

ICG Call #19 – Wednesday, 8 July 2015 – 12:00-14:30 UTC
Chat Transcript

Milton: (7/8/2015 19:41) I cannot dial in via telephone i am i a college in Oxford. Can you enable my computer to talk or dial out to me?

Eric Evrard: (19:42) Milton, i enabled your Microphone, please remember to mute your Microphone whenever you do not speak.

Hartmut Glaser: (19:49) Hi Everyone Good Morning (for me)

Mohamed EL Bashir: (19:50) Hello Everyone, Good afternoon (my side)

Milton: (19:53) good afternoon all from the UK

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: (19:56) Good evening from a Chinese river island far east

Yannis li: (19:57) Welcome to the ICG call # 19! Please note that chat sessions are being archived and follow the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior:

<http://www.icann.org/en/news/in-focus/accountability/expected-standards>

Jennifer Chung: (19:57) Hi Everyone - please remember to mute your microphones when not speaking

Manal Ismail: (19:58) Hello everyone :) !!

Milton: (19:58) Are you on holiday Wolf-Ulrich?

Manal Ismail: (19:58) Can I have my mic enabled please ?

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (19:58) Hi all

Keith ccNSO: (19:58) Hi all

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (19:59) You in Oxford, Milton?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: (19:59) Yes, I am, rainy season...

Manal Ismail: (19:59) Thanks !!

Milton: (19:59) Yes, Martin, sitting in Jesus College. Let's say I have come to Jesus

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (19:59) At last?

Milton: (19:59) heh

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (19:59) Thought I saw you last night

Milton: (19:59) we'll see how long he can stand me

Jennifer Chung: (20:00) @Manal - your mic is enabled, as is all ICG members - please do remember to mute when not speaking, thank you!

Alan Barrett (NRO): (20:00) we hear you

Mohamed EL Bashir: (20:01) Fine for me

Manal Ismail: (20:01) Thanks Jennifer ..

Milton: (20:02) Didn't know you lived in Oxford Martin

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (20:04) I don't but Nominet is there and I was overnighing in the town. Coming back from dinner with my son

Manal Ismail: (20:05) No comments on the agenda ..

Jandyr Santos: (20:06) Could you enable my microphone? Thanks

Yannis li: (20:07) @Jandyr, it is enabled now. Thanks

Jandyr Santos: (20:07) Thanks Yannis!

Kuo Wu: (20:08) I can not dial in by telephone too, could you also enable my computer too?

Yannis li: (20:09) @Kuo Wei, your microphone is enabled, please let me know if you could not connect

Joseph Alhadeff: (20:09) Question for the group... as we look at the proposals, I note that there is substantial operational detail that goes beyond what we need to address in our proposal. Do we include that in the body of our proposal or

as annexes to our proposal, focusing on the most relevant elements in the proposal? I would hate for us to have to field comments that are not directly related to the transition...

Keith ccNSO: (20:11) Lost sound here

Milton: (20:11) No one is talking

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (20:11) Hello? It is very quiet

Joseph Alhadeff: (20:11) ditto... no sound

RussMundy-SSAC: (20:11) same here

Milton: (20:11) Alissa?

Lynn St.Amour: (20:11) Has the audio gone for everyone>

Alan Barrett (NRO): (20:11) i heard that

Alissa Cooper: (20:11) I am speaking but people can;t hear me

Milton: (20:12) Yes, let's hear from Keith

Mary Uduma: (20:12) Hello all , I am attending AFTLD AGM currently in Kenya, I may not be able to speak but will follow the call silently.

Milton: (20:13) yes

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (20:13) yes

Manal Ismail: (20:13) yes we can Alissa

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (20:15) @Alissa +1

Jari Arkko: (20:15) Regarding the dependency to CCWG results, that is of course clear. But what should the ICG do? 1) wait until the CCWG result is available 2) say that we assume features XYZ must be present in the CCWG result and then the transition plan works 3) something else_. I'd like to see something along the lines of option 2.

RussMundy-SSAC: (20:15) +1 to Alissa's description

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (20:15) As one of the ICG Liaisons to the CCWG Accountability, I can assure everyone the CCWG is very aware of the key dependencies identified in the CWG Transition proposal and are working towards inclusion of those key requirements, so as not to upset or undermine the work of the CWG. We can't predict the outcome of the CCWG work at this time, but there's a clear recognition of the implications of NOT addressing the CWG dependencies.

Russ Housley: (20:16) I agree with Alissa. We need to confirm that the CCWG-Accountability achieves consensus and that it meets the requirements in the CWG-Stewardship proposal.

