

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

05:00 - 06:00 UTC, Wednesday, 27 May 2015

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

Participants

Alissa Cooper (IETF)	Michael Niebel (GAC)
Jandyr Ferreira dos Santos (GAC)	Mohamed El Bashir (ALAC)
Jari Arkko (IETF)	Narelle Clark (ISOC)
Joseph Alhadeff (ICC/BASIS)	Paul Wilson (NRO)
Keith Davidson (ccNSO)	Russ Housley (IAB)
Lars-Johan Liman (RSSAC)	Russ Mundy (SSAC)
Lynn St Amour (IAB)	Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen (GNSO)
Manal Ismail (GAC)	Xiaodong Lee (ccNSO)
Mary Uduma (ccNSO)	

Liaisons:

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

Apologies:

Alan Barrett (NRO)	Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)
Daniel Karrenberg (RSSAC)	Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries)
Demi Getschko (ISOC)	Martin Boyle (ccNSO)
Hartmut Glaser (ASO)	Milton Mueller (GNSO)
James Bladel (GNSO)	Patrik Fältström (SSAC)
Jean-Jacques Subrenat (ALAC)	Thomas Schneider (GAC)
Jon Nevett (gTLD Registries)	

Secretariat:

Jennifer Chung
Sherly Haristya

ICANN Support Staff:

Josh Baulch
Mike Brennan

Agenda

1. Minutes approval for call #16

Cooper noted recent editing of the minutes, and suggested that ICG members continue discussing the minutes of Call #16 on the internal-cg mailing list and finalize for approval on or prior to the June 10 Call.

2. Emails to OCs regarding timing

Cooper stated that she has made edits to the [draft letter to the three operational communities](#) based on input from ICG members. She noted [multiple opinions on the internal-cg mailing list](#) about whether to send a letter to ICANN as well, and asked for further discussion on the call to resolve this issue.

Discussion

- Wilson asked for clarification on how and what the ICG will be asking ICANN, and stated that he had no problem with the general principle of asking ICANN to identify their concerns regarding implementation issues.

- Cooper replied that the basic idea is to send a similar letter (as the [one drafted to the communities](#)) to ICANN asking for their approximate implementation timeframe.
- Wilson stated that it did not make sense asking ICANN the same way as the ICG is planning on asking the communities. He explained that since the proposals are coming from the operational communities, the communities would have an opinion about their expected implementation timeline. He suggested that the ICG should ask ICANN for any observations or concerns, rather than place any expectation on ICANN to comment on implementation under the circumstances.
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Uduma agreed with Wilson.
- *Adobe Connect chat*: Arkko stated he had no objections either but asked if the ICG is ‘asking about [ICANN’s] view [on] CWG/CCWG implementation or some other, extra implementation timelines on top of that?’.
- Knobens supported sending a letter to ICANN to invite them to contribute to the timeline discussion. However, he suggested that the letter mention that while ICANN’s contribution is invited, the discussion about implementation timeline is more between the operational communities and the ICG to come up with a final response for the NTIA.
- Mundy thought that it would be wise for the ICG to send a letter to ICANN, even though there are a lot of unknown specifics at this point in time. He stated that it is very appropriate for ICG to formally ask ICANN to express their opinion with respect to implementation and timeline.
- Uduma agreed with Wilson. She referred to [her previous email](#) and stated that if the ICANN Board has input about implementation for the operational communities, the Board should send it to the communities, and in turn, the communities will send it to the ICG. She added that the ICANN Board liaison should be able to take this question to the Board and return with information for the ICG.
- Lee supported sending a letter to ICANN to ask their opinion about implementation.
- Alhadeff agreed with writing a letter to ICANN, and echoed the point Wilson raised in that the letter should have a different orientation to the one being sent to the operational communities. He did not think that the ICG is asking ICANN for comments on the implementation timeline of others, and suggested that it will be more useful to ask if there are any ICANN internal steps that will take time to implement and may impact the submission [of the proposal to NTIA].
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: St. Amour agreed with Wilson and Alhadeff, expressed her preference to be more inclusive, and suggested that the ICG ‘make it clear the request is for ICANN specific considerations SHOULD there be any not able to be covered in the OC [...] responses’.
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Arkko agreed with St. Amour.
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Liman agreed with Wilson and Alhadeff and added his reason being ‘in the interest of transparency’.
- Ismail supported sending a letter to ICANN. She agreed with Alhadeff that the letter should be drafted differently, and suggested that the ICG could reach out to ICANN while making it clear that the final input regarding implementation will be coming from the operational communities.
- Cooper noted a general agreement among the ICG with sending a letter to ICANN as long as it focuses on asking about ICANN’s internal process that might take time in the implementation phase, and also reinforces the fact that the proposal and implementation details come from the communities. She proposed that the ICG Chairs send the [drafted emails](#) to the operational communities as soon as possible, as the ICG is seeking a response in a couple weeks’ time. Cooper also proposed that the ICG Chairs draft the letter to be sent to ICANN and discuss the draft with ICG members on the internal-cg mailing list.
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: St. Amour, Ismail, Mundy, Clark, and Davidson supported Cooper’s approach.

