Fifth IANA Stewardship Coordination Group (ICG) Teleconference
4:00 UTC, Wednesday 1 October 2014

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

Participants

Jean-Jacques Subrenat, ALAC	Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, GNSO
Hartmut Glaser, ASO	Milton Mueller, GNSO
Martin Boyle, ccNSO	Jon Nevett, gTLD Registries
Keith Davidson, ccNSO	Russ Housley, IAB
Xiaodong Lee, ccNSO	Lynn St Amour, IAB
Mary Uduma, ccNSO	Jari Arkko, IETF
Kavouss Arasteh, GAC	Alissa Cooper, IETF (ICG Chair)
Heather Dryden, GAC	Narelle Clark, ISOC
Manal Ismail, GAC	Demi Getschko, ISOC
Michael Niebel, GAC	Adiel Akplogan, NRO
Jandyr Ferreira dos Santos, GAC	Patrik Fältström, SSAC (Vice-chair)
James Bladel, GNSO	Russ Mundy, SSAC

Liaisons:
Kuo-Wei Wu, ICANN Board Liaison

ICG Apologies:

Mohamed El Bashir, ALAC (Vice-chair)	Paul Wilson, NRO
Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries	Daniel Karrenberg, RSSAC
Joseph Alhadeff, ICC/BASIS	Lars-Johan Liman, RSSAC

Liaison apologies
Elise Gerich, IANA Staff Expert

ICANN support staff:

Alice Jansen	Ergys Ramaj

ICANN support staff apologies

Hillary Jett	Theresa Swinehart

Non-ICANN staff minuting support:
Samantha Dickinson

1. Welcome and roll call

Cooper asked for ICG members not in the Adobe Connect room to announce their presence on the call. [The results are displayed in the attendance list at the beginning of these minutes.]

Cooper reminded ICG members to use the "raised hand" function in Adobe Connect if they wished to be added to the speaking queue.

2. Minutes approval from 17 September teleconferences

Cooper asked if there were any objections to the adopting the minutes of the previous teleconferences.

- Arasteh responded that not all of his interventions made to Cooper appeared in the minutes.
- Cooper replied that she noticed many references to Arasteh in the minutes and asked him to provide a specific list of things that Arasteh thought were missing.
- Arasteh stated that he did not remember, as he did not keep notes of what he had stated, but he did state at the beginning of the call that the ICG should not go into too much detail and move as quickly as possible.
- Cooper noted that the specific comment Arasteh had just mentioned appeared in the minutes. She suggested that Dickinson could comment on how she had produced the minutes.
- Arasteh responded that this was not necessary, but he did want to request that everything he said on the current call would be recorded. He stated that the past was the past.
- Cooper asked Arasteh to clarify if this meant he had no objections to publishing the 17 September minutes as they were currently written.
- Arasteh confirmed he had no objections.
- Cooper further noted that there were multiple records for each of ICG's meetings: chat logs from the Adobe Connect room, audio recordings and transcripts of the calls.
- Arasteh asked Cooper if she could see him raise his hand in the Adobe Connect room so he could tell if he was connected to the room properly. She confirmed she could.

Cooper asked if there were any other objections to the minutes. There were not. Cooper asked Jansen to publish the minutes.

Actions:

1. **Jansen to publish minutes of 17 September teleconference on the ICG website.**

3. Review ICANN 51 schedule and logistics

Cooper explained that ICG events at ICANN 51 had been discussed on the previous teleconference, but there had been some changes since that time. She reported that there were now five events on the ICG calendar for ICANN 51:

15:45-16:45 PDT, Tuesday, 14 October - Meeting with ALAC
10:30-11:30 PDT, Wednesday, 15 October - Meeting with the GAC
10:00-12:00 PDT, Thursday, 16 October - Community Discussion with the ICG
20:15-22:00 PDT, Thursday, 16 October, ICG Dinner
9:00-17:30, Friday, 17 October - Third Face-to-Face Meeting of the ICG

Cooper explained that she had reached out ICG members from the different communities to ensure there was at least one person who could speak about the processes of the operational communities to develop stewardship proposals. She

reported that she was still trying to find someone from the numbers community for the ALAC session as neither Akplogan nor Wilson would be at the ICANN meeting. Cooper also explained that all members of the ICG were welcome to participate in the meetings with communities, and not just the members she had already lined up to speak.

