

**ICG F2F Meeting #6 – Friday 18 September 2015**  
**Los Angeles - 9:00-17:00 UTC-3**  
**Chat Transcript**

Jennifer Chung: (9/18/2015 23:47) Welcome to the ICG Face-to-Face Meeting 6!  
Please note that chat sessions are being archived and follow the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior:

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

kavouss.arasteh: (23:57) Hi Staff

kavouss.arasteh: (23:58) Hi evry ICG Member,

Mohamed: (23:58) Hello everyone

Mohamed: (23:58) hi Kavouss

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (23:58) Hello All!

kavouss.arasteh: (23:58) I am attending with other GAC distinguished Members of ICG physically

James Bladel: (23:58) Audio not enabled for this AC room?

Mohamed: (23:59) Good evening JJS

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (23:59) I'm with you through this Adobe Connect page.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (23:59) Staff, could you please enable my laptop microphone? Thanks.

James Bladel: (9/19/2015 00:01) Jean/Jacques - I don't believe they have enabled audio for this meeting.

Yannis li: (00:01) @Jean-Jacques, we have enabled your microphone

James Bladel: (00:01) Ah! thank you!

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (00:02) @jennifer, thanks. I tried the mic, but it seems no one heard me...

Yannis li: (00:03) @JJ, we are trying to get the voice projected into the room

Jennifer Chung: (00:04) @James and Jean-Jacques - we have not enabled any microphones in Adobe Connect because of the audio set up in the live meeting room

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (00:04) @Yannis, thank you.

Jennifer Chung: (00:04) If you are able to dial in via adigo the EN bridge - or if you have a dial out number we can call you

James Bladel: (00:05) No worries, I was mainly concerned about being able to hear speakers. This is now fixed.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (00:05) Alissa, I would like to suggest a change in the order of agenda items.

Jennifer Chung: (00:06) @James and Jean-Jacques - mainly if you wish to make vocal interventions, we have to have you on the EN phone bridge

Jon Nevett: (00:08) Hearing an echo

James Bladel: (00:13) Understood. I will dial in when I wish to speak.

Mike Brennan: (00:14) Hello everyone, due to the way we are set up with translation that echo will unfortunately occur if you are using your laptop

mic/headset in Adobe. We need to get you on the phone line only, I can dial out to you if needed.

James Bladel: (00:16) Why would those be separate from comments from other geographies who were opposed to the Transition?

Milton Mueller: (00:16) no geographic distinction exists, you are right James

Manal Ismail: (00:17) @James I think the idea is to separate those who are against the transition in principle not the proposal per se ..

James Bladel: (00:17) Thanks, not sure of the value of calling out that they are / are not from the US.

James Bladel: (00:17) Or perhaps I misunderstood Jean/Jacques.

Manal Ismail: (00:18) I hope I understood correctly the voice was not that clear .. apologies for the typos ;)

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (00:19) @James: those I mentioned were from the US, were opposed to any transition out of the US, and provided no comment on the ICG Proposal itself.

Milton Mueller: (00:19) Manal, I agree. If they reject the whole idea of the transition, or, e.g., reject the idea that the NTIA should have set the parameters of the transition, then the comment is "outside the box" because it does not address the proposal itself

James Bladel: (00:19) Agree with Jari, but would hesitate against characterizing any comment as "unconstructive."

James Bladel: (00:20) +1 Daniel.

Manal Ismail: (00:20) @Milton & James agree with both of you ..

Mohamed: (00:22) agree, outside of scope or Mandate seems a better categorization

Mary Uduma: (00:22) +1 Joe

Pranesh Prakash: (00:25) Perhaps comments that simply reject the transition should be distinguished from those that raise concerns about the process and criteria followed by the ICG.

Daniel Karrenberg: (00:25) process of the icg is *very* relevant and within our remit

Daniel Karrenberg: (00:25) criteria too. so we have to deal with them.

Pranesh Prakash: (00:26) Thanks for the clarification, Daniel.

