

Minutes: Day 2 of first meeting of the IANA Stewardship Coordination Group (ICG)

Viscount Suite, Hilton London Metropole
Friday 18 July 2014

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

London attendees:

Mohamed El Bashir, ALAC
Jean-Jacques Subrenat, ALAC
Hartmut Glaser, ASO
Xiaodong Lee, ccNSO
Mary Uduma, ccNSO
Martin Boyle, ccNSO
Tracy Hackshaw (Interim Member), GAC
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen, GNSO
Milton Mueller, GNSO
James Bladel, GNSO
Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries
Joseph Alhadef, ICC/BASIS
Russ Housley, IAB
Lynn St Amour, IAB
Jari Arkko, IETF
Alissa Cooper, IETF (interim ICG Chair)
Demi Getschko, ISOC
Adiel Akplogan, NRO
Paul Wilson, NRO
Daniel Karrenberg, RSSAC
Kuo-Wei Wu, ICANN Board Liaison
Elise Gerich, IANA Staff Expert

Remote attendees:

Keith Davidson, ccNSO
Narelle Clark, ISOC
Russ Mundy, SSAC
Jon Nevett, gTLD Registries

Apologies:

Patrik Fälström, SSAC
Heather Dryden (Interim Member), GAC
Lars-Johan Liman, RSSAC

ICANN staff:

Theresa Swinehart
Jim Trengrove
Ergys Ramaj
Alice Jansen

Luna Madi
Nancy Lupiano

Non-ICANN staff support:
Samantha Dickinson

[Meeting began 9:10 am, British Summer Time/ 8:10 am, UTC]

1. Introductions of ICG Members Not Present on Day 1

Cooper asked Lee, who was not able to be present on Day 1, to introduce himself. A matrix of the details provided by all ICG members is included as Annex A to the minutes of the first meeting. *(Please note that the matrix also contains some additional information supplied by members of the ICG following the meeting.)*

2. Agenda Bashing

Cooper reported that she had posted an [updated version of the agenda](#) overnight. She explained that Day 2 would be a mix of “parking lot” discussions left over from Day 1 as well as some new topics. But there had been some requests to move the ICG participation item to the beginning of the meeting. The [final version of the agenda](#), agreed to by ICG members, was duly posted.

3. Parking Lot: ICG Participation Discussion

Cooper noted that St Amour had sent a draft note to the internal-cg mailing list to consider sending to the GAC (see **Action Item ICG-03** from meeting Day 1).

St Amour noted that she liked a [proposal on the mailing list by Cooper](#) to amend “consensus” to “rough consensus” in the note to the GAC.

Discussion on contents of the note:

- Subrenat suggested that the note to the GAC should include text that acknowledges that the expansion of GAC representation on the ICG is in response to the GAC’s request for five slots (the choice of the number five was not the ICG’s arbitrary decision). He also suggested specifically mentioning that the ICG understand that, based on the GAC’s working methods, having five members on the ICG would help engage more governments in the stewardship process.
 - St Amour noted that this language had been included in the [draft note sent to the mailing list](#) and asked if Subrenat was requesting a refinement to the language.
 - Subrenat suggested that it could be more clearly stated that the ICG viewed the GAC request as being entirely reasonable.
- Wu reported that after talking to Swinehart about the process used to determine the number of GAC members on the ICG, he was happy to remove his concerns about process that he had [expressed overnight](#) on the internal-cg mailing list.
 - St Amour asked the group to reconfirm that they were happy with the process used on Day 1 to agree to have five GAC members on the ICG. She noted there were nods and thumbs up in the room in response to her question.

- Subrenat suggested including a summary of the discussion held on Day 1 in the note to the GAC so it was clear to the wider community why GAC numbers were being expanded while no other community is having its numbers expanded on the ICG.
 - Akplogan agreed with this, noting that it would help prevent other communities coming forward and wanting to request more seats on the ICG.
- Cooper suggested that it would be good for the ICG to make the letter to the GAC public, and not just be a private communication to the GAC Chair. She stated that she also thought there was value in linking the expectations that the ICG had of how the five GAC members would work and the ICG's decision to accept the GAC's request for five seats on the ICG.
- Karrenberg supported Subrenat's suggestions.
- Wu thought that no detailed explanation of why the ICG had decided to increase the number of GAC members was needed. A simple rationale should suffice.
 - Akplogan agreed that the note to the GAC did not have to be detailed. Detail about the ICG's discussion and decision about five GAC members could be included in the report of the meeting or in the minutes of the meeting.
 - Alhadeff agreed that explanation did not have to be elaborate, but did believe that it would be worth including a mention of how the ICG was looking forward to the GAC members participating not just in the ICG, but also in the communities of interest developing specific proposals.
- Uduma supported all suggestions made so far and asked for information on how the GAC had made its request for more members.
 - Cooper explained that the ICG had not received a request from the GAC. Instead, it was relayed to the ICG by ICANN staff.
- Mueller supported the original draft note sent to the internal-cg list by St Amour. He explained that he liked that the draft explained that there were conditions related to why the ICG was supporting more GAC members joining the ICG, and that the number had not been increased just because the GAC made the request.
 - Arkko and Drazek supported this approach.
- Akplogan stated that he was fine with Cooper's mailing list proposal to change "consensus" to "rough consensus" but wanted to prevent any expectation that the ICG would be sending anything more to the ICANN Board than a report of how consensus was reached on the final proposal – not every detail of the discussion leading up to consensus.
- Arkko stated that he thought that of the items listed in St Amour's draft, it was items 3 and 4 ("(3) clear expectations that the work be done in the respective communities, with participation from all stakeholders, leaving the CG the relatively narrow role of coordination, and 4) a nascent agreement that we would operate by "consensus" judged more by the merit of the objections rather than the number") that were most important to include.
 - Akplogan supported this emphasis, agreeing with Arkko that the other numbered items could be deleted.
 - Karrenberg expressed a concern that some of the proposed points seemed more appropriate in a communiqué about the meeting rather than in a response to the GAC. He also suggested using more diplomatic language so it was clear that the ICG was responding to the GAC's understanding of how their five members would work, rather than the ICG imposing expectations on the GAC.
- St Amour wondered procedurally how the note to the GAC could be presented to the GAC, given the GAC did not seem to have made the request to the ICG in the first place.

