Third IANA Stewardship Coordination Group (ICG) Teleconference

Tuesday 12:02 UTC 26 August 2014

Meeting archive

ICG members:

Mohamed El Bashir, ALAC	Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries
Jean-Jacques Subrenat, ALAC	Jon Nevett, gTLD Registries
Hartmut Glaser, ASO	Joseph Alhadeff, ICC/BASIS
Keith Davidson, ccNSO	Russ Housley, IAB
Martin Boyle, ccNSO	Lynn St Amour, IAB
Mary Uduma, ccNSO	Jari Arkko, IETF
Kavouss Aratesh, GAC	Alissa Cooper, IETF
Heather Dryden, GAC	Demi Getschko, ISOC
Manal Ismail, GAC	Adiel Akplogan, NRO
Michael Niebel, GAC	Paul Wilson, NRO
Jandyr Dos Santos, GAC	Daniel Karrenberg, RSSAC
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, GNSO	Lars-Johan Liman, RSSAC
Milton Mueller, GNSO	Patrik Fälström, SSAC
James Bladel, GNSO	Russ Mundy, SSAC

Apologies:
Xiaodong Lee, ccNSO
Narelle Clark, ISOC
Elise Gerich, IANA Staff Expert

Liaisons:
Kuo-Wei Wu, ICANN Board Liaison

ICANN staff:
Alice Jansen
Hillary Jett
Ergys Ramaj
Theresa Swinehart
Jim Trengrove

Non-ICANN staff support:
Samantha Dickinson

1. Introduction
Cooper stated she would experiment with free-form discussion and not use the speaker queue on the call.

2. Community Request for Proposals
She reported that Wilson has sent the latest version (version 8) of the Community Request for Proposals (RFP).

2.1 Discussion on how to deal with input from operational and non-operational communities

Subrenat reported that the At-Large community was concerned that there was too strong a distinction between the operational communities and others in the draft RFP. The text in the current draft stated that "proposals" would be solicited from operational communities while "input" would be solicited for others. He stated that from the At-Large perspective, proposals made by the whole of the ICG should be a compound of the proposals made by the operational communities as well as the input by other communities. It would for the ICG to determine the validity of feedback from all sections of the community.

- Alhadeff responded that he did not think the text as written was an attempt to stop input from those communities. Instead, it was an attempt to encourage non-operational communities to participate directly in each of the operational community development of proposals while also enabling them to have input later in the process, when operational communities were submitting their proposals to the ICG.
- Mundy noted that the NTIA's 14 March 2014 memo says that the proposal *must* have input from the operational communities. He stated that, clearly, there was a strong will to incorporate the broader community, but the 14 March member did not make their input essential.
  - Alhadeff differed from Mundy's view that NTIA's memo meant only operational communities needed. The ICG has reached decision that all communities need to be included in the process.
- Subrenat asked why representatives from non-operational communities were included in the ICG if their contributions aren't equally considered with the operational communities.
- Karrenberg noted that the ICG at its London meeting quite clearly stated that the group wanted proposals from the operational communities and input from other communities. He explained that the ICG did not want to have to adjudicate between texts submitted from different sources that dealt with the same facet of the stewardship transition. He asked Subrenat to provide alternative text that could remove the At-Large community's objections to the current text.
- Subrenat responded that he could not provide such text on the spot, but could get back to the group
- Mueller stated that he did not understand Subrenat's objections as the community RFP had been under discussion for the previous two weeks. He stated that the RFP text noted that the proposal has to be as inclusive as possible.
- Subrenat explained that since London, things had evolved and communities had gained a clearer understanding of the situation. He stated that he would come back to the group with some proposed revised text, but could not provide that text immediately on the call. He explained that his aim on the call was to alert the ICG to the fact that ALAC thought the current text was not satisfactory.
- Cooper stated that the community RFP text included direct quotes from the ICG's charter, which ALAC had previously commented on before withdrawing its comments. She asked Subrenat if the problem was that the language had

been copied into the RFP, but was acceptable in the charter, or whether it was the language itself, regardless of where it appeared? She noted that she was of the opinion that the charter seemed to have consensus amongst the ICG members.

