

Minutes of second face-to-face meeting of the IANA Stewardship Coordination Group (ICG)

Room Tyana, Grand Hyatt Istanbul, Turkey
Saturday 6 September 2014

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

Istanbul ICG participants

Mohamed El Bashir, ALAC (Meeting Co-Chair)
Hartmut Glaser, ASO
Keith Davidson, ccNSO
Xiaodong Lee, ccNSO
Mary Uduma, ccNSO
Kavouss Arasteh, GAC
Heather Dryden, GAC
Manal Ismail, GAC
Michael Niebel, GAC
Jandyr Ferreira dos Santos, GAC
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen, GNSO
Milton Mueller, GNSO
Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries

Joseph Alhadef, ICC/BASIS
Russ Housley, IAB
Lynn St Amour, IAB
Jari Arkko, IETF
Narelle Clark, ISOC
Demi Getschko, ISOC
Adiel Akplogan, NRO
Paul Wilson, NRO
Daniel Karrenberg, RSSAC
Lars-Johan Liman, RSSAC
Patrik Fältström, SSAC (Meeting Co-Chair)
Russ Mundy, SSAC
Jon Nevett, gTLD Registries

Remote ICG participants

Jean-Jacques Subrenat, ALAC
Martin Boyle, ccNSO

Alissa Cooper, IETF (ICG Chair)

Liaisons

Elise Gerich, IANA Staff Expert

Kuo-Wei Wu, ICANN Board Liaison

ICG apologies:

James Bladel, GNSO

ICANN support staff

Theresa Swinehart
Jim Trengrove
Ergys Ramaj

Alice Jansen
Nancy Lupiano

Non-ICANN staff support

Samantha Dickinson

Note: there were also silent observers present at the back of the room.

[The meeting opened 9:01 Eastern European Summer Time (EEST)/6:01 UTC.]

1. Welcome, appointment of meeting chair, and approval of Draft Agenda

Fältström opened the meeting and reminded ICG members to state their names for the interpreters and for the record each time they spoke during the meeting. He handed over to Glaser to discuss the appointment of the meeting chair for the day.

Glaser explained that the ICG Chair, Cooper, was unable to be present in Istanbul and that the two Vice-chairs, Fältström and El Bashir, had met before the current meeting and had proposed sharing the role of chair during the second face-to-face meeting. Glaser suggested that the ICG members accept this way of working.

In response, there was applause in the room.

Glaser noted that El Bashir would chair the morning session and Fältström would chair the afternoon session. Glaser handed over to El Bashir.

El Bashir welcomed ICG members who were attending their first ICG meeting.

2. Roll call and introduction of ICG members

El Bashir asked ICG members to introduce themselves and the community they were representing. ICG members proceeded to do so. [The results are displayed in the attendance list at the beginning of these minutes.]

3. Summary of ICG activities since the previous meeting

El Bashir reported that since the first face-to-face meeting, held in London, 17-18 July, the following had been achieved:

- The Chair (Cooper) and Vice-Chairs (El Bashir and Fältström) had been elected.
- The draft community Request for Proposals (RFP) had been published – El Bashir noted that there had been some miscommunication about the draft RFP, but it was the draft RFP that had been published and the final RFP publication would be discussed in the current meeting.
- There had been extensive work on developing the RFP for an independent secretariat.
- There had been a lot of email work on the consensus-building document
- A draft timeline for the process of developing and implementing the proposal for a post-NTIA model of IANA stewardship had been created.

4. Review the Status of ICG Documents

4.1 Community RFP (also called the IANA Functions Transition Request for Proposals)

Wilson reported that the draft RFP had apparently been released without first getting full ICG agreement for it to be released. He noted that he had, personally expected that the RFP would be released as a draft before the Istanbul meeting and was a little surprised that it would need to be clarified that it was a draft. However, clearly, that clarification was needed and the ICG needed to clarify exactly what version of the RFP (a further draft or a final version) would be released after the current meeting. He stated

that he hoped it would be a draft and would have a substantial time for public comment. He noted that the ICG would be talking about the document in more depth later in the meeting.

Alhadeff stated that, for him, the confusion was about the language related to the release and not with the release of the draft RFP itself. If it had been clearer that it was a draft, then ICG members would have been happier.

Clark noted that a timeframe for public comments to be received on the draft had also been missing from the announcement.

Arkko stated that the only mistake that seemed to have been made was that the announcement did not mention that the RFP had draft status. He suggested that mistakes happen and that the ICG should follow the procedure that many organizations did, and issue a correction.

Arasteh noted that there seemed to be some word changes between the draft RFP that had been published and the draft RFP that the ICG members had agreed upon.

El Bashir reported that a correction had already been issued to make it clear to the community that the issued RFP was still a draft.

Action:

- 2. ICG to publish the final IANA Functions Transition RFP with a period of clarification open until 24 September, 23:59 UTC.**

4.2 Independent Secretariat

Akplogan reported that there were two steps in the process for selecting an independent secretariat:

- 1. A call for Expressions of Interest (EOI)** – This was published 2 September. Akplogan noted that the Expression of Interest was initially released as an RFP but that mistake had been corrected. The EOI was an important step as it enabled the ICANN procurement team to have early contact with potential responders to the RFP and would allow for easier communication during the RFP process itself, if needed.
- 2. The RFP itself** – The latest version is available in Dropbox and was due to be published on the ICANN site on Monday 8 September.

Akplogan thanked all ICG members for their contributions, noting that the secretariat RFP had been one of the least controversial documents that the ICG has work on to date.

He explained that there were now two matters for the ICG to consider with regards to the RFP:

- 1. The timeline** - With a plan to publish the RFP on 8 September and a closing date of 22 September, the ICG needed to factor in an interim step where potential applicants could send questions regarding the RFP to the ICG & the ICG would have enough time to respond to those questions.

- 2. A selection committee to review a shortlist of secretariat applicants and make a final proposal to the ICG** – Akplogan proposed using a different set of ICG members to those who wrote the RFP.

Arasteh asked who would be responding to questions about the RFP between its release and deadline, El Bashir suggested deferring further discussion on the RFP that to the agenda item dedicated to the secretariat RFP later on in the day.

4.3 Timeline

Housley reported that there had been a couple of changes made to the draft timeline since the first face-to-face meeting to align the timeline with changes made to the community RFP. In particular, the earlier version had a deadline for community responses to the RFP of 31 January 2015, whereas the latest version had a date of 31 December 2014.

Housley had emailed the latest version of the timeline to the mailing list. Wilson offered to create a folder on Dropbox for the timeline as well.

4.4 Consensus building process document

Knoben reported that there had been extensive discussion on the internal-cg mailing list about the document and that he had tried to polish the latest draft as much as possible based on agreements reached in that discussion. Remaining items to be addressed were:

- How to find consensus
- What types of measurements should the ICG take

Knoben suggested that the ICG should consider the document to be a living document that could be updated as needed throughout the lifetime of the ICG.

Arasteh noted that he had sent an email to the mailing list at 1 am that day with some structural suggestions for the document. He also requested that while he had no problem with the document being a living document, it should be stable during meetings (so decisions could be made based on well-understood procedure documented in the document) and any changes be discussed between meetings. Arasteh clarified that his version of the document was sent to the mailing list on 6 September and was not the version 5 in Dropbox. Knoben responded that he had not seen an attachment to Arasteh's email. El Bashir suggested that Arasteh resend the email with the attachment and the document be further discussed later on in the day during the agenda item dedicated to the consensus document.

Dryden suggested ICG members use break times during the meeting to sort out some of the outstanding issues in the consensus document.

[Clark noted that there was an ongoing series of noises coming from an electronic device in the observer area and asked observers to silence their electronic devices.]

5. IANA Functions Transition Request for Proposals (RFP)

Subrenat interjected before the discussion to note that he had been on the call remotely for some time, but had not been able to speak to the room to announce his presence, so was doing so now.

El Bashir opened the floor for discussion on the RFP.

Discussion:

- Karrenberg enquired if version 15 of the RFP was the most current draft.
 - Wilson noted that this was correct and was the latest official version by the ICG before it was published on the ICANN website. He was not aware that any edits had been made before publication and asked for more information from the secretariat about changes made.
 - El Bashir suggested using the published version as the latest draft RFP.
 - Arkko reported that the IETF had been using the most recent draft that that it had been working well in terms of the IETF's preparation towards a proposal. He suggested that from his perspective, the draft was ready to move forward to become a final version.
 - St Amour noted that the version being displayed on the project was version 15, but the most recent version seemed to be version 16.
- From an editorial perspective, Arkko suggested that experience from the way IETF was using the RFP—which was to use everything in the RFP as a template and insert IETF's materials into that template—it might be better to encourage communities to use the overall RFP structure to design their RFPs, but not copy the headings of the RFP slavishly.
- Mueller expressed surprise that, given lengthy discussions with ALAC, the RFP still seemed to be formally requesting complete proposals directly from operational communities rather than presenting operational communities as conveners of processes to develop proposals. He stated that the process had to be open to other participants who were not part of the three operational communities (names, numbers and protocol parameters), otherwise there was the potential for the operational communities to reach agreement amongst themselves, but not get agreement from other communities, which would affect the ability to have a final consensus proposal at the end of the process.
 - Karrenberg pointed Mueller to text on page 2 of the draft RFP that stated that communities were being asked to conduct an open and inclusive process and seek out wider participation by any other parties that may be interested in the proposal development.
 - Mueller replied that the first paragraph of the RFP only stated that the ICG was seeking proposals from operational communities and did not mention that the operational communities were also being asked to convene open processes. He stated that it would be a simple edit to make the opening text more inclusive. He suggested “conveners of processes” rather than “drafters of proposals” be used to describe the operational communities in the RFP.
 - Subrenat supported Mueller, stating that on behalf of the ALAC, he had reached a compromise on some text about including non-operational community participation, but he was not sure if the text had been included in the latest draft.
 - El Bashir confirmed that the text had been included in the document.