- Arkko suggested that the manner in which the ICG received the request should not matter, but, echoing Subrenat's earlier concerns about making it clear why one community had its numbers increased while others have not, the response should be made public.
- Cooper pointed out that the draft note did not actually state what the ICG had actually decided in relation to the GAC's request, so that should be added.
- St Amour asked if there was consensus to remove items 1 and 2 from the draft note and leaving points 3 and 4 in. Knobn and Subrenat stated their support for this way of handling the items.

In response to a question by Knobn, St Amour clarified that a small drafting group would finish the drafting process on the note to the GAC after this discussion concluded. Subrenat and Akplogan offered to help with drafting.

Discussion about how to communicate the ICG's decision to the GAC:

- St Amour reported that ICANN staff had been receiving queries about the ICG's decision on the number of GAC representatives, and given the ICG's decision on Day 1 was on the public record, it was better to send a response to the GAC Chair sooner rather than later. She suggested that the note should be signed "The Coordination Group" and be sent by Swinehart or some part of the secretariat.
- Mundy expressed concern that the first formal communication by the ICG could be this note to the GAC rather than publication of a draft charter or summary statement of the ICG's meeting.
 - Karrenberg supported this view, stating that the ICG should not be seen to be overly influenced by external pressure – specifically from the GAC.
 - El Bashir suggested that the note to the GAC be part of the general package of documentation to be finalized by the end of the day.
 - Wilson expressed surprise about how long it was taking to complete the note to the GAC, given the meeting was open and that GAC members observing the discussions remotely already knew what the decision was. He suggested that the primary outcome for the ICG's meeting should be the charter document, followed afterward by the GAC letter.
 - Lee supported this view, stating that there was not a need to spend a lot of time crafting the GAC response.
- Subrenat asked if the communication with the GAC had to be a formal letter from the ICG or it could be done less formally, such as Swinehart contacting the GAC Chair by phone or email.
- St Amour explained that part of the reason for wanting a fast turnaround for the GAC note was that the ICG was going to make some significant decisions through Day 2 and it would be useful to be able to let the extra GAC members feel informed about their new role and the discussions taking place. She suggested working on the letter in parallel with other discussions during the day, with perhaps an initial brief email to the Chair to let her know that a more formal communication would follow shortly. She noted that nodding around the table indicated agreement amongst group members to follow this path.

4. Parking Lot: Leftover Charter Discussion

Arkko reported that he had met with Mueller and Uduma over breakfast to develop a new version of the proposed charter for the ICG (see Action item ICG-01 from Day 1). The small drafting group was able to resolve all issues that had been raised during Day 1 discussions and on the mailing list except use of the word “legitimate,” the introductory text for the charter, and how to ensure that the charter sufficiently covered directly affected parties as well as less directly affected parties.

Arkko proposed that the ICG members look at the latest draft of the charter, [version 4](#), which had been sent to the mailing list earlier that morning.

Discussion on the relationship between stakeholders and how input from all communities would be handled:

- Akplogan asked if the ICG planned only to assess the proposals of the three directly affected parties.
 - Arkko agreed that, yes, the latest draft did not try to attempt to have equality of process for handling directly affected and indirectly affected parties.
- Alhadeff noted that the new version tried to address the concerns he’d expressed on Day 1 by referring to “directly affected parties” and “indirectly affected parties”. However, he did not think this distinction would be meaningful to the reader as “directly” and “indirectly” seemed to be a matter of scale rather than an objective difference. He suggested “entities engaged with IANA” as an alternative.
 - Arkko thought this could work, while noting that some “indirectly affected programs” did engage directly with IANA, such as software programmers needing port numbers who would send email to IANA.
 - Alhadeff replied that he thought Arkko’s example was more of “directly affected” party than of an “engaged” entity.
 - Housley did not support “engaged” as there were many people who did engage directly with IANA, not only to obtain a port number, but also to register a media type, etc.
 - Wilson suggested that the term “operational communities” could work as long as the charter included quotation marks around the term and explained that the term meant parties that had an operational relationship with IANA.
 - Housley did not believe that “operational” clarified matters more than “directly affected” and did not have a strong preference for either description. He suggested perhaps putting “directly affected” in brackets, then including a description along the lines that Wilson had suggested.
 - Cooper supported putting the term, whether “engaged entities” or “directly affected parties” in quotes, with definitions to accompany, as Wilson had proposed.
 - Alhadeff clarified that for the business community, its worst fear was that the IANA stewardship transition could go off the rails, at which point, with IANA unable to perform its commercial function, businesses would become directly affected parties. Therefore, “directly” or “indirectly” was a matter of interpretation. Instead, Alhadeff stated that he could accept [Wilson’s proposal](#).
 - Akplogan suggested “directly engaged” or “direct customer”.
 - Subrenat stated that he thought user communities would understand the difference between “directly engaged” and those “directly affected” by

decisions. However, “customer” implied a commercial relationship and would exclude users.

- Arkko stated that he currently preferred “direct customers” as a replacement for “directly affected parties”.
- Boyle confirmed that referring to “contracted” parties was not an acceptable term to use at this stage, but that “direct customer” was a useful concept as it brought to the forefront the idea that if the service did not work properly, the DNS would be in jeopardy. He suggested “directly impacted” as an alternative that would get around the issue with the word “customer”.
 - Karrenberg asked to remove the reference “all contractual” as “service relationships” covered the notion of contracts.
 - Arkko noted there was consensus to remove “contractual”.
- Arkko noted that Wilson’s formulation sent to the mailing list, “those with direct operational, service or contractual relationships with IANA” could cover a broad range of cases that could cover the relationships of names, numbers and protocol parameter communities associated directly with the three IANA key functions. Cooper also supported the formulation.
- Alhadeff supported Wilson’s formulation, noting that his concern with the use of “customer” was related to the fact that most people associated “customer” with a financial relationship, and that this was not necessarily the case with IANA and the entities it directly worked with.
- Mueller stated that he liked “operational communities” but since that was now defined as “direct operational service or contract relationships,” there was no need to use “directly affected”.
- Arkko asked if anyone in the group minded deleting “directly affected”. There were no objections.
- Wilson noted that version 4 talked about assessing the outputs from communities, but did not mention the process for soliciting proposals in the first place.
 - Housley supported adding text that would specify how this should happen.
- Bladel stated that the current version referred to three main categories of IANA functions—names, numbers and protocol parameters—but that this omitted a fourth implicit function of an independent accountability structure for ICANN, particularly for the naming community. He asked the group if that fourth function should be included in the charter, or whether it was something that was specific to the naming community and therefore left for the naming community’s proposal to address.
- Arkko noted that Wilson had suggested that the charter contain five main tasks, the first of which was to solicit proposals not only from operational communities, but also input from other stakeholders. From Arkko’s point of view, it was becoming clearer that everyone was now an “interested party” and that the ICG would solicit *proposals* from operational parties and *input* from other parties.
 - Alhadeff suggested that rather than just “soliciting” a proposal from operational parties, the ICG needed to state more clearly that it was providing requirements that proposals needed to meet. He also suggested clearer text about the input from other parties that would note that while there were no formal requirements regarding such input, such parties were requested to channel input through their community liaisons. This would prevent the ICG from potentially being directly flooded by community input.

