

Fourth IANA Stewardship Coordination Group (ICG) Face-to-Face Meeting – Day 2

09:00 – 14:50 SGT / 01:00 - 06:50 UTC, Saturday, 7 February 2015

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

Singapore ICG Participants:

Mohamed El Bashir (ALAC)(ICG Vice chair)
Patrik Fältström (SSAC)(ICG Vice-chair)
Hartmut Glaser (ASO)
Martin Boyle (ccNSO)
Keith Davidson (ccNSO)
Xiaodong Lee (ccNSO)
Mary Uduma (ccNSO)
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)
Jandyr Ferreira dos Santos (GAC)
Manal Ismail (GAC)
Michael Niebel (GAC)
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen (GNSO)

Milton Mueller (GNSO)
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries)
Jon Nevett (gTLD Registries)
Russ Housley (IAB)
Joseph Alhadeff (ICC/BASIS)
Jari Arkko (IETF)
Narelle Clark (ISOC)
Alan Barrett (NRO)
Paul Wilson (NRO)
Russ Mundy (SSAC)
Daniel Karrenberg (RSSAC)
Lars-Johan Liman (RSSAC)

Remote ICG participants:

Alissa Cooper (IETF)(ICG Chair)
Lynn St. Amour (IAB)

Jean-Jacques Subrenat (ALAC)
Demi Getschko (ISOC)

Liaisons:

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

ICG Apologies:

James Bladel (GNSO)
Thomas Schneider (GAC)

Secretariat:

Jennifer Chung
Yannis Li
Sherly Haristya

ICANN Support:

Alice Jansen
ICANN Technical Staff

1. Welcome and Agenda Review

El Bashir welcomed all to the second day of face-to-face meeting and went through the revised agenda for the day that front-loaded discussions to before 14:00. There were no objections to the proposed agenda, thus the ICG proceeded with the revised agenda as posted.

2. Protocol Parameters Proposal – discuss and finalize questions for the community

Summary of the first day main and informal sessions:

- Arkko noted that the discussion yesterday was very productive and summarized the outcome from both the main and informal sessions into three categories of questions:
 1. Factual information requests that can be dealt with without needing to go back to the IETF community;
 2. New information requests regarding differences between the community proposals and how the communities intend to align them;
 3. Disagreement with the community proposal either as the ICG or in an individual capacity.
- Arkko cautioned that the third category must be handled very carefully by the ICG as it may be seen to be going against what has passed through operational community processes. Arkko also summarized questions that were discussed and answered such as the contract situation with the IAOC, statement from the ICG to encourage continuous improvement, jurisdiction and the role of the IAB as a final arbitration power, and clarification of NTIA oversight of IETF.

Question to be sent to the protocol parameters community:

- There was discussion and further refinement of language to the question Mueller [posted](#) to the internal-cg mailing list. It was suggested that the question should be rephrased to reference the whole paragraph from the numbers proposal that is related to the trademark and IANA.org, and that the ICG should use neutral phrasing to ask if the two communities are willing to coordinate and better align their proposals.
- It was suggested and agreed to have Mueller rephrase the question and for the ICG to send the same question to both the protocol parameters community and the numbers community.

Action item 1: ICG chairs to formally transmit [question](#) (formulated during the ICG face-to-face meeting and finalized on the internal-cg mailing list) to both the numbers and protocol parameters communities.

- Cooper asked if there needs to be alternative language to be worked out regarding questions other than the trademarks and iana.org (regarding jurisdiction, NTIA oversight, etc.). Arkko distinguished these questions as belonging to category 1 detailed above, and offered to write up a list of these ‘requests for information’ and send to the internal-cg mailing list.

Action item 2: Arkko to do write up of jurisdiction and NTIA oversight in the protocol parameters community and send to the internal-cg mailing list.

3. Numbering Resources proposal – discuss and finalize questions for the community

- Alhadeff gave a brief summary from the informal session regarding the numbers proposal that highlighted questions which were agreed to be useful to provide to the community as constructive items to look at during the contract drafting, namely:
 - Could the RIRs separately exercise their decision to work with the numbers operator and therefore have multiple operators with RIRs?
 - Will the contract be specifying a jurisdiction or will there be an opportunity for the contract to be interpreted in different jurisdictions?
- Further discussion on whether or not these questions should be formally put towards the relevant operational community resulted in the conclusion that there would just be [one formal question](#) posed to both the protocol parameters and numbers communities. Cooper, Arkko, and Niebel stated the need for summary of questions discussed and resolved amongst the ICG regarding the two proposals received.

Action item 3: Secretariat to [summarize questions/answers resolved](#) internally about the protocol parameters and numbers proposals discussed.

- Arasteh restated specific questions regarding section II.B.2 and III.A of the numbers proposal to which Wilson agreed to obtain clarification and summarize for the ICG.

Action item 4: Wilson to do write up clarification regarding questions put forth by Arasteh regarding Section II.B.2 and III.A of the numbers proposal.

4. ICG Timeline

Cooper produced [version 7](#) of the timeline based on the information received from CWG-IANA. Fältström framed the discussion and asked the ICG to first decide on how much time the ICG needs to do its work, and not mix it up with the discussion of the [CWG-IANA timeline](#).

