

# Fourteenth IANA Stewardship Coordination Group (ICG) Teleconference

04:00 – 05:00 UTC, Wednesday, 8 April 2015

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

## Participants:

Alan Barrett (NRO)	Lars-Johan Liman (RSSAC)
Alissa Cooper (IETF)	Lynn St. Amour (IAB)
Daniel Karrenberg (RSSAC)	Manal Ismail (GAC)
Demi Getschko (ISOC)	Mary Uduma (ccNSO)
Hartmut Glaser (ASO)	Michael Niebel (GAC)
James Bladel (GNSO)	Milton Mueller (GNSO)
Jandyr Ferreira dos Santos (GAC)	Mohamed El Bashir (ALAC)
Jari Arkko (IETF)	Narelle Clark (ISOC)
Jean-Jacques Subrenat (ALAC)	Patrik Fältström (SSAC)
Jon Nevett (gTLD Registries)	Russ Housley (IAB)
Joseph Alhadeff (ICC/BASIS)	Russ Mundy (SSAC)
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)	Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen (GNSO)
Keith Davidson (ccNSO)	Xiaodong Lee (ccNSO)
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries)	

## Liaison:

Elise Gerich (IANA Staff Expert)

## Apologies:

Martin Boyle (ccNSO)	Paul Wilson (NRO)
Kuo Wei Wu (ICANN Board Liaison)	Thomas Schneider (GAC)

## Secretariat:

Jennifer Chung  
Yannis Li  
Sherly Haristya

## ICANN Support Staff:

Mike Brennan  
Alice Jansen

## Agenda

### 1. Welcome (Introduction and roll call )

Fältström welcomed the ICG meeting participants, took a roll call and noted the apologies.

### 2. Review of last meeting action items

#### [ICG Call #12 - Action Item #1](#)

Fältström inquired if anyone has issues with the [draft explanatory text to Timeline v8](#).

- *Adobe Connect chat*: Drazek stated that he had no outstanding issues with the draft. Karrenberg, Getschko, Subrenat, Bladel, Davidson, Arkko, Clark, Housley, Santos, Mundy, Glaser, and Knoblen concurred.
- *Adobe Connect chat*: Mueller and Cooper pointed out that the date should be April 2015.
- Fältström concluded that, with the date edit, there is consensus on the draft.

**Action item 1: Secretariat to publish Timeline v9 (with approved edit “March 2014”->”April 2015”) on ICG web site. (Discussed on call #14.)**

## [ICG Call #12 - Action Item #2](#)

Fältström indicated that there is no immediate need on the call to appoint individuals to this action item, and suggested further discussion on the internal-cg mailing list. He underlined the importance of not missing early comments, thus the ICG should find individuals or a mechanism for catching comments soon.

- Subrenat asked whether the Secretariat is following this matter and relaying comments to the ICG as they arise.
  - Fältström replied that the ICG has the Secretariat's support for the mechanical work, but the ultimate responsibility is on the ICG members to ensure all issues are caught.
  - Subrenat volunteered as one of the token holders for this action item.
- Clark asked for clarification of the role of the volunteers.
  - Fältström explained that the role is to track questions discussed during the proposal assessment - discussions within the ICG, and questions that the ICG needs to send to the operational communities for clarification.
  - Clark restated, with confirmation from Fältström, that the role is an issues-tracking, action-tracking one between the three operational communities and the ICG. She volunteered to assist Subrenat in this role.
- Arasteh mentioned that the CWG-IANA will provide the Names proposal in June and asked whether the date has changed.
  - Fältström replied that 25 June, 2015 is the latest information from the CWG-IANA. He further explained that as the ICG did not receive all three proposals at the same time, an issue tracking system is needed to ensure that the ICG will look at the same issues across the board and conduct a coherent evaluation for the three proposals.
- *Adobe Connect chat*: Mueller asked what exactly is the ICG "tracking"?
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: Cooper explained that it is to track the questions/answers that come up during the ICG's assessment of the proposals. She stated that the Secretariat has [consolidated this information for the IETF and RIR proposals](#).
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: Clark stated her understanding to be that the ICG is tracking 'a) requests for further information, as a whole b) passing the request over c) receiving/not receiving responses' and this tracked list will be attached as a record to the final proposal.
- *Adobe Connect chat*: Barrett stated that 'the person who raises a question is best placed to say whether it's a formal question from the ICG to one of the communities, or just an internal discussion within the ICG'.
  - Fältström agreed, and explained that with the third proposal coming in, it is important that distinction is clarified if needed.
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: St. Amour and Subrenat agreed with Barrett.