- Alhadeff responded that he agreed with Karrenberg that the concerns expressed by Mueller and Subrenat had been addressed in the RFP.
- Mundy suggested that as the ICG were the group responsible for reviewing proposals from the community, it was time to focus less on the structure of the RFP and more on the content expected in the proposals.
- Arasteh suggested the text of the RFP needed to be more precise about who was expected to receive comments about proposals under development: was it the communities convening the process, the ICG, or both?
 - Alhadeff noted that it was important for ICG members to be responsive to stakeholders outside the communities represented on the ICG and that the ICG had to be open to accepting comments, or it could appear that the ICG wasn't truly representative or responsive to the wider multistakeholder community.
- Wilson asked how ICG members would like to proceed with the RFP: whether the group was happy to make decisions on edits in the current meeting or wanted to go back and continue making more changes after the meeting, which may not reflect the discussions of the meeting.
 - El Bashir suggested that the ICG begin editing in the meeting and asked Wilson to be in charge of editing the document.
- Mueller noted that the document seemed to be missing a line that there was previous agreement to include: "This RFP does not preclude any form of input from the nonoperational communities".
 - El Bashir agreed that this text had been agreed to and it was worth checking that the text was inserted into the document.
 - Subrenat asked to double check that the precise wording by ALAC was included: "Although full proposals are not expected from nonoperational communities, this RFP does not preclude any form of input from the nonoperational communities."
 - Mueller reminded Subrenat that there had been agreement not to include "Although full proposals are not expected from nonoperational communities" in that sentence.
- [The ICG made a number of small, specific word changes to the document. For details of the changes, see pages 34-38 of the [transcript](#).]

Housley read out an extract of an [email from Cooper](#) to the internal-cg mailing list that reported feedback from the IETF that it would be useful to clarify whether the use of "IANA functions", "IANA services" and "IANA activities" meant the same thing or were different. If they meant the same thing, then the suggestion was to use a single, uniform, term throughout the RFP.

Wilson then led a read-through of the document to examine each reference to IANA.

- Housley asked whether, when referring to "IANA functions", the ICG wanted to include functions that were part of what IANA did, but were not part of the IANA functions related to the NTIA contract.
- Fältström noted that while it was clear that the final proposal to get to the NTIA had to cover all the IANA functions that their contract covered, it did not preclude some operational communities wanting to include elements of other IANA functions in their proposals as well.
- Housley stated that he believed that the ICG should encourage the communities to concentrate on the functions that were related to the NTIA

contract, but that if communities wanted to include additional functions, then that should be accepted by the ICG as well. However, the RFP should not require that communities do anything outside dealing with the specific functions in the NTIA agreement.

- Akplogan supported this.
- Karrenberg disagreed, stating that some communities may believe that this was too limiting. He requested including some text that would explicitly note that if there were any other functions that the communities considered essential, but that were not mentioned in the NTIA agreement, then that could be included in a proposal as well.
- Arasteh supported Karrenberg, with the clarification that any non-NTIA agreement-related functions be kept separate in the proposal to enable easier review.
- Clarke noted that, to date, the ICG had been working on the RFP without having a substantive discussion about what was in the NTIA's IANA contract. She noted that the contract had been written a long time ago and that there may need to be elements updated, so it would be useful for the ICG to be open to elements not included in the contract
- Mueller supported Karrenberg and Clark, noting that the transition away from NTIA stewardship could have an affect on other IANA functions, services or activities.
- Alhadef stated that while primary purpose of the RFP is to help the ICG assemble the final proposal, it had other benefits as well. In particular, one of the RFP's purposes was to get information out to non-technical communities so they could understand what was happening with the stewardship transition.
 - St Amour responded that she had never seen the RFP as an educational document and that such a document was a poor place to do education. She supported having educational activities, but not using the RFP as one of those activities. She clarified that the RFP's sole purpose was about supporting the transition of the US government's oversight of IANA.
 - Alhadef clarified that he was not suggesting that the RFP be an IANA tutorial, but the RFP could be used to address the fact that non-technical communities were interested in the accountability component of the stewardship transition.
- Mundy stated that he could accept communities adding functions that were not covered by the NTIA contract, but that the RFP should concentrate on language about what was required, rather than optional, of community proposals.
 - Akplogan supported this. He also noted that there some arrangements between ICANN and IANA that were not covered by the NTIA contract, and if there was a community desire to have accountability about those functions, then that would need to be handled by the ICANN accountability process, not the IANA stewardship transition process.
- Mundy noted that the NTIA contract did not just include the 62-page formal contract with ICANN, but also included another 450 pages of text that was ICANN's response to the IANA RFP.

- Alhadeff explained that from a business community perspective, what was most important was that the stability, security and resilience of the Internet be maintained during the transition, and while it would be nice to have a wish list of additional changes outside the NTIA contract, that was something better addressed after the core transition requirements were met.
- Davidson noted that he was worried about the ICG being binary about what it was discussing about NTIA contract versus non-NTIA contract functions. He explained that it might only be as the communities do the detailed work of developing a proposal that communities and the ICG realize that there were things that need to change, but were outside the bounds of the NTIA contract.
- Arkko agreed with Alhadeff, Mundy and Akplogan about needing to stay focused about the NTIA requirements in the RFP, while leaving it open for communities to decide whether or not to include other IANA functions in their proposals. Mueller and Niebel also supported this.
- Karrenberg stated that he was concerned about some of the IANA-related issues that weren't explicitly mentioned in the 400 pages of the ICANN response to the NTIA RFP, but that were still very important. An example of such an issues was the maintenance of the registry of the addresses of the root name servers. He proposed including text that stated that if a function seemed to be closely related to the existing contracted IANA function, that function could be considered as part of the scope.
- Getschko suggested that the ICG had to be conservative in what it requested from the community and liberal in what it accepted.
- Arasteh suggested that there had been enough discussion on the issue and it was time for people to make a concrete proposal on the way forward.
- Subrenat proposed removing the first sentence of the second paragraph of section zero of the RFP, "Complete Formal Responses", which stated, "Proposals are expected to enjoy a broad consensus of support from all interested parties." He explained that from a legal perspective, the text was unclear about who was expecting the proposals to enjoy consensus, so it was best to remove it completely.
- Karrenberg proposed moving text about additional functions not part of the NTIA contract to a footnote in section "I. Description of Community's Use of IANA Functions".
 - Davidson stated that he could accept this move.
- Ismail suggested that the language in the RFP, rather than concentrate on what the ICG did not want included in proposals, be more positive in explaining what elements should be included.
- El Bashir asked if there was general agreement on the proposed text about what was required and optional for communities to include in their proposals. A show of hands showed support for the text.
- The ICG continued looking through the RFP for references to IANA functions, activities, etc. [See pages 70-72 of the [transcript](#) for more information.]

Discussions on working methods that arose during the editing of the RFP:

- Alhadeff believed there needed to be a better way of capturing agreements about what needed to be added into documents, particularly as the ICG was working on more documents. He suggested that the current working method, which consisted of an ongoing stream of comments in documents made it hard to know what had actually been agreed to.
- Arasteh requested that when an ICG member wanted text deleted, it not be deleted entirely, but be marked in some other way in case it needed to be added back later.
- Arasteh observed that it was difficult to follow the editing process as the tracked changes were in light green and therefore hard to read.
- St Amour suggested that, looking around the room, people were trying to find the most recent version of the document, and that there perhaps needed to be a deadline for submission of documents before meetings—perhaps 24 hours—to ensure everyone was better able to track which version of a document would be discussed at a meeting.

Housley noted that the above discussion had dealt with Cooper’s first point in her email to the mailing list. Her second point was to propose a new bullet at end of the bullet list in Section “IV. Transition Implications” about how long proposals in Section 3 were expected to take to complete and any intermediate milestones that might occur as they were completed.

- El Bashir noted that due to connectivity issues in the meeting room, it was not clear if any of the remote participants wished to speak. He requested that the secretariat alert the Co-chairs if remote participants wished to take the floor.
 - In response Subrenat noted that the connection was working well for remote participants, but it was difficult to follow the editing of the document happening in the room.
 - Fältström suggested that when documents were being edited in the room, they should be edited within Adobe Connect so participants could also follow along on their computers, but this change would not be attempted until the break.
 - Wilson clarified that the version currently being edited was [version 16 in Dropbox](#). Karrenberg further explained that the room was currently looking at Section “IV. Transition implications”.
 - El Bashir asked if there was any disagreement on the text proposed by Housley.
 - Subrenat asked to go back to his request earlier in the day to delete “Proposals are expected to enjoy a broad consensus from all interested parties” from the second paragraph of Section zero, “Complete Formal Responses”. He noted he had sent his proposed change via the Adobe Connect chat room. Rather than deleting the text, he was now proposing that the text be changed to “When submitting proposals, communities are expected to have garnered sufficient support from the communities they represent.”
 - Alhadeff responded that he thought that that the substance of Subrenat’s proposed change should be read in such a way as to include not only the affected operational communities, but also other communities providing input into the process. He proposed some additional edits that would make this inclusiveness more clear.
 - Niebel supported Alhadeff’s proposal.

