

ICG F2F Meeting #6 – Saturday 19 September 2015

Los Angeles – 9:00-17:00 UTC-8

Chat Transcript

KAVOUSS.ARASTEH: (9/19/2015 08:40) Hi all remote participants

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (08:50) Hello Kavouss and all, greetings from the suburbs of Paris!

KAVOUSS.ARASTEH: (08:52) Jean Jaques, we missed you here physically

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (08:59) Dear Staff, in addition to being on Adobe Connect, I'll follow your instructions and call the audio bridge. But may I suggest looking at best practices, such that Remote participation allows a member to use audio (mic+speaker) only on his laptop, using Adobe Connect? As I remember, on the ALAC calls this was possible most of the time... Thank you!

Yannis li: (09:01) Welcome to the ICG F2F Meeting 6! 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>

demi getschko: (09:04) deep silence on the room... :-)

Avri Doria: (09:04) Is the chat useable by observers?

Alissa Cooper: (09:04) yes

Yannis li: (09:05) @remote participants, we begin shortly in a min.

Avri Doria: (09:05) thanks

Yannis li: (09:05) We are starting now going through the agenda

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (09:07) Hello Colleagues!

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (09:12) Milton, thanks for preparing this draft. Suits me.

Paul Wilson: (09:14) Typo in the question: "not become RZM the without being subject"

Alissa Cooper: (09:14) suggested edit:

Alissa Cooper: (09:14) OLDdid the CWG also intend to imply that ICANN or its IFO should not become RZM the without being subject to a "wide community consultation?"NEWdid the CWG also intend to imply that ICANN or the IFO should not become the RZM without the proposal to make that change first being subject to a "wide community consultation?"

Alissa Cooper: (09:14) mmm that did not work

Alissa Cooper: (09:15) I think the end of the sentence would be a little clearer if it said:

Alissa Cooper: (09:15) did the CWG also intend to imply that ICANN or the IFO should not become the RZM without the proposal to make that change first being subject to a "wide community consultation?"

demi getschko: (09:18) I do not see this "separation" as a principal. Is rather a particular arrangement ithat fits the scenario in 98

demi getschko: (09:18) (principle)

Alissa Cooper: (09:24) suggested preamble: "The ICG has a question for the CWG based on comments received in the ICG's public comment period."

Jennifer Chung: (09:26) @Everyone - here is the link to the email
http://mm.ianacg.org/pipermail/internal-cg_ianacg.org/2015-September/001608.html

Milton: (09:26) demi: CWG said it was a principle

Kuo Wu: (09:26) The internet access is slow today. What's happens?

demi getschko: (09:33) Milton: I also do not think we have to deal with the NTIA x Verisign arrangement now. It is out of our scope.

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (09:35) @Milton: strange but I cannot find the Annex I rememebered so well (Alan as editor): A touch of anno domines, I guess. But the vestigial point in the text was in para 1175

Jari Arkko: (09:35) I believe part 0 needs to be a consistent explanation of the proposal. There may be a need to produce a comment report or appendix.

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (09:35) Alan Greenberg's text was a lot more detailed on mprocess

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (09:35) So I withdraw!

Jari Arkko: (09:35) we can make changes to part 0 (and should), but detailed comments analysis and commentary is probably not something we want to put there.

Milton: (09:43) no, not detailed comment analysis and summary, that is why Joe's suggestion is a good one. Summary records of how we understand and processed public comments can be used

Jari Arkko: (10:08) +1 to answering topics that we can by ourselves

demi getschko: (10:17) + 1 to John. "Exacerbated by the process"!

demi getschko: (10:18) (Joseph, sorry...)

elise gerich: (10:19) @Joe and Demi - +1 to asking the question about cross-commuinty cooperation

Jari Arkko: (10:39) We can say "you are in the rough part of the rough consensus". *If* the topic has been discussed and the points raised. There may be other cases where people bring up new points, which we (or the OCs) need to look at.

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (10:43) As Manal and others said, we have multiple categories, like:

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (10:43) 1. Have been discussed, this view is in the rough side of rough consensus

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (10:44) 2. Out of scope, because the issue is related to whether the process itself should take place

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (10:44) 3. ... etc

Yannis li: (10:45) We will have a 30min break now and resume at 11am (Local Time)

Yannis li: (10:51) 11:15am to be correct. Thanks

Yannis li: (11:19) We are now on the NTIA Criteria agenda item.

Jennifer Chung: (11:27) @Everyone, here is the email with the text that is being discussed right now http://mm.ianacg.org/pipermail/internal-cg_ianacg.org/2015-September/001617.html

Keith Davidson ccNSO: (11:34) FWIW, RFC1591 says it is inappropriate to talk about "ownership" of a ccTLD, but rather that it is delegated to a "trustee" in a somewhat custodian sense

Kavouss Arasteh: (11:52) JOE +!

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (11:55) @Keith D: that's an important point, we should put in a word under B/d on the screen.

Alissa Cooper: (11:56) that is just a quote from the commenter I think

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (11:57) @Alissa and Keith D: we can quote briefly, but add a few words to point out it's at odds with RFC1591.