- Wilson supported this suggestion, as did Drazek, with the clarification that rather than “requirement”, the word “request” or “recommendation” be used.
 - Housley agreed with Drazek and suggested that the ICG also needed to ask the directly affected communities why they think they had consensus on the proposal they were putting forward.
- Karrenberg stated that one of the main problems that the ICG may encounter as it starts assembling the complete proposal is that new stakeholders will want to enter the discussion. He suggested it would be helpful to state a very clear and explicit expectation that interested parties must participate as early in the community processes as possible and not wait until proposals are submitted to the ICG.
 - Bladel supported this concept, as did Alhadeff and Boyle. Housley liked that the proposed language was more explicit about encouraging participation directly in the communities and not at the level of the ICG.
 - Boyle suggested that the text specifically talk about participating “within their communities” so anyone who felt they did not get their way within their community would look for other avenues to achieve their aims.
 - Alhadeff asked that text also be added to state that while people should participate within their respective communities, the ICG was open to input on topics that cut across all three areas (names, numbers and protocol parameters).
 - Cooper also suggested text noting that if there was community-specific input submitted to the ICG, that the ICG reserves the right to forward it to the relevant community.
 - Akplogan responded that there are people who have either by choice or legacy reasons not identified themselves as part of the three main communities and may find it difficult to participate in processes of those main communities. He asked if it was the ICG’s role to force such parties into those three main communities or whether the ICG should allow those parties would be able to send input to the ICG instead.
 - Arkko suggested that, yes, such parties should be forced to engage in the existing communities – otherwise it would become an unscalable situation.
 - Drazek expressed the importance of acknowledging that there may be two separate proposals from the naming communities—ccTLD and gTLD.
 - Cooper stated that saying “plan or plans” could imply more than two proposals, so it would be better to explicitly state “one or two plans”.
 - In response, Boyle noted that there were some ccTLDs with strong views that may want to submit a separate plan, so there could conceivably be more than two name-related proposals.
 - Arkko stated that he hoped that the naming community could find a way to divide up the work of developing a plan that would result in complementary rather than competing plans. He also noted that it might be necessary for the ICG to help coordinate between separately developed ccTLD and gTLD proposals.
 - Davidson stated that he preferred the original text.
 - Arkko asked the group if they objected to the inclusion of “possibly a joint proposal” in the charter.

- Wu stated that he would prefer the original text, but would not object to Arkko's proposed text.
- Arkko summarized the discussion, noting that there seemed to be consensus to have text that allowed the naming community to deliver one or two plans, as they felt best. He noted the revised version would be sent as [version 5](#) to the mailing list.

Discussion about the use of "legitimate":

- Arkko asked the group how they felt about using "legitimate" in the current text, "[t]his group's scope is focused on the arrangements required for the continuance of IANA functions in an accountable and legitimate manner after the expiry of the NTIA-ICANN contract".
- Mueller noted that there seemed to be concern by some in the group that "legitimate" implied a relationship to law and regulation. However, he had proposed the term in the context as used in political science, where to establish authority, it was necessary to have popular acceptance of that authority. He explained that the NCSG had agreed that they wanted a reference to the legitimacy of ICANN in the charter – something that would invoke its popular acceptance as an authority. He asked why others in the group thought that "legitimacy" was such a problematic word.
 - Alhadeff explained that in some cases, it was government that granted legitimacy. He suggested using "legitimized" as an alternative word to avoid the legal overtones of "legitimacy". Or "recognized".
 - Mundy supported "recognized" as a possible word. Or "appropriate".
 - Boyle stated that he struggled with "legitimate," but for a different reason: its use seemed vague within the context of the sentence it appeared in. The essence seemed to be to state that IANA was following previously recognized or agreed rules. So instead of "legitimate", Boyle stated a preference for the use of the simpler words "agreed" or "recognized".
 - Arkko agreed with Boyle on the issue of recognition.
 - Mueller argued that "recognized" could have more of an official legal connotation than "legitimate" as it implied that someone had the power to bestow that recognition. If the text said "popularly recognized" or "popularly accepted", that would be more acceptable.
 - Subrenat offered "representative of the affected communities".
 - Arkko stated that he did not think this formulation would work as there needed to be almost universal acceptance of IANA, not just acceptance by the names, numbers and protocol parameters communities. A description along the lines of "widely recognized" would be more appropriate.
 - Akplogan preferred the term "accepted" over "recognized" as it seemed to be cover a broader range of concepts: "in an accountable and widely accepted manner".
 - Arkko noted there were no objections to this suggestion in the room.

[Coffee break]

5. Internal and External Communications Needs

Boyle reported that there were two separate groups of communication tools that were needed: one set to help the ICG communicate amongst its members and another set to communicate with the outside world.

Boyle noted that the group currently had a mailing list, and wondered if there was interest in having other tools, such as a non-public mailing list ICG wiki, summaries of the mailing list for ease of information access and reference documents to help the ICG do its work. He noted that the platform used for adding comments to the NETmundial draft outcome document was very impressive and asked if such a platform might be useful for the group.

Internal wiki:

- Housley, Cooper and Lee supported a Wiki.

