IANA STEWARDSHIP TRANSITION COORDINATION GROUP
CONFERENCE CALL #2
19 August 2014
Chat Room Transcript

Alice Jansen: Welcome to the ICG call #2! Please note that this call is being recorded. The chat session is being archived and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior: http://www.icann.org/en/news/in-focus/accountability/expected-standards – @ Observers, please note this is a listen-only call. ICG members will not take questions at this time.

Guest: Hi Everyone. Thisis Mary

Alissa Cooper 2: Mary did you raise your hand?

Xiaodong Lee: the voice us too small

Xiaodong Lee: the voice is too small

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Hello all!

Paul: hello all.

demi getschko: voice cutting...

epg: Good morning from Elise

Guest: I am ok . I liwered my hand

Keith Davidson: Hi all

Guest: lowered

Alice Jansen: Please mute your computer speakers - thank you :-)

Xiaodong Lee: cannot hear

Josh Baulch: Xiaodong, please refresh your adobe room

Alice Jansen: Xiaodong, please join the bridge!

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Alice: my Adobe Connect page only provides "dial in", so I cannot speak! Can you change those settings, so that I can use the laptop audio? Thanks.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Alissa: and nationality please.

Alice Jansen: Jean-Jacques - please join using the bridge avenue for audio - we can also dial out to you should that be your preference.

Alice Jansen: Please mute your line if not speaking to avoid echo.

Martin: I'm now line

Alice Jansen: Please mute your computer speakers

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): All, please mute your computer speakers. We're getting an echo. To mute your computer, click on the little green speaker icon at the top left of the Adobe screen.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Hi, I'm in

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Alice, pls. what is the Adigo for mobile calls from Germany?

Narelle Cl: What is the telephone mute key sequence?

Josh Baulch: *6

Josh Baulch: to mute,

Josh Baulch: *7 to Unmute

Guest: Any echo from me?

Jing: Excuse me , are there any real time notes avilable?

Josh Baulch: @ wolf-Ulrich - http://adigo.com/icann/

Josh Baulch: @ Jean Jacques - your mic has been enabled

Heather Dryden: Noted. I will do my best to provide some input.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Alissa: I don't have microphone connection for the time being, but Staff is trying to correct that. About process: I had proposed compulsory voting for a limited number of organizational items.

Jari Arkko: J-J: is that compulsory to vote, if there's a vote, or is that we have to have a vote on specific items?

epg: July10th minutes

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Jari: my proposal was to make voting compulsory for some items such as Chair structure, decision process... In these cases, all would have to vote yes, no or abstain.

Jari Arkko: ok, thanks

Hartmut Glaser: my name must also be included in the minutes

Alice Jansen: ok - we will add your name, Hartmut - thanks for flagging!

Alan Greenberg: Can each participant please scroll documents

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Staff has changed my settings, my microphone is now enabled.

Bladel: I'm having difficulties hearing Wolf.

Joseph Alhadeff: can you make the document page width

Jandyr: Hello Alice, this is Jandyr. You misspelled my name in the list of participants. Thanks

Bladel: Thank you

Mohamed EL Bashir: There is echo, other participants might need to be in mute

Alice Jansen: Fixed! Sorry, Jandyr :-)

Patrik Fältström: An when talking about spelling, my last name is "Fältström" or at least "Faltstrom" (i.e. 2 of the 't') :-)

Guest: Please add my name too.

Guest: Mary Uduma please

Kuo Wu: hard to hear

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): All, if you're not speaking, please mute your phones and computers.

Paul: Lots of background noise.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): Can the operator please try to minimize the background noise?

Joseph Alhadeff: Also if anyone has a cell phone near a land line, please move it away.

Jandyr: too much background noise

Alice Jansen: the background noise is coming from Wolf-Ulrich's line I am afriad

Martin: lot of background: can people please mute?

Guest: Hard to hear the speaker

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): Ok, thanks Alice.

Bladel: Can we interrrupt WOlf and have him pause until audio issues are resolved?

Alan Greenberg: Mary, you can change your own name - the little pull down list to the right of ATTENDEEDS

Kuo Wu: adobe mute is *6

Alan Greenberg: ATTENDEES title that is.

Mary Uduma: Thanks

Kuo Wu: adobeconnect, please mute at the button onleft top button

Josh Baulch: Participants that have Adobe Connect computer Microphones Enabled -   please mute - Select the microphone icon and sleect Mute. You cna Unmute when you are ready to speak. thank you!!

Alice Jansen: You now have scroll control.