Daniel Karrenberg: (00:27) however .... changing the criteria set by the ntia is *not* within our remit.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (00:30) @Daniel +1.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (00:42) @Alissa: I agree with answering per theme, not individual responses.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (00:47) @Joe, good point about the process, which was not criticized.

Jari Arkko: (00:48) I very much agree with Joe's statement about the support of the process.

Jari Arkko: (00:49) And in general, our ICG meeting materials and slides are about the things we need to deal with (like suggestions for possible changes).

The actual report that we should write is not focused only on this, it will also have to explain the overall supportive commentary.

James Bladel: (00:49) No objections to proceeding.

Jari Arkko: (00:49) I do believe we have broad community support

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (00:51) @Alissa: we have a majority on process; for content, sticking points were jurisdiction, separation or not from Iann, and nomination process for PTI Board and CSC.

Milton Mueller: (00:58) Some commentors were collective; e.g. LACTLD represents multiple TLD operators in the Latin American region. ccNSO Council is also global. Rather than "unknown" the "non-regional category" might be classified as "global" or "transnational"

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (01:08) @Martin, my hand is up too.

Lynn St.Amour: (01:15) +1 milton re global comment

Pranesh Prakash: (01:17) It must also be kept in mind that at least some of the comments on jurisdiction have been written by those trained in law.

Paul Wilson: (01:19) Re Joe's point, Q12 in the ICG FAQ addresses jurisdiction. Perhaps it could be updated to give more explanation as suggested.

Snehashish: (01:19) The current slide is inaccurate. The Government of India submission states, "The issue of legal jurisdiction in such circumstances assumes greater importance especially as the ICANN and the newly proposed PTI are based in one particular country"

Joseph Alhadeff: (01:19) Daniel: They referenced their CWG submission in our submission, without specifying the detail.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (01:19) @Martin, several of us have a hand up...

Snehashish: (01:20) The Government of India submission also states, "There are concerns with respect to whether the implementation of the proposal will continue to adhere to the criteria based on which IANA transition has been proposed. One of the criteria for present transition is that the proposal should have necessary safeguards to ensure that it is immune to control by any government or an inter-governmental organization."

Joseph Alhadeff: (01:20) Paul: I agree that it could be there, but it would be great if the lawyers could draft the clarifying material...

Paul Wilson: (01:20) sure.

Paul Wilson: (01:21) I support the suggestion.

Joseph Alhadeff: (01:24) Jean-Jacques: the suggestion was for the work to be done in the OC, we would provide some requested direction related to the work.

Daniel Karrenberg: (01:28) which ID is the BR response

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (01:29) If we're trying to develop a response to comments on the jurisdiction issue, I think it's appropriate to note that the CCWG Accountability group has identified ICANN's jurisdiction as a topic for further work in Work Stream 2 (post transition). I believe the CCWG Accountability recognized that a change of ICANN's jurisdiction before or during the IANA transition would introduce unpredictability and complexity at a time when NTIA is seeking predictability and stability.

Milton Mueller: (01:30) Agree with Keith, it is a good way to resolve the issue

without ignoring those who are opposed to current jurisdiction

Daniel Karrenberg: (01:31) In my 16 Sept spreadsheet i cannot find the word brasil nor id #115. Is the BR response we are discussing?

Milton Mueller: (01:31) yes, I had the same problem

Jennifer Chung: (01:33) @All 115 is available on the comments list of the spreadsheet

Daniel Karrenberg: (01:34) ah, ok. for the record: if there is an explicit reference to another public document we of course need to take that into account. I am also in favour to copy the referenced language into our spreadsheet if practical but with a clear indication that it is referenced text.

Jennifer Chung: (01:34) A point of clarification, if we did not receive any reviewer input for that particular comment, the secretariat hid the row

Daniel Karrenberg: (01:34) the reason for my pedantism is that i expect the spreadsheet to become part of the public record

Snehashish: (01:35) Response 131 also refers to the issue of jurisdiction. Has the same been reflected in the said spreadsheet?

