Fourth IANA Stewardship Coordination Group (ICG) Teleconference

21:30 UTC, Wednesday 17 September 2014

Meeting agenda and archives

Participants

Mohamed El Bashir, ALAC (Vice-chair)	Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries
Jean-Jacques Subrenat, ALAC	Joseph Alhadeff, ICC/BASIS
Hartmut Glaser, ASO	Russ Housley, IAB
Martin Boyle, ccNSO	Lynn St Amour, IAB
Keith Davidson, ccNSO	Jari Arkko, IETF
Mary Uduma, ccNSO	Alissa Cooper, IETF (ICG Chair)
Kavouss Arasteh, GAC	Demi Getschko, ISOC
Heather Dryden, GAC	Adiel Akplogan, NRO
Manal Ismail, GAC	Paul Wilson, NRO
Michael Niebel, GAC	Lars-Johan Liman, RSSAC
Jandyr Ferreira dos Santos, GAC	Patrik Fältström, SSAC (Vice-chair)
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, GNSO	Russ Mundy, SSAC

Liaisons:

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

ICG Apologies:

Xiaodong Lee, ccNSO	Jon Nevett, gTLD Registries
James Bladel, GNSO	Narelle Clark, ISOC
Milton Mueller, GNSO	Daniel Karrenberg, RSSAC

ICANN support staff:

Alice Jansen	Ergys Ramaj
Hillary Jett	

[Time shifted] non-ICANN staff minuting support:
Samantha Dickinson

1. Welcome and roll call

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

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

2. Minutes approval from 19 and 26 August 19 teleconferences

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

Dryden asked that an amendment be made to the minutes of the 19 August teleconference in Item 4 on the consensus process. The revised text was to be "She explained that GAC members, on the ICG, could not vote on such narrow issues."

Subrenat requested, as a general principle, to have the links to the documents under discussion always made available in the Adobe Connect chat facility.

Arasteh urged ICG members not to start redrafting the consensus-building document.

Cooper stated that there appeared to be consensus to approve the minutes, pending the edit requested by Dryden.

Decisions:

Decisions:

1. **Minutes of 19 and 26 August conference calls were approved with one suggested change to 19 August minutes by Dryden.**

Actions:

1. **Dickinson to amend the minutes of the 19 August teleconference to reflect Dryden's edits.**
2. **Jansen to post the finalized minutes of August 19 and 26 to the website.**

3. Consensus building document

Cooper reported that the version of the consensus-building document being displayed in Adobe Connect was the [clean version of the document](#) she had [sent to the mailing list](#) the previous day. She explained that the version contained all comments received up until 16 September, but nothing that had been sent to the list on 17 September. She suggested going through the document in two steps:

1. Identify substantive issues that any ICG members still had with the document.
2. Discuss editorial changes that ICG members may wish to make to the document.

Subrenat requested that each member on Adobe Connect be given the ability to independently scroll through the document displayed in the room.

- Cooper noted that she did not have the permissions to make such a change but could hand control of the room back to Jansen if individual scrolling ability was required. Cooper noted that everyone should have a copy of the document as it had been sent to the internal-cg mailing list as well as placed in Dropbox. However, if people wanted the ability to scroll through the version

Arasteh requested that the consensus-building document be reviewed paragraph by paragraph.

- Cooper responded that she hoped by this stage of the discussion on the document, there would be very few substantive issues that ICG members would

still have, so hoped to get them out of the way quickly before embarking on a paragraph-by-paragraph editorial review of the document.

Cooper asked if anyone wished to raise issues about the substance of the consensus-building document, and noted that there was a lot of support being expressed in the Adobe Connect chat room for the document's contents. She suggested moving on to the editorial review of the document. She explained that the version of the document now being displayed in the Adobe Connect room was a [more recent version](#) that also included edits submitted during the current day.

Discussion:

- o Mundy asked if the document should be explicitly exclude members of the independent ICG secretariat from the decision-making process.
    - o Cooper said she was happy to add this information.
- o Subrenat noted that the first paragraph of Section 2 of the document referred to Statements of Interest (SOI), but he thought the relevant issue was conflicts of interest, or statements of conflicts of interest.
    - o Knoben explained that he had taken the text directly from the GNSO working group guidelines.
    - o Subrenat responded that he thought the GNSO definition was narrower than that was needed in the ICG's document and needed a more accurate definition.
    - o Cooper stated that the ICG had already made statements and that there was a matrix of information that ICG members had provided about where they worked and where their funding was coming from. She asked Subrenat if was more he believed that ICG members needed to disclose.
    - o Subrenat explained that it was a matter of establishing norms. And that one of those norms for the group should be statements of conflicts of interest.
    - o Cooper noted that she had added a reference to conflicts of interests to accommodate Subrenat's concerns.
    - o Knoben explained how SOIs worked in the context of the GNSO, noting that because people's circumstances could change, the GNSO asked people at every meeting to provide a new SOI if their positions had changed.
- o Cooper continued to scroll through the document, paragraph by paragraph, asking people to comment if they objected to any of the tracked changes.
- o Subrenat suggested that the last paragraph of Section 2, that included the text, "Where appropriate and practical, public comment periods will also be provided", was problematic as he did not believe the decision to hold a public comment period should be left to the group to decide.
    - o Cooper responded that her personal view was that the decision to hold public comment periods depended on how substantive the decision was. For example, there was no need to hold a public comment period on the ICG's decisions on when to hold its next meetings.
    - o Mundy supported Cooper in this view.
    - o Subrenat accepted this interpretation of the text, explaining that he ha simply not wanted to have the ICG criticized for not holding public comment periods where it mattered.
    - o Referring to the same paragraph, Arasteh questioned who would decide what is "appropriate".