Fältström confirmed Subrenat and Clark as the volunteers, and noted the discussion on Adobe Connect chat. Fältström stated that he is not closing this action item yet.

**Action item 2: Subrenat and Clark to draft a report summarizing information collected during the ICG assessment process of the operational communities' proposals. This report can be published together with the final transition proposal and should be based on summaries of ICG questions/answers provided by the secretariat. (Discussed on calls #12 and #14.)**

**Action item 2: REVISED on 20/04/2015, see Summary of Action Items at the end of the document.**

### [ICG Call #12 - Action Item #3](#)

- Arkko apologized for not being able to complete this action item yet as planned and hopes to complete the illustration of the IETF accountability mechanisms soon.
- Barrett reported that the CRISP team together with the RIRs' staff have been preparing similar diagrams for the Numbers community that will be ready in a few days.
- Arasteh reiterated two questions posed to the IETF in previous meetings:
  - First, a request for a diagram to show the link between the various IETF entities before and after the transition.
  - Second, a request for clarification on the jurisdiction [of the IETF MoU for the IANA functions – Mueller, *Adobe Connect chat*].
- Arkko stated that while the illustrations he will provide will be informative, the IETF proposal as written is clear and complete. To the second question, Arkko replied that he understood that a sufficient answer was provided at the Singapore meeting and that the IAB has final say in any dispute between the IETF and ICANN according to the RFC for the MoU that was created 15 years ago.
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: Arkko reiterated that the Protocol Parameters community does not 'plan to make a change with regards to accountability or jurisdiction'. He pointed out that 'the situation is different in CWG/CCWG', and to not 'ask [the Protocol Parameters community] to follow models for other communities in areas where coordination is not necessary'.
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: Mueller stated that he recalled a discussion on jurisdiction and requested the Secretariat to provide the reference.
    - *Adobe Connect chat*: Chung provided the link to the [transcript of the first day of the F2F meeting \(6 Feb 2015\)](#) – jurisdiction discussion begins on page 77.
- Fältström stated that the ICG has not closed Call #12: Action Item #3, but he merged Call #13: Action Item #2 since it is duplicative.

**Action item 3: Arkko and Barrett to provide further information (diagram) to the internal-cg mailing list regarding the IETF and RIRs' current overall internal accountability and oversight system related to IANA interaction. (Discussed on calls #12, 13, and 14.)**

**Action Item 4: If any ICG member has a specific question about the jurisdiction of the ICANN-IETF MoU that has not been previously answered either in the IETF proposal or in ICG discussions, that ICG member should send that question to the ICG mailing list. If no questions are received before call #15, this action item will be closed. (Discussed during F2F meeting #4 and calls #13 and 14.)**

### [ICG Call #12 - Action Item #4](#)

- Cooper confirmed that she sent an e-mail to the internal-cg mailing list six weeks ago and there was only one [response from Arasteh](#) regarding wanting more time. She invited the ICG members to discuss any issues they have with the completion of [Step 2 of the assessment process](#) for the Numbers and the Protocol Parameters proposals.
  - Since there were no further objections from the ICG members, Fältström announced the closure of this action item.

### [ICG Call #13 – Action Item #1](#)

- Fältström confirmed this action item as closed.

### [ICG Call #13 - Action Item #2](#)

- Fältström confirmed that this action item will be merged with Call #12: Action Item #3.

