

# Second IANA Stewardship Coordination Group (ICG) Teleconference

Tuesday 12:01 UTC 19 August 2014

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

## ICG members:

Mohamed El Bashir, ALAC  
Jean-Jacques Subrenat, ALAC  
Hartmut Glaser, ASO  
Keith Davidson, ccNSO  
Martin Boyle, ccNSO  
Xiaodong Lee, ccNSO  
Mary Uduma, ccNSO  
Kavouss Aratesh, GAC  
Heather Dryden, GAC  
Manal Ismail, GAC  
Michael Niebel, GAC  
Jandyr Dos Santos, GAC  
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen, GNSO  
Milton Mueller, GNSO

James Bladel, GNSO  
Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries  
Jon Nevett, gTLD Registries  
Joseph Alhadef, ICC/BASIS  
Russ Housley, IAB  
Jari Arkko, IETF  
Alissa Cooper, IETF  
Narelle Clark, ISOC  
Demi Getschko, ISOC  
Adiel Akplogan, NRO  
Paul Wilson, NRO  
Daniel Karrenberg, RSSAC  
Patrik Fälström, SSAC  
Russ Mundy, SSAC

## Apologies:

Lynn St Amour, IAB  
Lars-Johan Liman, RSSAC

## Liaisons:

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

## ICANN staff:

Theresa Swinehart  
Ergys Ramaj  
Alice Jansen

## Non-ICANN staff support:

Samantha Dickinson

### 1. Welcome and logistics

Cooper explained that Jansen would take the role call of attendees on the teleconference from the Adobe Connect list. She requested that members not in Adobe Connect room to state, for the record, state their attendance:

- Dryden reported she would connect to the room shortly.
- Mueller, Mundy and Karrenberg reported that they were in the Adobe Connect room but were not showing in the list.

Cooper asked ICG members wanting to be placed in the queue to speak to use the “raise hand” option in Adobe Connect. Those not using Adobe Connect were requested to ask to be added to the queue verbally over the phone.

Cooper noted there was a packed agenda for the teleconference. She then requested that those not present in the first face-to-face meeting in London introduce themselves to the group. An updated matrix of the details provided by the members is included as Annex A to the minutes of the teleconference.

## 2. Chair appointments and roles

Alhadeff reported that voting for the appointment of a Chair and two Co-chairs had been completed:

- He reported that there had been unanimous support for Cooper as Chair.
- Votes for the nominees for Co-chair had been very close, with only a couple of votes separating the various nominees. The successful candidates were El Bashir and Fälström.
- He congratulated the Chair and Co-chairs and thanked all who participated.

Alhadeff also updated the ICG on the status of the discussion on the roles of the Chair and Co-chairs:

- He noted that he had not changed the draft documentation on role of the group's Chairs in the consensus process, as the consensus process was still being discussed by the group.
- He reported that in the London face-to-face meeting, ICG members seemed to have reached consensus that the role of the Chairs were not decision-making but administrative, helping lead the ICG towards each new meeting.
- He suggested the roles document could be decided online after the consensus process had been decided.

Cooper noted that no hands had been raised in the Adobe Connect room to suggest any ICG members had concerns about Alhadeff's proposal to move the decision about the roles document to the mailing list.

Alhadeff noted that Dryden had posted that the GAC members of the ICG would not be able to vote on issues such as Chair elections. He asked whether, should a similar non-voting issue should arise in future, that would effect how a quorum was reached.

Bladel agreed that it was important to understand how GAC members not being able to vote on such issues could affect the ICG's decision-making processes.

## 3. Minutes approval

Cooper reported that there were four documents for discussion:

1. [Preliminary report of the first ICG teleconference](#) (10 July 2014)
2. [Minutes of Day 1 of 1<sup>st</sup> ICG face-to-face meeting](#) (17 July 2014)
3. [Minutes of Day 2 of 1<sup>st</sup> ICG face-to-face meeting](#) (18 July 2014)
4. [Annex A of Minutes of 1<sup>st</sup> ICY face-to-face meeting](#) (the "matrix")

Cooper asked if there were any objections to the documents:

- Wu noted that his name was missed in the July teleconference report.
- Mundy asked that the matrix include information noting that he would be requesting travel support in future.
- Alhadeff noted that at times, he may request partial funding for a hotel or similar costs in future. He noted that while he was representing ICC BASIS, he would be conducting outreach with business community members outside ICC BASIS as well. He stated that he would send text to be added to the matrix to explain this.

