

# Fourth IANA Stewardship Coordination Group (ICG) Face-to-Face Meeting – Day 1

09:00 – 16:31 SGT / 01:00-08:31 UTC, Friday, 6 February 2015

Meeting [agenda](#) and [archives](#).

## **Singapore ICG Participants:**

Mohamed El Bashir (ALAC)(ICG Vice chair)  
Patrik Fältström (SSAC)(ICG Vice-chair)  
Hartmut Glaser (ASO)  
Martin Boyle (ccNSO)  
Keith Davidson (ccNSO)  
Xiaodong Lee (ccNSO)  
Mary Uduma (ccNSO)  
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)  
Jandyr Ferreira dos Santos (GAC)  
Manal Ismail (GAC)  
Michael Niebel (GAC)  
Thomas Schneider (GAC)  
James Bladel (GNSO)

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben (GNSO)  
Milton Mueller (GNSO)  
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries)  
Jon Nevett (gTLD Registries)  
Russ Housley (IAB)  
Joseph Alhadeff (ICC/BASIS)  
Jari Arkko (IETF)  
Narelle Clark (ISOC)  
Alan Barrett (NRO)  
Paul Wilson (NRO)  
Russ Mundy (SSAC)  
Daniel Karrenberg (RSSAC)  
Lars-Johan Liman (RSSAC)

## **Remote ICG participants:**

Alissa Cooper (IETF)(ICG Chair)  
Lynn St. Amour (IAB)

Jean-Jacques Subrenat (ALAC)  
Demi Getschko (ISOC)

## **Liaisons:**

Kuo-Wei Wu (ICANN Board Liaison)  
Elise Gerich (IANA Staff Liaison Expert)

## **Secretariat:**

Jennifer Chung  
Yannis Li  
Sherly Haristya

## **ICANN Support:**

Josh Baulsch  
Alice Jansen  
ICANN Technical Staff

## 1. Welcome

- Fältström welcomed everyone to the ICG's fourth face-to-face meeting, including those in Adobe Connect and the attendees in the room. He announced the support of the new Secretariat for the face-to-face meeting this time. He thanked the support from the previous Secretariat, and also recognized the continuing support from them as the contact point with ICANN.

## 2. Introduction

### 2.1. Agenda Review

- Fältström explained that there was misunderstanding amongst the Chairs regarding the previous approved agenda which did not include the suggested changes from Cooper. He then pointed the ICG members to the [updated agenda](#) posted which included Cooper's inputs. Faltstrom also mentioned that he [noted](#) that Arasteh had a question to why the time for discussing the accountability issue was shortened. After some discussion, it was decided the ICG will keep the updated agenda as it is.

### 2.2. Approval of the 28 January 2015 Teleconference Minutes

- Fältström pointed out that there were some proposed changes accommodated in the minutes of January 28's teleconference as discussed previously on the internal-cg mailing list. He asked the ICG members if they had any other objections to the revised minutes. There were none and thus the minutes approved.

#### Action Item 1: Approval of the 28 January 2015 minutes.

### 2.3. Secretariat and Logistics

- Fältström gave an update about the Secretariat – that there is the new Secretariat but also the continuing support from the previous Secretariat wherein there is a division of labor between the two parties. He also addressed the on-going transition process in terms of the internal-cg mailing list, website, and calendar.

## 3. Status Coordination with CCWG-Accountability

- There was discussion among the ICG members whether to discuss the accountability issue on the first or second day of the meeting. After some discussion, it was decided that the reporting back from the liaisons can go forward in the allocated time slot with further discussion tabled for the second day.
- The ICG liaisons to the CCWG-Accountability, Arasteh and Drazek, reported the significant progress of the group.
- Arasteh reported further details regarding how the work is structured: the CCWG-Accountability has two work-streams that deals with accountability matters pre (work stream 1) and post (work stream 2) the transition respectively; four working areas that deal with the existing accountability (work area 1), comments during the accountability discussion (work area 2), accountability on naming (work area 3), and contingencies and tests (work area 4); and lastly the recently formed working party 1 related to review and redress matters, and working party 2 focusing on community empowerment.

- Arasteh expressed his doubt with respect to the statement from the ICG Chairs to the CCWG-Accountability Co-Chairs that, according to him, stated the ICG does not expect any outcome from CCWG-Accountability in regards to accountability.
- Drazek stated that there is a good coordination and ongoing dialogue between the Co-Chairs of CCWG-Accountability and CWG-IANA to identify dependencies between the two groups. He noted that the fact that CCWG-Accountability is on a separate track is a due to the original plan by ICANN to keep two separate but parallel tracks – CCWG-Accountability is not supposed to be submitting anything to ICG, it is supposed to deliver their proposal directly to the ICANN Board. Drazek identified that the challenge for all groups involved to is ensure that input, particularly from CCWG-Accountability work stream 1 is incorporated into the CWG-IANA names proposal for the ICG to consider for the final proposal.
- In regards to Arasteh’s objection, Cooper clarified that the initial question from the CCWG-Accountability Chairs to the ICG Chairs was whether the ICG expected a response to the RFP from the CCWG-Accountability by January 15. The answer from the ICG Chairs was: "No, we are not expecting a response to the RFP from you by January 15." This is because the ICG expects an RFP response from CWG-IANA. Furthermore, Cooper also emphasized that the CCWG-Accountability is not expected to produce accountability mechanisms for numbers and protocol parameters, unless it is done in coordination with the two communities.
- After some discussion, Mueller identified that the ICG can’t do anything further with the discussion until the ICG receives a proposal from CWG-IANA and can examine the interdependency of that with the CCWG-Accountability.