Cooper asked Fältström, who was managing the agenda for the community discussion session on Thursday 16 October, to give an update.

Fältström reported that he had made time for seven five-minute presentations in the second half of the two-hour session for communities wanting to give feedback to the ICG. He noted that if more people wished to present, then the agenda would need to be revised.

Cooper asked if ICG members had any questions about the community session.

Discussion:

- Arasteh noted that on the agenda there were hyperlinks to the ALAC and community discussion sessions and asked what the links were to. He also noted there was no hyperlink to the GAC session with the ICG. He noted he had not had a chance to follow the hyperlinks yet.
    - o Cooper explained that the ALAC had links to the ICANN 51 agenda page for that meeting and to the specific ALAC community page for their Tuesday 16 October schedule. She further explained that she had not found a link to the GAC session at the time she had composed the agenda earlier in the day, but could now advise ICG members that the meeting would take place in the Plaza Pavilion. However, she had not yet received a link from the GAC regarding the session itself. She noted that if she received the link, she would add it to the list of sessions.
- Arasteh asked what sort of discussions the ICG would have with the communities. Would it be general presentation of what ICG was doing or question and answer format? He explained that he was aware that the GAC, when it met with the ICANN Board, would formulate its answers in advance. He asked if that was what would happen for the ICG in the Los Angeles meeting.
    - o Cooper explained that the idea was to give a very brief introduction tot eh ICG then have a representative of each operational community explain how their community would develop their part of the IANA stewardship proposal and how people could participate in that process. Finally, there would be time for questions from anyone in the room.
- Knoben suggested it might also be worth mentioning sessions by other communities at ICANN 51 that would be discussing the IANA stewardship transition – in particular, the Cross-Community Working Group to Develop an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal on Naming Related Functions, which would be holding a [session](#) on Monday, 13 October. He also noted there would be a meeting of the coordination group on [enhancing ICANN accountability](#).
    - o Cooper thanked Knoben for highlighting these two sessions.

Cooper also highlighted the dinner on Thursday, 16 October, noting it would begin toward the end of the ICANN wrap-up cocktails. She explained that the ICANN staff had experienced some trouble finding a venue that could accommodate 30 people, but had found a restaurant at the Intercontinental Hotel where there was a three-course meal

available for USD83. She noted that ICG members would be paying their own dinner bills separately. ICANN staff had put a deposit down at the restaurant already.

Cooper asked if the ICG had any comments on the dinner.

Discussion:

- o Arasteh asked if the dinner was just for ICG members or whether other people would be there.
    - o Cooper replied that she was not sure if ICANN staff who had been supporting the ICG planned to attend.
- o Uduma stated that she though that the dinner was meant to be an opportunity for the community to talk with the ICG informally.
    - o Cooper responded that she was flexible about who attended the dinner, explaining that the original idea behind the dinner was to enable a group dinner for the entire ICG, given the dinner at the London meeting did not include all ICG members.
- o Arasteh suggested taking a photo of all ICG members at the dinner, given it would be the first time all ICG members should be together informally.
- o Cooper suggested that unless there was a strong feeling amongst the ICG members that the dinner be opened up, the dinner go ahead as planned, pending any emails that may come through to the internal-cg list in the couple of days following the current teleconference.

Action:

2. **Cooper to leave discussion on events at ICANN 51 open on internal-cg mailing list for a couple more days to enable ICG members to add anything else they think should be on the list or modified on the existing list.**

4. Discussion of FAQ

Cooper displayed a copy of the [draft FAQ](#) in the Adobe Connect room. Arasteh requested that the size of the text of the document be increased.