- Arasteh emphasized that what is sought is a comparison of the current and post-transition accountability mechanisms that the operational communities have relating to the IANA functions.
  - Fältström noted Arasteh's concerns. Fältström suggested that the ICG Call #12: Action Item #3 to be as follows: Arkko and Barrett to provide further information/diagram to the internal-cg mailing list about the IETF and RIRs' current and future accountability related to the IANA interaction. He further stated that the ICG will continue the discussion after this information is provided.
    - Arasteh agreed with the caveat that the information that the Numbers and Protocol Parameters communities provide also look at the preliminary output of CWG-IANA and CCWG-Accountability.
      - Karrenberg objected to the ICG placing the onus on Arkko and Barrett to take into account an unfinished process while creating the diagrams for further information.
        - Arasteh emphasized that if the Numbers and Protocol Parameters communities do not take into account the incomplete work from CWG-IANA or CCWG-Accountability, they need to state that in their proposal.
  - Arkko clarified that the accountability mechanisms of the IETF is not dependent on ICANN. He reiterated that the Protocol Parameters proposal reflects their community's wishes and while they look forward to working with CWG-IANA and CCWG-Accountability, he did not believe that there is a need to precisely align these aspects.

#### [ICG Call #13 - Action Item #3](#)

Fältström suggested that the ICG should continue discussion of this action item on the internal-cg mailing list while waiting for information from Arkko and Barrett. He requested the Secretariat, with the help of the Chairs/other ICG members, to try to recap what was discussed regarding the jurisdiction issue and send to the internal-cg mailing list.

- Arasteh asked whether the ICG has considered obtaining legal advice regarding jurisdictional issues.
  - Fältström answered that no decision has been made and the ICG should wait for further information from the communities and discuss this issue then.

**Action Item 5: If any ICG member has a specific question about the practicalities of coordination between the operational communities (referred to in the protocol parameters proposal and referenced RFCs) that has not been previously answered in ICG discussions, that ICG member should send that specific question to the ICG mailing list. If no questions are received before call #15, this action item will be closed. (Discussed on calls #13 and 14.)**

#### [ICG Call #13 - Action Item #4:](#)

- *Adobe Connect chat:* El Bashir stated that the Secretariat has indicated that there will be response by end of this week.

**Action Item 6: ICG chairs to determine whether ICG secretariat is available to produce outreach messaging/infographs. (Discussed on calls #13 and 14.)**

### **3. ICG revised timeline in light of [CWG-IANA's announced proposed dates](#)**

Fältström confirmed that the ICG working sessions will be on 18-19 June. He stated that the Chairs have been recently notified that there is a conflict with CCWG-Accountability's meeting on 19 June, and Chairs from both groups are synchronizing the agendas to minimize the issues for individuals who

participate in both groups. He clarified that the ICG will not have an official meeting on 25 June, but the room and time slot is currently reserved for ICG use.

