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

05:00-07:00 UTC, Wednesday, 29 July 2015

Meeting agenda and archives

Participants:

Alan Barrett (NRO)	Lynn St Amour (IAB)
Alissa Cooper (IETF)	Martin Boyle (ccNSO)
Daniel Karrenberg (RSSAC)	Manal Ismail (GAC)
Demi Getschko (ISOC)	Mary Uduma (ccNSO)
Hartmut Glaser (ASO)	Michael Niebel (GAC)
Jandyr Ferreira dos Santos (GAC)	Narelle Clark (ISOC)
Jari Arkko (IETF)	Paul Wilson (NRO)
Jean-Jacques Subrenat (ALAC)	Patrik Fältström (SSAC)
Joseph Alhadeff (ICC/BASIS)	Russ Mundy (SSAC)
Jon Nevett (gTLD Registries)	Russ Housley (IAB)
Kavouss Arasteh (GAC)	Xiaodong Lee (ccNSO)
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries)	

Liaisons:
Elise Gerich (IANA Staff Liaison)
Kuo-wei Wu (Board Liaison)

Apologies:

James Bladel (GNSO)	Mohamed El Bashir (ALAC)
Keith Davidson (ccNSO)	Thomas Schneider (GAC)
Lars-Johan Liman (RSSAC)	Wolf-Ulrich Knoben (GNSO)
Milton Mueller (GNSO)	

Secretariat:	**ICANN Support Staff:**
Jennifer Chung	Mike Brennan
Yannis Li	

Agenda
Cooper gave an overview of the agenda noting that there were documents that need to be finalized on the call for the public comment launch.

- Ismail asked about the deadline for the ICG FAQ. Cooper stated that if there was no time to discuss the FAQ on this call, then ICG members should send in feedback on the internal-cg mailing list by Friday 31 July. See Decisions Taken 1.

1. Combined proposal including ICG report
Cooper noted that additional edits were sent in by Arkko and Wilson after the document was frozen and this version is projected for discussion. The ICG proceeded through each paragraph and live-edited the document.

Section II. Process Summary
- Boyle noted a defensive tone in paragraph 4, and suggested a positive formulation that gives an explanation as to why the ICG is adopting this approach, that the ICG believes the proposal needs to reflect current operations and build on the multistakeholder operational communities that were

established for each function. Boyle further suggested that ICG needs to talk about the coherence of the total document instead of noting that "it is not as streamlined as it could have been".

- o Wilson agreed with Boyle and suggested avoiding a defensive or negative tone.
- o *Adobe Connect chat*: Arkko, Subrenat, St. Amour agreed that paragraph 4 is defensive and negative. Arkko agreed with Boyle's reformulation for paragraph 4.
- o *Adobe Connect chat*: Arkko, Subrenat, Uduma, Clark concurred with Boyle regarding the comment on not using "streamlining". Clark suggested alternate wording: "In order to appropriately reflect the existing operational model underpinning IANA, the proposal has been developed by soliciting and then bringing together discrete proposals from the three operational communities." Arkko and Ismail supported Clark's suggestion.
- o Arasteh agreed with Boyle to frame sentences in a positive way. However, he stated that the ICG needs to also maintain the language used in its charter.
- o Cooper agreed and suggested deleting the two paragraphs that ICG found overly defensive.
- Wilson noted that in the draft executive summary, the ICG is not very clear in explaining its approach to take the proposal as three separate sub parts. He added that this was not given to ICG as a direction, but came from comments in the ICANN initial consultation – this was subsequently accepted by ICG on the basis that the communities are independent and the functions are independent.
  - o Cooper suggested taking the draft text from Wilson for the executive summary and the public comment web site.
  - o *Adobe Connect chat*: St. Amour and Lee agreed with Wilson. St. Amour further noted that it was based on the IAB submission in the community consultation. Wilson, St. Amour, Ismail supported the way forward suggested by Cooper.
- *Adobe Connect* chat: Subrenat stated that paragraph 4 contains the expression "... and essentially DELEGATED TO the three communities." He noted that the use of 'delegated' is too strong from a community perspective and suggested, "...in order to properly reflect their respective functions, the 3 OCs were requested to submit their separate proposals."
  - o Further discussion on wording contained input from Alhadeff ('grounded') and Arasteh ('assigned').
- Responding to a request to change the order of the proposal, Cooper stated her preference to leave it as is, but asked if anyone still wished to change the order at this point.
  - o *Adobe Connect chat*: Arkko stated that, "…as the first one to propose an order change, I'm fine with the current order." St. Amour, Wilson, Boyle, Ismail, Mundy, Uduma and Alhadeff agreed with keeping the current order.
- *Adobe Connect chat*: Barrett wrote, "In the diagram in paragraph 6: Number related requests are 0.1%, not 0.001%."
  - o Cooper asked the Secretariat to correct the said number in the diagram. See Action Item 1.