- Arasteh preferred Subrenat's original edit, stating that Alhadeff's changes made the text too complex.
- Karrenberg agreed with Arasteh about Alhadeff's proposed changes and proposed a slight amendment to the existing text of paragraph two to meet Subrenat's goals: replace "proposals are expected to enjoy" with "proposals must have" and replace "broad consensus" with "broad support".
- El Bashir proposed replacing "broad consensus" with plain "consensus".
- Mueller stated that his preference was for "broad support" as broad consensus could be difficult to reach in the names community.
- Alhadeff suggested that as the ICG was requiring broad support/consensus of the communities, it would make sense to also require that the operational communities consult broadly too, in the following sentence.
 - Davidson stated that a requirement to consult would not be easy for each community to meet. For example, in the ccTLD community, some ccTLDs do not recognize ICANN and the NTIA's role in IANA therefore would not recognize any attempt to consult with them about the transition of NTIA's stewardship.
 - Alhadeff recognized that this was a legitimate problem and nobody could be forced to consult if they did not want to be consulted; however, it could be a requirement to at least reach out and make the effort to consult, whether or not the other party chose to respond.
 - Dryden supported this approach.
- Drazek enquired if there was any difference in the meaning of the two terms, "interested parties" and "affected parties" in the RFP, and if there was not, that a single consistent term could be used.
 - Clark stated that she was also not clear whether "parties" was referring to "responding parties", "interested parties" or "parties" in general.
- Arasteh stated that, legally, "must" and "shall" were very strong words. He suggested tempering the language if the described actions were not absolute requirements of the community.

[Coffee break: 11:02 am – 11:25 am EEST]

Drazek returned to the issue of "interested parties" and "affected parties" in the RFP, noting that during the break, other ICG members had made the distinction clearer to him. He wondered if it would also be useful to make the distinction clearer in the RFP so communities developing proposals also understood the distinction better.

Alhadeff returned to the issue of requiring broad consensus/support from the community, proposing the following text for section zero, "Complete Formal Responses":

"Proposals should be supported by the broad range of stakeholders participating in the proposal development process. Proposals should be developed through a transparent process that is open to and inclusive of

all stakeholders interested in participating in the development of that proposal."

- Dryden strongly supported Alhadeff's text. Subrenat stated that while he could not read the text, what had been read out sounded good.
- Mueller suggested that if the ICG was making a distinction between interested and affected parties, then the ICG should have that distinction through all of the RFP text.
 - Alhadeff responded that he had tried to remove that distinction in the initial part, but that Mueller was right to note that not all the references had been removed and that this should be made consistent.
 - Arasteh suggested using "affected or interested, as the case may be".
 - El Bashir noted that there were no disagreements to make references to interested/affected parties consistent throughout the RFP.

El Bashir suggested that before the agenda item on the RFP be closed, ICG members agree with the changes made during the meeting to the latest version of the RFP and move towards the process of publishing the final RFP.

- Wilson suggested a substantial period, perhaps four weeks, was needed for public comment.
 - Clark supported this timeframe and suggested some wording in the request for comments along the lines of "Does your community consider this form of words will adequately capture the input you need to give?"
 - Arasteh noted that if there were to be a four-week/one-month comment period, that would take the ICG up to 8 October, with a deadline for proposals of 31 December. He observed this did not leave the communities much time to develop proposals. He asked why the RFP would need a month-long comment period when the public comment period for the ICG charter was only six and a half days.
 - Karrenberg suggested allowing requests for clarification for the RFP, as is used by other organizations issuing RFPs. Additional clarifications could be requested by communities until a certain date. He explained that if the ICG published another draft version of the RFP, with a four-week comment period, then some communities might not start working until after the comment period had ended in October.
 - Arkko, Arasteh, and St Amour agreed with Karrenberg. Arasteh stated that if the ICG kept amending the draft, they would never get around to the real work of the group (collating and forwarding a proposal to the NTIA).
 - Akplogan disagreed, stating that it would be possible to public the draft for comment at the same time as opening it for clarifications.
 - Alhadeff noted that the communities had already seen versions of this RFP and that there had not been any substantive changes to content in the versions that the public had seen – only the introductory text had substantial changes.
- Alhadeff suggested that requests for clarification on the RFP must be public and transparent because other communities might have similar questions further down the track.
- Alhadeff also noted that it was important to publish a timeline along with the RFP.

El Bashir noted that there was general agreement to adopt Karrenberg's proposal to issue the RFP as a final document, with a clarifications period to allow communities to ask questions of the ICG. He also noted that it was important to have very clear messaging about the RFP and the timeline in the announcement of the published RFP.

- Subrenat acknowledged that what was going to happen with the final RFP was a request for clarifications rather than a public comment period, but suggested that it would be useful for the ICG align itself with ICANN's or IETF's best practices on public comment periods. He noted that he thought that ICANN's standard was 15 working days.
- Karrenberg proposed postponing the discussion about the length of the call for clarifications until the ICG had dealt with the timeline agenda item later in the day.
- Housley stated that the ICG knew when its next face-to-face meeting would be (ICANN 51, Los Angeles), so if the ICG had any clarifications to make, it could make them around that time.
- Mundy suggested that, to ensure the RFP announcement aligns with the intent of the group, the text in the announcement for the RFP should be reviewed by at least the ICG Chairs.
- El Bashir noted that there seemed to be general agreement for a clarification period of at least 15 days
- Alhadeff suggested that instead of 15 working days, the ICG decide on a precise day. Otherwise, due to holidays, different countries might have different interpretations of what "15 working days" meant.
 - Arasteh supported having a specific date, requesting that the period be no more than 14 calendar days.
- Fältström noted that the aim of the agenda item later in the day on upcoming ICG meetings was to propose teleconferences for 17 September and 1 October. He suggested that using September 24 (23:59 UTC), which fell between the two proposed conferences, would be a good deadline for requests for clarifications.
 - Subrenat supported Fältström's proposal.
- Uduma asked if the ICG would do a final reading of the text of the RFP before the end of the meeting, following the same process used in the first face-to-face meeting.
 - El Bashir stated that the RFP, as edited by the group, was available to review in Dropbox, and suggested that if anyone had any issues, they could raise them before it was published on the ICANN website on Monday 8 September.
 - Arasteh supported this suggestion, stating there was not enough time to come back to the document in what was a very packed meeting agenda.
- St Amour pointed out that the RFP used "IGC" instead of "ICG" in the text and that this should be corrected.
- Wilson asked ICG members to review a [draft of the announcement](#) to accompany the final RFP.
 - Arkko suggested that text encouraging communities to begin work on their proposals be added to the announcement.
 - El Bashir suggested that it be clearer that the RFP was a final document and that the RFP text would not be amended following the call for clarifications (clarifications would be made separately).

- Karrenberg suggesting adding the date for the end of the call for clarifications and the date the ICG was committed to publishing responses to those calls.
- El Bashir suggested that edits to the draft announcement be made offline to save time.
- Fältström supported El Bashir's suggestion, stating that, as Chairs, they would commit to finalizing the announcement, then having the standard 48-hour comment period for ICG members before asking ICANN to publish the RFP and announcement. Fältström also committed to have the Chairs ensure that the text of the announcements was aligned with the text of the RFP itself.

Action:

- 3. The latest version of the IANA Functions Transition RFP to be published as the final version of the RFP, allowing for a period for final questions and clarifications from the community. The associated announcement to have very clear messaging around the RFP and timelines.**

6. Timeline and consultation process

Housley reported that the latest timeline documents had been sent to the internal-cg list a few days ago and added to Dropbox earlier in the day ([version 3](#)). He reported that some communities had already begun work on developing proposals and that the timeline proposed a deadline for proposals of 31 December 2014. The ICG would compile the proposals into a single document by the end of February, and follow that with a two-month public comment on the draft. After that, there would be a one-month period in which the ICG would create a final proposal that incorporated public comments. Testing would begin as soon as parts of the proposal were stable enough to begin testing. Housley noted that it was not clear how long NTIA would need to respond to the submitted proposal, but it was clear it would need several months, with Larry Strickling needing to brief an as-yet-unknown number of US Congressional committees.

Discussion:

- Davidson observed that the 31 December deadline for community proposals was a very tight deadline. He explained that the CCWG on IANA has just been formed and there had just been a call in the ccTLD community to join it. He was extremely concerned that the current timeline had very little flexibility around the proposal deadline.
 - Knoblen agreed that the CCWG would be challenged by the deadline and suggested that one of the first discussions of the CCWG would need to be about whether or not they believed they could make the deadline and to let the ICG know the outcome of that discussion.
- Arkko stated that he believed the IETF community could probably meet the 31 December deadline.
- Arkko suggested that the timeline was not as linear as it may at first appear to be, with many of the activities able to take place in parallel.
- Alhadeff suggested it might be useful to have a date somewhere between 31 December and mid-January to give the ICG time to provide feedback to communities about their proposals. He suggested that it would be too late to wait

for the February deadline for compiling proposals to let communities know their was a potential issue with their proposals.