Cooper explained that the idea behind the FAQ was to have a set of shared and agreed talking points that all ICG members could use when speaking about the ICG to other communities. To achieve this, Ismail, Boyle, Fältström and El Bashir had developed a list of questions that they thought communities might ask about ICG. The first task for the ICG on the current call was to identify if there were any other questions that should be added. Cooper noted that there had been some discussion about this on the mailing list already.

Discussion:

- o Arasteh asked how long the FAQ would be considered a "living document" and whether there would still be time after the call to complete the FAQ.
    - o Cooper replied that she thought the ICG should not focus on finalizing the FAQ, but keep it as a living document that could be updated as needed. She

suggested focusing on the concepts that the questions and answers aimed to tackle rather than taking a word-by-word approach to editing the text.

- o Arasteh asked what form the FAQ would take, nothing that the ICG should not waste time answering questions orally if the FAQ could easily be made available as on paper. Instead, it would be better for the ICG to reserve its time to discuss additional or complementary questions not included in the FAQ.
    - o Cooper responded that it would be good to publish he FAQ on the website. However, given the limited time available before ICANN 51, she suggested the ICG's primary focus be reaching a shared understanding on the overall topics rather than wordsmithing the text in detail.
    - o Mueller stated that he thought that while the exercise of agreeing on the concepts in the FAQ was useful, but that it was important to publish the document shortly after ICANN 51, if it was not possible to publish it in time for ICANN 51.
    - o Arasteh if, to save time, it could be a good idea to have a copy of the FAQ available to people who would be attending meetings with the ICG prior to those meetings. People could then have many of their questions answered before the meeting and only ask questions that were not part of the FAQ.
        - ▪ Cooper responded that it was a reasonable option as long as the ICG could work with the ICANN staff to find out the cutoff date for having the FAQ published before ICANN 51 and make it clear in the published FAQ that it was a living document.
    - o Cooper noted that via the Adobe Connect chat room, Mueller had asked if the ICG would work on the FAQ during ICANN 51. She asked others to give their own opinions on this, and stated that her own view was that the ICG should reserve some time during the face-to-face meeting on 17 October to consider incorporating questions that had ben asked by the communities during the week.

Cooper then asked Ismail to lead the discussion on the FAQ.

Ismail thanked ICG members for their comments on the FAQ, noting that while she not yet incorporated some of the comments on the mailing list that had arrived overnight. She suggested that the group discuss the version of the FAQ that included all comments received prior to that period section by section.

Question 1: What is ICG?

- o Ismail noted that the answer to this question had been copied directly from one of the ICG's existing documents. She asked if there were any objections to the answer to Question 1.
- o Clark noted that she did not have any objection but would like to polish the wording. She stated that she would like to submit a number of clarifications and improvements that would include links to documents related to the ICG's work. Clark also believed that a reference to the NTIA should appear in the first section of the FAQ.
    - o Ismail noted that there was already a link to the NTIA's March 2014 announced in Question 1 and asked if Clark was asking for an explicit mention of "NTIA".
    - o Clark replied that she thought there should be mention of the "US Government's Department of Commerce" or NTIA and that, if she was able

to fit it in, she would add her proposed edits to the FAQ in the following few hours.

o Arasteh stated that the answer to Question 1 should explicitly mention that the NTIA announcement was made in March 2014.

Question 2: Who are members of ICG?

o There were no comments on this question and answer set.