Section III. Proposal Summary

- **Paragraph 9**: the following edits were suggested and accepted:
  - o Alhadeff pointed out that the statement "This proposal document includes the three final community proposals as received…" might give an impression that it was the order as they were received. He viewed ICG needs to credit two communities that were timely or at least not create an impression that they are the last proposals received. He suggested removing the word "as".
  - o Barrett stated that ICG has changed paragraph number and added section numbering, and suggested softening the statement produced verbatim "without changes by the ICG". Cooper changed the text to read "aside from formatting changes".
- **Paragraph 10**: Regarding the line in paragraph 10 that states "These provisions apply to the names functions only", Boyle said that this will lead first time readers to believe that the provisions are not accepted by two other communities. Boyle emphasized the importance of framing part 0 in a positive manner, and suggested wording that conveys that these provisions only apply to names proposal, but the ICG views that it is still coherent with the other proposals.

- o Cooper clarified that the sentence describes the review conducted by Customer Standing Committee (CSC) and IANA Function Review (IFR) as applying only to the names function. Reiterating Uduma's comment from a previous call, Cooper said that there are multiple layers of review for the different functions but this does not create an incompatibility.
- o Addressing Boyle's concern, Alhadeff suggested re-wording the description to say that this review process will be focused on names community. He also highlighted that proposal summary is not the place to start introducing conclusions about the compatibility of the proposal, and the ICG does go on to talk about its findings later on in Part 0.
  - ▪ *Adobe Connect chat*: St. Amour and Arasteh supported Alhadeff's view.
  - ▪ Cooper changed the text into "These reviews will focus on the names functions." Arasteh and Boyle accepted the edits.
- **Paragraph 11**: Arasteh pointed out the importance of using consistent terminology. He noted in paragraph 11 there is reference to a 'standing committee of stakeholders and experts' and stated that there is only the CSC, and that term should be used.
  - o Boyle explained that the term 'standing committee of stakeholders and experts' come from paragraphs 1153 and 1155 which state that the authorization of changes could happen to the content and architecture of root zone management. Boyle recollected the related recommendation is for the creation of standing committee of stakeholder and experts to look at these issues and provide the basis for consultation and recommendation to ICANN Board for approval.
    - ▪ *Adobe Connect chat*: Fältström stated that SSAC pointed out implementation issues relating to this, where there might be a conflict from advice from this 'standing committee' and formal advice from the ACs that the ICANN board has to take into account.
  - o Alhadeff suggested including a short parenthetical as clarification in paragraph 11 which explains that there are two standing committees. *Adobe Connect* chat: Arasteh, Barrett and Subrenat supported Alhadeff's suggestion.
  - o Boyle raised a separate issue in paragraph 11 regarding clarifying the description of the names community proposal of authorization of root zone changes. Boyle offered extract text from the names proposal to further clarify paragraph 11. See Action Item 2.

Diagram
- Mundy raised an issue with the diagram contain in the ICG report. He commented that the diagram only emphasizes the primary oversight and review process, and lacks a visual representation of ongoing daily IANA functionality and customer flow. He stated that the ICG should differentiate but include both the oversight overview and ongoing operations.
  - o Cooper explained that this was by design because the transition is about the oversight, and not about changing the day-to-day operations. She proposed asking the designers to add the missing names component- the flow between customer and PTI to the diagram, and draft text for paragraph 17 to clarify that the diagram only represents the contents of the proposal for the transition of the oversight, and there is a lot more detail that is not covered in the diagram that relates to the day-to-day operations of IANA. See Action Item 3.
    - ▪ Mundy agreed with Cooper's approach. *Adobe Connect chat*: Uduma supported Cooper's idea.
    - ▪ *Adobe Connect chat*: Arkko, St. Amour and Arasteh agreed that the diagram should reflect high level process.
  - o Ismail reiterated Karrenberg's suggestion on *Adobe Connect chat* to add the word "oversight" to the diagram caption. *Adobe Connect chat*: St. Amour, Ismail, Uduma and Getschko supported this addition.
  - o Barrett asked for a key to be added to the diagram to explain the color coding. Cooper agreed to ask the designers to add the key.