**Action item ICG-11: Documents of first teleconference and face-to-face meeting to be updated to reflect ICG member corrections then published to the ICG website.**

#### 4. Consensus process

Knoben stated that he would be reporting on [version 3](#) of the consensus process document. He reported that he had tried to incorporate, as much as possible, the comments of ICG members made to date, but there were still some major topics that needed to be discussed further.

He also reminded members that the draft was based on the working group guidelines of the GNSO regarding consensus and decision-making. He noted that the latest version included a recommendation that there be at least a minimum level of availability of all stakeholder groups involved in any meetings where decisions take place

#### Discussion:

- It was noted that the version of the document projected in the Adobe Connect room was a PDF version of version 3 and slightly older than the DOCX version available in Dropbox. Wilson noted that he had added comments to version 3, but they weren't appearing in the PDF version.
- Cooper asked if Wilson had only recently made the edits. Wilson confirmed that he had only made the edits in the couple of hours before the teleconference. He verbally summarized the changes he had made:
  - Wilson felt the wording in the document needed restructuring for clarity
- Mueller noted that nobody should be surprised if a document uploaded within an hour or two of a meeting had not been read by other members of the group.
- Mueller stated that he preferred Knoben's language to Wilson's, but preferred to keep the debate conceptual rather than linguistic. He stated that clearly, if everyone in a particular customer group wanted to object to an IANA proposal, then that should kill the proposal; however, he was uncomfortable with the option that any single person within a customer group would have veto power over an IANA proposal.
- Milton also stated that he supported Boyle's original language that suggested that anyone objecting to part of a proposal should also provide information on how the proposal could be modified to make it acceptable.
- Alhadeff noted that it was possible for a small group to be representative of wide range of business and non-business users. Therefore, he was worried that the objections of the small number of business and non-business user representatives on the ICG may not be listened if value was placed on the number of ICG members making objections.

- Knoblen noted that there were 13 communities represented on the ICG, and it could be helpful to find a way to consider at some point how those 13 communities were having input to the process.
  - o Subrenat expressed concern that this would lead to a weighting of positions expressed, which would be rather complicated. He suggested that the ICG should stick to notion that what should count is that there is a given total number of ICG members.
- Subrenat also suggested that voting still be a legitimate method for the ICG to use if an ICG member requested it for a particular item, noting that at the beginning of the ICG's work, he had suggested that voting be used for a limited set of topics, such as electing a Chair. He suggested that when nay vote take place, there would need to be an explanation provided by those who may choose to abstain from the vote.
- Boyle stated he was hostile to idea of being pushed into voting, particularly when there was a delicate balance between sides. He explained that voting meant that "the majority wins" and the views of minority would be disregarded completely.
- Cooper stated she would send her comments on the topic to the list as time was short to cover the remaining items on the agenda.
- Dryden explained that, in her view, the GAC members were hesitant about voting as the instinct of governments was to focus on consensus and consensus processes. She noted that Boyle had been very clear in his comments about needing emphasis on consensus and not exiting that process to conduct a vote. If there were to be a vote or doodle poll on a very specific topic such as Chair selection, it would be unlikely that the GAC members of the ICG could vote on such questions. She explained that GAC members on the ICG could not vote on such narrow issues. She explained, however, that the GAC members would endeavor to convey views on more substantive issues where possible, and it that it was possible that more than one view could be conveyed to the ICG from governments.
- Dryden also noted that regarding the issue of silence, and how that should be understood, whenever the GAC members were not able to convey a position or vote, they would endeavor to explain to the rest of the ICG members what that silence meant.
- Knoblen asked other ICG members to consider how, if the group were to aim for consensus, to define when a consensus process should come to a conclusion. He noted that the issue of how silence was to be handled also needed to be addressed more clearly in the consensus process document, as did the possibility of needing to define when voting might be appropriate to use in which circumstances.

