if the Board could send written confirmation of what Wu had just told the ICG on the call, then the issue of the Board's role in the process could be resolved, with both parties (Board and ICG) having mutually agreed a process.
- Karrenberg suggested keeping the original text from the second paragraph of 4 c), but removing edits to the text after that point.
 - Subrenat supported previous speakers on the issue of text references to the ICANN Board. He stated that the ICG should not give ICANN or any other organization or contributor any special status in the proposal process. NTIA had designated ICANN as a facilitator of process, but that did not mean they had a special status in the proposal's development. He was particularly concerned about the proposed text, "or exceptionally to raise them for the liaisons". He stated that it was not the ICG's role to tell the ICANN Board how they should raise any issues they may have with the proposal.
 - Lee suggested that, perhaps, if Board was concerned about legal issues, general counsel from ICANN could assist the ICG on any legal matters as needed.
 - Uduma stated that she was satisfied with Wu's statement and with the idea of Board's communication.
 - Cooper noted support from chat room on the issue too.
 - Cooper asked ICG members if they wanted to keep the highlighted text from section b) as she was not sure that it was necessary to keep. She asked members if, given the minuted comments from Wu on the call, the ICG could make the assumption that no formal correspondence was necessary. ICG members agreed.
 - Cooper noted some support in chat room to remove highlighted text in b) and not include any specific text about early feedback from the Board.
 - Cooper stated that she hoped the ICG could finalize the document by next call, on December 10.

Action:

- 1. Cooper to edit the proposal finalization document, Step 4, to remove more specific text in part b), on how the proposal is transmitted, and update part c), to not be so specific about how and when the ICANN Board is to give feedback on the proposal.**

3. Updates from the Communities

3.1 Names Community

Boyle reported that the Cross Community Working Group (CWG IANA) had effectively completed its responses to Section 1, "Community use" and Section 2, "Arrangements". In the CWG's face-to-face meeting the previous week, CWG members had also identified way forward for post-transition oversight and accountability arrangements (Section 3). He explained that there would be conference call for CWG members on 26 November to discuss this section further.

Boyle reported that discussion on Section 4, "Transition implications", had taken place on 25 November and there would be another conference call to continue the discussion on 28 November.

He explained that the CWG aimed to have the draft out for consultation on Monday 1 December and in the meantime, there was still a lot of discussion happening the CWG mailing list.

He reported that there were some problems in meeting the ICG's 15 January 2015 deadline, as some of the affected communities had identified at the beginning of the process. However, for those trying to meet the deadline, there was a lot of work underway.

Boyle explained that the Cross-community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN accountability stream 1 (mechanisms that must be in place or committed to before the IANA Stewardship Transition) needed to be addressed before the stewardship transition could take place. However, as the Cross Community Working Group on that issue (CCWG Accountability) had just started, the CWG IANA would not be able to address these issues in its IANA proposal.

Knoben noted that the CWG had timeline decided it needed until 31 January 2015 to submit the names component of the IANA stewardship proposal. Therefore, the ICG would need to consider how to take that later submission into consideration. He suggested that there should be early contact between the ICG and CWG IANA chairs on this issue.

Cooper observed that the names community seemed to be making extraordinary effort to get the work completed, which was appreciated. Since ICG had set 15 January 2015 as a target date rather than hard deadline, then the ICG could use the time between when it received the protocol and number proposals on 15 January and the names proposal on 31 January to begin the evaluation on the first two components of the proposal.

Boyle noted that the CWG's current discussion is looking at contracting and separability of IANA functions and operations and the possibility of re-bidding. In the CWG's face-to-face meeting it was noted that this discussion could have implications for the other communities (numbers and protocol parameters). He viewed as ICG's responsibility to check there was coherence between the three components. However, that particular issue may also need to be a point of discussion between those chairing the three different strands of the proposal.

3.2 Protocol Parameters Community

Housley reported that the latest [draft](#) had just been announced. A two-week IETF-wide last call was to be announced shortly. The community hoped to have the proposal finalized in time for the 15 January deadline.

In summary, Housley explained that the proposal stated that no new organizations were needed and that an SLA (service level agreement) was in place that was updated each year. All of the new items that people had suggested be included could therefore be added to the 2015 SLA.

3.3 Numbers Community

Karrenberg reported that the CRISP team was now finalized. The CRISP team would develop the numbers proposal. The CRISP team consisted of three representatives from each RIR: two from the community and one from RIR staff.

Cooper asked if the CRISP team would try to harmonize the drafts discussed to date by each RIR. Karrenberg responded that CRISP would work to develop a joint proposal based on the discussions that have been taking place in all regions. He was confident that there would be a clearer proposal emerging by the end of the year.

Action:

- 2. ICG to consider flagging issue of contracting and “separability “of IANA functions (under discussion by CWG on names component of IANA stewardship transition) with leaders of all communities developing stewardship proposals.**

4. Any Other Business

Cooper noted that in response to an earlier question on the call from Lee about the status of the ICG’s secretariat, she was not able to confirm finalization, but understood it was very close. She explained that she did not have any details that could be shared publicly at that point, but details should be available very soon.

Cooper reported that for the end of year, there were a few things the ICG needed to finalize or complete:

- Action items from the current call
- The ICG secretariat
- An updated version of the FAQ
- Logistics for the Singapore ICANN meeting (with time on the meeting agenda for a session with the community and the possibility for side meetings with community.
- A meeting and call schedule for 2015 (a Doodle poll to be posted shortly for all ICG members to respond to)

[Teleconference ended 3:00 UTC]

Summary of Action Items

1. Cooper to edit Step 4 of the latest version of the proposal finalization document (proposal-finalization-v3-pw-lsa.docx), to remove the more specific text in part b), on how the proposal is transmitted, and update part c) to not be so specific about how and when the ICANN Board is to give feedback on the proposal.
2. ICG to consider flagging issue of contracting and “separability” of IANA functions (under discussion by CWG on names component of IANA stewardship transition) with leaders of all communities developing stewardship proposals.