Martin: Looks like v3 to me but not the one with Paul's additions

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Alissa and All, @"Recourse to anyu form of voting should be the exception". I suggest we add something like "A member of the ICG can request a vote to be taken on a subject".

Narelle Cl: I have updated the matrix to v5 as it did not have my information. Apologies I was unable to say this earlier.

Alissa Cooper 2: Jean-Jacques, do you have audio?

Josh Baulch: he does, he just needs to unmute when he is ready to speak

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Alissa, yes I now have audio.

Alissa Cooper 2: Would be good to get in the queue to make your comments.

Jari Arkko: I wanted to explain my rationale for my suggested changes to the consensus doc. I felt that the substantial/non-substantial and recommendation-by-consensus/recommendation distinctions were not so useful. If you take them out, and require objections to be understood and documented, I think we have a simpler process.

Josh Baulch: Speak softer Milton pls

Jari Arkko: milton: in practice those are the same - we at least from the IETF will have our own proposal and the ICG members are standing by that, as a group. (or so I hope!)

Benny / Nordreg AB: The audio was really terrible

Roberto Gaetano: It would be nice if the speakers did *always* tell teir names before speaking

demi getschko: +1 to Roberto

Jandyr: +1 to Roberto

Mary Uduma: +1 Mary

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Chair: please require speakers to first state their name. Thank you.

Milton Mueller: yes

Alissa Cooper 2: We should close the queue.

Alissa Cooper 2: (on this topic)

Milton Mueller: agree with Alissa, we can wordsmith the decision method via the list

Jari Arkko: FWIW, consumer, business, etc. views are also IMHO present in many of the other groups. A serious business issue, for instance, would surely get complaints from the IETF folk, for instance.

Alissa Cooper 2: James - queue was closed.

Milton Mueller: Yes, Jari in response to Joe's comment if we silence or ignore an entire group surely this will show up in the public comment period as well

Bladel: Didn't see that, was AFK.

Joseph Alhadeff: proposal for the list - perhaps we can propose that the chairs be giiven the right to call for a vote where they believe that such a process would be uselful to move us to consensus?

Milton Mueller: why restrict it to chairs?

Bladel: Let me go on record as the lone opposition to the idea that "IANA Customers" should be given precedence in decision making procedures.

Joseph Alhadeff: By for the list, I mean discussion afterwards on the list...

Jari Arkko: I think the only real possibility for a successful outcome is broad agreement - a couple of people objecting may not prevent this, but it really has to be a very small number. Personally, i'd be OK with leaving the deterimnation of "small minnority" to the chair...

Alissa Cooper 2: I will put my comments to the list.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @ALL: PLEASE GIVE YOUR NAME EACH TIME YOU SPEAK. For remote participants this is really useful.

Milton Mueller: voting needn't mean we go with the majority, it just makes it transparent who agrees and who doesn't

Milton Mueller: also some people may be too timid to speak up but a vote allows them to express their opinion

Alissa Cooper 2: My issues are: 1) the number of people in the group is arbitrary, so I don't see how we can do numeric calculations of any kind and have them be meaningful, 2) I don't think any group or individual should have veto power - documenting objections should be enough, 3) fully agree with what Martin is saying about voting, 4) there is no specification of how the decision process terminates, 5) I think we should be able to make decisions on themailing list if we can. I'm fine with voting on personnel issues though.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Martin: it's not about "pushing" members to vote. As democracy is still the least awful form, we should leave voting as a possibility.

RussMundy: +1 to Alissa's last chat

Martin: Needs to be justified

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Martin: yes, obviously.

Joseph Alhadeff: Can we propose a deadline for finalizing this document? it striles me that the perfect is rapidly becoming the enemy of the good. If we consider the revised version of the document with Milton's suggestion as a working model of consensus keeping in mind the possibility of voting where needed, could we move to finalization? We would all acknoledge that a couple of outstanding issues will exist regarding where we don't reach consensus, but I am not sure we can troubleshoot them without knowing the context of the issues and the ragne of possible solutions. Just trying to be practical.

Milton Mueller: agree with Joe

Alissa Cooper 2: I think we should set a deadline for completion, but I have a couple of major issues with the current doc, stated above.

Alissa Cooper 2: the hold-out problem being the main one

Milton Mueller: Alissa, the current draft deals with the hold out problem, as far as I can tell. See the distinction between "Recommendation byu consensus " and "Recommendation"

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (14:54) @Alissa, about silence: voting is precisely a fool-proof way of getting beyond silence.

Alissa Cooper 2: I didn't say anything about silence.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Alissa: oh, I heard you say that one problem is some members remaining silent, and therefore how to interpret their silence.