Internal mailing lists:

- Housley did not think a non-public mailing list as needed. He did think it would be useful to have a mailing list that only the ICG members could post to, but that mailing list should be publicly archived, as well as a separate mailing list that, further into the ICG's work, people could use to communicate with the ICG.
- Gerich noted that the group already had a mailing list, but Cooper responded that it remained to be discussed whether the group would maintain the list set up by ICANN or whether it would be a temporary list that would be replaced by longer-term, non-ICANN hosted mailing list.
 - Gerich expressed concern about changing lists, with the potential for the group's discussions to be spread in multiple locations.
 - Cooper stated that because the ICG was an autonomous body with independence from ICANN it was important to consider hosting an IGC website and mailing list independent of ICANN.
 - Karrenberg suggested that if the group wanted to host its mailing list separate from ICANN infrastructure, it would be possible to transfer the archives of the existing internal-cg list to the new ICG domain.
- Lee and Akplogan supported a private (ICG members only posting rights) mailing list. Akplogan suggested using the internal-cg list as the private list and creating a second list for interaction with the public.
- Karrenberg reminded group members of the community unhappiness that had resulted when ICANN tried to move the [ianatransition](#) mailing list to a forum platform and advised the group to think carefully about its own plans for mailing lists.
- Boyle asked if there was support for the idea of looking for another host for the mailing list and moving the existing internal-cg archive across. He noted group members in the room were nodding and giving the thumbs up to the idea. Boyle noted that there seemed to be agreement to continue using the internal-cg list just for ICG members, with archives publicly available, and that a separate list be set up for interaction between the ICG and the wider community.
- Wilson stated that given ICANN was facilitating the stewardship process, he did not see anything controversial with ICANN hosting the ICG's mailing list.
 - Cooper stated that she thought it was a controversial situation.

- In response, Boyle asked the secretariat to investigate possible hosts for the ICG mailing list.

Internal drafting platform:

- Subrenat stated that he thought it was always useful to have a drafting and editing platform used by authorized community members. He noted that in ALAC, specific pages would be set up as needed to document idea exchanges or edit documents.
- Boyle noted that when drafting a document it could be difficult to follow exchanges over a mailing list, which is where a drafting platform such as the NETmundial platform, which allowed readers to see exactly who had commented against each paragraph, could come in handy.
- Cooper stated that it was unlikely that ICG members would be creating much text itself, and that the NETmundial platform had a significant drawback: it did not allow overall comments on the document but only paragraph by paragraph comments. In terms of possible use of the platform for external communications, it was not necessary to address this yet.
- Akplogan supported having a drafting platform to allow for collaborative editing, as there would always be some forms of document that the ICG members would be working on. He stated that he preferred the Netmundial platform over a wiki because the NETmundial WordPress plugin replicated what most people were used to in editing and commenting on documents via word processing applications. In contrast, wikis favored those more used to text-oriented environments. He noted that the WordPress plugin could be configured to allow document-wide commenting as well as paragraph-by-paragraph comments.
 - In response, Boyle asked the secretariat to investigate possible tools for collaborative drafting.

Monitoring community activities:

- Boyle, noting that all ICG members had responsibilities to liaise directly with their communities, asked if there was any interest in proactively establishing liaisons with drafting groups within communities or perhaps waiting until communities organize themselves to decide how to proceed.
 - Knobon supported making a decision later, when it was clearer what was happening within communities.

Other internal:

- Lee suggested a group chat function via an instant messaging platform.
- Karrenberg expressed concern that whatever tools the ICG used, it was important that the tools not exclude anyone due to issues like low bandwidth, etc.
- Alhadeff suggested that independent of drafting platforms, it would be useful to have a methodology for naming versions of documents being developed.

Action item ICG-06: Secretariat to investigate 1) a non-ICANN host for the ICG mailing list and to provide an archive of the existing ICANN-hosted mailing list that can be transferred to the new host; and 2) options for a collaborative drafting/editing tool.

Boyle asked ICG members to consider what needs it may have for external communications. He noted that the group had already agreed to be fully transparent and make its materials – including streams, transcripts and mailing lists—public. He asked if there were any other communication that the group thought would be needed.

External summaries of ICG's work:

- Drazek stated that he thought it was important for the ICG to summarize its own work rather than have it summarized by others. He wondered if it would be good to have a regular series of updates for the communities, but believed that writing such updated could be done via the mailing list and did not need a specific drafting platform.
 - Cooper agreed, adding that such summaries could be placed on the ICG's own website. A website would also be a good place to provide snapshots of the work happening in the diverse communities creating proposals for the transition.
 - Karrenberg felt that there was a difference between summarizing discussions and drawing conclusions. He believed that the clerical task of summarizing and categorizing information could be delegated, as he didn't think the ICG members would have the resources to perform that task as well as all their other work.
 - Boyle summarized the discussion: the ICG would rely on the secretariat to produce summaries, with the ICG to do sanity checks on the summaries.
 - Wilson stated that he hoped that the communications coming out of the ICG would be at a lightweight, pragmatic and factual level, which could be performed by the secretariat.

Other external:

- El Bashir noted that the ICG's work was important to the future of Internet governance and therefore should use multiple channels outside the ICG website and mailing list to reach as many people as possible. Such channels would include press releases and social media.

6. Introductions (Continued)

Cooper noted that Hackshaw had arrived and asked him to introduce himself. The matrix of the details provided by all ICG members is included as Annex A to the minutes of the first meeting.

7. Framework for the Transition (Over Lunch)

Subrenat provided an overview of the wider Internet governance context that the stewardship transition was taking place within, in particular, the globalization of Internet structures. He reported that the BRICS countries (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa) had decided to set up a fund of USD 100 billion to finance large public infrastructure; while this fund was not related to the Internet, the Internet community should consider the ramifications of such spending on national infrastructure on the possible fragmentation of the Internet.

Subrenat also gave an overview of ICANN efforts to globalize, noting that with increasing globalization efforts in Internet organizations, the public would be closely watching how the ICG would take such globalization into account in terms of selection of its co-chairs (geographic and linguistic diversity).

Subrenat asked ICG members to consider why the NTIA had announced its plan to transition its stewardship role now rather than at an earlier point. He stated that he believed that the Snowden revelations were part of the reason for the NTIA's decision to make the announcement in 2014.