- Wu thanked the ICG for having this discussion and said that ICANN will do their best to provide useful information to ICG based on ICG's letter. He also asked if ICG could specify the timeline for ICANN to give their input.
 - Cooper confirmed that the ICG will do so in the letter.

Action Items:

1. **ICG Chairs to send the emails regarding implementation to the three operational communities as soon as possible.**
2. **ICG Chairs to draft a letter to ICANN focusing on asking about ICANN internal process that may impact implementation, and discuss the draft with ICG members on the internal-cg mailing list.**

3. ICG timeline

Cooper urged the ICG members to firmly agree on the ICG timeline before the ICG receives the Names proposal as the proposed [timeline](#) will come into action once that happens. She gave a brief overview of the [timeline](#), noting that it contains a 4-to-5-week public comment period and aims to have the final proposal by ICANN Dublin if CWG-IANA submits the Names proposal to the ICG during ICANN Buenos Aires. She suggested that the ICG consider how much time is needed for ICG's process (step-by-step and overall), noted [Wilson's question](#) on the internal-cg mailing list, and asked for opinions on whether the [timeline](#) is a good estimate.

Discussion:

- Uduma asked whether the timeline of CCWG-Accountability will impact on the submission of CWG-IANA. She also asked whether the proposed [timeline](#) has been adjusted properly for the August-September summer holiday.
 - Cooper stated that the CWG-IANA proposal has components that requires CCWG-Accountability output, and noted that the projected timeline for the two groups are 4 months apart (CWG-IANA to submit the Names proposal to the ICG by ICANN Buenos Aires, CCWG-Accountability to finish their component for the Names proposal by ICANN Dublin). Nevertheless, Cooper explained that the ICG will carry on its assessment of the Names proposal in parallel with the completion of the CCWG-Accountability work. In response to Uduma's second question, Cooper agreed that the ICG needs some flexibility with scheduling during the summer holiday. She explained that was in part why the proposed public comment period stretches across August and September.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* St. Amour reiterated points made in her [email to the list](#).
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Housley stated that he understood St. Amour's points, and that 'the schedule is aggressive, but it is the only way [he sees] to get it done by the end of the year'.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* St. Amour agreed with Housley.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Davidson stated that he thinks 'the Names community is a bit ambitious in seeking to make this timeline, and [...] if the Accountability track is to go through robust consultation, it is likely that the Names proposal will not be fully finalized with consensus from the community until ICANN Dublin or shortly after'.
- Mundy stated his concern regarding how many comments the ICG will receive during the public comment period, and how challenging it will be to resolve those comments. He said that the ICG needs to base the duration of the public comment period on empirical data. He asked if it is reasonable for the ICG to estimate the potential quantity of comments and complexity of responses to come to a quantitative basis for the timeframe.
 - Cooper replied that one of the main reasons the ICG needs the timeline is to give NTIA an estimate of how the process will progress. She stated that the ICG needs to think about factors that could

wildly change the overall estimate. She noted that it is possible that a flood of public comments is one of those factors, but she did not think that it has a high probability of occurrence based on the previous public comment processes of the two submitted proposals.