- Mundy questioned if the ICG should build into the timeline the time needed for the back and forth from the formal clarification questions sent to the operational communities.
 - Cooper agreed and flagged this item as a point the ICG needs to make a decision on.
- Alhadeff questioned if there is an effort in the CWG-IANA working group to cross-reference the existing proposals. He also added that a factor to be considered is the level of divergence between the three proposals that may add more time to the ICG's work.

Cooper clarified that [the 'after names tab' in version 7](#) of the timeline shows the time allotted for the ICG's work (after receiving all three proposals) has been extended to nine months from the originally proposed six. This was done in consideration of the consensus process in the names community.

- Karrenberg stated that the timing needed for the ICG's work should remain unchanged. Fältström, Knoben, and Niebel concurred.
- Knoben reminded the ICG that there are fixed dates such as ICANN meetings that cannot be changed.
- Knoben and Fältström asked for clarification on the 2.5 month assessment period which looked to be an increase of the previously agreed upon [version 5](#) of the timeline.

Cooper explained that the various parts have been changed in length due to taking into account the holidays period in the calendar and also a realistic expectation of work progress. She further explained that [version 5](#) of the timeline was published before the [finalization and assembly process](#) and [version 7](#) includes more details of the steps the ICG has agreed to follow. Lastly, she clarified that the 2.5 month assessment period represented the entire back and forth period between the operational communities and the ICG, not an extension of the ICG's work.

- Knoblen noted that the operational communities had worked intensively through the holiday period to deliver their proposals to the ICG, and that the ICG should be prepared to follow suit in its proposal assessment process as well as the final proposal assembly. Clark concurred.
- Niebel, Wilson, Karrenberg, Arkko and Lee expressed concerns that changing the ICG timeline for its own work could send the wrong signal to the operational communities that have in good faith and good time delivered their proposal to the ICG.
- Clark questioned the necessity of the time allotment for 'Testing for Everybody Outside' and 'NTIA review' in [version 7](#) of the timeline.
 - Cooper explained that this was taken from [version 5](#) of the timeline.
- Boyle highlighted the fact that the second consultation period was dropped from [version 7](#) of the timeline and cautioned against it. Alhadeff agreed with Boyle and mentioned that if the ICG is extending its timeline, it should be to do more consultation and not for the ICG's work. There was broad agreement that community feedback periods are important to the ICG's work.
 - Cooper agreed to put the second consultation period back into the timeline.
- Arasteh pointed out that the names proposal, with proposed new entities, may necessitate more time for the ICG's review as compared to the protocol parameters and the numbers proposals (both of which either confirm no or very little NTIA stewardship to their respective communities and processes). Boyle and Drazek suggested that the names proposal when submitted may already be a finely balanced compromise that may not require as substantial ICG work as others expect.
- Mueller defended the proposed nine month timeline. He noted that the NTIA, by law, cannot devote resources to review the final proposal before 30 September 2015. Mueller further noted that it is better to allocate nine months and finish work early, than to stay with six months and miss the deadline. Ismail agreed with Mueller regarding the reluctance to miss a deadline.
- Arkko suggested that the ICG and operational communities look at what it can accomplish before receiving the names proposal, and incremental continuous improvement can be achieved with contracts, reviews, and completing alignment of the received proposals.
- Drazek commended the protocol parameters and numbers communities for their timeliness. He cautioned the ICG on the use of divisive language that may imply that the names community is lacking focus or urgency. He reiterated that the names community has been just as hard at work while solving a more complex problem. He further suggested that the ICG may still be able to meet its target September deadline even with the CWG-IANA projected June date for the names proposal.
- Niebel articulated a general agreement in the discussion that the ICG should not pressure CWG-IANA to compress its timeline.

Cooper noted that there was a general agreement to split the timeline into before and after receipt of the proposals, with the second period represented as a generic time period based model. Fältström

summarized the discussion, noting that there were two main tasks that needs to be done before moving forward to determine whether the ICG needs to adjust the timeline for its internal work:

1. Review the finalization process in more detail to see which steps can be done independently with the protocol parameters and numbers proposals before the ICG receives the names proposal.
2. Review and verify length of time needed for each step.

Action item 5: ICG chairs to review details of the proposal finalization process and refine ICG timeline with assistance from the Secretariat.

5. Handling of Community Comments

Ismail summarized that there was agreement that: the ICG should respect the operational communities' processes and not try to replace their output with ICG's judgment; the ICG not be an appeals panel; and the ICG to not create a complex process to handle comments. She stated that there were two approaches discussed on the mailing list:

1. Consistently forward comments received on the [icg-forum](#) to the relevant communities.
2. Rely on having [icg-forum](#) publicly available for the operational communities and wider community to follow up and reply should they wish to.