Jari Arkko: (20:16) I agree as well

Manal Ismail: (20:16) +1 Alissa ..

Narelle Clark: (20:17) I am tempted to draw a flow chart/decision tree. To make the options obvious.

Milton: (20:17) I agree with what Alissa says here about CWG needing to affirm the CCWG WS1 work and believe that that is what we already agreed in BA

Jennifer Chung: (20:17) @everyone - please remember to mute if you are not speaking - thank you1

Milton: (20:17) yes

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (20:18) @Jari - I also favour option 2

Joseph Alhadeff: (20:18) Yes flow chart please...

Manal Ismail: (20:18) +1 to flow chart !!

Lynn St.Amour: (20:19) At Keith - south :-)) how well does the framework align with the CWG proposal?

Manal Ismail: (20:19) yes Milton .. I also recall this agreed in BA and conveyed in our summaries / reponses to the community

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (20:20) Agree with Jari. Prefer option 2.

Manal Ismail: (20:20) Also prefer Jari's option 2

Lynn St.Amour: (20:21) Also prefer option 2 and agree with Milton and Manal that we had previously agreed that the CWG would need to affirm the CCWG meets their requirements.

Keith ccNSO: (20:21) Lynn it has some strong alignment, but the finessing of wording (rather than intent) would help clarify the Names Proposal and reduce ambiguity

Manal Ismail: (20:21) can we get an answer to Lynn's question ?

Lynn St.Amour: (20:22) @Keith, thank you. Does that imply "significant" edits to the CWG proposal?

Keith ccNSO: (20:23) I would prefer to think of it as finessing, rather than significant editing...

Lynn St.Amour: (20:24) @Keith, there is as much danger in finessing as editing :-)

Keith ccNSO: (20:25) Of course there is always danger in relitigation on anything - but there is also danger in inclusion of ambiguity, etc

Lynn St.Amour: (20:25) For sure!

Keith ccNSO: (20:29) Martin, I think its more a question of having the "least imperfect" proposal and acknowledging we can't have a "perfect" proposal

Milton: (20:29) Yeah, if people are assuming we will have run our public comment period prior to Dublin they are mistaken, I believe

Milton: (20:30) We can't run a public comment until we have a complete proposal

Manal Ismail: (20:31) @Milton isn't this what we agreed on the timeline ?

Milton: (20:31) isn't _what_ we agreed to?

Manal Ismail: (20:32) that we will "run our public comment period prior to Dublin"

RussMundy-SSAC: (20:32) It looks to me that if we run a public consultation prior to having the CCWG work done & accepted by CWG then I think that we will need to run a second consutation after these CCWG/CWG steps are done?

Milton: (20:32) oh. No, I don't think we did. Or if we did, we miscalculated

Milton: (20:32) Right, Russ

Jari Arkko: (20:32) +1 to Joe

Milton: (20:33) May 3rd Sidley-Austin doc would be helpful, Joe

Milton: (20:33) plus your analysis of it

RussMundy-SSAC: (20:34) @Joe, yes, please add to Dropbox

Manal Ismail: (20:34) +1 to Joe .. Taking my hand down as my point on incompleteness vs dependencies has been covered by him ..

Jari Arkko: (20:34) i'm speaking...

Eric Evrard: (20:34) Jari, please connect your Microphone

Milton: (20:34) yes

Russ Housley: (20:35) @Russ: We need to confirm that the CCWG-Accountability achieves consensus and that it meets the requirements in the CWG-Stewardship proposal. That confirmation may not require a second public consultation.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (20:35) I agree with Joe and support a pre-Dublin public comment period, with a possible subsequent public comment period IF the key dependencies are not addressed by CCWG.

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (20:35) @Russ M: I do not think that is necessarily right. We can (do) have a document that clearly says what is needed for the names proposal

Keith ccNSO: (20:35) If the introduction to the section on policies for ccTLDs stated at the outset that RFC1591 and the GAC Principles 2005 are the broadly accepted policies and guidelines for the delegations and redelegations of ccTLDs and that all other documents including the GAC Principles 2000, ICP-1 and News Memo 1 have never been deemed to be policy or guidance by the ccTLD community

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (20:35) And we could also ask the CCWG to flag the things it is doing to "complete" the CWG proposal

Jari Arkko: (20:36) i reconnected. might work. not sure what was going on.

Milton: (20:36) You can't ask the public to express its support for a proposal that may not work due to inadequate or incomplete CCWG measures

Joseph Alhadeff: (20:37) Is it easiest for the group for me to write up some thoughts on the legal analysis and how it was incorporated and then post to drop box the 4 Sidley working documents I reviewed?