- Mueller suggested could we moving the 31 December back a week to allow for the fact that much of the world is celebrating the end of the year on 31 December.
- Housley explained that the original timeline had a deadline of 31 January, but he had moved it back a month in response to changes in the RFP document.
- Arasteh suggested a deadline of around 10 January to allow for people coming back from end of year holidays.
- Lee suggested that there was not much difference between moving the deadline before Christmas or after the end of year holidays and that a move in either direction would be acceptable.
- Akplogan suggested moving the deadline back to its original date of 31 January 2015.
 - Uduma supported this.
- Arkko noted that in the current timeline, communities appeared to have no more work to do on their proposals after the 31 December deadline, but that in reality, they would probably be revising their proposals based on feedback from the ICG and wider communities. He suggested that activity might be useful to incorporate in the timeline. He also suggested incorporating the fact that the NTIA would begin looking at the proposals in preliminary form in late 2014, even though the official timeline showed NTIA as beginning to look at the ICG-submitted proposal in March 2015.
- Cooper observed that the timeline dates were listed as targets. She suggested that if communities proceeded on slightly different timelines, the ICG could be waiting for the last one before the whole process could move forward.
- Arasteh proposed halving the time between the dates of 31 December and 31 January and have 15 January 2015 as the deadline.
- Alhadeff proposed that the ICG encourage communities to submit their proposals as soon as they were completed, and not wait until the deadline, noting that some communities were already making good progress on their proposals. This would enable the ICG to identify potential gaps, and get back to the communities, as early as possible.
 - Wilson suggested explicitly noting that the ICG would attempt to review drafts as they were submitted, as a way to help speed up the overall process.
 - Subrenat also supported this.
- El Bashir noted there seemed to be agreement in the room to use 15 January 2015 as the deadline for community proposals.
- Karrenberg asked for confirmation that changing the deadline to 15 January would not change any other dates after that. This was confirmed.
- In response to a question by Akplogan, Housley explained that “testing” involved operational communities beginning to operate in the manner detailed in their proposals as soon as the proposal was stable. The idea was that by putting the proposal into action, it would enable the communities to see if the proposed process was actually workable.
 - Akplogan noted that such testing would involve IANA and NTIA, and asked if these other parties had agreed to the testing stage.
 - Housley replied that the only issue outstanding was root zone updates.
 - Arasteh asked for more information on the testing phase.
 - Subrenat suggested there were two possible roles for the NTIA in the testing phase: either the NTIA could be passive, and just be told about the

results of the testing, or the NTIA could be actively engaged in the testing to see how the NTIA part of the process would work. He supported the latter option.

- El Bashir noted that it was time to move to the next agenda item for the day and suggested that there would need to be further discussions on the mailing list on the timeline after the meeting, including the different periods of time for the different stages of the process.
 - Housley proposed producing one more updated version of the timeline and discussing it on the ICG's next teleconference. If it was possible to reach agreement on the timeline at that stage, then it could be published for public comment.
 - Akplogan reaffirmed that he thought it was very important for the timeline to be published at the same time as the RFP.
 - Karrenberg stated that he thought it was more important to finalize the timeline now and that the consensus building agenda item could be deferred for a little while longer.
 - Fältström responded, noting that Boyle, who was participating remotely, had made a strong request to discuss the consensus document between noon and 1 pm, so he could join. He noted, however, that the discussion about the timeline was very important, too. He proposed that if there was agreement among the ICG members to have 15 January as the deadline for community proposals, then there were no other dependencies between the RFP and the timeline, and the RFP could go ahead and be published independently.
 - Karrenberg replied that his chief concern was to have the timeline finalized before the end of the meeting, so if the timeline could be put on the agenda for further discussion later in the day, he would be happy.
 - Niebel wondered if moving the deadline for community proposals to 15 January would have any impact on the NTIA's processes, given Washington DC political processes.
 - Subrenat agreed with Karrenberg on the importance of finalizing the timeline.
 - Cooper proposed asking Housley to update the timeline during a break and re-presenting the revised timeline before the end of the meeting.
 - Fältström agreed with this and asked Housley to present the revised timeline later in the day.

Decision:

- 2. There is to be a 15 January 2015 deadline for submitting completed community proposals to the ICG.**

7. Consensus Building Process

Knoben explained that he would be using the version of the consensus-building document he had sent to the ICG members the previous night as the basis of discussion. He would not be using the version that Arasteh had sent in the early morning as the changes in that document were not substantive content edits to the issues that were about to be discussed: quorum, voting and consensus. He proposed coming back to Arasteh's edits later. Arasteh agreed to this proposal.

Knoben stated that the London face-to-face meeting had established that the ICG wanted a consensus process that did not use numbers to establish whether consensus had been reached. He raised two issues:

- The concept of “quorum” required a certain level of participation to be reached before a decision could be taken. A quorum did not just have to be about the total number of participants, but could also be about a minimum number of representatives from different communities.
- “Consensus” had many forms, including “rough” and “full”. However, the decision was not specify “rough” or “full” because in the case of the ICG, it was decided that consensus meant 100% agreement. In cases that there was not 100% consensus, it could be considered a “recommendation”.

He asked ICG members to state whether they believed quorum should be imposed at all, and if so, how it should be defined. He also asked for input on how to find consensus.

Discussion:

- Arasteh stated he was not in favor of voting but was in favor of consensus. She suggested that every effort should be exhausted to reach consensus before embarking on voting. He suggested that any participation below two-thirds of the ICG was not sufficient to enable the group to make decisions. And even if two-thirds was reached, that two-thirds also had to have at least one member from each community represented on the ICG. If voting was necessary, a simple majority was not sufficient to show broad support and a threshold of two-thirds or four-fifths should be used.
- Boyle stated his concern that if a supermajority was used, that was still not enough if one or more of the affected parties were unable to accept the decision. He also expressed concern that if voting thresholds were implemented, they could be exploited. As a result, he preferred to retain some haziness about what a supermajority vote would be and concentrate on processes to find acceptable solutions to all. Boyle also agreed that quorums were needed, but believed the definition in the consensus document was impractical as some communities only had one representative on the ICG. He also suggested that if the ICG were to be making a decision in a meeting, if members who had difficulties with the issue were not able to be present, the ICG should have a process that would enable those members to participate—perhaps via a teleconference at some point after the meeting.
- Davidson supported Boyle on the issue of quorum. In terms of teleconferences, he noted that one out of the standard three time slots would be difficult for everyone, meaning not everyone would be able to make every call. He requested that the Chairs never make binding decision in one call alone but instead do it over two calls (in two different time slots). Davidson expressed concern about the idea of supermajority, noting that the NTIA had asked for a consensus proposal and could reject the proposal if the proposal had been voted on instead.
- Alhadeff stated that there could be some people who could support a consensus opinion but might want to add a reservation or caution. He suggested that the ICG enable people to do this. He also suggested allowing time after a decision is made for communities to be able to affirm or oppose the decision. He proposed that this could be achieved not by waiting for another cycle of teleconferences, but by giving people a few days to comment on the mailing list. He also suggested that if

proxies were to be used, proxies should be given a very limited scope to operate in so they did not overstep the topic they were chosen to be a proxy for.

- Davidson suggested that a few days to comment could be difficult for some ICG members, who may need longer than that to consult with their communities. In contrast, time between teleconference would give all ICG members sufficient time to consult their communities.
- Subrenat agreed with Arasteh's point that quorum should not be demanded on every point but only on a limited set of decisions to be made. He also referred ICG members to an email he had sent to the mailing list a few weeks earlier proposing two categories: decision-making without a vote and voting-based decision-making. Voting-based decision-making should be limited to matters of principles and personnel matters and quorum would need to be achieved. [*Note: via the Adobe Connect chat function, Subrenat formally requested of the Chair that his position on voting and quorum be recorded in the minutes, writing that "Those who have just spoken at length against, are mainly 5 or 6 people in the operational community. But the ICG is 30 people. So, here's proof that "consensus" practiced in this way is really quite limited."*]
- Cooper supported using the mailing list as a way of enabling everyone to comment, if they were not able to attend a face-to-face meeting or teleconference. She proposed that this be used for all decisions of weight, with a deadline for comments on the list. Cooper agreed with Boyle and Davidson about the hazards of voting on issues that needed community consensus. She was concerned that attempting to vote on issues that could not reach consensus would simply result in a stalemate. She proposed voting not be an option in such cases at all. She also drew attention to a reference to polling in the consensus document, noting that a poll was not the same as a vote, but was a way of gauging what others in the group thought.
- Arkko agreed with Cooper on the quorum discussion and, like Davidson and Cooper, was concerned about voting, believing that if it was not possible to get broad consensus, the process would be doomed. He stated that he understood it was not possible to ask for full consensus, but it would be possible to aim for a recommendation that a small minority opposed. He did not think that any threshold for voting would make the outcome acceptable to the outside world.
- Nevett agreed with Arkko, noting that he, too was concerned about a per-group quorum threshold being at risk of capture – if one group decided it really did not like an issue, they could simply refuse to participate, and therefore prevent quorum from being reached.
- Mundy agreed with Cooper. He drew attention to the NTIA's 14 March announcement, noting that nowhere was the ICG mentioned in that announcement. Instead, it referred to a particular set of communities and "affected parties". He stated that if the ICG voted on any substantive issue, it would be failing the NTIA's directive.

[Break for lunch 13:11 pm - 14:15 pm EEST. The meeting Chair position moved from El Bashir to Fältström after the break.]

8. ICANN Enhanced Accountability – relationship with ICG

Fältström explained that according to the ICG's charter, the ICG members acknowledged that the ICANN enhanced accountability process was related to the IANA stewardship transition process. He noted that in the [21-day ICANN enhanced accountability public](#)

[comment period](#), there was a proposal to have a liaison with the ICG. He asked for feedback from the ICG members on their views on this proposal.