Jennifer Chung: (01:35) @Daniel - we will be taking into account all the input received and will be actioning what is decided by the ICG

Jennifer Chung: (01:37) @Snehashish - the matrix right now is a working document for ICG analysis, it is not a final version by any means

Jennifer Chung: (01:40) @ Everyone, the ICG is now taking a break and will resume at 11:00 local time (in about 20 mins)

Snehashish: (01:41) @Jennifer: Thanks. That's good to know. Hope that the current slide will be corrected accordingly.

James Bladel: (01:46) I will likely rejoin the Adobe room at 2CDT/12PDT. Thanks.

Jennifer Chung: (02:01) @Everyone we have resumed

Daniel Karrenberg: (02:06) For the record: I had not read this part of the Response of Pedro Ivo Ferraz da Silva: 4. In that light, the Government of Brazil takes this opportunity to reiterate the comments made in its position paper of 20 May 2015 with regards the "Response to the IANA Stewardship Transition Coordination Group Request for Proposals on the IANA Stewardship Transition from the Cross Community Working Group on Naming Related Functions (CWG-Stewardship)"

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (02:07) Hi, I'm back on the call.

Daniel Karrenberg: (02:07) therefore I am in support of ICG taking not of these comments and they should be included at the appropriate points in the working spreadsheet.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (02:08) @Daniel and Joe +1.

Pranesh Prakash: (02:10) Saying it is not in ICG's remit would mean that jurisdiction is only a post-transition concern. That would fail to capture the responses received by the ICG.

Joseph Alhadeff: (02:11) I suggested reflecting the range of comments which includes that some think it is an element of transmission, but we have no current cross dependency with workstream 2...

Snehashish: (02:11) Amendment needs to be made with reference to Government of India comments on jurisdiction as well

Pranesh Prakash: (02:12) And jurisdiction issues people have raised relate not only to Iann but to RMZ and PTI, lwhich won't get captured in WS2

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (02:12) @Martin +1.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (02:20) @Lynn, Nomination process to PTI Board, Submission 50 also asked for details about

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (02:20) ...that

Lynn St.Amour: (02:22) yes J-J

Snehashish: (02:24) Again Government of India comments (131) on separation are missing from the slide. "The ICG proposal provides that the IANA Function Review process (IFR) can recommend a separation process that could result in termination or non-extension of the ICANN and PTI contract and may impact certain implementation level linkages between the operational communities. Such termination or non-renewal may also affect the functions of PTI in relation to the other two operational communities namely numbers and protocols. The recommendation of IANA function operations may thus lead to issues related to compatibility and interoperability as well as security and stability of the RootZone environment. The proposal should, therefore, provide for steps and safeguards to be taken to ensure that coordination is maintained between ICANN and PTI for successful implementation and its sustainability, keeping in view the expansion of Internet and technological innovations. "

Milton Mueller: (02:26) Is the Indian govt able to specify what "issues related to compatibility and interoperability" would arise if the IANA functions would be split into separate providers?

Snehashish: (02:28) Then is it okay to have three different bodies for three different operational communities, in three different jurisdiction?

Milton Mueller: (02:29) I think so

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (02:29) @Joe, you make an important point about remaining in silo mode.

Pranesh Prakash: (02:29) Very well stated, Joe.

Snehashish: (02:30) @Milton: Then I think you should disagree with what Joseph just said.

Milton Mueller: (02:30) I do

Milton Mueller: (02:30) My hand is up. I will express this

Jari Arkko: (02:33) Very much agree with Daniel\_'s and Joe's points of view on focusing on coordination. And I think that is largely a problem of better informing what the situation is rather than making a substantive change.

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (02:33) As SSAC already have said, it is NOT the case that IANA function at ICANN do only things under the IANA Contract and it is also the case that for example IETF have requested "IANA function parameters" to be managed by other parties than IANA function at ICANN.

Jari Arkko: (02:34) +1 to Milton's statement on "no veto"

Mohamed: (02:35) coordination is need, sure no veto needed

Daniel Karrenberg: (02:35) @milton: +100 "hear hear!"

