

Draft minutes: Eleventh IANA Stewardship Coordination Group (ICG) Teleconference

13:00 – 14:00 UTC, Wednesday, 28 January 2015

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

Participants:

Alissa Cooper (IETF)(ICG Chair)
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)
Jean-Jacques Subrenat (ALAC)
Manal Ismail (GAC)
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries)
Michael Niebel (GAC)
Martin Boyle (ccNSO)
Daniel Karrenberg (RSSAC)
James Bladel (GNSO)
Jon Nevett (gTLD Registries)

Jari Arkko (IETF)
Paul Wilson (NRO)
Joseph Alhadeff (ICC/BASIS)
Lynn St. Amour (IAB)
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen (GNSO)
Milton Mueller (GNSO)
Lars-Johan Liman (RSSAC)
Mary Uduma (ccNSO)
Russ Mundy (SSAC)

Liaisons:

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

ICG Apologies:

Keith Davidson (ccNSO)
Narelle Clark (ISOC)
Jandyr Ferreira dos Santos (GAC)
Hartmut Glaser (ASO)
Russ Housley (IAB)

Mohamed El Bashir (ALAC)(ICG Vice chair)
Patrik Fältström (SSAC)(ICG Vice-chair)
Xiaodong Lee (ccNSO)
Thomas Schneider (GAC)
Demi Getschko (ISOC)

Secretariat:

Jennifer Chung
Sherly Haristya

ICANN Support:

Eric Evrard
Theresa Swinehart

Cooper noted that the ICG Secretariat has identified Sherly Haristya as a part of the core ICG Secretariat team.

1. Minutes approval for 14 January call

Cooper noted that the draft minutes for the 14 January call were circulated on the internal-cg mailing list last week, and there were some edits suggested which have been incorporated into the current draft. Cooper then asked whether there are any objections to approving the minutes.

- Subrenat indicated on Adobe Connect as well as voiced his agreement for the minutes to be approved.

There were no objections from the attendees and thus Cooper declared the minutes approved.

Action:

1. Approval of the 14 January 2015 minutes.

2. How to handle community process complaints

Cooper explained, as stated in the [RFP](#), that although participation was primarily expected through the operational community processes, there was a [forum](#) set up for comments to be sent to the ICG directly. Comments were received on the forum after the proposals from the [Protocol parameters](#) and the [Numbers](#) communities were submitted to the ICG. Cooper stated that she then forwarded those comments to the relevant community without providing any further comments from the ICG itself. The [Numbers community asked for guidance](#) from the ICG regarding whether a response was required in regards to the comments directed at the Numbers proposal. Cooper stated that the ICG should establish a clear process to handle these comments as well as a deadline for any additional comments directed to the ICG.

Discussion:

- Bladel noted that there was spam in the submission queue and requested for staff to have it removed.
- Bladel cautioned against setting the ICG up as an appeals body for those not satisfied with the process that generated their operational community's proposal, and stated that this may open the floodgates specifically in regards to the Names community. Bladel agreed with Cooper that the ICG should refer such complaints back to the operational communities, and proposed that the ICG should ask the operational communities to address these process complaints either as an annex to their proposal, or explain why they believe it to be an inconsequential complaint. Bladel agreed with Cooper that the ICG should establish a deadline to receive comments, and noted that there was time to address this in parallel without jeopardizing the overall timeline as the two of the communities have already submitted their proposals. Meanwhile for the Names community; he saw the possibility for them to include this concern in their proposal.
- Alhadeff observed that there were two types of questions that arise from the complaints:

- Inclusiveness of the decision-making process: Alhadeff stated that these comments should be sent back to the community to request for clarification, such as what consensus means in the community and whether procedural rules were followed.
 - Proposal's completeness in addressing the [NTIA's requirements](#): Alhadeff noted, as raised by Richard Hill ([comment regarding IETF](#), [comment regarding RIR](#)), that this must be reviewed by the ICG per the [RFP](#) issued.
 - Alhadeff emphasized that the ICG needs to understand the nature of the complaint, and concluded that in all cases, the community should have an opportunity to elaborate on how they have addressed the issue.
- Subrenat agreed with Bladel and Alhadeff and suggested that the ICG Secretariat sort and keep track of incoming comments into those that require a response from the ICG, and those that can be forwarded directly back to the operational community for their response.
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Bladel questioned if the ICG needs to give the Secretariat guidelines to differentiate between the types of comments.
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Subrenat stated that he believed the Secretariat has the necessary criteria as they have been following the discussion closely, otherwise he expected the Secretariat to ask the ICG.
- Mueller agreed with Alhadeff. Mueller mentioned that the ICG had extensive discussions when developing the [RFP](#) and set certain criteria therein which tasked the operational communities to not only use their established processes, but also convene an inclusive process for all who wished to participate. In response to Bladel, Mueller emphasized that the ICG needs to uphold the RFP criteria and not redesign the process for the operational communities. In regards to the [IETF proposal](#), Mueller stated that he wanted to analyze the process against the RFP criteria. Mueller suggested a two-step process on dealing with complaints concerning inclusiveness or process: first, have the ICG request a formal response from the operational community, and subsequently have the ICG assess this response.
- Karrenberg reminded the ICG to adhere to the previously agreed and published [RFP](#) that the ICG will refer all comments back to the respective operational communities. Karrenberg stated that the ICG guidance given to the operational communities should be very simple – that the communities should use their own processes to decide on the substantiality of the comments and how they should be dealt with. Karrenberg emphasized that the ICG should make a clear statement to the community that if the ICG has any specific questions on their process or proposal, then the ICG will ask them directly, and not by way of forwarding third party comments.
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Bladel agreed with Karrenberg regarding forwarding comments back to the communities.
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Mueller stated that the ICG needs to ask for a response.
- Ismail agreed with the previous speakers, and noted that she has sent her [initial brainstorming](#) to the internal-cg mailing list. Ismail stated that the ICG needs to be consistent and predictable in their handling of complaints: whether the ICG forwards every comment; whether the ICG expect formal responses from the operational communities, or rely on ICG colleagues participating in those community processes to provide some responses. Ismail further questioned whether the ICG will acknowledge comments received. Ismail referred to Alhadeff's earlier point of categorizing the comments as process-related and substance-related, and further elaborated on substance-related comments. Ismail suggested that the ICG further

discuss on the internal-cg mailing list, and publicly publish after reaching agreement, a short document (that may update the [FAQ](#)) describing the process for handling the comments.

- *Adobe Connect chat*: Nevett agreed that the ICG should send comments back, and the community has the right to respond if it so chooses. He stated that the ICG should not become an appeals court for community processes.
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: St. Amour agreed that each community needs to apply its own appeal process because they are responsible for the community policy and oversight of their IANA component.
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Subrenat agreed with St. Amour. Bladel agreed with Nevett and St. Amour.
- *Adobe Connect chat*: Drazek agreed with Ismail that consistency and predictability are important. He also agreed with previous views that the ICG should be referring questions back to the relevant community, however he expressed reservations on whether the ICG could or should demand a response.
- *Adobe Connect chat*: Subrenat indicated his agreement with Ismail.
- *Adobe Connect chat*: Mueller appraised Ismail's questions and agreed that the ICG needs to acknowledge complaints, forward them, and formally request for a response.
- Knoben addressed two concerns:
 - First, he stated that he expected all incoming complaints to be substantive.
 - Second, he noted that the comments are being sent to the [icg-forum](#) and stated the ICG must deal with these incoming complaints.
 - Knoben expressed agreement to Karrenberg's earlier point that the communities concerned should handle the complaints, however he stated that it should be done under the guidance of the ICG. Knoben mentioned that CRISP has [commented](#) and is waiting for guidance from the ICG, and he further emphasized that the ICG needs to communicate clearly that an answer to every complaint is expected from the relevant community.
- Wilson stated a need for a filter to be applied when considering comments, and that timeliness should be a criterion. Wilson questioned whether a late comment by a non-participant in the process should be given the same consideration as comments that are more coherent with process. Wilson emphasized the need for the ICG to be clear on where the filter is being applied, whether it is with the operational communities, the ICG, or both. Wilson stated that the operational communities are in the best position to assess whether a comment was made in a timely good faith manner in the process. Wilson further stated that if the ICG delegates this responsibility to the operational communities, then the ICG must establish a clear procedure on whether or not the ICG could reconsider comments at a later stage.
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Mueller agreed with Wilson that timeliness and participation in the process are good criteria.
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Drazek stated that "at the end of this process, the ICG will need to have confidence that the community processes resulted in consensus and were inclusive." He further noted that if the ICG "continue[s] to receive complaints[...], then it will [...] be necessary for the relevant operational community to address the issue to give the ICG confidence processes have been followed."