Discussion:

- Arasteh stated that he was grateful that ICANN was thinking about an interface with the ICG on the issue of enhanced ICANN accountability, but at the current stage, there was not enough information about what the accountability process for the ICG to make an informed response to. If the process were about ICANN accountability, it would be outside the ICG's area of interest.
- Drazek reported that there had been an ICANN Town Hall at IGF 2014 that had discussed the accountability issue. At that meeting, Larry Strickling stated that these two processes were inextricably connected and that they needed to complete at the same time. Therefore, Drazek believed that it was very important for the two processes to communicate.
- Mueller agreed that it was probably too early to appoint a liaison, but suggested that when a liaison was appointed, it should be from the names community. He proposed that it could be useful for the ICG to prepare an analysis of the accountability implications of the IANA proposals between the time the ICG received the community proposals in mid-January and mid-March 2015. Such a report could encourage the ICANN enhanced accountability groups to do a similar analysis of the impact of their process on the IANA stewardship transition process. He noted that he was concerned about too tightly linking the two processes, as he believed that the accountability process was so large that it could have difficulty finding consensus on everything before the end of the IANA process timeline had been reached. He also recognized that there were some parts of the accountability process that had to be in place before the IANA stewardship transition could occur.
- Niebel agreed that it was too early to nominate a liaison while also agreeing that some elements of the accountability process needed to be in place for the IANA stewardship transition to be successful. He supported Mueller's proposal to do an analysis of the accountability implications of the IANA proposals.
- Ismail asked whether there would be some formal dependencies between the IANA and accountability processes, and if so, suggested that the two processes needed to align their timelines.
- Lee stated that he believed there was unquestionably a relationship between the two processes, but the ICG's main task was the IANA stewardship transition but agreed with Mueller that the ICG needed more time to determine what that relationship was.
- Drazek noted that at the IGF 2014 ICANN Town Hall meeting, Strickling had made it clear that the ICG would not necessarily feed into the accountability group or vice versa. He noted that the information sharing and liaison function were to ensure that, if there were any common areas of concern or questions, the IANA and accountability groups were aware of what the other group was doing.
- Alhadeff believed that the linkages between the processes were more extensive than Drazek viewed them and suggested that both processes needed to examine where the commonalities between them existed. He suggested that a statement of the ICG's work related to accountability would be helpful in clarifying for the larger community what process (IANA or ICANN accountability) was doing what part of the large accountability pie.
- Fältström summarized the discussion as he had heard it:

- There were different kinds of accountability involved and the ICG was more concerned with accountability related to IANA.
- The ICANN accountability process was not well defined to date, so it was difficult for the ICG to know how to embark on a relationship with the process.
- Information sharing between the two processes would not be sufficient. Instead, the ICG should investigate more formalized ways to interact with the ICANN accountability process.
- Arasteh stated that while there was a need to communicate with the ICANN accountability process, he felt that the issue was too important to delegate to a single liaison from the ICG. He believed any communication should be developed collectively by the ICG.
- Ismail noted that the proposals from the communities would contain some aspects of accountability related to the specific IANA functions. She suggested that, when the ICG was compiling the separate pieces of the proposal, if gaps in the overall accountability of IANA functions were identified, then the ICG might need to coordinate with the ICANN accountability process.
- Fältström noted that there seemed to be some interest in doing some sort of mapping exercise or evaluation of the intersections between the IANA stewardship and ICANN accountability processes

Decision:

- 2. ICG to defer any decision about the interaction between the ICG and the ICANN accountability process until further information about the precise linkages between the two processes is available.**

9. Communities updates

9.1 GAC

Dryden reported that the request by the GAC to have five seats on the ICG was a first for the GAC, and therefore an experimental way of operating. She noted that while the GAC had always respected regional diversity, it was not structured to develop advice along regional lines. She explained that the whole GAC had a long history of engaging in processes where there was a GAC liaison to another process. In this vein, Dryden had sent several emails to the GAC mailing list to keep them up to date with ICG developments. She reported that the other GAC members of the ICG were also sharing information with other governments as well, and the GAC had created a Contact Group, which consisted of the five GAC ICG members and the GAC vice-chairs to exchange information. The Contact Group would coordinate the work of the five ICG members and coordination information distribution to the rest of the GAC. The members of the Contact Group present in Istanbul would report back to the whole GAC.

Dryden noted that the GAC planned to participate in the community efforts to develop proposals and was working out precisely how to participate in the recently created CCWG on IANA to develop a names proposal. She noted that the GAC as a whole had no intention of commenting on the protocol parameter or number processes, but believed there was an opportunity for governments to be advised on how to participate individually in those processes.

Dryden suggested it would be useful if the ICG could meet with the GAC in Los Angeles during ICANN 51.

9.2 GNSO

Mueller reported that the GNSO had created the Cross Community Working Group to Develop an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal. The CCWG spanned the GNSO and ccNSO. The group's [charter](#) had been created. The CCWG would accept input from everyone but only certain people, designated by ICANN constituencies and stakeholder groups, could be members of the CCWG itself.

Drazek added that the various parts of the ICANN naming community—GNSO, ccNSO and ALAC—had started working together after the ICANN 49 meeting in Singapore. He reported that the various communities were now going through the process of ratifying the CCWG's charter.

Davidson reported that the ccNSO had a call out for volunteers to be on the CCWG and it was expected for the members to be appointed within a week. He also stated that if the CCWG was to meet the 15 January 2015 deadline for community proposals, he believed the CCWG would have to begin its work before the ICANN 51 meeting in October. Davidson also explained that the four members of the ccTLD community who were serving on the ICG would be excluded from serving on the CCWG.

Cooper asked for more information on how people who were not part of the naming community could participate in the CCWG. Fältström suggested that this question be taken up at the next ICG meeting, and made applicable to all communities. He asked all ICG members reporting on their communities to include information about how others could participate in their processes.

9.3 NRO

Akplogan reported that the numbers community had begun their own consultation process on a regional basis, via the Regional Internet Registries. The NRO website was being used to provide a single entry point for anyone looking for information about the five RIR processes underway. He reported that each RIR also had its own mailing list for community discussion. Akplogan also reported that the RIRs had embarked on their own process to develop an accountability framework.

Glaser reported that the ASO was working with the NRO on the numbers process.

9.4 IETF

Arkko reported that the IETF had been discussing the IANA stewardship transition for quite a while, and had held meetings in March and July that discussed the issue. Based on those meetings and subsequent discussions, the IETF had created a new working group called IANA Plan. The mailing list for the working group was now active and open to everyone. He reported that one person from the IAB had taken on the task of drafting a proposal and was collecting comments on that draft, but there was no official IETF proposal to date.

9.5 SSAC

Mundy reported that SSAC had published a [report on IANA functions](#) intended to be an educational document for the communities. He urged ICG members to read it. He also reported that SSAC was working on a couple of other documents that he expected to be published in the future. One of the future documents would be about the NTIA IANA contract while the other would be general SSAC commentary on IANA.

Alhadeff asked if the community processes were being added to the ICG pages so people could access all processes easily. Fältström responded that links were being added as they were found, and there were efforts to improve the information available on the website.

9.6 ccNSO

Davidson stated that within a week or so, when the ccTLD members of the CCWG were finalized, he would post the list to the internal-cg mailing list.

9.7 ALAC

Subrenat reported that ALAC had set up a dedicated Working Group more than a month ago and met weekly online. He also reported that the members of the Working Group were engaging with other communities on their proposal development processes. He also reported that ALAC's Future Challenges Working Group was looking at accountability, and in particular, in relation to IANA stewardship.

St Amour asked for more details on the ALAC's work on accountability and the transition. Subrenat replied that the work was not a direct response to the ICG's work, but was an issue that ALAC had felt was important to explore for some time.

9.8 General discussion about community reports

Patrick stated that the report had been useful input and hoped it would make the discussion easier to manage in future.

Cooper reported that there had been a suggestion for members of the ICG to write a blog post for CircleID explaining how communities could participate in the operational community processes. She started that she would raise the idea for further discussion on the internal-cg mailing list in coming weeks.

10. ICG Independent Secretariat

Akplogan reported that the Secretariat RFP was ready for publication and would be projected in the room but would not be available on Dropbox to ensure that everyone had access to the RFP at the same time. He explained that the contents of the RFP were the same as those seen in the previous version but with a revised format to make it conform to ICANN's internal procurement process and some additional ICANN legal documents added (such as a Non-Disclosure Agreement and a Conflict of Interest form). He noted that the contract for the secretariat would be signed by ICANN but the work would be performed for the ICG.

Akplogan sought agreement from the ICG members on the timeline for the RFP process. The proposal was to release the RFP on 8 September with a deadline of 22 September for responses. There needed to be agreement on how long to have the period for

requests for questions from potential applicants. A special mailing list would be set up to receive those questions from applicants, while any legal questions would be referred to ICANN staff for advice.

Akplogan asked the ICG for input on how the selection of the secretariat should be performed, in particular, whether a separate group of ICG members distinct from those who drafted the RFP should be established to guide the selection process.