Mohamed EL Bashir: @Jari, agree .. but if full/broad agreement is not reached due objection, we should be able to document their position in our deliberations, proceed with voting a final option in the sustantitive issues (e.g proposal selection) as proposed in Wolf document

Jari Arkko: Mohamed - yes, I think that is reasonable

Joseph Alhadeff: To the veto issues, could we suggest that we appreciate and recongize the importance of the agreement of the Operational Communiites with the consensus proposal and the likelyhood that a failure of obtaining thier consensus would undermine the credibility of any proposal, but no single group has the ability to veto consensus.

Jari Arkko: (14:56) (although i'd probably not start the sepaeration to substantive and non-substantive...)

Heather Dryden: The point about ability to come to a conclusion on a matter is an important one.

Joseph Alhadeff: The word poll was used as opposed to vote. That might be the better word as vote indicates winners and losers...

Milton Mueller: Joe, if ALL the operational community reps on the ICG don't agree, the proposal should be dead

Milton Mueller: If SOME agree and others dont, then we revert to the "rough consensus" model

Joseph Alhadeff: Milton, can you define what all means? Does all mean the reps to the committee or the broad community consensus process?

Milton Mueller: on the ICG

Matthew Shears: I agree with Richard Hill's comcerns as just highlighted about the opportunity for "other interested parties" to be able to contribute

Milton Mueller: Matthew: other interested parties have always been able to contribute, there is no need to change the charter for that

Russ Housley: Matthew: the charter text says we will seek input from everyone tht is interested

Matthew Shears: Perhaps the mechanisms for doing so could be highlighted

Paul Wilson: i agree with you there Jari (on accountability)

Joseph Alhadeff: That is a very operational issue for a charter. Prhapswe can have a how to contribute dcoument?

Alissa Cooper 2: I was thinking that information could appear on our web site when it's ready.

Milton Mueller: Matt:

Russ Housley: Matthew: I suspect that we will use more than one mechanism. Some examples include briefigs at meetings (like we are trying to do in LA) and mail list discussion, and web pages, and maybe other things we cannot envision just yet

Milton Mueller: (15:05) the most important mechanisms will be at the commuity level (e.g., the Cross community working group for the names communities) -

they are not dictated by the ICG

Joseph Alhadeff: In the name of transparency, I think it might be useful to provide a document that indicates the various paths to contribution to the process, this could include links to the community processes that enable participation in proposal development...

Matthew Shears: Agree

Russ Housley: Jari: Based on the mail list discussion that I saw, I think the first sentence needs to change: Internet community —> global multistakeholder community

Keith Davidson: Alice can you make the charter document scrollable please

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Jari, you did a nice piece of work!

Adiel A Akplogan: With the timeline we will be working on, we have to design the input/comunity comment period in a way that it is dynamic. i.e: (a) Comment are free to start comming in as soon as document is published, and (b) ensure taht any given document has been up for comment for a minimum of 15 dyas (maybe more for the final proposal)

Joseph Alhadeff: +1 on good work!

Alice Jansen: Jandyr?

Russ Housley: Jari: very nice job collecting and categorizing comments from so many parallel discussions

Adiel A Akplogan: indeed nice job done by Jari there

Narelle Cl: @KeithDavidson - the same document has been uploaded to the dropbox so you can get your own to scroll if needed.

Manal: Apologies for the late joining .. Difficulties to connect and now to hear .. will have to listen to the recording or go through the transcripts as soon as they are available and provide any comments I may have, on the mailing list ..

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): Can someone please post the dropbox link here?

Alissa Cooper 2:
https://www.dropbox.com/s/p0o4x3i6mamrrmk/charter-commentary-analysis.pdf

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): Thansk Alissa

Alissa Cooper 2:
https://www.dropbox.com/s/y78rgw7ldddmg5i/charterv8.pdf

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Jandyr: +1 about why this happened when it happened.

Alissa Cooper 2: first is the analysis, second is the edited charter

Alissa Cooper 2: when I scroll, do you see the document move?

Kuo Wu: yes

Joseph Alhadeff: Wasn't that the purpose of including the GAC members? Like Jari, I'm missing the point?

Alissa Cooper 2: ok, I can scroll somewhere if I am told where

Joseph Alhadeff: can you go back to the accountability edit?

Alissa Cooper 2: I'd like to close the queue.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): The ICG should not presuppose the input received from the various community processes. The "other" accountability process may very well feed into the recommendations we received from the communities.

Russ Housley: +1 to what Milton is saying about participating on other processes

Narelle Cl: I agree with Milton: the Charter is a brief for work, not a procedure/process document.

