Draft minutes: Twenty-second IANA Stewardship Coordination Group (ICG) Teleconference

05:00-06:00 UTC, Thursday, 10 September 2015

Meeting agenda and archives

Participants:

Alan Barrett (NRO)	Martin Boyle (ccNSO)
Alissa Cooper (IETF)	Mary Uduma (ccNSO)
Daniel Karrenberg (RSSAC)	Michael Niebel (GAC)
Demi Getschko (ISOC)	Mohamed El Bashir (ALAC)
Hartmut Glaser (ASO)	Narelle Clark (ISOC)
Jari Arkko (IETF)	Patrik Fältström (SSAC)
Joseph Alhadeff (ICC/BASIS)	Paul Wilson (NRO)
Keith Davidson (ccNSO)	Russ Housley (IAB)
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries)	Russ Mundy (SSAC)
Lynn St Amour (IAB)	Wolf-Ulrich Knoben (GNSO)
Manal Ismail (GAC)	

Apologies:

Elise Gerich (IANA Staff Liaison)	Kuo-wei Wu (Board Liaison)
James Bladel (GNSO)	Lars-Johan Liman (RSSAC)
Jandyr Ferreira dos Santos (GAC)	Milton Mueller (GNSO)
Jean-Jacques Subrenat (ALAC)	Thomas Schneider (GAC)
Jon Nevett (gTLD Registries)	Xiaodong Lee (ccNSO)
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)	

Secretariat:	**ICANN Support Staff:**
Jennifer Chung	Mike Brennan
Sherly Haristya	Josh Baulch
Yannis Li	

Agenda

1. Public comments (Plan for analysis & discussion of initial impressions)

Cooper announced that the ICG public comment period has ended about 28 hours ago. She stated that the ICG received 142 confirmed submissions and noted that there are some unconfirmed submissions that came in before the deadline. She thanked the six volunteers (Mueller, Boyle, St. Amour, Subrenat, Knoben and Alhadeff) who agreed to do a first pass analysis of the comments before the ICG meeting in Los Angeles. She mentioned that the volunteer group had a brief coordination call earlier on review logistics and stated that the Secretariat will be consolidating all reviews into the matrix for the ICG to review the following week (Tuesday 15 September). Cooper made note of the limited time between the call and the face-to-face meeting in Los Angeles, and explained that the agenda for the face-to-face meeting will be based on the organization of topics and issues that arise from the initial analysis.

- Mundy requested the addition of a column in the matrix for the reviewers to enter their own comments and stated that using the spreadsheet is a good approach.
  - o Cooper gave a brief overview of the structure of the matrix, noted it was being updated, and pointed out where Mundy's request may be accommodated within the layout. *Adobe Connect chat*: Chung confirmed that the Secretariat will add the column as requested.

- Cooper highlighted the need to identify what the action item is for the ICG while reviewing the comments. She categorized the public comments received into three main types:
    i. Comments that are short supportive statements of support of the proposal that may not require any additional action from the ICG.
    ii. Comments that may require ICG to clarify or add text to the ICG report in part 0 of the combined proposal.
    iii. Comments that may require the ICG to send questions back to the operational communities for a response.
- Karrenberg noted that the confirmation process is a spam prevention measure. He asked if the Secretariat could go through the unconfirmed submissions received before the deadline, manually filter out spam, and then include these comments as part of the overall public comments received.
    o *Adobe Connect chat*: Wilson, Ismail, Niebel, Arkko, Boyle and St. Amour agreed.
    o Cooper agreed with the Karrenberg and asked the Secretariat to proceed as requested. (See Action Item 1).
- Cooper added that there are also submissions received in languages other than English and official translations are not available until next week, and noted the ICG will not have a complete set of public comments until after the translations are received. In response to Arkko's comment on Adobe Connect chat, Cooper confirmed that submission IDs are not assigned until after the confirmation steps so the unconfirmed comments will be assigned submission ID numbers higher than the existing submissions.

Cooper concluded this agenda item by thanking the public commenters for their time spent reviewing the proposal and sending detailed feedback. She noted that the ICG has a lot to work on, but has a solid foundation in terms of establishing the public record.

2. Update on CCWG activities

Drazek gave an overview of the recent developments in CCWG-Accountability contained in the email he sent to the internal-cg mailing list before the call. He stated that the CCWG proposal is currently out for public comment (40-days, 3 August - 12 September at 23:59 UTC) and three public webinars were held (4, 7, 25 August). He noted that approximately 15-20 comments have been received so far with more expected to come at the end of the public comment period.

Drazek reported that the CCWG gave a briefing to the ICANN board on 31 August. On 2 September, the CCWG had a 3-hour call with the ICANN board where the board agreed with the CCWG recommendations on community empowerment and enforceability but also provided notice that it intended to submit public comments raising concerns about the proposed sole member model. Drazek mentioned that the 2 September call was 'fairly contentious'. He stated that the CCWG has taken a 'wait-and-see' approach pending receipt of the details of the Board's concerns and suggestions, and will be treating it as part of the public comment period input.

Drazek noted that the legal teams from ICANN (ICANN legal and Jones Day) as well as legal advisors to the CCWG (Sidley and Adler) have met to discuss the board's concerns and will meet again after the board submits its formal input. He added that a face-to-face meeting for CCWG has been proposed for late September in Los Angeles around the time of the ICANN board retreat to facilitate follow-on discussion.

Drazek concluded that there is uncertainty on the extent that the board's concerns would require substantial change in the CCWG proposal that a third public comment period might be necessary. He stated that the CCWG is still working towards Dublin for delivery of a proposal for community approval.

