

DRAFT MINUTES: Third IANA Stewardship Coordination Group (ICG) Face-to-Face Meeting

9:45 PDT/16:45 UTC, Friday 17 October 2014

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

Participants

Mohamed El Bashir, ALAC (Vice-chair)
Jean-Jacques Subrenat, ALAC
Hartmut Glaser, ASO
Martin Boyle, ccNSO
Keith Davidson, ccNSO
Xiaodong Lee, ccNSO
Mary Uduma, ccNSO
Kavouss Arasteh, GAC
Manal Ismail, GAC
Michael Niebel, GAC
Thomas Schneider, GAC
Jandyr Ferreira dos Santos, GAC
James Bladel, GNSO
Wolf-Ulrich Knoen, GNSO
Milton Mueller, GNSO

Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries
Jon Nevett, gTLD Registries
Russ Housley, IAB
Lynn St Amour, IAB
Joseph Alhadef, ICC/BASIS
Jari Arkko, IETF
Alissa Cooper, IETF (ICG Chair)
Narelle Clark, ISOC
Demi Getschko, ISOC
Adiel Akplogan, NRO
Paul Wilson, NRO
Lars-Johan Liman, RSSAC
Patrik Fältström, SSAC (Vice-chair)
Russ Mundy, SSAC

Liaisons:

Elise Gerich, IANA Staff Expert

Kuo-Wei Wu, ICANN Board Liaison

ICG Apologies:

Daniel Karrenberg, RSSAC

ICANN support staff:

Alice Jansen
Hillary Jett
Nancy Lupiano

Ergys Ramaj
Theresa Swinehart

Non-ICANN staff minuting support:

Samantha Dickinson

1. Welcome and roll call

Cooper welcomed everyone to the ICG's third face-to-face meeting, including those in Adobe Connect and the observers in the room. She reminded ICG members to state their names every time they spoke, for the record.

Cooper asked Dickinson to be as sparse with the minutes as she felt would be useful.

2. Agenda review

- Knoen asked for an item on outreach to ICANN staff added.

- Niebel asked for the agenda to include an item on interaction with the communities during ICANN 51. Cooper suggested this be part of the discussion of any concerns/issues arising agenda item due to begin at 15:30.
- Boyle asked for there to be time allocated to discussion of [ICANN Board resolution 2014.10.16.16](#).
- Ismail suggested moving the FAQ agenda item to later in the day, so the day's decisions could be taken into account when reviewing the contents of the FAQ.

3. Minutes approval from 6 September face-to-face meeting and 1 October teleconference

Cooper asked if there were any objections to the adopting the minutes of the 6 September face-to-face meeting and 1 October teleconference. There were not. Cooper asked Jansen to publish the minutes.

Action:

1. **Jansen to publish, on the ICG website, the two sets of minutes adopted by the ICG: 6 September face-to-face meeting and 1 October teleconference.**

3. ICANN Board resolution

Cooper noted that it was her understanding that [ICANN Board resolution 2014.10.16.16](#) was related to the Cross-Community Working Group on ICANN Accountability & Governance (CCWG Accountability) and not to the ICG process.

ICG members expressed strong concerns about the possibility of the ICANN Board having the ability to assess in any way the final proposal compiled by the ICG. This possibility was felt to be contrary to the communities' wishes. It was suggested that the ICANN Board members, as stakeholders just like everyone else in the community, participate directly in the processes to develop proposals.

Cooper asked dos Santos, Lee and St Amour to form a small group to develop requirements about how the final ICG proposal is to be handled by the ICANN Board.

Actions:

2. **dos Santos, Lee and St Amour to form a small group to document how the ICG expect the ICANN Board to handle the final ICG proposal.**
3. **Given Action Item 2 above, Cooper to ask ICANN Board member, Bruce Tonkin to not send information outlining potential Board thoughts on how they might handle the ICG proposal.**

4. ICG relationship to Enhancing ICANN Accountability process

Swinehart outlined the relationship between the IANA stewardship transition process and the two work streams of the ICANN accountability process. Summary of the two work streams:

1. ICANN accountability in the context of the changing historical relationship with the US government in light of the IANA transition in their stewardship role.

2. Accountability issues that the community has raised throughout the ICANN accountability dialogue (including the ATRT2 report) that are not directly related to the changing historical relationship with the US government.

Swinehart reported that ICANN staff were preparing a diagram to more clearly explain the relationship between different parts of the accountability and IANA-related processes.

Discussions among the ICG members clarified that it was the Cross Community Working Group to Develop an IANA Stewardship Transition Proposal on Naming Related Functions (CWG IANA) that would be interacting directly with the CCWG Accountability, although the ICG would have an interest in the CCWG's activities as well.