- Arasteh asked whether the ICG has plans to discuss preliminary ideas from CWG-IANA.
  - Fältström stated that the ICG has not scheduled any formal interaction between the ICG and any of the two groups' working sessions. He noted that the ICG has liaisons to both CWG-IANA and CCWG-Accountability, and that the ICG should be careful to not confuse the process of receiving information via the liaisons and sessions, and the formal submission of the Names proposal.
- *Adobe Connect chat*: Karrenberg suggested that the ICG make a plan based on relative dates from the point it receives the Names proposal and not a plan starting from 25 June.
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: Mueller and Uduma agreed with Karrenberg.
- *Adobe Connect chat*: Drazek stated that the ICG 'will have early visibility into both the CWG and CCWG proposals in early June' as it will be posted for a public comment period, and 'that will give the ICG an opportunity to review the almost-final recommendations prior to the formal approvals'.
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: Getschko agreed with Drazek.
  - Mueller agreed with Drazek regarding ICG having early visibility to the Names proposal. He further clarified that the process followed by the CWG-IANA requires them to get the approval of their chartering organizations before submitting the Names proposal to the ICG.
    - *Adobe Connect chat*: Arkko agreed with Mueller regarding 'early review and ICG engagement on the topic before formal approval'.
- Arasteh asked if Fältström can confirm that there will be no chance in Buenos Aires for the ICG to discuss anything related to the CWG-IANA.
  - Fältström answered that based on the previous discussion, the ICG will be able to discuss (content and feedback) the Names proposal that the CWG-IANA will send to the Names community chartering organizations on 8 June. He stated that he would like to hear more views on the possibility for the ICG to base their work on 18-19 June on the proposal that will be delivered to the chartering organizations by the CWG-IANA.
    - Cooper stated that this is in line what the ICG has said before regarding early engagement with the Names proposal. She further stated that the ICG should analyze and evaluate the Names proposal (even if it is not final) to the furthest extent possible during the working sessions on 18-19 June.
      - *Adobe Connect chat*: Arkko, El Bashir, Niebel, Lee and Uduma agreed with Cooper
- Knob questioned if the ICG should forward questions that may come up during the 18-19 June working sessions to the CWG-IANA prior to the formal delivery of the Names proposal.
  - Fältström stated that fewer round trips with CWG-IANA can shorten the calendar time. He cautioned the ICG on asking questions based on preliminary data, but agreed that the ICG should take into account the question Knob raised.
- Fältström concluded that there is ICG consensus to work with the proposals received from the two operational communities, and in addition the preliminary data the CWG-IANA can deliver in early June.
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: St. Amour, Subrenat, Getschko and Housley agreed with Fältström.
- Fältström opened the discussion on scheduling calls after Buenos Aires. ICG members both on the call and on Adobe Connect chat indicated a preference to start the calls one week after the Buenos Aires meeting.

**Action item 7: Fältström to coordinate with the ICG secretariat on proposed call schedule for after ICANN 53. (Discussed on call #14.)**

#### 4. Approval of minutes from previous ICG meetings

- Chung pointed out the redline sections on the 6 February minutes v4 from Mueller's and Karrenberg's edits have not been resolved. She also noted that the redline sections on the 11 March minutes v3, based on Uduma and Chung's edits have not yet been approved.
- Fältström announced the approval of the 7 February minutes v2. He asked the Secretariat to send remaining minutes with redline sections to the internal-cg mailing list to be resolved and approved on the next call.

#### Summary of Action Items:

1. Secretariat to publish Timeline v9 (with approved edit "March 2014"->"April 2015") on ICG web site. (Discussed on call #14.)
2. Subrenat and Clark to draft a report summarizing information collected during the ICG assessment process of the operational communities' proposals. This report can be published together with the final transition proposal and should be based on summaries of ICG questions/answers provided by the secretariat. (Discussed on calls #12 and #14.)  
**Action Item 2 REVISED on 20/04/15:** Subrenat and Clark having agreed that the matrix provided by Secretariat is sufficient, it is no longer necessary for them to produce the report mentioned above. Secretariat to add relevant data from the ICG assessment of the Names proposal, as well as any additional data necessary, to the questions/answers matrix for ICG approval. This matrix can be published together with the final transition proposal. (Discussed on calls #12 and #14.)
3. Arkko and Barrett to provide further information (diagram) to the internal-cg mailing list regarding the IETF and RIRs' current overall internal accountability and oversight system related to IANA interaction. (Discussed on calls #12, 13, and 14.)
4. If any ICG member has a specific question about the jurisdiction of the ICANN-IETF MoU that has not been previously answered either in the IETF proposal or in ICG discussions, that ICG member should send that question to the ICG mailing list. If no questions are received before call #15, this action item will be closed. (Discussed during F2F meeting #4 and calls #13 and 14.)
5. If any ICG member has a specific question about the practicalities of coordination between the operational communities (referred to in the protocol parameters proposal and referenced RFCs) that has not been previously answered in ICG discussions, that ICG member should send that specific question to the ICG mailing list. If no questions are received before call #15, this action item will be closed. (Discussed on calls #13 and 14.)
6. ICG chairs to determine whether ICG secretariat is available to produce outreach messaging/infographs. (Discussed on calls #13 and 14.)
7. Fältström to coordinate with the ICG secretariat on proposed call schedule for after ICANN 53. (Discussed on call #14.)