Alissa Cooper: (11:58) also we are using the minutes as the way to mention where the slides are wrong, rather than editing the slides. the slides were just for spurring discussion.

Paul Wilson: (11:59) +1 to Milton on special mention of Governments

Keith Davidson ccNSO: (11:59) It was just a comment from me - If I had thought it was worth entering into the record, I would have raised my flag and spoken on it

Manal Ismail: (12:01) +1 to Alissa's comment on the mentioning of government participation ..

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:04) @Martin +1. States must be mentioned, while avoiding any "special status", or the appearance thereof.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:05) @Milton and Kavouss: yes, we need neutral language.

Milton: (12:05) just took myself out of the queue but i still think it is highly tendentious to single out a specific stakeholder to discuss the "legitimacy" of them or their role

Manal Ismail: (12:05) +1 to Joe's proposed compromise ..

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:08) @Joe: if we keep it in, we must write "immunity" between quotation marks.

Russ Housley: (12:09) In fact, the immunity discussion is counter to the goals of the accountability requirements in the CWG-Stewardship proposal

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (12:12) Speaking personally, I don't see how any comment can justifiably suggest that the ICG proposal (or the CCWG proposal) replaces NTIA with a governmental or intergovernmental solution. The answer must be no. The issues raised in the comments are not without merit, but they don't in any way undermine the fact the NTIA criteria is met by the proposal. Some have said that any change in the role of the GAC (i.e. from advisory to voting) raises concerns, but it's not inconsistent with the criteria. I support responding to this question narrowly.

Lynn St.Amour: (12:13) @Keith +1

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (12:13) @Keith +1

Lynn St.Amour: (12:14) and as Milton said - unambiguously as well...

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:14) @Keith +1.

Jandyr Santos Jr: (12:15) @Keith +1

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:18) Aliisa: count me in for helping to draft the part about governments and inter-governmental organizations.

Alissa Cooper: (12:23) thanks JJS, given that Joe has produced text already and will edit, if you can review as soon as that comes out that would be appreciated

Narelle Clark: (12:55) ccTLD issues...

Narelle Clark: (12:56) If I am reading things correctly - there is the exclusion of an appeals process? Isn't that a change?

Keith Davidson ccNSO: (12:58) There is a contemplated appeals process for resolution of issues between IANA customers and IANA - but this is for every day issues, and is excluded from applying to delegations or revocations of ccTLDs

Keith Davidson ccNSO: (13:01) +1 Martin

Narelle Clark: (13:01) So the 'new way' doesn't make a substantial change, ie by preventing new appeals processes from coming into being?

demi getschko: (13:07) I do not see any NTIA action on "appeals", so, it seem to be out of the scope "substituting NTIA oversight"...

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (13:09) @Demi: +1

Yannis li: (13:19) @remote participants, we will have a short break now and start the working lunch. We will reconvene at 13:40 (local time)

Seun: (13:19) okay

Jennifer Chung: (13:42) @ Everyone we are resuming now

Jennifer Chung: (13:42) We are now on the agenda item 'Future call and meeting planning'

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (13:58) Am back on the call.

Jari Arkko: (13:59) I agree with what Lynn stated

Jari Arkko: (14:01) I'm ok with the proposed compromise dates approach

Paul Wilson: (14:03) +1 patrik

Lynn St.Amour: (14:21) distributed model not complex....

Lynn St.Amour: (14:21) model

Lynn St.Amour: (14:24) for names - separability principle won --giving us PTL.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (14:25) +1 Paul

Jari Arkko: (14:32) +1 to Lynn's point about having a distributed system to begin with

Lynn St.Amour: (14:41) @Daniel, agree it is important that if NTIA has any questions for us that we are "here" to receive them.

Joseph Alhadeff: (14:43) +1 to Daniel

demi getschko: (14:43) @Lynn + 1

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (14:44) @Daniel +1, you stated what I wanted to bring up, very much in those terms!

Moh: (14:45) +1 Daniel, if we need to continue following up the implementation we need to have an updated charter

Daniel Karrenberg: (14:46) @kavousss: not until NTIA approves/disapproves but until they tell us that they have no further questions for us on the substance of our deliverable. we should not stay around until the US political process finished.

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (14:46) The only thing I am thinking of is whether one of the OCs feel coordination is needed that they can not do themselves. Should they be able to "wake us up"? Where I completely agree with Daniel is that we are continueing to NEVER madeke any decisions. Those are made by OCs and potentially NTIA.

demi getschko: (14:46) Yes. @Daniel + 1

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (14:47) So in general +1 Daniel!

Russ Housley: (14:47) The ICG has one deliverable, a proposal to NTIA

Moh: (14:48) Extending our mandate need to get the buy-in of NTIA, ICANN and OCs as a guardian and monitor of the submitted proposal in the implementation phase

Russ Housley: (14:49) I agree with Daniel that we should handle questions about the proposal from NTIA, but we should not "coordinate" the implementation. The operational communities achieved consensus on the proposal, so we can leave it in their hands to implement it

demi getschko: (14:50) Anyway, someone must be available during implementation phase, I think...