Jari Arkko: +1 to what milton is saying now about public policy

Russ Housley: Keith: I agree that we need to make sure that the accountability process completes in a way that provides a credible names proposal, but the ICG cannot and should not drive that process

Xiaodong Lee: agree to Russ

Joseph Alhadeff: I think that there is a legitimate interest to reassure stakeholders that we are properly focusing on the accountability mechanisms in IANA. The one sentence edit is a good compreomise to that end. I agree with milton that we should not conflate the two accountability issues.

Narelle Cl: Agree with Milton re public policy and IANA being separate BUT is

there a role in "stewardship" that is a test for "when the policy processes might be sufficiently broken to warrant intervention by the steward"?

Milton Mueller: Narelle: yes

Milton Mueller: That is why some of us are talking about constiutitional limitations on ICANN's authority

Narelle Cl: Milton: and that is the $64,000 question.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): Agree Russ. The ICG should not drive it, but it must be open to the input from the community on ICANN accountability, particularly if any group or groups determine that greater ICANN accountability is a key requirement for their particular IANA functions transition.

Milton Mueller: however, that is an ICANN question more than an IANA question. IANA is relevant only insofar as one might have to take IANA away from ICANN is there is a problem with the policy process

Matthew Shears: Agree with Keith

Milton Mueller: agree also with Keith

Joseph Alhadeff: Did we lose a reference to the importance of this process to maintaining the stability and operational functionality of the IANA functions? that could go the user and commerical interests which are beneficiaries of IANA?

Mohamed EL Bashir: Thats help

Milton Mueller: +1 to "independent"

Milton Mueller: Jari: Yes, I think we can - and must – finalize the charter based on your edits

RussMundy: I think current update is very close to final

Mohamed EL Bashir: Fine from my side with the edits sugguest about solicting proposals from operational communities and interested communities

RussMundy: push for completion prior to next f2f meeting'

Mohamed EL Bashir: Agree to Independant Accountability work stream

Joseph Alhadeff: We should publish before IGF.

Alissa Cooper 2: +1 to Paul

Milton Mueller: Agree with Joe, MusT be published as final charter before IGF

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): I'll take it to the list, but the language Fadi has used is "inter-related and inter-dependent" not independent.

Alice Jansen: Daniel, you may be on mute

Joseph Alhadeff: Keith, where in the documenmt?

Milton Mueller: Keith, you are talking about a different issue. James wants the word "accountability" to b emodified as "independent accountability" referring to the end state, not the process

Milton Mueller: Fadi is talking about process

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): Got it, sorry. Thanks for clarification.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): My bad.

Milton Mueller: the processes re indeed interdependent and related ;-)

Alissa Cooper 2: We need to move on in the agenda.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): Please disregard my excessive sensitivity. ;-)

Milton Mueller: and we already have the "interrelated and independent" words in the charter

Matthew Shears: I think it would be wise to suggest in the charter that the two processes coordinate rather than "appropriately coordinate" which sounds a little wishy washy

Joseph Alhadeff: Fine to take my hand down

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): Yes, let's proceed.

Narelle Cl: Can we move this to a "last call"?

Milton Mueller: i think it would be inappropriate to delete appropriate at this stage ;-)

Narelle Cl: this=charter

Mohamed EL Bashir: Thanks @Jari

Alissa Cooper 2: I support ICANN hiring independent contractors who report to the ICG.

Mary Uduma: ICANN procuring would shorten the process, I support this.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Russ +1.

Xiaodong Lee: I support independent one

Joseph Alhadeff: Fine, we need to proceed - support Alissa's proposal.

Xiaodong Lee: ICANN could support it finance

Carl Frank: Alissa, is there a link for this version of this document?

Alissa Cooper 2: https://www.dropbox.com/s/i613y9e7oie72r4/ICG-Secretariat-v03.docx

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I also support independent contractors. I think at least chair + vicechairs should be given the opportunity to have a look to the RFP + the contract

Narelle Cl: If the GAC and ccNSO have an independent contractor, do a) process descriptions exist and b) previous RFP documents exist?

Carl Schonander: SIIA supports the independent Secretariat option

Jon Nevett: Think we have a way forward -- let's move on

Mohamed EL Bashir: Are we looking for an independent Secretariat which also without any operational relation to ICANN/Domain names industry/IANA communities ?

Russ Housley: I am willing to help Adiel on the Secretariat text

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): I also support ICANN hiring an independent contractor who reports to the ICG.

Keith Davidson: ccNSO secretariat goes back to 2004, Narelle, so likely lost to the passage of time

Milton Mueller: =1 to Daniel

Milton Mueller: +1

Narelle Cl: Mohamed: one of the requirements was that any Secretariat have a

"good understanding of the Internet Governance ecosystem" so therefore not possible.