Joseph Alhadeff: (02:36) Separation is an essential element of accountability, but the need to coordinate rather than announce is not a preclusion of veto as much as a requirement to act as responsible stewards in safeguarding the stability, security and resiliency of the net.

Mohamed: (02:40) a requirement for coordination is essential to ensure a responsible dealing with the security and stability implication of such change/action

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (02:43) (my phone does not know how to nod)

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (02:44) +1 Mohamed. But we probably need to include this in our communication to the OCs

Milton Mueller: (02:44) not a very smart phone, JJS!

Joseph Alhadeff: (02:44) A very discrete phone...

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (02:45) Fwiw, I am trying to identify the feedback to our proposal whether people request more centralization than today or less. Today each OC is very much in control over "their parameters", and some comments I view as either people not being aware of that OR that they do not like the OC's to be in control. The latter scares me.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (02:47) @Milton, "dumbphone"...

demi getschko: (02:47) Yes.. the issue is keeping complicating itself without a real necessity... Agreed with Patrik

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (02:48) A number of comments identified need for info-sharing between OCs. I think that is a good idea (even if I would expect it to be done fairly automatically. It is still worth saying, though, isn't it?

RussMundy-SSAC: (02:50) @Joe: very much ++1

Manal Ismail: (02:51) +1 Joe

Jari Arkko: (02:51) I agree with Joe's characterisation of the coordination topic

demi getschko: (02:51) Question: what would be ICG role (if any) during the implementation phase. I think it could be very important to follow up the implementation...

RussMundy-SSAC: (02:52) @Martin: it seems to me that anything beyond saying there needs to be coordination gets into implementation detail

Jon Nevett: (02:53) FYI in case folks haven't seen yet --

<http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-15-642>

kavouss.arasteh 2: (02:54) We should stick to and respect the earlier decision made that the ICG will decide which questions /comments to be replied by ICG and which questions/comments should be sent to OCsr

Jari Arkko: (02:55) Daniel: I would be happy with the "confirm" approach. (May depend on topic, and what we want confirmed, of course, but generally I think it would work.)

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (03:05) line dropped, but am now back on the call.

Jari Arkko: (03:23) I am still somewhat confused about what \_problem we are trying to solve in this discussion. Sorry.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (03:25) Alissa & Lynn: I suppose drafting will start later today, on the spot. Not being present, I'm afraid I cannot volunteer...

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (03:27) ... for the Sub-team.

Joseph Alhadeff: (03:30) Support the proposal, am booked with other work this evening, however, but would be willing to work between meetings, need to step out for a call..

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (03:32) +1 for Daniel's suggestion to be more pro-active. Sorry I'm not present to help.

Lynn St.Amour: (03:33) Thank you J-J

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (03:35) Alissa & All: when you break for lunch, I will leave this Day 1 call (it will be past 22:00 here, and I had another conference call this morning from 02:30 to 04:00 my time).

Alissa Cooper: (03:36) Thank you for joining, Jean-Jacques!

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (03:38) Here's the link to NTIA's August 17 blog post referencing the RZM function proposal from ICANN and Verisign. As you are likely aware, the RZM issue was deemed out of scope for the ICG and IANA Functions transition. NTIA announced in March 2014 that there would be a separate/parallel process. <http://www.ntia.doc.gov/blog/2015/update-iana-transition>

mike: (03:39) Intel-122 should be added to the list of those asking for an IFO-RZM contract (which the "Verisign proposal" does not seem to be, to be developed in a multi-stakeholder process.

Mohamed: (03:42) i don't think we should sent these comments to NTIA, its it's captured and will be documented in the proposal annexures, but its outside our mandate and mandate we can reference NTIA in the comments responses

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries) 2: (03:54) Here's the proposal submitted to NTIA by ICANN and Verisign:  
[http://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/publications/root\\_zone\\_administrator\\_proposal-relatedtoiana\\_functionsste-final.pdf](http://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/publications/root_zone_administrator_proposal-relatedtoiana_functionsste-final.pdf)

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries) 2: (03:55) I was included in a hyperlink in the NTIA blog post I linked above.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries) 2: (03:55) it was...