Discussion:

- Alhadeff asked if the RFP contained enough information to enable a potential applicant to respond. For example, a requirement to “manage the documents” might not give an applicant enough information to know how much work that would entail.
 - Housley responded that when the RFP group had spoken with ICANN’s procurement staff, they had suggested providing applicants with an estimate of how many hours the ICG was thinking the service would take.
- Subrenat asked that the call for proposals be made as widely available as possible and not be limited to a set of Western-based countries that have traditionally provided a lot of consultant services. He suggested considering giving a slight preference to companies outside the usual set of consultancy companies used. Subrenat also volunteered to be part of the group performing the selection process.
- Arasteh stated that it was not necessary to create a new group for the selection process, but to use the existing group.
- Karrenberg asked if the ICG members were being asked to agree to the specific text of the final RFP, and if so, had everyone seen it, or were ICG members being asked to acknowledge that the RFP group had completed the work on the RFP.
 - Akplogan replied that the original text of the RFP had been posted on Dropbox and that he had integrated all comments made on that draft. The final version consisted of that amended version plus all of the usual ICANN procurement-related documents that needed to accompany the RFP. The last version of the RFP had not been posted to Dropbox or to the internal-cg list as both were accessible to the public.
 - Karrenberg stated that he wanted to know the specific version of specific documents that had formed the final version of the RFP and asked that it be minuted that the ICG did not get to see the whole proposal.
 - Akplogan replied that the ICANN procurement group had used [RFP-ICG-Secretariat-v.01](#) to compile the final package that would be published on Monday.
 - Fältström asked Akplogan to confirm that the final RFP package, which would also contain other materials from ICANN, would be made public for the world and for the ICG at the same time. Akplogan confirmed this and offered to list the other documents that would be part of the package.
 - Knoblen stated that the group conducting the selection process should have no interest in any of the bidders.
 - St Amour asked if the RFP group had reviewed the full package, including the ICANN documents. Akplogan replied that they had. St Amour also supported having a different group of ICG members perform the selection from those members who had developed the RFP. She also proposed that potential applicants should not be an entity with a contractual

relationship with ICANN and that none of the other operating committees that were going to be impacted by the operations of this particular proposal should be part of the selection subcommittee.

- Subrenat supported St Amour's suggestions.
- El Bashir agreed it would be useful to have the criteria for evaluation circulated to all ICG members. He also suggested that the operational communities, for the sake of transparency and trust in the overall IANA stewardship transition process, should not apply for the role of secretariat.
- Davidson supported St Amour and El Bashir's comments, noting that ICANN had a strict conflict of interest policy in place. He asked if the secretariat RFP was taking ICANN's conflict of interest policy into account and whether the RFP had been checked by ICANN's legal team.
 - Akplogan replied that the conflict of interest policy would be applied and that the RFP was currently being reviewed by ICANN's legal team.
 - Davidson asked if it was possible for ICANN to circulate the conflict of interest policy to the mailing list. ICANN responded that this was a reasonable request.
- Subrenat also asked if there was a selection criteria related to geographic diversity to ensure that proposals outside North America, western Europe and Australian and New Zealand would be received on a level playing field. Subrenat also asked for more information about the current members of the selection committee and how they had been appointed or nominated, and repeated his request to participate on the committee.
 - Akplogan responded that there was no explicit section in the RFP that discussed regional diversity because it was an open process that anyone could participate in. He also clarified that the group that had drafted the RFP consisted of himself, Housley, Karrenberg and Fältström.
 - Subrenat asked for more information on how the members of the group had been appointed. He also proposed adding a line in the RFP draft that stated that the RFP committee conduct outreach for the purposes of geographic diversity.
 - Akplogan replied that the issue of outreach had been discussed and it had been suggested that all ICG members be counted on to help spread the word about the RFP. He suggested adding some text about diversity to the announcement of the RFP if that would help broaden interest in the RFP.
 - Fältström observed that there appeared to have been some communication problems within the ICG on how the secretariat RFP had been handled, and that speaking as a Vice-chair, he felt it was something he felt the chairs needed to pay attention to. He also reported that the call for Expressions of Interest (EOI) announcement had been communicated to the ICG members with the aim of enlisting their help in distributing information about the RFP. The second step of the process was then to send the RFP to entities that had responded to the EOI. In essence, he explained, the train was already moving, and Akplogan was trying to manage that moving train.
 - Arasteh stated that geographic diversity was not a main criteria for the selection process, but that if there was a desire to include some text on the issue, it should be qualified by "to the extent practicable". The key was to

concentrate on expertise. Finally, Arasteh stated that it was not good for the ICG to state that it had not seen the RFP. Instead, it should be made clear that there were two parts of the package: the RFP itself, which the ICG had developed, and ICANN-related procurement documents, that were not within the expertise of the ICG.

- Karrenberg proposed that the ICG members ask Akplogan to request ICANN to go ahead and publish the RFP and that no additional constraints be placed on the RFP itself. He suggested that some general text could be added to the announcement welcoming submissions from all geographic regions but he cautioned against extending the criteria for the RFP via the announcement.

Fältström summarized the discussion and asked ICG member to agree on three things:

1. That Akplogan could move ahead and announce the RFP.
2. The possible addition of text regarding diversity to the RFP or announcement.
3. The request by Subrenat to be added to the secretariat selection committee.

Discussion:

- Drazek stated that he thought Subrenat was requesting to be part of the selection group, not the RFP drafting group, if there were to be two separate groups.
- Fältström confirmed this, noting that there was currently only one group, which meant that Subrenat would be added to the group that Akplogan was leading. He noted that there not seem to be consensus on how to do the evaluation or who should be in the evaluation group.
 - Akplogan suggested continuing with the current group, which had been formed for the drafting of the RFP, and if a conflict of interest arose, that could be addressed at the time. He stated that there seemed to be agreement that those who were on the drafting group could continue with the work of the selection process.
 - Drazek stated that he was not sure there was general agreement to have the drafting group also so the work of the secretariat selection. He hoped that if there was a second group created to do the selection work that Subrenat would not be conflicted out of being part of that group by his inclusion in the current (drafting) group.
 - Uduma stated that it was her understanding that there would be a different group of ICG members doing the selection work and asked for clarification about the situation.
 - Wu asked if the ICG was also expecting the independent secretariat to supply the equipment associated with ICG meetings (such as translation booths). Fältström clarified that the secretariat was not expected to supply audio-visual equipment, etc.
 - Arasteh stated that it was sufficient to have the existing drafting group do the work of the selection process and that if anyone else wished to be added to the group, that shouldn't cause a problem.

[At 3:42 pm EET, Davidson left the meeting.]

- Alhadeff agreed with Arasteh's suggestion, stating that a benefit of having the existing group work on the selection is that they would better

understand the reasons for the criteria in the RFP, while new members could add fresh perspectives as well.

- Subrenat stated that he was happy to join the existing or new group, as long as he was able to make a contribution.

Fältström asked ICG member to consider on three things:

1. That Akplogan could move ahead and ask ICANN to announce the RFP.
2. That there be some additional wording—but no an additional requirement—regarding diversity in applicants.
3. That anyone else who wanted to join the secretariat selection committee should feel free to make a request to do so.

Discussion:

- Uduma asked if ICANN would be part of the evaluation process.
 - Akplogan explained that only the ICG would be evaluating the proposals.
 - Fältström further explained that because ICANN would be one of the contracted parties in the final contract, they would have to ensure that the applications met various legal requirements, but the substantive evaluation was up to the ICG.
 - Akplogan added that even in evaluating the legal requirements, ICANN would not make any decisions, but would simply provide the ICG with information on their assessment of the applications.
- Dryden asked to confirm that there would be a copy of ICANN's conflict of interest policy circulated among the ICG members.
- St Amour suggested it wasn't necessary to be as specific in the RFP announcement as some of the ICG members wanted it to be. She also stated that it was important to see ICANN's conflict of interest policy before the RFP was published as it was important to understand what criteria the conflict of interest policy would be imposing on the RFP process.
 - Akplogan responded that the conflict of interest policy was not specifically mentioned as one of the criteria for secretariat selection, so it might be looking at that issue.
 - Cooper stated that she thought the criteria for selection were listed under Section 2 of the RFP. She also suggested that it might make more sense to ensure that the RFP would be distributed to a diverse range of interested parties rather than to have language in the announcement stating that the RFP should go out to a diverse range of parties.
 - Dryden agreed with St Amour and supported more clarity on the conflict of interest policy in relation to the RFP, hoping that the issue could be addressed quickly.
- Housley suggested circulating the conflict of interest policy straight away and asked if ICANN was able to give permission to do this.
 - Akplogan stated that circulating the conflict of interests document was one of the earlier actions that had been agreed upon. He also clarified that the criteria for selecting the secretariat were contained in section 12 of the RFP.
 - El Bashir withdrew his earlier request for evaluation criteria to be circulated but still believed it was important that the ICG see the document before publication.

Fältström asked if, with the document circulated, ICG members believed there was enough time to review the document and, if they felt it necessary, request the process be halted before the RFP was due to be published on Monday. He noted that asking ICG members to review the document over the weekend violated what the ICG had agreed at the start, which was not to require documents to be reviewed over weekends unless absolutely necessary.

