

DRAFT MINUTES: Sixth IANA Stewardship Coordination Group (ICG) Teleconference

12:04 UTC, Wednesday 29 October 2014

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

Participants

Jean-Jacques Subrenat, ALAC
Hartmut Glaser, ASO
Mary Uduma, ccNSO
Manal Ismail, GAC
Michael Niebel, GAC
Thomas Schneider, GAC
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen, GNSO
Milton Mueller, GNSO
Keith Drazek, gTLD Registries

Jon Nevett, gTLD Registries
Russ Housley, IAB
Lynn St Amour, IAB
Joseph Alhadeff, ICC/BASIS
Jari Arkko, IETF
Alissa Cooper, IETF (ICG Chair)
Demi Getschko, ISOC
Adiel Akplogan, NRO
Patrik Fältström, SSAC (Vice-chair)

Liaisons:

Kuo-Wei Wu, ICANN Board Liaison

ICG Apologies:

Mohamed El Bashir, ALAC (Vice-chair)
Martin Boyle, ccNSO
Keith Davidson, ccNSO
Xiaodong Lee, ccNSO
Jandyr Ferreira dos Santos, GAC
Kavouss Arasteh, GAC

James Bladel, GNSO
Narelle Clark, ISOC
Paul Wilson, NRO
Daniel Karrenberg, RSSAC
Lars-Johan Liman, RSSAC
Russ Mundy, SSAC

Liaison Apologies:

Elise Gerich, IANA Staff Expert

ICANN Support Staff:

Alice Jansen
Ergys Ramaj

Theresa Swinehart

Non-ICANN staff minuting support:

Samantha Dickinson

1. Secretariat

Cooper reminded ICG members that the teleconference was a public call and not to infer in the call who of the Secretariat candidates could be.

Akplogan reported on the status of the Secretariat selection process:

- The last of the shortlisted candidates had been interviewed the previous night.

- For the sake of clarity the Secretariat working group had asked the ICANN legal team to perform an enhanced conflict of interest assessment on the two final candidates based on the information the candidates had provided.
 - Subrenat noted that while listening to candidates' presentations, it had struck him that it was rather difficult for the selection group to decide how valid, in legal terms, the conflict of interest statements provided were. Therefore, Subrenat had suggested that ICANN staff provide advice on whether the conflict of interest statements were satisfactory.
- The aim was to have ICANN legal team feedback by the end of the week and have the final candidate notified as soon as possible to enable ICANN to begin the final negotiation process. The details of the final candidate and the selection process would then be shared with the ICG's private mailing list on the secretariat process, hopefully by the end of the week. ICG members would have 48 hours between the email to the private list and the deadline to submit any feedback or questions on the selection of the final candidate.
- The aim was to have the chosen Secretariat in place by 15 November 2014.

Cooper thanked Akplogan and the rest of the selection team for all the work they had invested in the Secretariat selection process.

Action Items:

- 1. After receiving enhanced assessment on conflict of interest statements by ICANN's legal team, Akplogan to send email to private ICG mailing list to notify ICG members of the selected candidate for the ICG Secretariat, as well as details of the process used to select the final candidate.**
- 2. ICG members to respond with any comments or questions they have on the final candidate selection within 48 hours of Akplogan sending the notification email to the private mailing list.**

2. Any Other Business

Cooper noted that the call only had one formal agenda item, Secretariat, but given the Secretariat discussion had finished early, if there was anything else that ICG members wanted to discuss informally, to please feel free.

2.1 Upcoming ICG Calls and Face-to-Face Meetings

Fältström reminded ICG members that the Doodle poll for the 29 October call also included three other calls up to the end of 2014. He reminded ICG members who had not completed the Doodle poll to do so to enable calls to be scheduled well in advance.

Fältström noted that ICANN was considering the location of ICANN Marrakech meeting, which may affect ICG's ability to meet in Marrakech. He reported that as soon as there was more information available, ICANN would inform the ICG.

Fältström reported that the ICG Chairs had been discussing the 2015 budget for ICG activities with ICANN. He explained that the budget plan was awaiting details of the cost of Secretariat. He reported that ICANN was willing to support ICG's costs, so did not foresee any issues with holding a face-to-face meeting in early 2015. ICANN would need to hold a meeting in early 2015, so there would be a meeting that ICG could collocate with.

Action Items:

- 3. ICG members to complete Doodle poll for remaining three teleconference calls for the year.**

2.3 ICG's Expectations Regarding the Proposal Submission

St Amour reported that she had sent an [email](#) containing a draft outline of text on the submission of the final proposals by the ICG, including the role of the ICANN Board in the process. She suggested that the finalized text could become part of the overall process finalization process rather than be another standalone document (which would make it harder for the community to track).

Discussion:

- There was discussion whether to include a full list of the names or functions of communities that the ICG expected to be involved in the process.
- Wu noted that based on the ICG's face-to-face meeting in Istanbul, the ICANN Board planned to discuss the IANA stewardship transition proposal process in the near future (date to be decided) and communicate with the ICG on the issue before the next ICANN meeting.
 - Cooper suggested that ICG members work on St Amour's text over the following few weeks so the ICANN Board would have something to consider during its discussion on the topic.
- Ismail suggested that the FAQ might need to be updated based on the final text agreed upon. She also noted that the text might need to make reference to the NTIA's early feedback (a stage mentioned in the ICG's [timeline](#) document) as well as the timeline, as the timeline stated that the ICG would submit the proposal directly to the NTIA.

Action Items:

- 4. ICG members to continue working on developing a draft of expectations the ICG has of the ICANN Board's handling of the final stewardship proposal in time for the Board's discussion on the issue (discussion due by end of November).**

2.4 Community Proposals

Arkko reported that IETF group on the IANA stewardship transition, IANA-plan, had [announced a last call](#) on their proposed plan. He encouraged ICG members to comment.

[Teleconference ended 12:37 UTC]

Summary of Action Items

- 1. After receiving enhanced assessment on conflict of interest statements by ICANN's legal team, Akplogan to send email to private ICG mailing list to notify ICG members of the selected candidate for the ICG Secretariat, as well as details of the process used to select the final candidate.**
- 2. ICG members to respond with any comments or questions they have on the final candidate selection within 48 hours of Akplogan sending the notification email to the private mailing list.**
- 3. ICG members to complete Doodle poll for remaining three teleconference calls for the year.**
- 4. ICG members to continue working on developing a draft of expectations the ICG has of the ICANN Board's handling of the final stewardship proposal in time for the Board's discussion on the issue (discussion due by end of November).**