- Arkko stated that there seemed to be a disconnect between what Subrenat saw in the community RFP and what others were intending it to be: for other members of the ICG, the RFP was about what the operational communities had to include in their proposal to the ICG, whereas for Subrenat, it was an opportunity to have outreach to other communities. He stated that while he was sure everyone agreed such outreach was important, he believed that the RFP was not the right place to document it. He wondered if it would be worthwhile to write a document aimed at other communities, such as ALAC and governments, highlighting the need to be involved in the process and documenting the processes they needed to become involved in.
- Alhadeff stated that people had been posting comments on the topic of the community RFP for the previous two weeks. The current draft was the solution to that discussion that had taken place on the list.
- Subrenat asked if it would be possible to include text stating that the task would consist of soliciting input from a) operational communities, and b) the broad group of communities. An additional line could be added, stating that all this input would be vetted during the process for developing the final proposal. Without such text, Subrenat believed that there would be a very clear distinction implied between the operational and non-operational communities.

2.2 Discussion on publishing the community RFP

Cooper asked if there were any objections to publishing the draft community RFP in its current form, as communities wanted to be able to begin their work as soon as possible. She asked if Subrenat, Arkko and Alhadeff could work on the text in the meantime to find acceptable solution to all.

- Mueller stated that he did not think the ICG should publish the community RFP before it was finalized. He thought it would probably only take a week to sort out the remaining issues and that the ICG should not publish the draft RFP straight away just because some of the operational communities were impatient to begin work on their proposals.
- Subrenat believed it would be good idea to convene by email or Skype to discuss this further with Arkko and Alhadeff. He stated that he also believed the issue could be sorted in less than a week and possibly within a day or two. He stated he could probably send some suggested edits on behalf of ALAC to the mailing list within the next two days.
- Mueller noted that the charter already contained a distinction between operational and non-operational communities. He stated that if ALAC could not agree to that, it would make it impossible for the ICG to manage the process as it was not feasible to view a random Internet user as having an equally legitimate opinion as that of an operational community expert.
- Cooper noted that the ICG needed agreement on the community RFP from the whole group and not just from ALAC and therefore hoped the subgroup of

ICG members (Subrenat, Arkko and Alhadeff) could reach agreement on a way forward.

2.3 Discussion on separating the IANA functions

Karrenberg asked if, as IANA currently supports a number of operational communities, ICG should also ask those communities to state in their proposals whether they consider it still desirable to have one entity serve all communities or whether it could be a number of entities serving the different communities.

- o Alhadeff replied that it would be interesting to see proposed text on this. However, user communities could be concerned that the more changes are introduced, the more chance that complications could arise. Therefore changes such as revising the IANA function to become more than one entity could be quite risky.
- o Cooper suggested that perhaps this was something the ICG could consider after the proposals had been received, when the ICG could see if any community was proposing such changes. Otherwise, it could be premature to consider, now, whether such changes would be proposed.
- o Karrenberg explained that it was not his intention to suggest the need for proposals for separating out IANA functions. His intention was to have the communities consider this option consciously with the aim of when/if this was to be included in any community's proposal, the ICG have some input on it from all the communities. He agreed with Alhadeff's operational continuity concerns but did not want to need to run an additional separate consultation on the issue if it were to arise in any of the proposals.
- o Housley asked how would the possible separation of IANA functions could impact a proposal. If a particular community had a solution that did not involve splitting IANA, then how would they say that? If a proposal does come forward to separate the functions, then it would be very obvious what that community was thinking.
- o Mundy suggested perhaps asking the communities to work together before proposals reach the ICG.
- o Karrenberg proposed that since the ICG already had a subgroup to work on the RFP, he add himself to that group and the subgroup could explore this issue too. He stated he could send proposed text to mailing list in following few days.

2.4 Discussion on what is meant in the RFP by "IANA"

Cooper drew the group's attention to comments on the mailing list from Gerich regarding text about the service relationship with IANA.

- Fälström responded that, in his opinion, the group was using "IANA" as in sense of the authority rather than in sense of "department of ICANN". Cooper agreed with Fälström's view.
- Fälström stated that first, the ICG members needed to understand what they all meant by "IANA". Changing the text before the members had a common understanding of "IANA" could be premature.