Question 2 ½: Who provides ICG support functions?

o Ismail noted that this was a new question added to the FAQ. She noted that, like Mueller, she did not feel it was a pressing question and the ICG had never been asked the question. However, she had included it because Uduma had asked for it and that by including it, there was a simple place to refer to the Secretariat RFP. Ismail believed that the FAQ should include links to all of the ICG's documents, but that the Secretariat RFP had not been included elsewhere.
o Arasteh requested that the question stay as it was useful.
o Cooper noted there were a couple of comments in the Adobe Connect chat room:
    o Mundy supported removing the question.
    o Mueller was not concerned whether it stayed or was deleted.
o Boyle stated that he did not mind whether the question stayed or was deleted, but thought that the question should really be about the independence of the ICG rather than the secretariat. The reason for the secretariat process was to show that ICG was independent. He suggested adjusting the answer slightly to emphasize ICG's independence over the secretariat process it was conducting. Boyle suggested discussing the wording on the mailing list after the call.
    o Ismail responded that Uduma had also mentioned the independence of the ICG, so perhaps she (Ismail) had simply failed to use the right words for the answer. She agreed to continue discussions on amending the text after the meeting.

Question 3: What is ICG's scope of work?

o Mueller suggested that the question could be stated less technically, for example "What is ICG's mission" or " What is ICG supposed to do".
o Subrenat suggested using "remit".
o Bladel suggested changing the verb in "(iii) Assemble a complete proposal for the transition" to something more descriptive to show that what the ICG was really trying to achieve at that stage was a reconciliation of the proposals if there were any differences between them.
o

Question 4. What are the IANA functions?

o Ismail noted that there had already been a lot of discussion on the internal-cg list about the FAQ section on IANA functions, so she had been very cautious and copied and pasted text from other documents that the ICG had already agreed upon, but that this did not seem to have worked either. She noted that the answer to Question 4 came directly from the ICG's definition of the IANA function in the community RFP (footnote 1 from page 1 of the RFP).

o Cooper noted that she had sent an email to the mailing list about this question. She was concerned that it was possible to write a treatise about what the IANA functions were and that the FAQ was not the appropriate place for that level of detail. Instead, the FAQ could cover the aspects of IANA that were part of the stewardship transition and specific what functions were not parts of the process (time zone database, etc.).

o Arasteh agreed that the answer could be replaced, suggesting a list of the four functions, as described in many NTIA documents, would be a good answer.

Genera discussion about the FAQ:

o Arasteh suggested that there should be a question about "what is the global multistakeholder community" as the NTIA announcement stated that stewardship had to pass to the global multistakeholder community. It was not clear whether this meant ICANN or something else. Arasteh noted that several people had raised this question with him.

   o Ismail noted that this was an important issue, that it was a question already posed to the community and that the various community proposals were expected to provide the answer to that question. She noted that the FAQ should contain questions related to ICG's processes and activities and that there were other questions that she felt were also too substantial for the ICG to be able to answer alone.

   o Arasteh asked how ICG members should answer questions about what the "global multistakeholder community" was if they were asked.

   o Arasteh asked what would happen to the non-contracted functions of the IANA. Would those functions be transferred as part of the transition process?

   o Cooper requested that when Arasteh wished to rejoin the queue, he raise his hand in the Adobe Connect room as there was a lengthy queue of ICG members wishing to speak.

   o Akplogan noted that his understanding was that the answer to Arasteh's questions would be part of the outcomes of the whole process and that the ICG did not need to answer the questions by itself.

   o Fältström stated that the ICG members needed to remember that the FAQ was something being created for other people. If ICG members wished to include other questions, they should also submit answers to those questions, as it was not possible to move forward with the FAQ if it was a case of ICG members asking, but not answering questions.

      ▪ Arasteh disagreed that ICG members needed to provide an answer. Sometimes, there would be a question, but no answer by the person asking the question. Other people in the ICG should give the answers. He thought it was a stupid answer to say that people could not submit questions without answers.

      ▪ Fältström acknowledged Arasteh's point of view, noting that his point was that ICG members had to work together on the FAQ. However, if the answer was "we don't know the answer" or "it is not clear yet" or "there are multiple answers to the question", then that was what should be included as the answer in the FAQ.

   o Clark suggested a possible question and answer for Arasteh's "global multistakeholder community" query: Question: What does the NTIA mean by global multistakeholder community?" Answer: This is not defined, but

several definitions exist. The transition proposal process will identify the multistakeholder community that will perform the role of stewardship.