Cooper stated that the discussion on the consensus document had been productive and noted that while some ICG members were expressing a desire to conclude the document as quickly as possible, she thought that the current discussions were helpful in refining the remaining points. She suggested taking the remaining refining efforts to the internal-cg mailing list and trying to conclude the consensus document by the middle of the following week.

## 5. Charter

Arkko apologized for publishing the [latest draft of the charter](#) (version 8) an hour before the teleconference began. He reported that he had also published a [summary of the feedback](#) received on the draft charter put out for comments. He noted that some of the comments received were related to the solution rather than the charter, so were out of scope. Arkko explained that the document summarizing feedback also included his thoughts on which comments should be addressed and which could be dismissed.

Arkko then highlighted some the comments received and his suggested changes:

- Richard Hill had suggested that under the “assessment” task, there be a requirement for the ICG to summarize also the input from outside the operational communities. Arkko suggested that this absence in the draft charter was a bug that needed to be addressed, and that while the ICG had not discussed the issue at length, since the ICG was calling for input, it seemed reasonable that it should also be compiled and assessed.
- Hill had also suggesting adding a requirement that dissenting views be documented. Arkko stated that it seemed to be the general opinion in the ICG is that this was a reasonable proposal; however, that this be addressed as part of the consensus process documentation rather than in the charter itself.
- Seun Ojedeji had proposed adding text that if a community needed to update its proposal, the update should be re-presented to the global community. Arkko suggested that omission of such text from the current draft was another bug and that it would be useful to add explicit text that would note that updated proposals would be subject to the same verification, review, and consensus processes as initial proposals.
- Ojedeji had also suggested that information sharing be mandatory (“will”) not optional (“should”). Arkko supported this change.
- .SE had proposed that the charter be more specific about the relationship between accountability and transition work. Arkko noted that the issue of accountability had cropped up in several comments. He stated that he believed the ICG in general agreed that accountability was important and proposed adding text stating that there needed to be sufficient accountability mechanisms for running the IANA function in place. He noted that it was important to limit the text to IANA-related accountability, and not all possible accountabilities related to ICANN under the parallel accountability process.
- .SE had also proposed providing ample time for community review of proposals. Arkko noted that while he believed that the ICG members would agree to the importance of this, the ICG was also aware of overall timeline pressures. He stated that in his view, given the draft charter had been available to the public for a month, the one-week public comment period was not an unreasonable timeframe. He noted that the ICG was working, separate to the charter, on developing the timeline and request for proposals for the communities. He suggested that the proposal on comment periods be addressed in those processes rather than in the charter.

Discussion:

- Ferreira dos Santos stated that the public policy perspective was just as important as the technical aspects of the transition proposal and that political

endorsement was just as important as technical endorsement. NTIA's decision to transition IANA was a political, not technical decision. NTIA's announcement did not say that governments should not be involved in the transition process.

- Arkko agreed with Ferreira dos Santos, noting that it was the right approach to include and address the policy and other concerns of governments. He asked if Dos Santos had any specific changes that he would like in the charter to reflect this.
  - Ferreira dos Santos noted that his views were those of his government and not that of the GAC. He reported that the GAC members would work with the GNSO and ccNSO to address public policy issues related to names.
  - Mueller, responding to Ferreira dos Santos, noted that the primary public policy issue for IANA was that a single government had been in a position to circumvent policies and decisions coming out of the ICANN community. Under the transition, however, that problem would disappear. He noted that IANA was not a policy making entity and should not be a decision point for circumventing policies. Instead, policy happened rightly in the names, numbers, and protocol communities.
- Mueller stated that Arkko had done a perfect job of distilling all of the comments received. He noted that the comments on accountability received were a result of misunderstanding the purpose of the charter. The charter was a broad outline of the ICG's activities and not an operational set of rules or bylaws or process.
- Bladel noted that as well as technical and policy ramifications, there were also economic issues. He suggested a minor edit to address the problem that "accountability" was such an overloaded term that it could lose all meaning. Instead of referring to general "accountability", the ICG refer specifically to "independent accountability mechanisms".
  - Arkko stated he had no strong objections to this.
- El Bashir stated that on the mailing list and in the community RFP discussion, there had been talk about submissions outside the core communities. He suggested that the charter needed to be aligned with the RFP discussion about who could submit proposals. He noted that Boyle and Ismail had raised valid points on the mailing list about ccTLDs not part of ccNSO perhaps wanting to submit own proposals to the ICG.
  - Arkko observed that version 8 of the charter did not include text about compiling input from non-operational communities. Such text would address El Bashir's concerns. He stated he would make another edit to include the "independent accountability" suggestion and the missing compilation text.
- Wilson stated that he would like to proceed with publishing whatever is agreed on as soon as possible. He stated that he thought the ICG had agreed not to have anything set in stone, which means that the charter could be published now and updated later as discussions progressed.
- Arkko suggested having a couple more days for email discussion on the charter, with a deadline for the end of the week for a new version of the charter to be published.