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (03:57) @Milton's answer to Keith D: yes, all of that, plus Jurisdiction.

mike: (03:59) Alissa +1

elise: (03:59) Where is this principle that Keith Davidson references written?

Keith Davidson ccNSO: (04:00) Submission 123

Pranesh Prakash: (04:00) A lot of folks also believe that a closed-process document is not legitimate.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (04:01) Bye All, "see" you tomorrow!

elise: (04:01) Ah, so it is called out in a statment and is not something that was defined as a principle going into the transtion discussions. thanks.

elise: (04:01) bye, Jean-Jacques.

Manal Ismail: (04:01) Bye Jean-Jacques .. appreciate your participation at such a late hour !!

Keith Davidson ccNSO: (04:02) Yes Elise - as I said, some submissions asserting support for the transition predicated upon the fact that ICANN must not become the RZM

Jennifer Chung: (04:02) @everyone we will be resuming at 13:15 local time

elise: (04:02) Thanks for the clarification, Keith.

Pranesh Prakash: (04:03) Keith (NZ) : others have also suggested principles for RZM function, as CIS did with the jurisdictional resilience principle, in addition to InternetNZ's principle of separation.

Yannis li: (04:04) @remote participants, we are on a 15min break now and we will restart the adobeconnect now for techical reason. Thank you very much.

nigel hickson: (04:19) long coffee!

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (04:21) lunch!

Yannis li: (04:27) We will be resuming shortly in 3 mins

Yannis li: (04:33) @remote participants, we have resumed now for the discussion item on RZM

Milton: (04:40) Jennifer/Secretariat; Can you bring up the part of the proposal Martin referenced?

elise gerich: (04:50) Yes, as both Keith Dr and Milton have said the CWG note they want the authoriztion function eliminated (otherwise called the RZA)

elise gerich: (04:59) Here is the language from the CWG - "Post transition there will only be the IFO and the Root Zone Maintainer. The CWG-Stewardship is not recommending any change in the functions performed by these two roles at this time. The CWG-Stewardship is recommending that should there be proposals to make changes in the roles associated with Root Zone modification, that such proposals should be subject to wide community consultation."

RussMundy-SSAC: (04:59) @milton: I think that we have already addressed the sequencing issue in para 55

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (05:07) FWIW: my personal view is that many of the RZM issues are implementation issues (and requirements). Not pre-transition requirements.

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (05:07) @Patrik +1

Milton: (05:11) Has there been an agreement to have a F2F meeting in LA under aegis of ICANN board?

Joseph Alhadeff: (05:14) A number of comments have raised the issue of RZM as important the security and stability of the Interent. All who have touched on Root Zone issues have asked for greater transparency and opportunity for comment in the process. A subset highlighted a concern related to separation of duties, specifically the potential that ICANN may at some point take over some RZM functions. A few comments have raised concern of the elimination of a seprate root zone authorization function and its symbolic importance to trust. Some have requested that the ICG undertake a a role or review of that process. While the ICG accepts that there are dependencies between the resolution of the RZM issues and the IANA trnsition, they were specifically excluded from our process as they were to be the subject of a sepsarate and parallel process. We will pass the specific nature f comments as appropriate, recognizing that some issues have been dealt with wholly or aptrially in existing processes and will take note of he resolution of depe

nigel hickson: (05:15) @Milton - F2F CCGW in LA on 25/26 September; Board present



Joseph Alhadeff: (05:15) dependencies. - I took a shot at starting the comment... In case Milton's inbox creates insurmountable issues.

Milton: (05:18) good

Milton: (05:18) Kavouss - do we really need a blow by blow account of the ICANN board's comments?

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (05:23) The CCWG has only just begun reviewing the public comments submitted.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (05:24) It's safe to say that there is continued uncertainty around the budget question that is one of the key dependencies from the CWG proposal. More work needs to be done to ensure it's fully addressed.

Alissa Cooper: (05:24) ok, that was my question -- if there is a sense about the rest of the comments received and whether they raise issues related to the CWG's requirements

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (05:25) Not yet. That will be a big part of the CCWG face-to-face meeting next weekend.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (05:29) Joe's proposed language above related to RZM (our previous discussion) looks fine to me.