Discussion:

- Alhadeff suggested that if ICANN was uncomfortable sending the conflict of interest document to the internal-cg list, perhaps the document could be sent to the personal email addresses of ICG members.
 - Swinehart responded that she would need to confirm if this was possible.
- Clark stated that ICANN must have a well-established public procurement policy with a standard set of procurement policies available on the ICANN website somewhere, so it should not matter if a copy also went to the ICG mailing list.
 - Fältström responded that a procurement policy and the actual document associated with the RFP could be different things, and that there was nobody from ICANN present at the meeting who could clarify the situation.
 - Swinehart clarified that ICANN's conflict of interest policy for the ICANN Board and related parties was up on the website and was possible to circulate. The ICANN contracting and disbursement policy was also available on the website. She was not, however, able to respond to the question about the specific document Akplogan was suggesting be distributed as she had not been involved in the RFP discussions and could therefore not respond to questions regarding the document.
 - Akplogan clarified that the document he was referring to was the "ICANN contractor conflict of interest policy".
- Arasteh suggested that the RFP be released preferably on 8 September, but no later than 9 or 10 September. He was concerned about delays incurred waiting for further comments on the RFP package from ICG members.
 - Fältström clarified that he was not suggesting people comment on the document over the weekend, but merely have the opportunity to say "stop" to the RFP publication if they felt such an action was necessary.
- Akplogan suggested that ICG members also needed to agree on the limitations that were governing the publication and end dates of the RFP. The ICG members had previously agreed that the independent secretariat had to be in place for the ICANN 51 meeting in LA. If that constraint were to be removed, there could be more time to discuss the elements of the RFP that were causing some concern amongst ICG members.
- Mundy suggested that there seemed to be a desire amongst ICG members to have the secretariat in place as soon as possible, so urged the ICG to proceed with the using ICANN's standard conflict of interest policy and have confidence in the organization (ICANN) doing the procurement for the ICG.

Fältström stopped the discussion at this point. He clarified that the members of the RFP drafting group, whom the rest of the ICG had tasked with making decisions, had seen the whole package and were happy to move forward having seen that package. He stated that now that other ICG members outside the drafting group wanted to see the package

as well, it felt a bit strange and that the ICG needed to trust the various subgroups it was creating. He suggested that the ICG think carefully about the ramifications of how it was making decisions.

Discussion:

- El Bashir stated that he was not requesting the whole package, but just the specific conflict of interest component. He asked if it would be possible for the drafting group members who had seen that component to explain what it contained.
- St Amour agreed with El Bashir, saying that she fully trusted the drafting group and was concerned about criteria related to the conflict of interest component that could mean that some proposals would not be accepted.
 - Dryden supported St Amour's comments
- Arasteh suggested moving the RFP publication date to 10 September to allow ICG members Monday and Tuesday to review the conflict of interest document on the mailing list.
- Karrenberg read an excerpt from the conflict of interest disclosure document, concluding that the document was very broad and gave the ICG all the tools it would need to prevent conflicts of interest.
 - Alhadeff, however, was concerned that the text referred to conflicts with ICANN and not conflicts with ICG.
 - Karrenberg responded that the issue had been discussed at the previous face-to-face meeting, where he had suggested that if the ICG wanted the secretariat to be fully independent, then the ICG members, not ICANN should be funding the secretariat. However, the ICG had chosen to have ICANN fund the secretariat.
 - Alhadeff suggested that any conflict of interest template not only had to document conflicts of interest with ICANN, but also had to require disclosure of conflicts of interest with the ICG.
 - Akplogan replied that the text Karrenberg had read out showed that the policy extended beyond just ICANN to any relationship with any other entity that could be considered a conflict of interests.
 - Mundy supported Akplogan's reading of the policy.
- Cooper suggested sending the conflicts of interest document to the ICG members who were concerned about it or possibly to wait until ICANN had ascertained whether it could be sent to the public internal-cg mailing list. She also expressed concern about making a judgment about the document based on the small excerpt Karrenberg had read out.
- Uduma stated that she felt reassured by the text that Karrenberg had read out and suggested there was enough information to proceed with the RFP.

Fältström observed that time-wise, it was now going to be impossible to reach consensus on some of the ICG's documents during the meeting that he had thought were more important than the secretariat RFC. This included the consensus document and the timeline. He asked if anyone objected to moving forward with the RFP, noting that ICG members who had concerns about the conflict of interest document could approach Akplogan and ask him for a copy directly.

Discussion:

- Alhadeff stated that, if the ICANN legal team could be asked if the ICANN conflict of interest policy could also cover conflicts of interests related to the ICG, then he did not need to see a copy of the conflict of interest document.
 - Karrenberg and Fältström responded that it was not possible to have a reply from the legal team in time for the RFP to be published on Monday.
 - Karrenberg withdrew his objection to not seeing the whole RFP package as he believed the danger was sufficiently small, but believed the questions needed to be asked as the process continued to move forward.
- Akplogan announced that he had emailed the conflict of interest document to Alhadeff, St Amour, El Bashir, and Dryden. He stated that he believed there was concern within the ICG that the issue was related to conflicts of interest related to the ICG as well as to ICANN and that the committee would need to look at that issue as they began evaluating applications.

Fältström summarized the discussion and declared consensus on the following issues:

1. He asked Akplogan to move forward with the RFP on behalf of the ICG, noting there was an explicit question about the conflict of interest document in terms of whether or not it covered ICG-specific conflicts, or just ICANN conflicts.
2. He noted that Subrenat had been added to the secretariat subgroup and welcomed others to join if they were interested.
3. He noted Subrenat's request to encourage diversity in secretariat applications by reaching out to the communities that ICG members represent but not by changing the RFP criteria itself.

Decisions:

3. **Subrenat added to the group that will evaluate the applications for the role of independent secretariat.**

Actions:

4. **Akplogan to ask the ICANN staff to proceed with publication of the Secretariat RFP.**
5. **Akplogan to add some language about diversity to the announcement accompanying the Secretariat RFP.**

11. Conference calls schedule and next face-to-face meeting arrangements

Fältström reported that the Chair and Vice-chairs had discussed the division of duties and that Fältström had taken on the task of working with logistics and dates. As part of this responsibility he was proposing the following face-to-face meetings of the ICG:

1. An open meeting with the community during ICANN 51 in Los Angeles – work on the floor plan and place in the meeting week schedule was underway. The plan was to have all ICG members on the stage during their open session with the community. He reported that all ICG members should have a copy of the floor plan.
2. A third face-to-face meeting after ICANN 51 in Los Angeles – the venue for the meeting would have space for 60 observers as well as the ICG participants.

3. A fourth face-to-face meeting before or after ICANN 52 in Marrakech, 8-12 February 2015 – Fältström suggested using a Doodle poll to find out whether before or after the ICANN meeting worked for most people.

Discussion:

- Housley reminded the ICG that at the London face-to-face meeting, there was discussion about the possibility of beginning the LA face-to-face meeting on the Thursday if the Board finished its meeting early.
 - Fältström responded that the chairs had discussed this and did not believe that the Board would end early enough to justify the possibility of holding a working meeting of the ICG on the Thursday of the ICANN meeting.
- Uduma noted that it appeared that the ICG would have more work to do in LA, with requests to meet with various communities having been received. She asked how these meetings would be added to the ICG's schedule.
 - Fältström confirmed that the ICG had been receiving requests from ICANN communities to meet with them during ICANN 51 and it was a logistical challenge.
 - Liman suggested that as ICG members represented different constituencies, it would suggest that something was not working if those constituencies felt the need to meet with the ICG rather than work with their representative on the ICG. He was open, however, to meeting with constituencies not represented on the ICG.
 - Arasteh noted that travel support for ICG members only covered the ICG meeting itself, so if there was a need to meet with constituencies on other days, that would be difficult. He suggested meeting with all interested constituencies as the same time.
 - Wilson questioned whether any community meetings were needed at ICANN since some of the communities affected by the IANA stewardship transition, such as the RIRs, would not normally be at an ICANN meeting.
 - Knoblen suggested that if the only point of the meetings were to exchange information with communities, then that would be unnecessary. However, if a stakeholder group wanted to raise concerns with the ICG about the overall process, that would be a different matter.
 - Arkko stated that he believed that the ICG as a whole would not need to meet with communities, but sometimes, meeting in person could achieve a lot more than emails or sending a liaison statement could.
- Glaser reported that ISOC planned to hold meetings after the Marrakech ICANN meeting, so the ICG should avoid a post-ICANN 52 meeting.
- Arasteh noted that to be in Los Angeles for the third face-to-face meeting, he had had to cancel attendance at a meeting associated with the ITU plenipotentiary conference and could not cancel another important meeting that was happening after the ICANN 52 meeting.
- Karrenberg suggested that further discussion about appropriate dates for the Marrakech meeting be moved to a Doodle poll.
- Boyle suggested that given the ICG had not been able to complete all its work in its current meeting, perhaps it should consider a two-day meeting at the ICANN meeting, perhaps with one day before the ICANN meeting starts and a second day after the ICANN meeting ends.
- Fältström noted that people talking off microphone were suggesting that if there were to be a two-day meeting, the days should be consecutive.

- Wilson proposed holding an open session of the ICG in LA. Fältström noted that the ICG was already holding an open meeting and asked for Wilson to explain what his idea was. Wilson explained that as he understood it, the open meeting was for the community to listen only, but he was proposing a consultation session.
- Cooper stated that face-to-face engagement was very important in ensuring that everyone knew how to participate in the proposal processes and to ensure that, come December or January, there were not lots of people saying they did not know how to become involved. She stated she would send a longer email to the mailing list about this issue.

Fältström also proposed the following details for ICG teleconferences:

1. Calls be rotated over three time slots: 4:00, 12:00 and 20:00 UTC. – He noted that to date, only the 12:00 UTC slot had been used.
2. Calls be held every second week, and based on previous teleconferences, that the calls be held on Wednesdays.
3. The new fortnightly call schedule to begin 17 September at 20:00 UTC, then 1 October at 4:00 UTC, and so on.