- Karrenberg suggested having a whole week of comments or five working days to give ICG members time to properly review the comments and associated changes.
- Akplogan suggested having a public comment on latest draft in parallel to the ICG mailing list discussion.
- Arkko responded that he was not sure the ICG should be taking the charter back to public comment at this point in time.

Cooper noted that due to limited time, it was time to move on to the next agenda item.

## 6. Secretariat

Akplogan presented [version 3](#) of the draft Secretariat proposal to the other ICG members. He explained that in London, ICG members had agreed to have an independent company be secretariat, with funding provided by ICANN. He noted that this was the original basis for the secretariat document. However, on the mailing list, ICG members had subsequently appeared to rule out a need or independent contractor, but had accepted ICANN doing the secretariat role via contractors. He asked the ICG members to choose which of the options they preferred:

1. Do ICG members want to have independent secretariat funded and contracted by ICANN?
2. Do ICG members want ICANN to provide some staff to the ICG that report exclusively to the ICG?

Discussion:

- Housley stated that he favored selecting an independent secretariat and that this should follow procurement procedures.
- El Bashir also supported an independent secretariat contracted by ICANN, but was concerned about timeframes. He asked how long it would take to conduct the selection process.
  - Akplogan replied that the original intention was to have the secretariat selected by the end of August, but was not sure if ICANN could complete the process by end of August at this point.
  - Swinehart stated that there would be a need to establish an RFP based on what the ICG wanted from a secretariat. Then ICANN for call for input from interested parties.
  - Akplogan noted that it would be a month or so from the start to end of the procurement process.
  - Swinehart noted that the items in the email she had sent to the mailing list were what would need to be clarified to develop the RFP.
- Akplogan noted that in terms of selection and transparency, the ICG already had some ideas listed in the spreadsheet. If, after all the submissions, the ICG realized that there was nobody suitable to do the secretariat function, there would need to be additional discussion to decide how to proceed.
- Cooper stated that she supported funding independent contractors and that to start moving on this, she would be happy if a subgroup could drive the process to develop the RFP. The subgroup would consist of Akplogan, Cooper and any other interested volunteers. She suggested that it should not need full ICG agreement at

each and every stage of the process as long as the subgroup was able to provide explanations for their decisions.

- Akplogan supported having a small working group for the secretariat RFP development and invited anyone with an interest to join.
- Karrenberg was concerned that the process could take longer than expected and asked for a realistic time plan. He stated that he was opposed to doing all of the work involved in developing an RFP for an independent secretariat, and others on the mailing list also felt same way. Therefore he did not see consensus on moving forward in the direction proposed by Cooper and Akplogan.
- Akplogan noted that if there was a decision to go forward with an independent secretariat, ICANN's formal RFP process must be followed. Then ICG subgroup could probably have an RFP completed within a week, so in total, the whole process realistically could not take less than one month. In meantime, he suggested the ICG would keep using ICANN staff support.
- Swinehart asked how long the ICG would want to have the RFP open for so everyone has a chance to respond to it? She explained that having this information would help the ICANN staff know how to create a timeline for the process.
  - Akplogan stated that it was probably fine to have the RFP out for a maximum of 25 days.