8. Secretariat tasks and selection

Karrenberg pointed group members to an email he had sent to the mailing list containing a [summary of input](#) he had received from everyone. He suggested breaking the discussion into two parts: agree to the tasks and then how to have those tasks performed.

Discussion on tasks:

- Subrenat suggested that the secretariat should continue the translation and interpretation services temporarily supplied by ICANN.
- Housley stated that he had highlighted meeting and travel arrangements as something to be considered, as it was not clear that ICANN would perform the role of secretariat going forward.
- In terms of the secretariat's role in supporting communication with the community, Wu reported that it would be useful if the secretariat could provide information from the current meeting so Wu and Wilson could take it to the upcoming [APrIGE](#).
- Alhadeff requested that the proposed task of "summarizing the input from the community" to "summarize, subject to review by the community".
 - Cooper proposed "assist in the compilation and summarization", which Alhadeff supported.
- Hackshaw asked if the secretariat could track information such as stewardship discussions happening at regional IGF and presenting compilation papers on such discussions back to the ICG.
 - Cooper stated that she thought the ICG members should be doing this task and not the secretariat.
- Karrenberg stated that it should be made explicit that it was not the task of the secretariat to develop conclusions or interpret the material that the ICG was discussing.
- Uduma asked what "Operate and managed contact points for the community" meant. Karrenberg explained that it referred to the secretariat's role in compiling and maintaining contact information.

Media requests:

- Karrenberg reported that based on the discussions from Day 1, he was proposing that if there were media inquiries, the secretariat would simply point to where the ICG's documents were and assist the media find the information it was looking for. He was also proposing that if there were media requests to speak to someone, the secretariat would provide the media with a complete list of ICG members and ask the media to choose from that list. He stated that he was comfortable about the discussion earlier in Day 2 that had suggested that the co-chairs have a special role to play in speaking to the media.
 - Subrenat stated that he thought that giving a list would send the message that the group members did not trust each other.

- Alhadeff stated that media might want queries answered from an ICG rather than a constituency perspective, so there might need to be a process that the ICG could use to develop collective statements. He explained that the ICG might be doing itself a disservice if it did not answer the actual question being asked by the media but rather pointed to people who could only answer pieces of the question.
- Cooper stated that if the media were to be presented with a list of 30 names, they would give up, make up the information they needed, or look elsewhere outside the ICG to obtain the information they needed. She proposed that requests be forwarded to the whole ICG to coordinate a response to. Members could then volunteer to talk to the media before the deadline. Alternatively, a couple of ICG members could be nominated to respond to the media if there was not enough time for that group process. She also suggested that another option was for some of the ICG members to be enabled to, if not be quoted by the media, at least provide the media with background information on the transition process.
- Arkko agreed with Cooper's suggestions, noting that it might be useful to ensure that the co-chairs were particularly well prepared on media matters, as the media were more likely to approach people in those positions.
- Akplogan reinforced his comment from Day one that he believed it was important to have a preferred contact for media because if everyone was able to speak, they would be doing it as representatives of their communities rather than on behalf of the whole ICG but it would be in the ICG's interests to have someone able to represent the entire group. This would not prevent members speaking to the media if contacted directly, but there should be talking points to aid everyone in talking to the media in such cases. He also noted that if the group waited until there was agreement amongst the members before responding to the media, the group would waste many valuable opportunities, as media often had very short deadlines.
- Subrenat suggested that the ICG develop agreement on the general messages it wished to convey as the process progressed over time. He also suggested deferring continued discussion on media relations as it was heading away from the agenda item on secretariat tasks.
- Uduma asked if all representatives of a community would be able to speak to the media, or whether there would be a single representative from each community. She also suggested that if the group were to be taken seriously, it needed to be seen as a team and therefore should have a focal point to talk to the media. She suggested that this role be performed by one of the co-chairs.
- Lee supported having a spokesperson for the media. He also suggested using the secretariat to support media tasks by providing materials or assistance in handling the media.
- Cooper suggested that the secretariat be a communications channel for directing media requests to the group and assisting the group by providing external relations support and leave further discussion about the media until later.
- Karrenberg stated that from preceding discussions, it was clear that the group wanted to be able to tell the secretariat what they could and could not do in relation to contact with the media.
- Wu stated that the ICG should issue official press releases to let the public know what its decisions were but that other than that, each ICG member should be able to express their personal opinions to the media.
- Mueller stated that there was no need to regulate how group members spoke to the media, whether as individuals or as representatives of stakeholder groups.

- Akplogan suggested that instead of “talking to the press”, the secretariat could “liaise with the press” as he saw it as part of the secretariat’s responsibility to coordinate the group’s communications strategy.

Karrenberg suggested to remove the press related tasks until the broader issue of media relations was resolved. He asked whether there was consensus on the remaining tasks. When no objections were raised he stated that he saw consensus on the list of tasks.

Action item ICG-07: ICG members to make decision on how to handle media relations.

Secretariat funding:

- Cooper noted that it was her understanding that ICANN needed to put out a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the secretariat function.
- Swinehart reported that it was up to the ICG how the secretariat were to function. ICANN had some budget available to support the secretariat function from its funds allotted to the NTIA stewardship transition process. The stewardship budget was also where the travel funding for ICG members came from.
- Karrenberg asked if group members would find it acceptable for ICANN to perform the secretariat function if the staff allocated to the secretariat reported exclusively to the ICG.
 - Drazek, St Amour and Cooper supported having the secretariat as an independent function. St Amour noted that external parties would view ICANN as an interested party in the IANA stewardship transition, so it was important to prevent perceptions of secretariat bias.
 - Akplogan noted that if the ICG were to choose to have an independent secretariat, it would need to be set up very quickly because when the substantive work of the ICG got underway, it would need support very quickly. He suggested building on the way that the NETmundial secretariat had been formed.
 - Wilson stated that he thought that ICANN’s role was uncontroversial, but that if others thought there was controversy about ICANN’s role, then the best thing was to have an independent secretariat.
 - Karrenberg supported this view.
 - Alhadeff stated that there was a difference between administrative support (arranging a meeting venue, translation services, and travel support) and the work of liaising with the ICG to summarize documents or provide communications support. He suggested that ICANN could continue to provide the administrative services it was already providing to the ICG.
- Karrenberg asked for views on how an independent secretariat could be selected.
 - Subrenat asked, if the ICG planned to separate administrative support provided by ICANN from a secretariat that performed summarizing and communications support, whether it was possible for ICANN to fund that separate secretariat function.
 - Cooper stated that her understanding was that ICANN could pay for a separate secretariat. She also noted that the process of selecting a secretariat could be completed completely, citing the example of the IETF secretariat.
 - Swinehart confirmed that ICANN could hire an independent person to work directly with the ICG. She also noted that because the idea of an independent secretariat was the result of community feedback, there might be a need to engage