Milton: (20:38) Yes, Joe

Manal Ismail: (20:38) This would be extremely helpful Joe ..

Joseph Alhadeff: (20:38) OK will try to have that later today or Thursday.

Yannis li: (20:38) @Alissa, we are dialing out to Jari in that case

Eric Evrard: (20:39) Jari is unmuted, the problem could come from his computer Microphone.

Eric Evrard: (20:39) All is good on the Tech side i control.

Kuo Wu: (20:39) C 斯 C □ □

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (20:40) @Milton: Can't we ask the public to support (or not) the consolidated proposal provided the CCWG addresses the CWG dependencies?

Milton: (20:40) No, I don't think we can

Joseph Alhadeff: (20:41) +1 on Russ suggestion...

Keith ccNSO: (20:41) Russ, that is a clear articulation of what I have been stumbling around trying to say

Jari Arkko: (20:41) i should be back on the call, with different tech now

Manal Ismail: (20:41) +1 Russ

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (20:41) @Keith GNSO - I think we can and should

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (20:42) Only issue is if the CCWG produce something really different

Milton: (20:42) yes

Kuo Wu: (20:42) yes

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (20:42) I support Alissa's summary.

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (20:44) @Jari +1

Narelle Clark: (20:44) Alissa's summary makes sense to me. We can't really validate the quality of process created to complete the dependent need.

Russ Housley: (20:45) We need to confirm two things: (1) The CCWG-Accountability achieves consensus; and the mechanisms for accountability meet the CWG-Stewardship requirements

Alan Barrett (NRO): (20:45) I agree with Jari. Only numbers has explicitly said things about IANA trademark etc.

Narelle Clark: (20:46) @Russ but not validate those mechanisms. The community needs to tell us it's adequate. Surely?

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (20:48) @Milton: The CCWG will be running another public comment period before Dublin, with a goal of submitting a final proposal to the chartering organizations for approval in Dublin.

Alan Barrett (NRO): (20:48) regardless of whether or not we have an early comment period, we must have a late public comment period after CCWG proposal (at least workstream 1) is done.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (20:49) @Alan: *Only* Work Stream 1

Jari Arkko: (20:50) +1 to what Alissa said. we should be clear with our words, "incomplete" or "blank" is a bit too simplified.

Russ Housley: (20:50) @Narelle: Indeed the community needs to reach consensus on work stream 1, and they need to tell us that they fulfill the CWG-Stewardship requirements

Joseph Alhadeff: (20:50) complete but subject to dependency...

Alan Barrett (NRO): (20:51) +1 joseph

Milton: (20:51) What do we gain by having the public comment on the incomplete proposal?

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (20:51) @Alissa: fully agree

Milton: (20:51) is it possible to integrate the comments on the two?

Joseph Alhadeff: (20:52) can you expand the last question, not sure what you're getting to Milton?

James Bladel: (20:52) Apologies for being late. Calendar error.

Milton: (20:53) exactly my concern, Russ

Milton: (20:54) quite a stretch

Milton: (20:54) "as if"

Milton: (20:55) plus "comment fatigue"

Jari Arkko: (20:56) communication and clarity would be useful, if there's a danger of confusion.

Joseph Alhadeff: (20:58) Milton, if I may impose on you comment fatigue... If there were no dependencies and maes could dictate the implementation of the accountability mechanisms by fiat, would you consider there to be missing elements?

Joseph Alhadeff: (20:58) maes should be Names...

Russ Housley: (20:59) @Milton: It seems to me that we can meet these goals if the Chartering SOs/ACs are explicitly asked whether the requirements are met in their approval process

RussMundy-SSAC: (20:59) @Joe - I think that it is possible that careful wording might make things clearer but I think the clarification would then 'shift' the determination of what is a 'final proposal' from the ICG to the CWG

Joseph Alhadeff: (21:00) @Russ, final proposal remains ours, finality of proposal is realistic them... recall we may have issues with their version of resolving dependencies...

Jari Arkko: (21:01) By the way, I think ultimately we don't have a big problem, because the approval of the plan at NTIA will most likely require completion of the bylaws changes at ICANN, which means that the CCWG result must have been there, and the ICG has always an opportunity to say that CWG

requirements were not met, if that unlikely thing were to happen_. Finally, the IETF and CRISP are not dependent on the CCWG results.