Ismail listed the pros for the first approach as being a consistent, predictable, and fair process for all comments especially since the ICG has set up a forum to receive them directly. Karrenberg spoke to the reasoning behind the second approach. He said he was concerned about the reduced flexibility for the ICG and the high potential for abuse that any fixed procedure caused. He suggested that the ICG use its [existing process](#) to deal with comments by taking note of all comments and deciding to ask specific questions to the communities based on comments the ICG agree to be relevant while the operational communities remained free to act on any and all comments on their own initiative. He also noted that the procedure as written delegated inappropriate judgment calls to the Secretariat.

Cooper reminded the ICG that the [RFP](#) states that the ICG will direct comments received to the relevant communities. She also noted that the ICG has already sent messages to the IETF and RIR communities asking them to treat the comments as if they were received inside their own process and deal with them accordingly.

Discussion:

A middle approach that took from the two listed above was suggested, with emphasis placed on ICG's internal review of the comments. Ensuing discussion highlighted the need for the ICG to show due diligence to comments received and the importance of documenting the output. A digest or summary approach was also suggested to mitigate the potential of 'attack vectors' to the ICG or the operational communities' processes, and to also acknowledge commenters while foregoing the need for individual responses. Various ICG members suggested to have preferences from the operational communities sought whether they wished to have comments automatically forwarded (either individually or bundled) or if they wanted to monitor the [icg-forum](#) themselves.

Action item 6: Ismail, Arasteh, St. Amour, Alhadeff, Subrenat, and Karrenberg to continue working on community comments handling document on internal-cg mailing list with suggestions put forward by other ICG members.

6. Proposal finalization process

Taking into the account the discussion earlier regarding the ICG timeline and general agreement of ICG members to stay with the planned steps, Fältström stated that the Chairs were working with assistance from the Secretariat to create a new version of the finalization process that splits up the major steps into more detail. **See Action item 5 above.**

7. Accountability

- Drazek reported that the CCWG-Accountability and CWG-IANA are coordinating and significant progress has been made building upon the intensive work since the Frankfurt face-to-face meeting.
- Arasteh reiterated that apart from work stream 1 and work stream 2, there are also work areas 1 (accountability that currently exist), 2 (comments received for that accountability), 3 (work relating to the CWG-IANA), and 4 (contingencies). Arasteh further noted that there are two new working parties created: WP1 deals with review and redress, and WP2 deals with the empowerment of the community to take necessary action regarding ICANN board decisions.

8. Future Teleconference and Face-to-Face Meeting Schedule

Teleconference schedule:

- Fältström proposed that the teleconference schedule for the ICG every two weeks starting on the second Wednesday (25 February) after the ICANN meeting. Arasteh requested that the schedule be coordinated with the CWG-IANA and CCWG-Accountability meeting schedules to allow the ICG members to participate in all meetings without time conflicts.

Action item 7: Fältström to communicate with CWG-IANA and CCWG-Accountability before coordinating ICG teleconference schedule.

Face-to-face meeting:

- Opinions for having the meeting before the ICANN week included having the ability to do ICG first, then engage with the community, as well as scheduling constraints with various ICANN structures.
- Opinions for scheduling the meeting at the end of ICANN week included the possibility of receiving the names proposal (or a more progressed names proposal) as the ICANN chartering organizations would have a chance to approve and further progress items at the ICANN meeting.

Action item 8: ICG chairs to take into account input received from ICG members as well as logistics and present a suggested conclusion on the next ICG face-to-face meeting.

9. Talking points for the Monday session

There was a request to discuss whether the ICG should prepare a statement or a position to take during the Monday session. There was agreement to not issue an official statement, since the details of the timeline were tabled for the following teleconference call after ICANN week. There was further discussion and live-editing on [talking points that Fältström posted](#) on the internal-cg mailing list regarding the use of the word “incremental” and debate around whether or not “6 months” should be specified.

It was concluded that there was agreement that real-time drafting was not constructive to reaching consensus on a piece that should be considered general bullet point facts reflecting the ICG discussion so far.

Action item 9: ICG to continue to discuss and agree on talking points and ICG chairs to send bullet points for Monday session on the internal-cg mailing list.

Summary of action items:

1. ICG chairs to formally transmit [question](#) (formulated during the ICG face-to-face meeting and finalized on the internal-cg mailing list) to both the numbers and protocol parameters communities.
2. Arkko to do write up of jurisdiction and NTIA oversight in the protocol parameters community and send to the internal-cg mailing list.
3. Secretariat to [summarize questions/answers resolved](#) internally about the protocol parameters proposal and numbers proposal discussed.
4. Wilson to do write up clarification regarding questions put forth by Arasteh regarding Section II.B.2 and III.A of the numbers proposal.
5. ICG chairs to review details of the proposal finalization process and refine ICG timeline with assistance from the Secretariat.
6. Ismail, Arasteh, St. Amour, Alhadeff, Subrenat, and Karrenberg to continue working on community comments handling document on internal-cg mailing list with suggestions put forward by other ICG members.
7. Fältström to communicate with CWG-IANA and CCWG-Accountability before coordinating ICG teleconference schedule.
8. ICG chairs to take into account input received from ICG members as well as logistics and present a suggested conclusion on the next ICG face-to-face meeting.
9. ICG to continue to discuss and agree on talking points and ICG chairs to send bullet points for Monday session on the internal-cg mailing list.