- the community again for feedback on the proposed secretariat. Swinehart also reported that the budget for the NTIA stewardship was part of the larger ICANN budget that had made available for public comment. Community feedback was currently being incorporated. She noted that the stewardship related budget was part of the same funding pool that incorporated the ICANN accountability process.
- El Bashir suggested either an RFP or a process where ICANN could provide the ICG with a contractor to perform the non-administrative functions of a secretariat and that while the independent secretariat was being put in place, ICANN could continue to prove the interim secretariat function.
 - Drazek and Akplogan supported this option.
 - Mundy expressed a concern that if ICANN was hiring such a contractor, it would be little different in reality to ICANN providing a staff member that would report exclusively to the ICG.
 - Housley stated that from the IAB's perspective, it was important that the secretariat be as independent from ICANN as possible, but that there was a significant difference between a contractor paid by ICANN and an ICANN employee performing the function. He also supported ICANN continuing as interim secretariat until a new secretariat was put into place.
 - Glaser explained how the secretariat for NETmundial was developed: ICANN funded the secretariat, while Glaser selected the secretariat personnel. The selection process only took a few days from start to finish.
 - As another example, St Amour explained how ISOC funded the IETF secretariat. Contracts are in ISOC's name, but the secretariat takes direction only from the IETF.
 - Karrenberg proposed that if ICG members were serious about secretariat independence, perhaps the members themselves should fund the secretariat, rather than ICANN.
 - After using the [IETF humming method](#) to gauge support for the three options on the table, there was no support amongst ICG members for this option, but there was support for either an ICANN staff member reporting directly to the ICG or an ICANN-funded contractor to perform the secretariat function.

Action item ICG-08: ICG members to make decision on how the secretariat function should be performed.

9. Parking Lot: Self Organization Discussion

Alhadeff reported that he had sent a [summary of Day 1 discussions on the topic](#) to the mailing list. He reported that, to date, there had been five nominations for the positions of co-chair: Housley, Cooper, Fälström, Davidson and Subrenat. He hoped that the process of choosing co-chairs could be resolved within a week.

- Hackshaw noted that, with the five GAC members having just been approved, it would be good to involve them in the co-chair process.
 - Alhadeff noted that GAC members had not yet been aware of the possibility of self-nominating for co-chair positions.
- Drazek suggested that it would help the ICG members with making decisions about who would be selected as co-chairs if the roles of the co-chairs could be defined more clearly.

As he understood it, the role would be to set the agenda, work with the secretariat and keep the ICG running smoothly. He wondered if there was any desire to have equal community representation, but suspected that this would be a slippery slope.

- Boyle supported defining co-chair roles more clearly. He also supported taking a week for making the decision about co-chairs to enable ICG members to go back to their community to see if there was any wish to put forward anyone from the community as a co-chair nominee.
- Arkko suggested that the chair role should be lightweight, with other members of the ICG still playing active roles as session leaders and drafting leaders.
- Housley stated that one function for chairs was tracking action items and encouraging people to complete them.
- Alhadeff stated that discussion at the meeting seemed to be reaching convergence on the role of chair as helping to lead the process toward consensus if consensus was not emerging organically, rather than calling consensus. He also suggested that nominees write a short statement to support their nomination to help with the selection process.
- Karrenberg asked whether there was consensus that the chair could fully participate in the discussions while chairing the meetings. There were no objections.
- Karrenberg added that he hoped the group would trust and empower the chair to exercise their tasks rather than engage in arguments about procedure.
- Drazek pointed out that with three co-chairs, it would be possible to have a representative from the three IANA functions communities: names, numbers and protocol parameters, However, it was not necessary to mandate that each community have a co-chair position, particularly as there were other communities within the ICG that may also want to be represented.
- Subrenat suggested that co-chair selection could consider regional diversity and ensure that any one nation has no more than one representative as a co-chair.
- Cooper noted that with all the discussion about the appropriate number of co-chairs, it might be easier to have two rather than three co-chairs.
 - Arkko agreed this was a viable option, with perhaps a third co-chair being added if it became clear that the work was too much for two co-chairs.
 - Akplogan stated he was in favor of three co-chairs and in favor of diversity.
 - Wilson also supported diversity, but not in terms of one representative from each of the IANA functions community. He suggested greater diversity would be achieved by perhaps having representatives selected from the technical community, government, business and At-Large users.
 - Mueller stated that he was not concerned with diversity but with the co-chairs' ability to do their jobs well.
 - Knoblen and Karrenberg agreed with Mueller, with Karrenberg stating that complementary skills amongst the co-chairs was a more important factor.
 - Akplogan responded that it was possible to have both skills and diversity amongst the co-chairs.
- Uduma asked if perhaps there could be a single chair and then subcommittee members instead of co-chairs.
 - Alhadeff explained that subcommittees could add another layer of bureaucracy, which was something that the group wanted to avoid.

Alhadeff summarized the discussion on co-chairs:

- There were questions remaining about the appropriate number of co-chairs. He suggested that two be the minimum number to consider.
- There had been requests to make chairing skills the primary consideration when selecting co-chairs.
- He reported that he would write a draft of the chairs' responsibilities over the weekend and send it to the mailing list.
- He proposed that the final decision about the total number of co-chairs could be made on the mailing list.

Wilson stated that often, a chair was needed to move things forward, he preferred it if there was a decision about the chair, or interim chair before the end of the meeting.

- Alhadeff nominated Cooper as interim chair.

Cooper put the question of two or three co-chairs to the group: three co-chaired was the option favored by the group.

Action item ICG-09: Alhadeff to write a draft of the chairs' responsibilities and send it to the internal-cg mailing list.