- Mueller stated that the NTIA currently awards the IANA contract to ICANN. He suggested that the ICG had to consider IANA as a separate entity, as Fälström's email had noted. Therefore, he did not believe Gerich's proposed edits were needed.
- St Amour agreed that there was a difference between ICANN as legal home of IANA and concept of IANA.
- Mundy stated he disagreed slightly with Mueller. The function described really is the IANA function and the ICG needed to be able to describe this well so it was easily understood by the broader community.
- Davidson was concerned with Mueller's concerns about this. Davidson stated the ICG needed to be very explicit about what it meant by "IANA", "IANA database", "IANA function" and IANA function operator. Understanding the differences between these terms would provide clarity about what the ICG was talking about.
- Mueller responded that he did not think that Mundy or Davidson were disagreeing with him. He clarified that he did not want to accept Gerich's suggestion to change "customers of IANA" to "customers of ICANN". He explained that the ICG had to discuss IANA in a way that did not presume that the IANA contract would always be awarded to ICANN.
- Cooper suggested that perhaps ICG should just refer to the definition of IANA included in the [recent SSAC document on IANA](#).
- Mundy supported a reference to the SSAC definition.
- Karrenberg suggested that the ICG should refer to the NTIA announcement and documentation rather than the SSAC derivative. However, if that documentation did not include a definition, then the ICG should use the SSAC text.
- Fälström explained that SSAC had created its IANA document in isolation; therefore referencing the whole document would be dangerous, but the ICG could refer to the specific definition of IANA within the document.
- Cooper clarified that she was thinking that the actual text appear in the footnote to the community RFP, with a URL reference back to original SSAC document.
- Boyle noted that the NTIA announcement specifically used "IANA functions contractor" and had a general feeling that if the ICG were to use one or two extra words to clearly express what it was specifically referring to, "IANA functions contractor" would be the better option.
- Cooper summarized for clarification: Davidson and Boyle were suggesting going through the document and examining each IANA reference to see if it needed to be clarified by "function", "functions operator", etc.

[Boyle's audio feed was lost at this point.]

Cooper noted that the action item resulting from the discussion was to include a reference to the SSAC text in the RFP and to identify whether further words were needed to clarify the use of the term "IANA".

Action item ICG-xxx: ICG members to include a reference to the SSAC text in the community RFP and identify whether further words were needed to clarify the use of the term "IANA".

2.5 Discussion on next steps for the community RFP

Cooper noted that the ICG had not discussed the substance of the document in its current call, so assumed this meant ICG members all agreed on the substance of the RFP. She stated that she believed this was a good thing. She stated that she would like to be able to share the substance of the RFP, at least, with the IETF community so hoped a draft of the RFP could be shared by the end of the week.

Cooper noted that on the mailing list, ICG members had discussed public comments on the RFP. She suggested that, rather than using a process calling for public comments—which had been invoked for the group's charter—ICG members could take the draft of the community RFP back to each constituent community for consultation, and that feedback produced this way could be incorporate after Istanbul.

- Mundy stated that he believed the draft should be available immediate. He noted that everything was already available to the public in Dropbox and all that was needed was a status report from community representatives.
- Karrenberg noted that at some point, the ICG woud publish the RFP and it would become a fixed document that communities would work from. Karrenberg's impression was that the ICG was to publish the community RFP at its next meeting in Istanbul. If communities then came back with comments, the ICG could publish clarifications, which was normal procedure when publishing RFPs.
- Mundy stated that she had thought that reason for the current call was to achieve agreement on the RFP before the Istanbul face-to-face meeting.
- Cooper stated that she believed that agreement before the Istanbul meeting was still possible.
- Mueller reported that he had been sending the draft RFP around for feedback and had received no objections from those who had read it. However, he was concerned about the language changes being discussed on the call as they could change fundamental definitions. Therefore, the RFP should not be published until those definitions were agreed to.
- Arkko stated he had no objections to circulating the document. Responding to Mueller's comments, Arkko believed that the discussion about the definition of "IANA" had no substantive effect on the RFP. He stated that the other main issue on the call, raised by Subrenat about where proposals come from was an issue that had already been closed in relation to the charter, so could be said to have already reached rough consensus, or perhaps even full consensus, and that it was time to move on.
  - Mueller agreed with Arkko that the group had resolved the issue of who submitted what type of input to the process and hoped that the ICG could resolve Subrenat's issues in a couple of days with minor language changes.
- Karrenberg noted that it was only 1.5 weeks before ICG was to have its physical meeting in Istanbul and it was now discussing changes to an RFP that would have a major impact on the development of proposals. He suggested perhaps taking the time onsite in Istanbul to resolve these rather

than rush it before the onsite meeting. He stated that the RFP was most important document the ICG was creating apart from the final proposal, so it was inappropriate to make changes in an ad hoc way.

Cooper suggested that the group make a very strong effort in following two days to publish the document as a stable reference and make tweaks later if needed. As the substance of document was stable. On Thursday, the ICG would see what the status of the RFP was, and then decide whether it could publish a version by Friday.

- Alhadeff reported he had just posted proposed compromise text to the mailing list and had also posted proposed talking point slides for IGF.

3. Any other business

Cooper requested Jansen send the attendance list from the call to the internal-cg mailing list for the ICG members to review.

[Teleconference ended 13:03 UTC.]

Summary of Action Items

Action item: ICG members to include a reference to the SSAC text in the community RFP and identify whether further words were needed to clarify the use of the term "IANA".