Fifth IANA Stewardship Coordination Group (ICG) Face-to-Face Meeting – Day 2

09:00 – 16:00 ART / 12:00 - 19:00 UTC, Friday, 19 June 2015

Meeting agenda and archives

Buenos Aires ICG Participants

Alan Barrett (NRO)

Alissa Cooper (IETF)

Demi Getschko (ISOC)

Hartmut Glaser (ASO)

Jandyr Ferreira dos Santos (GAC)

Jari Arkko (IETF)

Jean-Jacques Subrenat (ALAC)

Jon Nevett (gTLD Registries)

Keith Davidson (ccNSO)

Lynn St Amour (IAB)

Manal Ismail (GAC)

Martin Boyle (ccNSO)

Michael Niebel (GAC)

Milton Mueller (GNSO)

Mohamed El Bashir (ALAC)

Narelle Clark (ISOC)

Patrik Fältström (SSAC)

Russ Housley (IAB)

Russ Mundy (SSAC)

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben (GNSO)

Xiaodong Lee (ccNSO)

Remote ICG participants:

Daniel Karrenberg (RSSAC)

Joseph Alhadeff (ICC/BASIS)

Paul Wilson (NRO)

Liaisons:

Elise Gerich (IANA Staff Liaison Expert)

Kuo-Wei Wu (ICANN Board Liaison)

ICG Apologies:

James Bladel (GNSO)

Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries)

Lars-Johan Liman (RSSAC)

Mary Uduma (ccNSO)

Thomas Schneider (GAC)

Secretariat:

Jennifer Chung

Sherly Haristya

Yannis Li

ICANN Support:

ICANN Technical Staff

1. Agenda review and one decision item from Day 1

Cooper went through the revised agenda for the day. There were no objections to the proposed agenda, thus the ICG proceeded with the revised agenda as posted.

Cooper sought and received confirmation on consensus from the ICG regarding one item that was discussed briefly during Day 1, namely that the ICG would inquire the CWG-IANA to find out whether the CCWG-Accountability's proposal meets the CWG-IANA's requirements (see Decision Taken 1).

2. Planning for public outreach before and after public comment period (materials needed, audiences to target, responding to media, press, and other inquiries)

Cooper stated that as the ICG work will intensify in July, there is need for the ICG to consider and decide on how to do proactive outreach around the public comment period; what materials will be needed; what to do when responding to media inquiries; and whether the ICG wants to delegate a subgroup to handle these items.

Summary of Discussion:

- There was recognition within the ICG for an opportunity to provide an 'impartial, trustworthy community message' and there was consensus within the ICG to do proactive public outreach and set up a communications strategy for formal and informal contexts.
- The ICG decided to form a Communication Working Group (see Decisions Taken 2). The ICG Communications Group, with the support of ICG Secretariat, to consider the below suggested works and development of the communications strategy:
  - Produce a Communications strategy for the ICG to produce material in advance (by 15 July or sooner) of the Public Comment Period (currently scheduled to begin in August 2015).
  - Compile and categorize repository/clearinghouse of outreach material that already/is currently in use (clearly marked as produced by the ICG or otherwise) regarding the ICG and its work.
  - Determine content, format and dissemination channels of materials to be developed (leveraging resources provided by ICANN Communications Team and other sources).
  - Keep track of material produced by other organizations/entities/channels to ensure that the information being disseminated about the ICG and its work is factually correct.
- ICG members have also suggested specific activities or items regarding outreach including:
  - Setting up a focus group (of people who have not been following the process closely) to figure out if the communications strategy makes sense.
  - Using the Secretariat to improve ICG's interaction with community using social networks (current social media accounts set up include Facebook and Twitter).
  - Coordinating re hard-copy mailings the ccNSO may develop for the final combined proposal (for the benefit of the ccTLDs not in the ccNSO).
  - Reviewing and ensuring the FAQ currently on the ICG web site is up to date.
- There was agreement to have the ICG Chair as the formal spokesperson when official or formal requests for information are sent to the ICG as a group. At the same time, all ICG members are empowered and encouraged to speak and engage with their communities, regions and other forums (while clearly identifying in which capacity they are speaking).
- In terms of the coordination and relationship with the ICANN Communications Team and other communications groups, ICG members highlighted the need for ICG to remain independent and also seen to be independent. There was also a request for the Secretariat to organize a meeting between the ICG Communications Working Group and the ICANN Communications Team during ICANN 53 week.
- Subrenat volunteered to produce, within 2 days, a first draft of a Communications Strategy for the ICG. His offer was accepted

Action Item1: Secretariat to send an email to the communications subgroup volunteers for them to meet early in the ICANN week. Subrenat to produce a first draft of the ICG Communications Strategy within 2 days.

3. IANA Trademark and domain name issues

Cooper had taken an action item from the first day meeting to draft a question to CWG-IANA regarding the IANA trademark and domain name and circulate on the internal-cg mailing list for further discussion during this agenda item. The draft question projected for discussion included some edits by Mueller.

- The ICG live-edited the draft during the discussion. Edits regarding language and word selection were suggested and agreed to for the second paragraph ('may not' be compatible) and the final paragraph (language was refined to clarify what actions the ICG is requesting of CWG-IANA).
- There was discussion regarding Mueller's edit in the second paragraph - 'without permission', and it was decided that this edit will not be included in the final draft.
- Cooper suggested that she finish the grammar and spelling edits and then send the final draft to the CWG-IANA. There were no objections to this suggestion.
- Karrenberg sent an email to the internal-cg list and also reiterated the importance for the ICG to clearly delineate what is within its mandate regarding communications with the operational communities.