Russ Housley: (14:50) I sent one minor editorial suggestion by email

Joseph Alhadeff: (14:51) In case my thought fails to get on the plane... only addition to Daniles intervention is that we indicate that once we have submitted NTIA proposal after confirmation from CWG, we go into dormant phase and are only responsive to questions from NTIA. Should any NTIA questions require us to consult we would of course engage again in public comments and interaction.

elise gerich: (14:51) thank you for adding the language about "coordinating the details of the implementatoin" . Nice

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (14:51) @Daniel, ok with me.

RussMundy-SSAC: (14:51) My take on the "When are we done?" question is after we deliver our proposal to NTIA and NTIA tells us they don't have any further questions but this does make the length of our existance dependent on NTIA

Paul Wilson: (14:58) Please see: <http://atlarge-lists.icann.org/pipermail/alac/2015-August/008833.html>

Russ Housley: (14:58) The ICANN Board statement purposefully allowed IETF Trust or a new one — there was no reason for them to pick — the important think in their statement was that they are willing to transfer the IPR

Paul Wilson: (14:59) Specifically:

Paul Wilson: (14:59) During the transition, ICANN is prepared to transfer full ownership of the IANA-related trademarks to a neutral third party mutually agreed among the operational communities with the understanding that ICANN, as the current IANA Functions Operator, will be granted license to those trademarks and ICANN will maintain operational control of the IANA.ORG domain for as long as ICANN remains the IANA Functions Operator.

Milton Mueller: (14:59) right, Russ H

Paul Wilson: (14:59) OK indeed, not necessarily a NEW independent party.

Russ Housley: (15:02) +1 to what Alissa just said

Milton Mueller: (15:02) Agree with Alissa, no need to mention IETF Trust

Moh: (15:02) +1 Alissa for way forward

Manal Ismail: (15:04) +1 Alissa

Alissa Cooper: (15:04) CWG comment:

<https://comments.ianacg.org/pdf/submission/submission68.pdf>

Daniel Karrenberg: (15:06) the important thing is to unlist iIANA IPR as a "compatibility issue"

Yannis li: (15:07) @remote participants, we will now have a 30min break and reconvene at 15:35 (local time)

Alan Barrett (NRO): (15:07) It's a compatibility question that was raised, and resolved.

demi getschko: (15:09) I have to leave now... Bye to all!

Lynn St.Amour: (15:13) bye Demi

Yannis li: (15:37) you could also look at the text via the archive:

http://mm.ianacg.org/pipermail/internal-cg_ianacg.org/2015-September/001623.html

Alan Barrett (NRO): (15:40) The transcript said October 15th, but I think I heard October 14th

Alissa Cooper: (15:42) I think we need to go with October 14

Joseph Alhadeff: (15:46) +1 to 14th, people will read on planes starting on 15/16...

Lynn St.Amour: (15:57) +1 to Daniel

Manal Ismail: (15:58) +1 to Daniel

Russ Housley: (16:20) The question is whether any ICG member thinks that there is not broad support for the proposal, using whatever metric they think is personally appropriate.

RussMundy-SSAC: (16:21) +1 to RussH

Daniel Karrenberg: (16:22) "breadth of support" is dangerous as it is often abused. we can do much better than that by just pointing to the process(es) we used.

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (16:24) @Daniel +1

Jari Arkko: (16:25) I believe we can say that we have broad community support.

RussMundy-SSAC: (16:25) +1 Jari

Avri Doria: (16:26) doesn't NTIA ask someone to determine that?

Jari Arkko: (16:26) Avri: I believe it is the ICG task to document community support in the proposal that we send to the NTIA.

Jari Arkko: (16:26) (but i'm sure they also do their own 1111111due diligence)

Lynn St.Amour: (16:26) It is the 2st criteria from NTIA..

Lynn St.Amour: (16:27) It is the 1st criterai and we have said (indirectly) that all criteria are met

Narelle Clark: (16:29) You could say something has "broad community support" when two thirds of the community support it, ie two communities of three... !?!? When surely two thirds of each of the three would be vastly better.

Narelle Clark: (16:29) but we've had that discussion.

Yannis li: (16:29) We will resume at 16:35 (local time)

Yannis li: (16:49) We are on the Action Items Review now

RussMundy-SSAC: (16:59) a "feel good" blog post sounds like a good idea

Kuo Wu: (17:01) Thanks a lot for all teh ICG members

Kuo Wu: (17:02) You all did a great job.

Avri Doria: (17:05) thanks for being open to observers. was fascinating.

Lynn St.Amour: (17:05) @Avri, in a good way, I hope

Keith Davidson ccNSO: (17:05) Thanks and bye

Avri Doria: (17:05) Lynne, of course!

elise gerich: (17:05) bye all

Mary Uduma: (17:05) Thanak you all for the productive meeting

Manal Ismail: (17:06) Thanks to all ICG members and to our observers !!

Yannis li: (17:06) Thanks everyone for joining! The ICG F2F meeting 6 is concluded.