- Mundy added that his concern is because it is the consolidated proposal, it might cause a number of people that did not pay attention earlier to jump in and say things that have not been raised at all previously. However, he is fine with Cooper's response and has no problem to move forward with what the ICG has.
- Alhadeff raised two points: 1. The ICG analysis of the public comments should start earlier because the ICG does not have to wait for the public comment period to be over before starting to look at comments. 2. If the comments result in a significant requirement for the ICG to go back to the three operational communities for dramatic changes of the proposal, then the ICG may need to have a second public comment period.
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Davidson, St. Amour, Ismail, El Bashir, Uduma, and Lee agreed with Alhadeff.
 - Cooper agreed that the ICG could start analyzing the comments earlier. She also agreed that the ICG could make use of a second public comment period if needed. She reemphasized that the ICG should try to meet the proposed [timeline](#), and continue to evaluate the process.
- Knoblen suggested two points: 1. Combine the assessment phases for the Names proposal and the consolidated proposal as they are interrelated. 2. Prepare an optional comment sheet in order to structure the incoming public comments (similar to those done by CWG-IANA and CCWG-Accountability) that could help commenters based on ICG criteria. Knoblen also asked for clarification on what needs to be done during the 'operational communities work (if necessary)' phase.
 - Cooper responded that the 'operational communities work (if necessary)' phase' is based upon request from the ICG. She further explained that if the ICG had clarification questions that required a response from the operational communities, that was the time allotted for this work. She assured Knoblen that the two other points are well taken.
- Ismail stated that she considered the proposed [timeline](#) to be a best case scenario timeline. She suggested that the ICG also create an extended scenario timeline with two public comment periods and factor in additional time for resolving controversial issues with the operational communities. She further suggested that, if necessary, ICANN Dublin may be used as the ICG's final face-to-face meeting to fine-tune the consolidated proposal and set the submission deadline for shortly afterwards.
 - Arkko responded that he is not sure having multiple timelines is the answer. He stated that the ICG could add text to the timeline stating clearly that it is a reasonable/optimistic timeline and if there are any additional events or complex comments that it may result in additional steps, such as adding a second comment period. *Adobe Connect chat*: Arkko added that 'the timeline currently doesn't show as much parallelism as there could be' and suggested that the 'preface to the three proposals' can be started before October.
 - Cooper and Mundy (*Adobe Connect chat*) agreed with Arkko regarding the timeline point.
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Clark agreed with Arkko regarding needing to work in parallel.
 - Ismail responded that it is not necessary to have two separate timelines, and reemphasized that it is more about taking into consideration what may shift the ICG's deadline. She stated she was fine with Arkko's suggestion.
- Cooper responded to Ismail's point regarding Dublin, and stated that the ICG have two options: the ICG can publish the timeline now without specific dates, or the ICG can publish the timeline with dates after receiving the Names proposal. She stated that the latter is her preference, and the ICG can then see if it will try to hit specific dates in Dublin or shortly thereafter.
- Alhadeff supported Arkko's proposal. He added that the ICG does not need to specify how much time additional issues may take. He suggested a disclaimer paragraph stating that the complexity of

comments may require changes in the timeline including the possibility of a second public comment period, and that it is a conditional timeline based on what the ICG receives.

- *Adobe Connect chat:* Arkko agreed.
- Lee wondered if the ICG can have some communication (informal or otherwise) with NTIA regarding their suggestions on the proposal, before the ICG finalizes the submission.
 - Cooper referred to the orange bar across the top of the [timeline](#) representing an on-going NTIA review of the proposal. She stated that this has been happening to some extent as NTIA feedback was given at the ICANN Singapore meeting.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Clark agreed that the NTIA has interacted, but pointed out that the NTIA does not review incomplete proposals and that the “testing’ bar is hardly validation of the [proposal] as a whole.’
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* St. Amour responded that ‘NTIA follows all this closely, and if they have serious reservations, I suspect they would become known’. Lee stated that ‘the NTIA always shows up when they think it is necessary to [comment] on the transition’.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Ismail noted that the discussion is mixing two different things: ‘NTIA review of the proposal vs. discussion with NTIA on the timeline and whether this is the response they are looking for’.
 - For more details on the NTIA interaction discussion, please refer to the [chat transcript](#).

Cooper summarized a general support from the ICG members to try to hit the proposed [timeline](#), but also make clear that there are some contingencies. She added that the ICG should do all it can to achieve timeliness including parallelizing review phases, formulating a comment sheet for the public comment period, and getting as much of the final proposal ready as possible. She noted [discussion on Adobe Connect chat regarding interaction with NTIA](#) and suggested that it can be discussed further on the internal-cg mailing list if needed. She stated she will incorporate comments received on ICG Call #17 and formulate text about contingencies to add to the [timeline](#), and noted this will give the ICG an estimate for the response to the NTIA letter. She concluded that the ICG can publish the [timeline](#) once the dates are added, after receipt of the Names proposal.

- There was no objection from the meeting participants for the proposed way forward.

Action Items:

- 3. Cooper to incorporate comments received on ICG Call 17 and formulate text about contingencies to add to the [timeline graphic](#).**
- 4. Cooper to update [timeline graphic](#) with specific dates once the Names proposal is received by the ICG. Secretariat to then publish the ICG [timeline graphic](#).**

Summary of Decisions Taken:

- 1. ICG to continue discussing the minutes of Call #16 on the internal-cg mailing list and finalize minutes for approval on or prior to the June 10 Call.**

Summary of Action Items:

- 1. ICG Chairs to send the emails regarding implementation to the three operational communities as soon as possible.**
- 2. ICG Chairs to draft a letter to ICANN focusing on asking about ICANN internal process that may impact implementation, and discuss the draft with ICG members on the internal-cg mailing list.**
- 3. Cooper to incorporate comments received on ICG Call 17 and formulate text about contingencies to add to the [timeline graphic](#).**
- 4. Cooper to update the [timeline graphic](#) with specific dates once the Names proposal is received by the ICG. Secretariat to then publish the ICG [timeline graphic](#).**