The following ICG members indicated they were planning to participate in CWG IANA. The names marked in **bold** will be the ICG's liaisons in the CWG, reporting back on the CWG's activities to the wider ICG:

- | | | |
|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|
| 1. Arasteh | 6. Dos Santos | 11. Lee |
| 2. Arkko | 7. Drazek | 12. Mueller |
| 3. Boyle | 8. Getschko | 13. Niebel |
| 4. Cooper | 9. Ismail | 14. Schneider |
| 5. Davidson | 10. Knoblen | 15. Uduma |

The following ICG members indicated they were planning to participate in CCWG Accountability. The names marked in **bold** will be the ICG's liaisons in the CCWG:

- | | |
|-------------------|-------------|
| 1. Arasteh | 3. Nevett |
| 2. Drazek | 4. Subrenat |

Decisions:

- 1. The three liaisons reporting back on the CWG IANA's activities are to be Boyle, Lee and Mueller.**
- 2. The two liaisons reporting back on the CCWG Accountability's activities are to be Arasteh and Drazek.**

5. Week in review

It was noted that there were unexpected levels of confusion within the community at ICANN 51 on what exactly was being transitioned as part of the IANA stewardship transition process. It was also clear to many ICG members that the community had not read the RFP for community submissions. There was discussion about how to clear up misunderstandings in the community to ensure that there would not be objections to the final proposal based upon those misunderstandings about the process and how to engage in the process. The community was also unclear on how the three separate parts of the final proposal (names, numbers and protocol parameters) would be combined to form the final proposal. There was also interest in encouraging greater coordination between the three operational communities to ensure all communities were aware of cross-cutting issues emerging from individual proposal development processes. There was also broad support to include some new questions in the ICG's FAQ to answer questions that were commonly asked at ICANN 51.

6. Proposal finalization process

Cooper introduced version 1 of the draft [Proposal finalization process](#).

There was discussion about the use of specific words in the draft that had the potential to suggest unintended readings of the text. For example, “assessment” had less unintended sense of subjective judgment than “evaluation”. The majority of the discussion about the text revolved around attempting to make it clear that the ICG would not in any way interfere with or judge the processes carried out by operational communities, but instead were checking that the proposals met the criteria specified in the RFP. There was also discussion about whether or not, in the interests of time, the ICG should begin assessing proposals as soon as the first one was submitted, or wait until two, or possibly all three, had been submitted.

Action:

- 4. Cooper and Alhadeff to revise the Proposal Finalization Process draft based on feedback from ICG members.**

7. FAQ

The ICG reviewed the existing FAQ, including questions and answers that had not had complete consensus prior to ICANN 51. The ICG also talked about the addition of new questions in light of the ICANN 51 participants’ confusion over the scope and details of the IANA stewardship transition.

Decision:

- 4. FAQ text on the role on the ICANN Board in the final proposal to hold placeholder text for the time being. The final text will be completed after the completion of the work of the small group drafting the ICG’s requirements on the ICANN Board’s handling of the final ICG proposal.**

Action:

- 5. Drafting of the update version of the ICG FAQ to continue on the internal-cg mailing list.**

8. Future conference call and meeting schedule

Decisions:

- 5. Dates of the Marrakech ICG meeting to be 6 and 7 February 2014.**
- 6. The teleconference scheduled for 22 October has now been cancelled.**
- 7. Teleconferences to remain 60 minutes in length.**

Action:

- 6. Fältström to issue a doodle poll for ICG members to show their preferred times for the next ICG teleconference.**

9. Parking lot (Any other business)

Knoben suggested conducting outreach to the staff of the IANA function to keep them informed of what was happening in the stewardship discussions. Subrenat suggested the ICANN staff expect liaison to the ICG, Gerich, perform this role.

Davidson suggested making regular use of the “thumbs up” function of Adobe Connect to gauge consensus during teleconferences. Following this suggestion, ICG members also began using physical thumbs up gestures in the face-to-face meeting.

St Amour suggested producing a document accessible to the wider community that would summarize the progress made by the ICG in its third face-to-face meeting. As a result of the subsequent discussion by members, Cooper asked Dickinson to produce a very short set of draft minutes by the end of the night that could be published on the ICG website.

Action:

- 7. Dickinson to produce a very short set of draft minutes on the night of 17 October for publication on the ICG website prior to the ICG’s adoption of the minutes.**

Cooper closed the call.

[Meeting closed 17:11 PDT/0:11 UTC]

Summary of the decisions and actions from the face-to-face meeting of 17 October 2014

Decisions:

- 1. The three liaisons reporting back on the CWG IANA’s activities are to be Boyle, Lee and Mueller.**
- 2. The two liaisons reporting back on the CCWG Accountability’s activities are to be Arasteh and Drazek.**
- 3. FAQ text on the role on the ICANN Board in the final proposal to hold placeholder text for the time being. The final text will be completed after the completion of the work of the small group drafting the ICG’s requirements on the ICANN Board’s handling of the final ICG proposal.**
- 4. Dates of the Marrakech ICG meeting to be 6 and 7 February 2014.**
- 5. The teleconference scheduled for 22 October has now been cancelled.**
- 6. Teleconferences to remain 60 minutes in length.**
- 7. Gerich to ensure IANA function staff are aware of discussions taking place on the stewardship transition.**

Actions:

- 1. Jansen to publish, on the ICG website, the two sets of minutes adopted by the ICG: 6 September face-to-face meeting and 1 October teleconference.**
- 2. dos Santos, Lee and St Amour to form a small group to document how the ICG expect the ICANN Board to handle the final ICG proposal.**

- 3. Given Action Item 2 above, Cooper to ask ICANN Board member, Bruce Tonkin to not send information outlining potential Board thoughts on how they might handle the ICG proposal.**
- 4. Cooper and Alhadeff to revise the Proposal Finalization Process draft based on feedback from ICG members.**
- 5. Drafting of the update version of the ICG FAQ to continue on the internal-cg mailing list.**
- 6. Fältström to issue a doodle poll for ICG members to show their preferred times for the next ICG teleconference.**
- 7. Dickinson to produce a very short set of draft minutes on the night of 17 October for publication on the ICG website prior to the ICG's adoption of the minutes.**