Cooper suggested the ICG keep discussing on the mailing list whether or not the members want to go forward with this, but noted that there were enough people interested in an independent secretariat that we it was worth continuing to work on the RFP in the meantime.

## 7. IGF statement

Alhadeff reported that there was going to be a panel on the IANA stewardship transition at the Internet Governance Forum. While many of the ICG would be on panel, he suggested it could be appropriate to have a statement read out in room from the ICG about current state of its work and where more of its work could be found. Has created draft of this.

Alhadeff explained that he had tried to include information about transparency, operational procedures and selection of chairs in the statement, but noted that some of the content in the draft was about topics that were still works in progress within the ICG. He had also included a calendar of the next couple of meeting dates so the wider community could make plans if they were interested in participating. Alhadeff was unsure whether the proposed document could be read into the session or could be circulated, or who could read it.

Discussion:

- Mueller stated that he would prefer a much less formal approach than Alhadeff's proposed talking points. He stated that he hoped that by IGF, the ICG would have circulated the community RFP and explained to community ICG's approach to the development of proposals. Mueller suggested that bullet points, rather than a formal document, would be more effective in the meeting itself.

- Alhadeff explained he had drafted the piece as a document as he had not been sure how it would be presented. He noted that it was not a set of talking points as it was not clear whether the ICG would be given time to present its overview of its work. He suggested that talking points could be extracted from the document.
- Mueller stated that some of the currently unresolved issues in the ICG's current work schedule could be resolved by IGG. He also noted that he hated presentation slides as much as Alhadeff, however slides could be a good starting point for discussion.
- Subrenat suggested that Alhadeff's proposed document was too formal, so the ICG should ensure that there was the possibility to make a presentation instead.
- Karrenberg agreed with Mueller that Alhadeff's document could be crisper, and have just the main points. He suggested making it very clear that participation in the development of proposals should happen within the communities. Also, talking points must mention the community RFP and how the proposals will be developed within the communities.
- Alhadeff reminded ICG members that the IGF community was not an ICANN-aware community and that many attendees would not understand context. Therefore, if there were a document to accompany the talking points, it would be useful to provide context for the non-ICANN attendees.
- Akplogan suggested two documents were needed: an ICG briefing to distribute onsite and a copy of the community RFP so the community would understand how they could participate. The RFP could be an almost-final version that could be used to attract feedback from the community. He noted that many people were waiting on the timeline for proposal development so it would be good to be able to provide IGF participants with an idea of the proposed timeline.

Cooper asked for the discussion to continue on the mailing list and be finalized before IGF.

## 8. Communities RFP

Wilson reported on the latest [communities RFP](#) (version 8). He noted that he had integrated as many comments from ICG members as possible to resolve the following issues:

- Openness of process: how widely the ICG will receive and process responses.
- Input from communities outside customer/operational communities: can such communities make input in own right or should those communities engage in operational community processes? Wilson stated that he favored openness and that comments made to previous drafts of the RFP were also leaning toward openness. How should such non-operational communities get invited or approached to make input?

Wilson noted that there was no time to discuss this in depth now but these issues should be discussed more on list.

Mueller noted he was glad Wilson identified that his proposed changes in the RFP was not ICG consensus but was his proposal for the way it should move forward. He expressed concern about too strictly identifying communities in section zero as it could encourage a "silo" perspective. He suggested editing this. Wilson agreed.

Cooper noted that it was currently 2 pm, which was when the teleconference was scheduled to end. She suggested taking the communities RFP discussion back to the mailing list and then decide if the group want another call to resolve the issue. She stated that she hoped ICG could have stable draft RFP before IGF, which is what many members of the ICG seemed to want to achieve.

### **9. Wrap-up**

Cooper asked Jansen to post the attendance list to the mailing list and asked ICG members to check that their attendance was recorded accurately.

Cooper stated that hopefully the ICG would have a teleconference the following week.

[Teleconference ended 2:03 pm UTC.]