Action Item2: Cooper to refine the grammar of draft letter to CWG-IANA regarding IANA trademark and domain name and then send it to the CWG-IANA.

4. NTIA Response

Cooper gave an overview of the draft response to NTIA circulated on the internal-cg mailing list. She noted that the ICG's implementation timeline is dependent on CWG-IANA's and CCWG-Accountability's timelines, and that CCWG-Accountability's timeline in particular contributes the longest time to the overall ICG's timeline in comparison to other communities' proposals.

Input to the draft response - 'alternative 1':

- Karrenberg referred to his email to the internal-cg mailing list, emphasized the need for coordination with CCWG-Accountability's response, suggested changes to the structure and language of the response.
- Arkko concurred with Karrenberg and suggested edits the last paragraph to more accurately reflect the differences in potential demand outlined in the various operational community proposals of resources requested of the IANA department.
- Boyle noted that there are other entities in the CWG-IANA proposal besides PTI that will require time to set up, including the Customer Standing Committee (CSC), IANA Functions Review (IFR), and other review mechanisms for Service Level commitments, all of which will impact the CWG-IANA implementation timeline.

Summary of the discussion:

- ICG members agreed to have the ICG liaisons to CCWG-Accountability, the ICG Chairs, and also other ICG members to collect for more information regarding the timeline of CCWG-Accountability's work completion during the ICANN week in order to have a clearer view of the situation.
- There was general agreement to not include the contract extension time periods in the response to NTIA since it is not the ICG's prerogative.
- The ICG agreed to continue drafting the response according to 'alternative 2' as suggested in the circulated draft - to identify CCWG-Accountability's work to be the longest part; refer to input received from operational communities and the ICANN Board re their respective implementation timelines; and include explanations about the parallelization and resource constraints on groups that are affected.

- The ICG to reconvene on Thursday, 25 June to further discuss and draft the ICG's response to NTIA (see Decisions Taken 3).

5. Talking points for ICANN meeting week

Fältström drafted and circulated a set of talking points to the internal-cg mailing list to be further discussed and finalized during discussion of this agenda item.

The ICG conducted live editing to the draft during the discussion.

Discussion:

- St. Amour stated that categorization of the questions and answers by topic would be helpful and suggested adding the two positions (from the IETF and RIR communities) regarding the PTI.
  - Clark suggested that the answer to the added question should be that the operational communities are actively discussion this at this time.
- Ismail and Wilson suggested including target or expected dates whenever possible.
- The ICG agreed to direct contract extension questions to the NTIA.
- For discussion regarding objections that may be received during the public comment period see J.
- Alhadeff suggested adding a question about how the ICG has dealt with accountability issues related to ICANN.

Input on Questions and Answers A-M:

A: Wilson suggested an answer that incorporates a broader set of issues than just the IANA trademark issue.

B: Wilson suggested clarifications on the both the letter the ICG is responding to and type of data ICG is gathering.

C: Ismail suggested adding the target date to this answer (see Wilson's general suggestion).

D: See above at C.

E: Mueller pointed out that the ICG has conducted evaluations of the IETF and RIR proposals.

F: See above at C. St. Amour suggested wording change. Ismail suggested adding a question regarding whether there will be more than one public comment period.

G: Cooper suggested rephrasing the question to 'ICG components'. Fältström suggesting using consistent terminology for the combined proposal going forward.

H: No change.

I: No change.

J: Mueller and Wilson noted and received support that the public must be able to have the chance to put objections on the record. El Bashir and Ismail both suggested a refocusing of the question in terms of the combined proposal. Wilson pointed out that comments on individual community proposals can be sent back to the communities for review. Knoben pointed out that the question is not 'can you object', rather it is 'what will the ICG do with your objection'. Regarding not reopening previously discussed issues, Boyle suggested adding the fact that individual proposal components have undergone thorough discussion and represent the consensus of the communities.

K: Alhadeff suggested rephrasing 'implementation' to as 'preparatory steps towards implementation'.

L: No change (Removed from the list after the second draft).

M: No change.

6. Wrap up

The summaries of decisions taken and actions items were discussed and agreed upon.

Cooper announced that she will send any changes to the time and agenda of Thursday 25 June session by Wednesday 24 June to the internal-cg mailing list.

Summary of Decisions Taken:

1. **Once the CCWG work stream 1 output has been sent to SOs/ACs for approval, the ICG will seek confirmation from the CWG that the CCWG's work meets the CWG's requirements.**
2. **The list of communications subgroup volunteers: Cooper, Fältström, El-Bashir, Subrenat, Alhadeff, Arkko, dos Santos, Lee, and Secretariat.**
3. **The ICG to reconvene on Thursday, 25 June to further discuss and draft the ICG's response to NTIA.**

Summary of Action Items:

1. **Secretariat to send an email to the communications subgroup volunteers for them to meet early in the ICANN week. Subrenat to produce a first draft of the ICG Communications Strategy within 2 days.**
2. **Cooper to refine the grammar of draft letter to CWG-IANA regarding IANA trademark and domain name and then send it to the CWG-IANA.**