Manal Ismail: (05:34) +1 to Joe's comments on accountability ..

Jari Arkko: (05:46) Joe you commented that many comments refer to dependencies: agreed, and that is why I think we need to be even more explicit about the dependencies described correctly and completely in our final submission.

Joseph Alhadeff: (05:50) Jari, If the comments indicated that existence of the dependency is a critical flaw of the proposal. The phrasing of the proposal that we are assuming the passage of the requirements and if not, the proposal is not complete has not carried the day.

Lynn St.Amour: (05:54) @ Joe: Strongly agree

Mohamed: (05:54) +1 Jo

James Bladel: (05:55) Thanks all. Need to drop the virtual meeting now. Appreciate everyone's contributions today.

Alissa Cooper: (05:56) Thanks James.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (05:57) My clear recollection is that the ICG would re-confirm with the CWG to ensure its key dependencies from the CCWG were met.

Keith Davidson ccNSO: (05:58) Mine too Keith

Lynn St.Amour: (05:59) para X011 in part 0

Lynn St.Amour: (05:59) that is to say I agree wuh Keith's

Lynn St.Amour: (05:59) s/Keith

Daniel Karrenberg: (06:00) can someone quote chapter and verse on what we committed to wrt synching with CWG

Daniel Karrenberg: (06:00) ?

Daniel Karrenberg: (06:00) thanks

Alissa Cooper: (06:00) "Once the CCWG has concluded its work on these mechanisms (estimated to occur prior to ICANN 54 in October 2015), the ICG

will seek confirmation from the CWG that its requirements have been met. At that point the ICG will make a final determination as to whether it considers the names proposal to be complete."

Daniel Karrenberg: (06:01) thanks, that certainly slipped by me, my mistake, sorry

Daniel Karrenberg: (06:01) !

Daniel Karrenberg: (06:26) +1 to Milton on IPR holder obligations being an implementation detail

Yannis li: (06:28) @Remote participants, we will have a 30-min break now and resume at 16:00 local time

Yannis li: (07:03) @Remote participants, we have resumed and now on the agenda item "Completeness of the proposal"

Lars-Johan Liman (RSSAC co-chair): (07:21) (My hand is up on Keith's behalf, as he cannot access Adobe Connect right now.)

Milton: (07:21) OK

Milton: (07:40) Please use Adobe to get into the queue if you can

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (07:42) The CCWG-Accountability has used language of "implemented or committed to" in its Work Stream 1...everything that needs to be in place prior to transition. Is that a construct that would help inform this discussion? I agree with Joe that we may need to consult with the OC's to help prioritize, if that needs to happen.

Milton: (07:44) helpful, Keith. Implemented or committed to - what form does the commitment take?

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (07:45) In the CCWG, the commitment is reinforced by the community's \*implemented\* ability to remove the Board.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (07:46) (proposed ability that is, at this time)

Joseph Alhadeff: (07:46) A message that seems to be an undercurrent of some comments is the concern that the coordination process on some topics is not highlighted in the proposal. When even within our group some say that the communities will only provide their implementation requirements is a symptom of the problem. I think it would help dramatically if the communities engaged in cross community consultations on issues such as this to create the positive impression of cooperation on issues essential to the collective fiduciary duty to the security stability etc of the Internet.

Joseph Alhadeff: (07:47) Sorry provide should have been prioritize...

Milton: (07:51) Joe, is that a normative comment you are making or a suggestion for what the ICG should be saying?

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (07:51) Perhaps it would be helpful for ICANN/IANA to consolidate all of the implementation requirements they see. And from there, the ICG could help coordinate communication among the OCs to determine coordinated prioritization.

Joseph Alhadeff: (07:52) I am suggesting that the OCs should provide comment and it would be useful if they consulted across requirements and prioritization. I think we can make it a request, nothing more.