- Cooper stated that she thought this could be a helpful way forward.
  - o Mueller stated that he believed the discussion was becoming side-tracked. The FAQ was for people asking questions about what the ICG was and what it did. It was not about the outcomes of the transition process nor about the proposals nor about any decisions regarding the transition. If people were not asking a question over and over again, it did not belong in the FAQ. Mueller stated that he believed the original list of questions was very close to what was needed and there was no need to overcomplicate the FAQ.
  - o Uduma agreed with Akplogan and Mueller that the ICG should not try to answer questions that were for the community to decide the answer to.
  - o Arasteh suggested to Cooper that at the beginning community meetings with the ICG, she make it clear that the question of what the "global multistakeholder community" was would not be discussed and that no questions beyond the scope of ICG activities—questions that needed to be answered by the communities themselves—would be answered.
  - o Ismail noted that the aim of the FAQ exercise was to provide common answers that all ICG members agreed upon. If there were questions that the ICG did not have agreed answers to, then those questions could be delayed for later. She reminded ICG members that the FAQ was a living document and new questions and answers could be added later.
- o Uduma asked that questions in the FAQ been made simpler so it was easier for non-English speakers to understand.

Ismail suggested that the discussion on the FAQ continue on the internal-cg mailing list. She reported that she would circulate an updated draft of the FAQ that would include the comments sent to the list overnight as well as the comments from the current call.

Ismail hoped that ICG members would begin inserting their proposed changes directly into the draft FAQ document to assist in making quicker progress on producing an agreed-upon version of the FAQ.

Cooper noted that there seems to be agreement to make more progress on the FAQ before ICANN 51 and there seemed to be some support for publishing the FAQ on the website before the meeting, too, as long as it was clear that it was a living document. She suggested that the ICG members review the status of progress the following week to see if publication was possible.

Decision:

1. **ICG to publish a version of the ICG FAQ online before ICANN 51, making it clear that it is a living document.**

Actions:

3. **Clark to submit edits to the answer to the existing FAQ answers, as well as a possible question and placeholder answer about the definition of "global multistakeholder community".**

4. **Q2.5 of FAQ on ICG Secretariat to be resolved on the mailing list, perhaps by refocusing it to be about the independence of the ICG itself.**
5. **Ismail to work on a second formulation of Question 3 of the FAQ based on feedback from Mueller, Subrenat and Bladel.**
6. **Discussion about remainder of FAQ, from Question 4 onward, to be discussed by the ICG on the mailing list.**

5. Wrapping up

Cooper asked Dickinson to post a list of the decisions and action items from the call to the mailing list after the meeting.

Arasteh asked if there was an agenda yet for the ICG's face-to-face meeting on 17 October. Cooper stated that there was not, and that she would be working with the Vice-Chairs to develop the agenda based on the progress made in the current call. She noted that the agenda would hopefully appear on the internal-cg mailing list early the following week.

Cooper closed the call.

[Meeting closed 5:05 UTC]

Summary of the decisions and actions from the teleconference of 1 October 2014

Decision:

1. **ICG to publish a version of the ICG FAQ online before ICANN 51, making it clear that it is a living document.**

Actions:

1. **Jansen to publish minutes of 17 September teleconference on website**
2. **Cooper to leave discussion on events at ICANN 51 open on internal-cg mailing list for a couple more days to enable ICG members to add anything else they think should be on the list or modified on the existing list.**
3. **Clark to submit edits to the answer to the existing FAQ answers, as well as a possible question and placeholder answer about the definition of "global multistakeholder community".**
4. **Question 2½ of FAQ on ICG Secretariat to be resolved on the mailing list, perhaps by refocusing it to be about the independence of the ICG itself.**
5. **Ismail to work on a second formulation of Question 3 of the FAQ based on feedback from Mueller, Subrenat and Bladel.**
6. **Discussion about remainder of FAQ, from Question 4 onward, to be discussed by the ICG on the mailing list.**