RussMundy-SSAC: (21:01) I'm in agreement with Manal's last intervention

Russ Housley: (21:03) @Joe: The final proposal delivered to NTIA can have a pointer, but it needs to be a pointer to an approved document, not a document that will exist at some point in the future

Joseph Alhadeff: (21:03) we cannot deliver a document to NTIA until there is resolution, but we can garner public support for the version in the interim...

Narelle Clark: (21:04) @RussH "a miracle occurs here" is not complete.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (21:04) +1 to Russ and Joe

Joseph Alhadeff: (21:06) Any material changes - minor textual edits may not raise to that level...

Jari Arkko: (21:08) hand up: i did NOT propose we assume - I suggested that we TELL CWG/IETF that we should go with CRISP model

Milton: (21:09) :-)

Milton: (21:09) so top down!

Manal Ismail: (21:10) Agree that this issue needs to be resolved before the public comment period ..

Jari Arkko: (21:11) it is not top down. it is logic. three communities, A, B, and C. Only A says _X must happen, the other two are open to different implementation details. The only way to complete the proposal is to do what A said...

Milton: (21:12) only if C explicitly says they don't object to A

RussMundy-SSAC: (21:12) +1 to Jari

Milton: (21:12) Well, this should be cleared up tomorrow

Russ Housley: (21:12) @Narelle: My assessment says that the proposal is not complete. The CWG-Stewardship proposal achieved consensus with a pointer to a yet-to-be-written document. The proposal depends on the mechanisms for the accountability of ICANN that are under development. Once it exists, the ICG needs to confirm that the CCWG-Accountability achieves consensus and that it meets the requirements in the CWG-Stewardship proposal. The Chartering SOs and ACs need to be explicit on both points.

Lynn St.Amour: (21:13) Support that approach

Manal Ismail: (21:13) Agree to discussing it next week after getting more info from their scheduled calls

Narelle Clark: (21:15) @RussH should the requirement for a miracle be replaced by [process acceptable to the SOs and ACs] then yes. Otherwise no.

Milton: (21:15) "requirement for a miracle" - I love it!

RussMundy-SSAC: (21:18) I'd like to also note that the SSAC recommended that "that the Framework of Interpretation Working Group's Final Report should be adopted and implemented as soon as possible by ICANN."

Milton: (21:19) is it possible to bring up the relevant section of the CWG proposal on the window

Keith ccNSO: (21:23) Martins suggestion is a quite elegant possibility

Manal Ismail: (21:24) +1 Martin, Alissa & Keith ..

Keith ccNSO: (21:24) Russ the FOI has been adopted by ICANN and is now being implemented

Lynn St.Amour: (21:24) also support Martin, Keith. Alissa, Manal

Yannis li: (21:25) @Milton, the screen is now showing the CWG proposal regarding Trademarks

Keith ccNSO: (21:26) SORRY ALL !!!
Lynn St.Amour: (21:26) Keith ccNSO -- good to be thorough :-)
Jennifer Chung: (21:26) @Everyone we are now taking a 5 minute break as announced by Alissa
Manal Ismail: (21:26) Not at all !!
Kuo Wu: (21:27) Coffee serve?
Manal Ismail: (21:27) of course my previous comment was to Keith ccNSO not to the break ;) !!
Keith ccNSO: (21:27) Its 1.30am here so too late for coffee
Keith ccNSO: (21:27) Thanks Manal
Jennifer Chung: (21:28) The livestreaming for AR and ZH will conclude now - if you are on the audio streams for these two languages, please join the EN bridge or the Adobe Connect room for the remaining 60 minutes on the call. Thank you!
Manal Ismail: (21:28) fasting .. so no coffee until sunset !
Milton: (21:32) :-) I am still alive!
Milton: (21:38) Voldemort
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (21:46) As everyone knows, Verisign performs the RZM function as a public service on behalf of NTIA. I unfortunately don't have anything to add by way of further detail or clarification, but will refer everyone to the NTIA March 2014 FAQs indicating they will run a parallel and related process to resolve. <http://www.ntia.doc.gov/other-publication/2014/iana-functions-and-related-root-zone-management-transition-questions-and-answ>
Alan Barrett (NRO): (21:46) agreement could be between ICANN (representing the names community) and the root zone operator. why does it need to be between the IANA functions operator and the root zone operator?
Alan Barrett (NRO): (21:47) look under Evaluation/Incoming
Jennifer Chung: (21:48) @everyone - all the operational communities' proposals are available in the this dropbox folder
<https://www.dropbox.com/home/CoordinationGroup/Evaluation/Incoming%20documents>
Eric Evrard: (21:48) Please mute yourself if you do not speak.
Joseph Alhadeff: (21:48) To the point raised by Russ, the issue is as follows... are there obligation for the parties contained in the written agreements today that are not contained in new versions of agreement or other mechanisms that bind those parties to their required actions. If not then it would seem appropriate for obligations to be memorialized in agreements.
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (21:49) I will have to drop from the ICG call at the top of the hour to Chair another call. Apologies.
Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (21:49) 150 page 28
Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (21:49) 2 a & b
Joseph Alhadeff: (21:49) In the section Milton didn't like it sounded like this would be in an new contract with PTI?
Jon Nevett: (21:49) I will need to depart for the same meeting as Keith Drazek.
Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (21:50) bad echo
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (21:50) Russ'
Alissa Cooper: (21:50) please mute
Eric Evrard: (21:50) The current speak is causing the Echo.
Joseph Alhadeff: (21:50) We may need to note this as a dependency to a future action.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (21:50) oops....Russ's phone and computer may be both live.