Milton: (07:54) Keith, would you like to say that out loud? ;-)

Joseph Alhadeff: (07:57) I think it would be most useful for the communities to engage in that conversation on their own volition, perhaps as a result of our call, but a collective process of their own. If we need to nurse a coordination process on such fundamental issues then we need to continue existence throughout all of implementation to assure that the communities will act in the collective interest. Our drumbeat has been the communities are incited to act in the collective interest... This is an opportunity to demonstrate this to the community.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (07:59) I didn't think the conversation was about negotiating outcomes....only timelines and prioritization.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (08:00) I support the ICG facilitating a conversation about prioritizations. I do NOT support ICG inserting itself into bilateral negotiations regarding outcomes.

Milton: (08:00) right

Milton: (08:00) someone needs to take an overall view, however

RussMundy-SSAC: (08:00) +1

Lynn St.Amour: (08:04) It should be the IANA operator that take the overall view of what is possible based on everything that is requested.

Lynn St.Amour: (08:04) if there is a problem doing that, they should go back to the OC's (in a group) if you want

Lynn St.Amour: (08:05) s/if you want/if they want/

Daniel Karrenberg: (08:06) +1 to Lynn. If that does not work in the short term it will not work in the long term

RussMundy-SSAC: (08:06) I think that Elise and the IANA staff are\_ faced with being asked to do a bunch of implementation tasks that do not have the real detail of what they do

Daniel Karrenberg: (08:07) joe is just saying what I meant in my last comment

RussMundy-SSAC: (08:07) I agree that what we're talking about a set of things that are outside of the ICG charter

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (08:09) I should have used the word "initiate" instead of "facilitate." I did not mean "coordinate." Semantics....

Daniel Karrenberg: (08:09) don't get me wrong: i empathise with Elise and it certainly is a difficult time for her and her staff, but ICG has no role other than to point out that the OCs need to solve this

Joseph Alhadeff: (08:11) Milton. I'm fine with us assuring that the coordination occurs, but if we have to nursemaid the coordination because we can rely on the communities to collaborate, then we need to build a lot more safeguards into the process...

Joseph Alhadeff: (08:12) sorry should have been "can't rely on the communities"...

Jari Arkko: (08:12) Milton: I agree that the ICG is an important coordination entity. But I think we *are* doing our job by ensuring that the proposal is reasonably sensible and not undue burden given the available time. I for one think that it is doable, even if it is useful to think about the order of events. But that is useful in any case. That we coordinated at that level doesn't mean we

micromanage on a more detailed level.

Milton: (08:12) do we or do we not have to deliver a complete proposal?

Daniel Karrenberg: (08:12) if we extend our mandate, we need to change our charter

Milton: (08:12) this is not an extension of our mandate it IS our mandate

Milton: (08:13) Coordination is in the name, or does the C stand for "cut and run"?

Daniel Karrenberg: (08:13) "The IANA stewardship transition coordination group (ICG) has one deliverable: a proposal to the U.S. Commerce Department National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) regarding the transition of NTIA's stewardship of the IANA functions to the global multi-stakeholder community."

Jari Arkko: (08:14) Milton, it is not a black and white question. The ICG needs to look at this, but when the big picture falls into place, don't think it needs to specify the detailed order of say, who does what and when for handling [iana.org](http://iana.org) domain name.

Daniel Karrenberg: (08:14) says not a thing about coordinating implementation.

Milton: (08:14) of course not

Milton: (08:14) (in ref to what Jari said)

Yannis li: (08:15) @remote participants, we will be resuming in 5mins to wrap up

Milton: (08:15) but we do need to make sure that the iana domain DOES get handled or that someone is responsible for handling it and we and the public know who that is?

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (08:22) I thought the discussion teed up by Elise was about prioritizing implementation to meet the transition target date. I did NOT think it was about negotiations between IANA and the OCs on their respective requirements. I suggested the ICG could facilitate communications among the OCs. If the answer from the OCs is "everything needs to be done before transition," then so be it. But I think there may be an opportunity to streamline the implementation work.

Yannis li: (08:32) Thanks everyone for joining. The meeting is concluded today.