10. Timeline

Housley reported that he had sent a [draft timeline](#) to the internal-cg mailing list based on previous discussion held on that list. The timeline worked back from a target date of September 2015 for NTIA to put a replacement—non-NTIA provide—stewardship mechanism into place.

Discussion:

- Bladel asked if each community was expected to put its proposal out for public comment before submitting its proposal to the ICG.
 - Housley replied that it depended on each community's own process but he assumed that communities would perform some sort of review before submitting proposals to the ICG.
- Bladel asked if there might also be an independent legal review of the final proposal to ensure it did not conflict with the bylaws of any involved organization.
 - Housley stated that he hoped communities would ensure this within their own process, but if a proposal stated that it also involved changes to bylaws, then the ICG would need to consider the issue.
- Gerich noted that the proposed six-week window for NTIA evaluation and approval was too short and asked if it might be possible to run the proposed testing phase in parallel with the NTIA evaluation phase, so that NTIA receives the draft proposal at the end of May 2015.
 - Getschko supported this.
- Knoblen reminded group members that communities were still organizing themselves around how to manage their own proposal processes, so it would be important for the ICG to let communities know what timelines they were expected to follow.
 - Akplogan supported this. He also noted that he did not think it would be possible for the numbering community to complete global proposal development by

December 2014. He proposed extending the time given to communities and shortening the time for the ICG to collate the proposals into a single document.

- Alhadeff asked where in the timeline the non-operational communities would have a chance to provide input into the proposals.
 - Housley suggested that as proposals were submitted to the ICG, they be made public and available for comment by the wider communities.
- Arkko noted that while the timeline looked like it was sequential, in reality, it would be iterative, with possible need to go back over various stages as potential adjustments needed to be made.
- Wilson shared concerns about needing to be less sequential and more parallel in terms of phases in the timeline and requested that a new step “zero” be added, which is where the ICG informs the communities about what the group are expecting from them.
- Lee stated that he didn’t think it was necessary to give communities six months to develop a proposal, and that phase could be shortened. He also supported giving NTIA longer to complete its evaluation.
- Karrenberg stated that he thought the most important issue was whether the ICG really wanted to have a proposal ready for the NTIA to implement in September 2015. If so, there were significant risks that some communities may not be able to finish their work according to the time plan being proposed. This would be perceived as a serious failure of the current Internet Governance model. He was also concerned that communities that had finished their work in time may then disengage from the work of the remaining communities, believing their own task had been achieved. He was also concerned that giving a short deadline to communities could create resistance from the three operational communities. He recognized that internal US politics meant that there were concerns that if the proposal was not implemented by September 2015, it might not be implemented at all, but did not want that uncertainty to be negatively affecting the way that the ICG was coordinating a quality plan. He therefore suggested extending the timeline beyond September 2015 or adding a second, optional, final deadline in case the 2015 deadline could not be met.
 - Cooper disagreed with this, believing that missing the September 2015 date would be a failure for the group.
 - Arkko supported Cooper’s view, but agreed that it made project management sense to evaluate how the project was proceeding and making adjustments as needed along the way.
 - Knoblen acknowledged there were risks in trying to meet the September 2015 date, but believed it was worth aiming for that date, but reviewing progress and the timeline along the way.
 - Gerich did not think it was realistic to have a backup deadline, as proposed by Karrenberg.
- Cooper suggested that the dates in the timeline (excluding the September 2015 deadline) be indicative rather than strict deadlines.
- Mundy suggested that if the group could reach tentative agreement on the timeline, with a deadline of September 2015, it could then be taken to the public to see if they felt the timeline was implementable.
 - Drazek agreed with Mundy, stating that he thought it was important to decide on a date of implementation, and then work backward from there.

Housley stated he would send a revised timeline to the list for the discussion to continue. He noted that it was important for the timeline to be sent to the affected communities fairly quickly so they could begin their own processes.

Action item ICG-10: Housley to post revised timeline to the internal-cg mailing list for further discussion.

[Coffee break]

11. CG meeting/conference call schedule

Mueller reported that he had proposed holding two face-to-face meetings in 2014, two face-to-face meetings in 2015, with monthly teleconferences in between. Options for the face-to-face meetings were IGF 2014 and ICANN 51.

Discussion on teleconferences:

- Wu asked how long the proposed teleconferences would be.
 - Mueller replied, "90 minutes".
 - Arkko suggested starting with calls of 30 minutes, and increasing the time as need.
- Cooper proposed having a teleconference every two weeks. Calls could be cancelled if there was nothing to be discussed, but she preferred shorter, more frequent calls to longer, less frequent calls. She also suggested needing to decide whether to have alternating times for calls so different parts of the world could share the pain of badly timed calls or to have a standard time for all calls.
 - St Amour stated that she supported calls every two weeks.
 - Akplogan suggested starting with monthly teleconferences now, given there was not much to talk about yet, then moving to a teleconference every two weeks as the pace of the ICG's work increased after communities began submitting their proposals.
 - Mueller supported this idea.
- Cooper noted that she assumed that teleconferences would be translated and transcribed, just as face-to-face meetings would be.
- Cooper proposed holding a teleconference between the end of this first meeting and the next face-to-face meeting to resolve any outstanding issues from the current meeting.
- Drazek strongly supported using Adobe Connect for calls.
- Cooper preferred Webex but understood that the ICANN community was used to Adobe Connect.

Discussion on face-to-face meetings:

- Alhadeff suggested not making any decisions about the two face-to-face meetings in 2015 until the general timeline still under discussion was finalized. He also suggested holding a face-to-face meeting at IGF, where there would be a wide range of people outside the usual operational communities that the ICG could engage with about the transition process.
 - Cooper and Hackshaw supported meeting at the IGF.
- Mundy noted that while the ICG should hold its meetings in conjunction with other meetings, they should not be held in parallel, but before or after the meeting.
- Bladel suggested establishing a minimum threshold for what would be a quorum as a way of seeing where most people are likely to be attending a meeting anyway.