- *Adobe Connect chat:* Mueller agreed with Drazek and further noted that “the point is to handle these things in a way that resolves them and builds confidence rather than giving the impression of dismissal or rubber stamp.”
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Ismail and Nevett agreed with Drazek. St. Amour agreed with Drazek and Mueller.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Bladel agreed with Drazek and noted that “...the ICG itself will be the subject of “top-down” process complaints if [the ICG] isn’t cautious.”
- Arkko stated that he agreed with most of the previous speakers, in particular Karrenberg. Arkko addressed two points:
 - First, he emphasized that community opinion, not individual, should direct ICG’s process and decision when assessing the complaints. Arkko agreed that it will require judgment calls. He explained that coming to a consensus requires broad agreement through an inclusive process that incorporated different positions, however it does not mean unanimous agreement on all aspects.
 - Second, Arkko questioned whether the ICG will forward the comments to the operational communities with an official opinion, or simply alert the communities of receipt.
 - Arkko concluded that the forwarding of messages is a necessary but minor step, whereas the fundamental end goal is to decide whether the ICG has questions for the community, and how the ICG will request for clarification regarding community processes, or request for change when discrepancies are observed between the three proposals.
- Arasteh agreed with Mueller, Alhadeff, Subrenat and Ismail’s views. He expressed disagreement to the approach of differentiating between community and individual comment, coherent and non-coherent comment at this stage. He noted that comments regarding inclusiveness should be referred back to the relevant community for a response both to the commenter and the ICG. Arasteh viewed every comment as valid and stated that the ICG needs to acknowledge all comments. Arasteh referred to Ismail’s suggestion of publishing a process and requested for Cooper to summarize the discussion.
- Based on the discussion, Cooper noted that the evaluation and decision-making process should be conducted on a case-by-case basis. She suggested the following steps:
 - ICG Secretariat to monitor the [icg-forum](#) and forward any incoming messages to the internal-cg mailing list for ICG review.
 - ICG to forward comments to the relevant operational communities as a matter of acknowledging receipt.
 - ICG to evaluate the comments as a part of the proposal assessment, and send requests for community response along with any other requests for clarification at the end of the proposal evaluation.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* St. Amour and Ismail agreed with using Cooper’s approach.
- *Adobe Connect chat:* Mueller suggested using the following process with incoming comments: 1. Apply seriousness filter; 2. Acknowledge comment; 3. Send to the operational community and ask for a reply.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Knoblen and Ismail agreed with Mueller.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Subrenat suggested that step 1 “could/should be done by the Secretariat.”

- Cooper stated that the ICG should be responsible for determining what should be forwarded to the operational communities, and the Secretariat should keep the ICG informed about incoming comments.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Mueller agreed with Cooper.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Subrenat agreed with Cooper that it is ICG's responsibility to determine what gets forwarded, but suggested that the Secretariat sift through and deliver incoming comments in a convenient form to the ICG for review.
- Cooper suggested announcing a deadline of 5 February 2015 for any additional comments regarding the [Protocol parameters proposal](#) and the [Numbers proposal](#), to allow for a timely assessment by the ICG and any subsequent communication back to the operational communities.
 - *Adobe connect chat:* Mueller agreed with Cooper's suggestion of time limits.
- Arasteh suggested that Ismail, in consultation with Cooper and assistance from the Secretariat, take the lead in developing a draft for the process by which the ICG will handle incoming complaints.
 - Cooper agreed with Arasteh
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Ismail agreed to take the lead with the help of other interested ICG colleagues to draft this process.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Arasteh and Subrenat offered to assist Ismail.
- Mueller noted his general agreement of Cooper's suggested approach, and pointed to his simplification of proposed process posted on the Adobe Connect chat: 1. Apply seriousness filter (including the timeliness criteria); 2. Acknowledge comment; 3. Send to the operational community and ask for a reply.
 - Cooper agreed with Milton, but expressed her preference that the filter applied should be weak (i.e. spam, messages received after an announced deadline). She stated that the ICG should ensure that the relevant operational communities know the ICG has received the comment, suggested that acknowledgement of receipt (back to the commenters) could be handled by the Secretariat if the ICG decided it was necessary. Cooper concluded that the ICG will evaluate and decide whether a response is needed in Mueller's suggested step 3. She further stated that since the [icg-forum](#) is public, and ICG's work process is public, it would be clear if the ICG is acknowledging comments or not.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Nevett agreed with Cooper.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Ismail questioned if Mueller's step 1 meant filtering spam or more.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Mueller explained that it is possible that the ICG may receive completely nonsensical comments.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Knoblen preferred the term categorize rather than filter.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Drazek proposed that the filter should be divided into two parts: spam and everything else. The latter should be categorized and forwarded to the ICG.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Nevett agreed with Drazek.
- Boyle agreed with Cooper's outlined process, recognized the need to acknowledge incoming complaints received, and expressed reservations of applying a filter. Boyle stated his

disagreement with Cooper's suggested step that the ICG will let the operational communities know if the ICG would like a response to the comments. Instead, he suggested that it is appropriate to invite the operational communities to give further background in context of the received comments that can help the ICG understand how their process worked. He cautioned against allowing the [icg-forum](#) to become a means for people to come to the ICG and 're-open' difficult judgment calls made in the operational communities. Boyle added that the ICG should announce that they would like to see additional input on process, to see if the views in the comments raised are more widely shared or not.