#### 4. New ICG Timeline Discussion

- This discussion was conducted in regards to [version 6 of the ICG timeline](#) Cooper created in response to timeline related information from CWG-IANA. [CWG-IANA produced a revised best case timeline](#) that impacts ICG work and the whole IANA transition process.
- There were two groups of opinion emerging from the discussion. The first one suggested the ICG to announce a definite timeline to the community and to fulfil those established timeline in order to maintain the credibility of the ICG. While, the second group proposed to strike the balance between achieving a realistic and effective timeline.
- There were concerns raised regarding the number of public comment periods and there was general agreement that at least two such periods are needed.
- Fältström suggested continuing this discussion to the second day’s meeting. He also proposed the ICG members to focus the deliberation by separating a discussion about how much time the ICG needs to finish their work from a discussion about the proposed timeline from the CWG-IANA.

#### 5. Status for Protocol Parameters Proposal – IANAPLAN Working Group

##### A summary of the protocol parameters proposal:

- Arkko reported that there for the most part, very board or even unanimous agreement during

the proposal process. Some aspects that led to debates and rough consensus were whether to specify the exact contract language on the role of iana.org or just provide guidance for the negotiating entities; and whether the community had sufficient statement of justification from the Chairs of the IANA PLAN Working Group.

- In regards to contracts and negotiation, Arko highlighted that the protocol parameters proposal stated some necessary items to be negotiated, namely the data in the IANA system needs to be in the public domain, that there needs to be a smooth transition in case of operator change, and also a set of requirements prescribed for the current operator. In addition, the working group also has a rough consensus that the specific negotiations and the detailed languages are in the domain of the IAOC (the administrative committee of the IETF) and IETF legal counsel.

#### **Discussion:**

- Some ICG members raised questions about the statement that the current ICANN-IETF MoU "does not specify a jurisdiction" and asked for clarification regarding the legal status of the MoU. The ICG decided to further articulate any questions to the operational community on the internal-cg mailing list and to discuss this topic further for the second day meeting.
- [Chart of internally resolved questions](#) regarding the protocol parameters proposal.

## **6. Status for Number Resources Proposal – CRISP Team**

#### **A summary of the numbers proposal:**

- Wilson presented an [overview of the CRISP Team](#). He talked about the formation of the [CRISP Team](#) (derived from the 5 respective RIR communities), its proposal-making process (similar to the ICG where the CRISP team has to combine the 5 regional proposals into a single proposal to be submitted to the ICG), intensive timeline (14 open meetings within just over a 1 month period), and process related matters.
- Wilson described that the numbers proposal was generated by the CRISP team based on open, transparent and inclusive community discussions in all five regions and that it represented the consensus built from these discussions in an open, transparent, and thoroughly [documented process](#). They agreed to have ICANN to continue its role as the IANA functions operator, to put all of the terms stated in the SLA and AoC into a single agreement, to establish a Review Committee to review the performance of the SLA, and also for the community to retain the intellectual property rights related to IANA.
- In regards to the assessment towards the numbers proposal provided by Wilson, Knobon, and Fältström, Wilson noted the following:
  - First, the RIRs already have an established policy development process. Also, the CRISP team documented how consensus was going to be measured, assessed, and reached.
    - Wilson noted that there were concerns raised by two individuals that were responded to by the Chair of the CRISP team ([here](#) and [here](#)), and there were no

unaddressed concerns remaining about the numbers proposal.

- Second, the numbers proposal demonstrated its completeness and clarity in regards to [NTIA's five requirements](#).

**Discussion:**

- Discussions among the ICG members clarified that the RIRs do not propose to change the way global Internet number policies are made. The RIR response is limited to the implementation of these policies. The oversight post-IANA transition is proposed to be taken over by the RIRs and the new Review Committee.
- [Chart of internally resolved questions](#) regarding the numbers proposal.

## 7. Status for Domain Names Proposal – CWG-IANA

**Update on the domain names proposal:**

- Mueller provided the update on the domain names proposal. He stated that the CWG-IANA initially proposed for the formation of two new entities, namely the Multi-stakeholder Review Team (MRT) and Customer Standing Committee (CSC) to act as an external contracting authority replacing the NTIA. In addition to that, there would also be a contracting entity that would take instructions from the MRT.
- Mueller noted that CWG-IANA currently faces legalistic discussions of the proposed different structures and its implications. This is due to the two groups of comments that they received after the first public comment period. The first group stated their inclination to support the general idea, but thought it was too complex. The second group preferred to keep the IANA functions within ICANN and to rely on CCWG Accountability process for any accountability concerns rather than to have a contracting process. Mueller further stated the two groups have since been pursuing separate tracks.
- Boyle agreed with Mueller's overview and added that there are four models from the two separate tracks at the moment looking at the possibility of a golden bylaw or an internal trust and on the other side an external trust or the originally proposed contracting company.

**Discussion:**

- There was a discussion about the roadmap to bridge the two groups of comments and also the new proposed timeline from the CWG-IANA. The key issue of separability was noted as something the names community was converging around, however there were concerns that the four models were on two mutually exclusive tracks as people considered separability in different ways. In addition, it was pointed out that to determine the viability of the models, CWG-IANA has identified the need for legal advice regarding California not-for-profit business law and this need has not yet been filled. Knoblen suggested for the ICG to not make any judgment at present on names proposal in its current form as the process of CWG-IANA is still very much on-going.

## 8. Informal preparation session for Day 2

- [Transcript of informal session](#)

### Summary of Action Item:

1. Approval of the 28 January 2015 minutes.