- Arkko stated that being visible to a wider community at an event like IGF would achieve separate things (external outreach) to any meeting of the ICG itself at the IGF (internal coordination).
- Boyle noted that there was a Day 0 at IGF, where rooms were available for meetings held in conjunction with IGF. He preferred meeting at IGF but, if there were to be a meeting at ICANN 51, asked for it to not be during the week of ICANN 51 but perhaps on the Friday and possibly the Saturday afterward.
 - Alhadeff reported that IGF Day 0 was already rather crowded, so any ICG meeting may have to be Day -1 or the day after IGF ended.
- El Bashir noted that the IANA stewardship was already an item on the IGF agenda, so would be a good opportunity for outreach, if not for a formal ICG meeting.
 - Mueller suggested that perhaps the ICG could propose holding an open forum on IANA stewardship at IGF 2014.
- Lee believed that ICANN 51 was the appropriate place to have the ICG meeting but that informal discussion could occur during IGF 2014 and IETF meetings.
 - Alhadeff expressed concern about informal get-togethers as they raised issues of transparency.
- Boyle remarked that attending IGF in Istanbul would be a more expensive option than attending ICANN 51 in Los Angeles. He therefore suggested meeting on 2 or 3 September during IGF.
- Mueller stated that he believed it would be easier for ICG members to find time to meet during IGF than they would to find time during ICANN 51.
 - Alhadeff reported that many people at IGF used lunch times to hold bilateral meetings, so any ICG meeting could be morning and afternoon, but skip the lunch break.
- Lupiano interjected to explain that it might not be possible to get a room during IGF as they were highly in demand, but she would contact the IGF secretariat and report back. She stated that she was already investigating the availability of rooms during ICANN 51.

Mueller summarized: there was to be a face-to-face meeting at the IGF, with monthly calls until the end of the year. He noted that there had not been a decision about whether to hold a meeting at ICANN 51.

- Cooper suggested that the decision about ICANN 51 could be made during IGF.
 - Gerich suggested that the decision should be made sooner so that travel costs could be kept lower.
- Mueller asked if members were interested in meeting at ICANN 51 on the Thursday afternoon of the meeting and the following day, Friday, after the meeting.

12. Parking Lot: Charter (continued from morning)

Arkko reported that he had sent the [6th version of the draft charter](#) to the mailing list and was looking for feedback from the members. He stated that he was in favor of leaving the final decision about the charter until the subsequent teleconference or face-to-face meeting, allowing for time for members to get feedback from their communities or the charter is sent out by the group for formal public feedback.

He observed that the group had two types of decision to make: 1) internal decisions on issues such as the charter; and 2) decisions that involved external parties, such as the timeline, being affected, and therefore needed external input to agree to.

Discussion:

- Alhadeff asked if the material that Wilson was working on would be linked to the charter in any way – perhaps as an annex.
- Arkko replied that he did not think it was necessary to link the two, but could keep the documents separate.
- In response to a question about how the charter would be finalized in time for IGF with no teleconference planned between now and then, Arkko suggested that the charter be finalized on the mailing list, within two weeks.

13. Communiqué drafting

Drazek thanked Arkko for drafting version 1 of the communiqué and stated that he had sent an [updated version](#) to the mailing list.

Discussion:

- Mueller noted that statements usually followed an inverted pyramid format, with the key elements described first. Therefore the current first paragraph should be moved further down the statement.
 - Bladel supported this.
- Alhadeff suggested that the document under discussion be a “report” and not a press release. A press release is short, punchy and more of a sales pitch. He noted that the group had not drafted both forms of document, but that a press release could be created out of the longer report.
 - Arkko stated that he thought the current document was about highlights from the meeting and was somewhere between a press release and more substantive document. He believed that a more formal meeting summary should come later.
- The group then collaboratively redrafted the text and added a title, “Statement from the First Meeting of the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group (ICG)”.
- Drazek then suggested he take the proposed edits and make the final amendments offline and circulate the final version to the mailing list.

14. Summary and wrap-up

Cooper went through the list of action items from the meeting. (See end of minutes)

She noted that Karrenberg was not interested in leading Action items ICG-07 and ICG-08. Akplogan volunteered to lead them.

After a short break for Drazek to tidy up the meeting summary, the group reconvened to read through the updated document. After some additional minor edits, there was agreement to ask the secretariat to post the statement.

There was discussion about where the wider community could have input into the ICG’s work:

- Gerich reported that there was a community input section on the ICANN microsite for the IANA stewardship transition process that the ICG could use as an interim location for such input.
- Arkko stated that ultimately, the ICG needed a public list that anyone could post input to. As an interim step, the existing [ianatransition](#) list could be used.

- Gerich suggested both avenues be used to collect input in the short-term.

[Day 2 closed 6:19 pm British Summer Time]

Summary of Action Items

Action item ICG-01: Arkko to lead a small drafting group to develop a new version of the proposed charter for the ICG.

Update: Version 6 of the draft charter sent to the mailing list for finalization after the meeting.

Action item ICG-02: Wilson to lead a small drafting group to move forward the draft text on scope of work and expectations about work in the communities based on input received during Day 1 deliberations.

Update: Wilson to send a new version of the expectations on the work of the communities text to the internal-cg mailing list by the end of the following week, with the aim of finalizing the text within two weeks of the end of the first meeting.

Action item ICG-03: St Amour to lead a small drafting group to write a note to the GAC confirming that the ICG had accepted the GAC's request to have five seats on the ICG.

Update: Text has been decided, with Subrenat to read through one last time. Who would send the message to the GAC to be worked out in discussion with Swinehart. Secretariat to post the final note to the GAC in same location as the group's other outputs from its first meeting.

Action item ICG-04: Alhadeff to send an email to the internal-cg mailing list encouraging ICG members to nominate for one of the ICG three co-chair positions.

Update: Five nominations received by end of Day 2.

Action item ICG-05: Secretariat to investigate 1) a non-ICANN host for the ICG mailing list and to provide an archive of the existing ICANN-hosted mailing list that can be transferred to the new host; and 2) options for a collaborative drafting/editing tool.

Action item ICG-06: Alhadeff to write a draft of the chairs' responsibilities and send it to the internal-cg mailing list.

Action item ICG-07: ICG members to make decision on how to handle media relations. Process to be led by Akplogan.

Action item ICG-08: ICG members to make decision on how the secretariat function should be performed. Process to be led by Akplogan.

Action item ICG-09: Alhadeff to write a draft of the chairs' responsibilities and send it to the internal-cg mailing list.

Action item ICG-10: Housley to post revised timeline to the internal-cg mailing list for further discussion.