- o Arkko responded that the ICG's charter made it clear that the ICG will hold public comment periods, so believed that the issue was covered by the charter.
- o Knoben further noted that the reference was appearing, not in a section about the criteria for holding public comment periods, but in a section about general norms of behaviour and believed that Subrenat's proposed edit ("The ICG will make all reasonable efforts to enable stakeholder communities to have appropriate time to consult on issues which the ICG will make substantive decisions, including through public comment period") was fine.
- o Cooper asked if any other ICG members had objections to adopting the document.
  - o Arasteh suggested added "where practical and appropriate" to the end of Subrenat's edit. Subrenat was willing to accept Arasteh's edit to his text.
- o Cooper again asked if there were any objections to adopting the document. Hearing no more objections, she declared consensus to adopt the document.

Decision:

2. **ICG consensus-building document approved by consensus.**

Action:

3. **Cooper to create a clean, final consensus building document to be uploaded to the website.**
4. **Jansen to post final version of decision making document to the website.**

4. Side meetings at ICANN 51

Cooper noted that the list of ICG meetings was now displayed on Adobe Connect. She advised the group that there were now two confirmed ICG events at ICANN51:

1. A public community session on the morning of 16 October 2014.
2. A third face-to-face meeting, all day, on 17 October 2014. Fältström was in charge of developing the agenda for this meeting.

Cooper explained that there had already been some discussion on the public session, so she did not want to spend time on that meeting in the current teleconference.

Cooper noted that there was an open question about side meetings between ICG members and various ICANN constituencies. She reminded ICG members that she had sent an email about the topic to the internal-cg list and there had been some discussion on the issue during the second face-to-face meeting in Istanbul. She noted that opinion was divided in the group about whether such meetings should happen.

Discussion:

- o Arkko stated that he believed it was useful to have side meetings with communities as it helped increase understanding on both sides.
- o Alhadeff also supported engaging with the communities, but wondered if it were possible to merge the individual community engagement meetings into a larger

version of the public community session. The benefit of this would be that everyone would have the benefit of hearing the discussions and concerns of every other community as well as their own. He also believed this would prevent repetition of the some questions and discussions across many individual side meetings.

- o Akplogan supported Alhadeff's approach that it would be more useful to have the discussions happening publicly where everyone could benefit from each other's discussions. He suggested that politely declining individual meetings with constituencies and instead asking them prepare their questions or concerns to be read out and addressed in the public meeting.
- o Dryden also supported Alhadeff and Akplogan's approach, along with some additional meetings that could focus on particular parts of the community. She explained that in the context of the GAC, there was a certain culture or expectation framework that governments had in trying to understand processes like the stewardship transition. She noted that the ICG had heard early on about the importance of being attentive e to the political dimensions of the process and that because of this, it would be useful to meet with the GAC at ICANN 51. She suggested that if the ICG did not meet with the GAC, it could be viewed negatively and miss the opportunity to help government representatives understand the process better.
- o Cooper responded that she did not believe there was much flexibility in scheduling for ICANN 51 at the moment, but would talk to the ICANN staff to see if it was possible to have some more time to engage with the community.
- o Cooper noted that she could contact the communities that had expressed interest in meeting with the ICG to say that there were some operational communities were interested in engaging with other communities anyway—perhaps not necessary as ICG members—so even if there was not ICG consensus to meet with other communities, at least communities could proceed with their scheduling for ICANN 51 knowing that there were opportunities for some cross-community engagement on the IANA stewardship transition process.. She suggested that interested ICG members could discuss such engagement offline.
- o Uduma asked a question about the ability for the ICG to engage with the Cross-Community Working Group (CCWG) on the IANA transition proposal at ICANN 51. Cooper stated she was not aware of who was managing the CCWG's schedule and suggested she follow up with Uduma about this offline.
- o Arasteh agreed with Alhadeff and Akplogan that there was not a need for separate meetings with ICANN communities.

Cooper stated that she would send an email to the mailing list about her proposed way of dealing with individual requests for meetings with the ICG, and that at the very least, the ICG would ask ICANN if it was possible to have more time for the public meeting.

Cooper closed the call.

Actions:

5. **Jansen to investigate extending the time for the ICG community session at ICANN 51.**
6. **Cooper to respond to GAC and ALAC ICANN 51 scheduling requests to indicate that individual communities may want to engage, but not on behalf of ICG.**

7. Cooper to follow up with Uduma regarding the CCWG schedule at ICANN 51.

[Meeting closed 22:40 UTC]

Cooper's summary of the meeting's decisions and actions

Decisions:

2. Minutes of the August 19 and 26 conference calls were approved with one suggested change from Heather.
3. Decision making document was approved with changes discussed on the call. (final redline is attached)

Action items:

8. Samantha to incorporate into August 26 [sic] minutes the change suggested by Heather.
9. Alice to post finalized August 19 and 26 minutes to the web site.
10. Alissa to produce clean version of decision making document.
11. Alice to post final version of decision making document to the web site.
12. Alice to investigate extending the time for the ICG community session at ICANN 51.
13. Alissa to respond to GAC/ALAC ICANN 51 scheduling requests to indicate that individual communities may want to engage, but not on behalf of ICG.
14. Alissa to follow up with Mary regarding CCWG scheduling at ICANN 51.