Narelle Clark: (21:50) ACK..

Russ Housley: (21:57) @Joe: Yes, but ... I see this a calling for incremental improvement post-transition

Joseph Alhadeff: (21:58) Agree that it hopefully ius improvement but in the period of time when obligations are not specified in agreement it can create uncertainty...

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (21:58) @Alissa +1

Joseph Alhadeff: (21:59) I need to drop off the call. I will post legal sydney docs and review in the next day or so to drop box and will send a note to the list.

Alissa Cooper: (21:59) thanks Joe

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (22:03) That would be helpful Russ

Lynn St.Amour: (22:05) @Alissa, after reading your email, I prefer your approach

Lynn St.Amour: (22:06) and it seems as though you had broad support for that approach

Jari Arkko: (22:06) +1 to a focused question

Alan Barrett (NRO): (22:07) Either approach is acceptable. I prefer a focused question.

Milton: (22:10) Yes

Yannis li: (22:11) @Milton, please be reminded to mute yourself when you are not speaking

Alan Barrett (NRO): (22:11) CWG produced a spreadsheet with a summary of comments and responses. there was a response to that comment on jurisdiction

Yannis li: (22:11) Thanks

Milton: (22:12) Yannis, the interface is lagging, I cannot control it

Yannis li: (22:12) No worries, I will control your mic next time

Eric Evrard: (22:13) I unmuted Milton.

Milton: (22:14) Thanks Eric - this was typed in a minute ago

James Bladel: (22:16) I'm inclined to simply ask the CWG to confirm that its process allowed for these issues to be raised and considered, and not second-guess their conclusions on the specific issue (jurisdiction).

Manal Ismail: (22:18) +1 James ..

Narelle Clark: (22:21) Thank you Alissa, all. The plan looks workable, I await more info on the list. It is now 2:20am here, so I will drop off the call.

Jari Arkko: (22:22) regarding the communications materials, I think we should adopt a model where the communities "own" and agree about the materials that relate to them. Obviously the ICG needs to "own " and agree on thematerials relating to the "whole". Some visualization of the whole is needed as well.

Manal Ismail: (22:24) Can the secretariat share the most recent FAQ in .doc format ?

Jennifer Chung: (22:28) @Manal - we are currently trying to determine which version in the dropbox is the published version on the website - we will circulate that on the mailing list as soon as we can verify this

RussMundy-SSAC: (22:29) if the secretariat put the FAQ in .doc, could they also provide an .rtf format also?

Jennifer Chung: (22:29) @Russ - noted, we can do that as well.

Manal Ismail: (22:29) Thanks Jennifer ..

Lynn St.Amour: (22:30) Thank you Alissa, good meeting
Keith ccNSO: (22:30) Thank you Alissa
RussMundy-SSAC: (22:30) Thanks, Jennifer
Russ Housley: (22:30) bye
Manal Ismail: (22:30) Thanks Alissa and everyone .. Bye ..
James Bladel: (22:30) Thanks.
Narelle Clark: (22:30) Thanks all - well done @KeithccNSO zzz
Jari Arkko: (22:30) thanks, all. bye.
Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (22:30) Thanks ALidsa, bye all
Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: (22:30) bye
RussMundy-SSAC: (22:30) thanks folks - good meeting
Kuo Wu: (22:30) Bye
Hartmut Glaser: (22:30) Thanks
Keith ccNSO: (22:30) time for sleep here
Kuo Wu: (22:30) Keith, you still on line///
Yannis li: (22:31) Thank you everyone for joining. The ICG Call #19 has been concluded.