- Mundy asked whether there are other comments from the community that might have a similar effect of potentially disrupting the CCWG timeline.

- o Drazek answered that so far to his knowledge there has not been others raising the same level of fundamental concern. Based on the community discussions, Drazek conveyed that there is general support for the second reference model the CCWG currently has out for public comment. He further noted that there may be comments recommending adjustments, but differentiated between adjustments and substantial change.
- *Adobe Connect* chat: Wilson stated, "The strong impression I get is that the board comments are substantial and will require another round of CCWG work, if it is to take ICANN into account."
  - o *Adobe Connect chat*: Ismail noted that she shared Wilson's impression.
  - o Drazek confirmed that Wilson's assessment is accurate.
- Knoben asked whether the board's concerns are only related to the sole member model or to the PTI model as well. He asked that if the board's concerns are also related to the latter, whether it will cause any change to the PTI model.
  - o Drazek responded there was no discussion about the PTI model on the last CCWG call. He noted that ICANN Staff and board acknowledged that there is a need in approving CCWG-Accountability's work to address the key dependencies between CWG-IANA and CCWG-Accountability, and that it will be addressed in the new proposal from the board. Drazek confirmed that this is one of the open questions for CWG-IANA, CCWG-Accountability, and ICG to circle back on.
- Karrenberg highlighted that the question ICG needs to discuss is how the developments in CCWG-Accountability will affect the ICG's schedule and work. He expressed his personal opinion that there is no direct impact to ICG's schedule and work at this point. Regarding the point Knoben raised, Karrenberg stated that the ICG should discuss at its face-to-face meeting whether the ICG should communicate and differentiate between the sole member and PTI models.
  - o Drazek agreed that there is a clear distinction between the PTI in the CWG-IANA proposal and the sole member structure proposed by CCWG-Accountability. Drazek concurred with Karrenberg that the CCWG-Accountability developments with the ICANN board does not impact ICG's work in terms of ICG analysis of its public comments received. However, he noted that there could be one area of concern for the ICG relating to the key dependencies between the CCWG-Accountability and CWG-IANA proposals. Drazek emphasized that the question of whether the CWG key dependencies are addressed and resolved could impact ICG's work.
  - o *Adobe Connect chat*: Wilson agreed with the independence of the 'single-member and PTI models'. He also agreed that the ICG has to continue with its work, and expressed a hope that "if ICANN is concerned with PTI, they would have expressed it in the comment period".
- Cooper stated there could be more information by the ICG face-to-face meeting in terms of whether there will be adjustments or significant changes to the CCWG-Accountability proposal. She noted that it would be premature for the ICG to make any changes to the ICG's plans now or at the face-to-face meeting, but added that the ICG needs to consider the impact of one process to another and fielding questions about this issue. She highlighted Drazek's reminder that the ICG has committed to seek confirmation from CWG-IANA on whether their requirements are met in the output of CCWG-Accountability Work-Stream 1 when the CCWG proposal goes to the chartering organizations for approval.
- Karrenberg asked whether the main message ICG should be giving when being asked about the impact at this point is that the ICG will proceed with its work as scheduled.
  - o Drazek deferred to the chairs on messaging, but he concurred with Karrenberg – namely that ICG can and should continue its work, and acknowledge that once the CCWG and ICANN board have a detailed exchange, the ICG will have a better sense of timing of the CCWG-Accountability track.
  - o Cooper agreed with Drazek and added that the ICG needs to be prepared to issue an updated message if it becomes clear that the ICG or CCWG is not on track any more. She confirmed that at this point, the ICG can carry on as planned.
    - ▪ Karrenberg asked Cooper for clarification on how the current developments in CCWG-Accountability will impact the proposal ICG is assembling.

- ▪ Cooper clarified the linkage and why it affects the ICG by referring back to the ICG commitment to seek confirmation from CWG-IANA that the seven dependencies outlined in the CWG-IANA proposal are met once the CCWG-Accountability work stream 1 work is completed. She further stated that this is based on the ICG model of deferring to the communities, and that the CWG's work is one of the components in the ICG proposal.
- *Adobe Connect* Chat: Ismail suggested adding this topic (and any other updates) to the ICG FAQ.
  - ○ *Adobe Connect* chat: Uduma, St. Amour, Karrenberg agreed
- Mundy asked if the ICG has a designated date in its timeline for when the ICG will hear from CWG-IANA on whether or not the CCWG-Accountability output meets their seven key dependencies.
  - ○ Cooper responded that the ICG will ask CWG-IANA whether their requirements are met when CCWG-Accountability Work Stream 1's work is completed. She noted that two weeks prior to the ICANN 54 meeting (around 8 October) is the expectation but some fluidity. She added that the ICG has open lines of communications with CWG-IANA.
  - ○ Drazek added that the reason for the CCWG-Accountability target in delivering its proposal to chartering organizations prior to ICANN 54 is because certain chartering organizations, such as the GAC and ccNSO, historically need a face to face meeting to be able to make certain types of decisions.

3. Logistics for Sept 18-19 F2F

Cooper gave an overview of the logistics for the 18-19 September face to face meeting in Los Angeles. She noted that the chairs will be producing the meeting agenda shortly before the meeting to reflect the public comment analysis. She also suggested a possible agenda item on the role of ICG during implementation phase and invited ICG members to start thinking about that discussion.

Summary of Action Items:
1. **Secretariat to process and publish unconfirmed public comments received during the public comment period.**