Milton Mueller: regarding the time frame

Mary Uduma: +1 to Daniel

Narelle Cl: KeithDavidson: what no retender? In 10yrs? By definition no longer independent

Narelle Cl: Realistically no RFT for Secretairat can be turned around in LESS than 4 weeks.

Alissa Cooper 2: +1 Adiel

Narelle Cl: Adiel: 10 days is possible, prefer 15 business days

Mary Uduma: I think we aready have the content of the RFP through the work already done. by Adiel and others. 10 days is feasible.

Narelle Cl: Mailing list #3 it is for the Secretariat.

Milton Mueller: Alissa: A few minutes for RFP?

Alissa Cooper 2: Milton, yes

Milton Mueller: Why bother? It is the most complicated and most important issue we are dealing with now

Milton Mueller: a few minutes won't accomplish anything

Alissa Cooper 2: Ah, I see. Well I thought the time on the consensus doc was well spent, and that's where we lost the time for this.

Alissa Cooper 2: I think if we can get 8 minutes of issue spotting on the RFP, it could be time well spent

Jari Arkko: I think it is fine to say "this part is work in progress". In fact, it would be very useful to say so.

Milton Mueller: OK, if we have actually 8 minutes

Milton Mueller: but I have to leave right at 10, don't want things to run over.

Alissa Cooper 2: Agreed.

Jari Arkko: Thank for you for working on the strawman text for the IGF, btw. Looks good to me.?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Joe, could you please scroll to the top?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thanks Joe.

Alissa Cooper 2: +1 Milton

Jari Arkko: Adding to what Milton says - the charter and the RFP are of course also key items to take to the IGF. I don't mind people speaking through their own words about them. But I like the fact that we have a dtalking pointss document as well - it will support my participation in the IGF at least.

Jari Arkko: I think we can pretty much confirm that we cannot present anything as is - but we can bring up some points in our participation in the panels etc

Martin: +1 Jari

Matthew Shears: + 1 Jari and also doc outlining participation/contribution mechanisms

Alissa Cooper 2: queue is closed

Mary Uduma: Agree with Daniel.

Alissa Cooper 2: Paul, queue is closed.

Milton Mueller: +1 to Adiel about providing opportunity for op comms to describe what they are doing

Paul Wilson: ok

Joseph Alhadeff: Alissa: would you be the one to reach out to them about a possible role for a statement as our new chair?

Joseph Alhadeff: Them being IGF...

Adiel A Akplogan: I will thing that the Charter is not going to have as much attraction at IGF (as it has already been through the public comment period). The RFP in other hand will ...

Milton Mueller: ....tick.....tick.....tick....

Milton Mueller: not sure it makes sense to open any discussion topics.

Alissa Cooper 2: the other question is if we want to have a call next week just about this?

Alissa Cooper 2: just an idea

Milton Mueller: meh

Jari Arkko: i'd support the idea of another call

Adiel A Akplogan: I will support a call next week on this

Patrik Fältström: I aree, another call on this.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: It would be good because it's timesensitive

Jari Arkko: Paul: I've read the document, and I think it is in reasonable state. It does need some work, but we're almost there.

Joseph Alhadeff: by the 28th as some will be in transit to IGF for ealy metings.

Patrik Fältström: ¨We should not "agree on this because of time issue". It is reasonable, we are close...etc.

Paul Wilson: thanks jari

Alissa Cooper 2: we could book this same time slot next week, or just the second hour

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Patrik +1.

Jari Arkko: sounds reasonable, Milton

Michael Niebel: +1another call

Xiaodong Lee: ＋1

Sivasubramanian M: Milton's comment is very vaild

Narelle Cl: Milton's point [re which community/system does the proposal addressis actually where the RFP started...

Jari Arkko: i'd suggest we do the work between now and the next week's meeting on the list, and then fine-tune/agree on the call

RussMundy: + 1 on another call

Daniel Karrenberg: +1 for call if we get a good trun-out

Joseph Alhadeff: All of us have an action item to contribute content to talking points!

Seun: cheers!

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): Thanks all. Good call and progress.

Mohamed EL Bashir: Thanks, Bye

Narelle CI: night all

Alice Jansen: Thank you for joining!

Mwendwa Kivuva, Kenya: See you in Istanbul

Kuo Wu: bye

Xiaodong Lee: bye

Franck Dossou: bye

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: thanks, bye

Mohamed: bye

Xiaodong Lee: thanks ?

Keith Davidson: Thanks and bye

Mohamed: Thanks