Discussion:

- Karrenberg stated that while he understood the idea behind having a series of rotating time slots for calls was to not always inconvenience a few people, he felt that the price paid by this method was too high overall, and preferred retaining a Doodle poll to select a time so the maximum number of people could be inconvenienced.
 - Clark responded that using Karrenberg's method would mean that there would be a systematic bias against the ICG members who were 10 or 12 hours away from UTC time.
 - El Bashir stated that Doodle polls were acceptable for him, but that whatever the method, once the times had been decided, it was important to have a six-month window of upcoming teleconferences marked out so ICG members could plan their time accordingly.
 - Wilson strongly supported a rotational approach to times of teleconferences since for some parts of the world, most meetings were being scheduled in the middle of the night. He also supported the use of a shared calendar to organize the teleconference schedule.
 - Fältström noted that a shared calendar could be implemented after the independent secretariat was in place. However, Wilson suggested that this needed to be implemented sooner than that. Fältström noted this.
 - Lee supported Wilson's call for a rotating series of time slots for teleconferences.
 - Cooper explained that she had been the one to suggest the 4:00, 12:00 and 20:00 UTC time slots to cater for the geographic distribution of ICG members. She also asked Fältström how long the calls would be.
 - Fältström suggested that with the teleconferences held to date, it had only been possible to discuss a single issue in a one-hour call. He suggested that future calls only be one hour and only discuss a single issue each time.

- Davidson also supported rotating teleconference call times and having advanced notice of upcoming calls.
- Ismail also supported call time rotation and suggested that perhaps seeing if people were more comfortable with the proposed times plus or minus an hour.
- Karrenberg clarified that he was not proposing abandoning rotational calls, but was proposing flexibility in the timing of the calls within certain time zones.
- Getschko suggested simplifying the rotational calls to 4:00 and 16:00 UTC

Decisions:

- 4. ICG teleconferences to be rotated around three main times: 4:00 UTC, 12:00 UTC and 20:00 UTC, with Doodle polls used to determine the exact hour of the calls.**
- 5. ICG face-to-face meeting at ICANN 51 to have an open microphone session to enable to the community to have a question and answer session with the ICG.**

Actions:

- 6. ICG to create a shared calendar of ICG meetings and teleconferences for the following six months.**

12. Timeline and consultation process (cont.)

Housley reported that he had tried to incorporate the outcomes of the discussion earlier in the day as well as a lot of email feedback that had come in since that discussion. He noted that he had originally omitted Step 7 in the graphical timeline altogether, so that had been added in, resulting in NTIA having two months—not two and a half months—and the ICG having two weeks to confirm consensus and possibly responding to the scenario that the testing phase has uncovered that one of the proposals has problems. He had also changed the date of the RFP publication in the timeline.

Discussion:

- Drazek relayed that Cooper asked if the discussion was available in Dropbox. Karrenberg responded that it was available as [TimelineDiscussion-v4](#) and [TimelineGraphic-v4](#).
- Arkko noted that the timeline was a document to be sent to the communities for review, so was not set in stone, but something for negotiation with the communities.
- Fältström stated that it was important to announce the timeline because many of the communities involved in the proposal process were not used to working with deadlines, so needed to be aware that deadlines, were indeed, part of the process. He noted, however, that feedback about external events would probably result in some modifications needing to be made to the timeline. He also noted that it was always important to have the most current timeline published so the community could see if there were changes that were being made at any stage of the process.

- Housley affirmed that the timeline would be a living document and pointed ICG members to the first paragraph of the timeline document, which stated that the timeline was being distributed for comment.
- Drazek stated that it was important to publish not just the key deadlines, but also the backup deadlines and why those dates had been proposed.
- Fältström relayed a message from Cooper in the chat room that it would be useful for the timeline document to include the URL and email address to which comments could be sent. Housley agreed that this information would be added to the document if he was given the URL and email details. Fältström agreed to send Housley the details.
- Arasteh asked why Step 4 had a later date—17 July 2015—than Step 5—19 June. Housley explained that this had been covered earlier: as soon as proposals were stable, testing would begin, but the latest possible date for beginning testing was listed in the timeline.
 - Wilson proposed that the timeline show periods of time to make the situation clearer.
 - Karrenberg noted that the RFP for community proposals included a reference to testing, and that not all communities might require testing of their proposals.
 - Uduma also expressed concern about the non-sequential listing of the testing step.
- Housley stated that he could publish another version of the timeline to incorporate the URL and email address and to fix a couple of typing errors, but not before the end of the meeting.
 - Fältström stated that he believed the changes were editorial and could be made after the meeting approved the document.

Fältström noted that the timeline document had been approved by the ICG members.

Action:

7. ICG to publish the proposed timeline for the development and implementation of an IANA stewardship transition proposal.

13. Any other business

Arasteh asked for clarification on the status of the consensus-building document, noting that if it was returning to the mailing list discussion, it could result in a flurry of emails, which was not a very efficient way to make progress.

- Fältström agreed with this and noted that it was unfortunate that the document could not be finalized before the end of the meeting, but it was the end of the day already. He suggested that perhaps interested ICG members who were staying in Istanbul could meet for coffee or dinner after the meeting to discuss the consensus document. He suggested that the teleconference on 17 September be used to finalize the consensus document after further discussion on the document on the mailing list after the Istanbul meeting.

Subrenat highlighted the Step 4 and 5 start dates were not chronological in the timeline. He also noted that he had asked in the morning to have a clear written response by

email about what testing entailed in detail. He also repeated his request from the morning to perhaps ask NTIA to be active during the testing phase.

- Housley asked Subrenat to look at the community RFP document approved that morning for details on the testing phase.

14. Summary of the meeting's decisions and actions

El Bashir summarized the actions of the meeting, asking ICG members to correct any mistakes or add anything that had been missed:

1. ICG to publish the final IANA Functions Transition RFP with a period of clarification open until 24 September, 23:59 UTC.
2. Communities to submit their proposals in response to the RFP proposal by 15 January 2015.
3. ICG to publish the proposed timeline for the development and implementation of an IANA stewardship transition proposal.
4. ICG to delay a decision about a possible liaison from the ICG to the IANA enhanced accountability process until there is further information about the intersection between the ICANN accountability and IANA stewardship transition processes.
5. Akplogan to add some text about diversity regarding the Secretariat RFP
6. ICG to publish the Secretariat RFP. Akplogan to coordinate with ICANN staff and ICG chairs to achieve this.
7. Subrenat to be added to the Secretariat RFP evaluation group.
8. Akplogan to send a copy of ICANN's conflict of interest document to interest ICG members. [Already completed]
9. ICG volunteers or secretariat to set up a shared calendar for upcoming ICG meetings and fortnightly teleconferences for the next six months.
10. ICG teleconferences to be rotated around three main times: 4:00 UTC, 12:00 UTC and 20:00 UTC.
11. ICG face-to-face meeting at ICANN 51 to have an open microphone session to enable to the community to have a question and answer session with the ICG.

Discussion:

- Mundy asked if there was a decision about the LA face-to-face meeting being one or two days.
 - Fältström explained that it had previously been decided to have a one-day meeting in AL and, logistically, it was now not possible to change the duration of the meeting to two days.
- Wilson reported that he had also sent an email about this topic, but given the ICG was holding an open session within the ICANN 51 meeting itself, there was no need to have an open microphone session during its face-to-face meeting as well.
- Karrenberg clarified that the language about diversity regarding the Secretariat RFP was to appear in the announcement and not to become a concrete criteria for evaluating applications.
- Karrenberg also noted that the times of teleconferences were to be rotated, but in combination with Doodle polls to determine the exact hour.

- Fältström also noted that there was also agreement to use a Doodle poll to determine the date(s) of the Marrakech face-to-face meeting in February 2015.

Arasteh thanks the vice-chairs of the meeting for their effective chairing of the meeting and thanked ICANN for providing the facilities for the meeting.

El Bashir thanked the remote participants and ICANN staff.

Fältström declared the meeting closed.

[Meeting closed 17:10 EEST]

Final agreed list of decisions and actions from the second face-to-face meeting of the ICG

Decisions:

1. Communities to submit their proposals in response to the RFP proposal by 15 January 2015.
2. ICG to delay a decision about a possible liaison from the ICG to the IANA enhanced accountability process until there is further information about the intersection between the ICANN accountability and IANA stewardship transition processes.
3. Subrenat to be added to the Secretariat RFP evaluation group.
4. ICG teleconferences to be rotated around three main times: 4:00 UTC, 12:00 UTC and 20:00 UTC, with Doodle polls used to determine the exact hour of the calls.
5. ICG face-to-face meeting at ICANN 51 to have an open microphone session to enable to the community to have a question and answer session with the ICG.

Actions:

1. ICG to publish the final IANA Functions Transition RFP with a period of clarification open until 24 September, 23:59 UTC.
2. ICG to publish the proposed timeline for the development and implementation of an IANA stewardship transition proposal.
3. Akplogan to add some text about diversity regarding the Secretariat RFP in the announcement accompanying the RFC.
4. ICG to publish the Secretariat RFP. Akplogan to coordinate with ICANN staff and ICG chairs to achieve this.
5. Akplogan to send a copy of ICANN's conflict of interest document to interest ICG members. [Already completed]
6. ICG volunteers or secretariat to set up a shared calendar for upcoming ICG meetings and fortnightly teleconferences for the next six months.
7. ICG to use a Doodle poll to determine the exact date(s) of the fourth face-to-face ICG meeting in Marrakech in February 2015.