- Cooper responded based on previous discussion, that the ICG should formulate questions based on the incoming comments before asking the operational community to respond. She stated that for some communities, preparing a response may require a lot of work, and it would be an unfair burden to ask them to respond without questions from the ICG.
- Wilson agreed with Mueller's suggested 3-step proposal. He reiterated that the ICG needs to be clear that it is referring the comments to the operational communities for a resolution. Wilson stated that he expected the communities' decision to be final, and if the ICG is offering any further appeal, it should only be in very defined conditions. Wilson reminded the ICG that the CRISP team's chair, Izumi Okutani has [requested guidance](#) from ICG on next steps. He stated that the ICG should agree on a clear procedure and convey this back to the operational communities before the open session in Singapore.
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Subrenat agreed that appeals should remain the exception.
 - Cooper noted Wilson's point of providing guidance to the operational communities before the Singapore meeting.
- Arasteh observed that the ICG members in the Adobe Connect chat has agreed to have Ismail take the lead in drafting the process document and to share it for further discussion on the internal-cg mailing list.
 - Cooper agreed with Arasteh and thanked Ismail.
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Ismail clarified, based on the discussion, that what is needed is "agreeing on a process in writing which may normally include a role for the Secretariat."
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Subrenat agreed with Ismail.
- Bladel reiterated the importance for the ICG to keep a light touch when making any substantive judgment on complaints, and to send them back to the operational communities wherever possible. If not, Bladel cautioned that the ICG may be subject to complaints of engaging in a 'top-down' process. Bladel reminded the ICG that the [RFP](#) issued specifically noted that each operational community has its own process for determining consensus and it should be defensible internally for them.
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Drazek agreed with Bladel.
 - *Adobe Connect chat*: Mundy agreed with Bladel's last comment.
- Karrenberg expressed discomfort with the progression of the discussion on defining a process on how the ICG will deal with comments or inputs. He also discouraged the use of the word 'complaints'. Karrenberg stated that he thought the ICG will be open to substantive criticism, if it applied filters or attached guidance to inputs when forwarding to the operational communities for a response. Karrenberg reiterated that the process should be forwarding all of the input received to the relevant operational communities, or simply direct the communities to monitor the [icg-forum](#) and to address anything that impacts them in accordance with their

processes. Karrenberg emphasized that if the ICG has any specific questions regarding the inputs, or process or substance of the proposals, that the ICG should ask the communities directly. In regards to the timeline, Karrenberg suggested setting a conditional deadline, which is to inform the community that if they want their comments to be discussed at the next meeting, then they need to submit it before certain date.

- *Adobe Connect chat:* Wilson, Subrenat and Ismail agreed with Karrenberg to use the word “comments” or “inputs” rather than “complaints”. Wilson clarified that if he mentioned “complaint”, he intended to say “comment”.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Arasteh stated his objection for the ICG to act merely as a “post office”.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Mueller liked Karrenberg’s idea, but thought that the ICG needs to get a response from the operational community before discussing their merit.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Ismail responded to Karrenberg and stated that the process should not get into details of the response, but more to timely acknowledgement, forwarding to operational communities, requesting a response, follow-up and other logistics as suggested by Mueller.
- Cooper concluded that actually there is a lot of agreement in the ICG on this issue. She restated the process to have the Secretariat monitor the [icg-forum](#) and inform the ICG of incoming comments. After ensuring comments are not spam, the ICG then forwards the comments to the operational communities. Cooper noted that it is unfair to ask the communities to monitor the comments because it is the ICG’s forum, and the ICG have not been closely monitoring it either. She re-emphasized that the ICG will ask the operational communities directly if it needs a more detailed response, and this can be achieved within the proposal assessment process that the ICG is currently undertaking.
 - *Adobe Connect chat:* Knoben stated that the ICG’s responsibility should be reflected in the process.

Action:

2. Ismail to follow up on the internal-cg mailing list and take the lead in developing a draft document to be discussed among the ICG outlining how the ICG will process public comments and inputs received.

3. Cooper to follow up with further discussion on the internal-cg mailing list regarding how the ICG will respond to the operational communities’ requests regarding responses to public comments and inputs before the end of this week.

Summary of Action Items:

1. Approval of the 14 January 2015 minutes.

2. Ismail to follow up on the internal-cg mailing list and take the lead in developing a draft document to be discussed among the ICG outlining how the ICG will process public comments and inputs received.

3. Cooper to follow up with further discussion on the internal-cg mailing list regarding how the ICG will respond to the operational communities' requests regarding responses to public comments and inputs before the end of this week.