Section IV. ICG Assessment
- **Paragraph 43**: Wilson mentioned that paragraph 43 about the Root Zone Maintainer is currently under the 'workability' section, and suggested that it would be a better fit under the 'completeness' section.
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: Karrenberg concurred with Wilson.
  - Mundy viewed that paragraph 43 should stay under 'workability'. He stated that 'completeness' is from the perspective of RFP answers and 'completeness' in fulfilling the direction coming out of the 14 March NTIA letter. Mundy stated that it is unclear whether or not the cooperative agreement should be considered part of it.
  - Cooper suggested leaving paragraph 43 as is because no one had strong feelings about moving it.
    - Wilson conceded and stated that he was not sure the ICG has a 'right place' for the paragraph.
    - *Adobe Connect chat*: Boyle agreed with Cooper.
- Ismail stated that she highlighted in blue the ongoing work of CCWG-Accountability and noted that these highlighted sections may not be accurate by the time the proposal goes out for public comment. She asked if the ICG is planning to review these sections.
  - Cooper said that ICG could expect to make changes to the temporal language in the combined proposal after the public comment period.
- Cooper flagged the placeholder in sub-section 6. "Does not replace NTIA role with a government or inter-governmental organization." and stated that the placeholder text (highlighted in blue) is about how ICANN is protected against captured by governments or inter-governmental organizations. She stated this point was made for the other two proposals and the ICG needs to do the same for the names component as well.
- Niebel thanked Cooper for drafting the text but raised an issue with the sentence, "These include bylaws provisions that prevent officials from governments or treaty organizations from serving as voting members of the ICANN Board and limit governments to an advisory role within ICANN through the GAC." He stated that it is the status quo and the whole construction is still being discussed in CCWG-Accountability. Niebel suggested striking that phrase, as the ICG should not preclude discussions in the GAC and CCWG-Accountability.
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: Ismail, Karrenberg, Subrenat agreed with Niebel.
  - Boyle agreed with GAC representatives in the ICG in that the ICG is not in a position to say much right now. Boyle added that the key reference is 'avoiding capture by any community'.
  - Arasteh explained that this issue was discussed on 28 July in CCWG-Accountability and it was decided that the CCWG-Accountability will mention in bylaws and procedures that GAC maintains its advisory capacity without any changes. Arasteh added that CCWG-Accountability also did not put GAC advice on the Independent Review Panel. He suggested deleting the blue highlighted placeholder text because GAC has not decided whether or not they would join the voting.
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: Lynn St.Amour asked if ICG could add: "In addition, the CCWG-Accountability is proposing under the "Community Mechanism as a Sole Member Model" that the community segments (Advisory Communities (AC's) and Supporting Organizations (SO's)) each have equal votes. There are 7 SO/AC's in total and if the GAC chooses to participate, it would be simply one segment out of 5 (or 7 if all the AC's choose to participate). The CCWG-Accountability group is also proposing incorporating the Affirmation of Commitments into the Bylaws, including requirements for higher voting thresholds to minimize the ability in the future to modify these obligations."
    - *Adobe Connect chat*: Drazek responded that St. Amour described the latest proposed voting distribution, however the discussion in CCWG-Accountability is not finalized and it will be up for further public comment.
  - Arasteh suggested adding the following text about pending aspects of CCWG-Accountability's proposal: "It is worth mentioning that that the Cross Community Working Group (CCWG) dealing with ICANN Enhanced Accountability including Community empowerment and Independent Review Process is being completed and published for public comment at the same that ICG publishing its proposal for public comments. ALL issues relating to the interdependency of the CWG and CCWG are adequately covered in the CCWG second proposal put to public comments as referred to above."

- Ismail noted that ICG does not need to go further because this section already describes the CWG-IANA paragraph 211 which covers all CWG-IANA has said about this issue.
- Cooper concluded that ICG will remove that phrase and the ICG will have something to say after the conclusion of CCWG-Accountability's process. See Decisions Taken 2.

Cooper proposed giving the ICG 24 hours after the end of the call to review and send in any last edits to the ICG report to the internal-cg mailing list. See Decisions Taken 3.

2. Executive summary

Cooper proposed accurately reflecting the final set of edits to the ICG report in part 0 in the executive summary as well. There were no changes proposed by ICG members to the executive summary during the call. See Decisions Taken 3.

3. Public comment web site material

Cooper confirmed that the changes made in the proposal document (as discussed on the call and internal-cg mailing list) will be reflected in the public comment web site as well. She gave a brief overview of the public comment web page layout and ways to submit public comments (via email and web form).

- Alhadeff reiterated an issue he raised on the internal-cg mailing list regarding requesting people provide 'opinions' as opposed to 'comments'. Cooper responded that the change was reflected in the public comment web page text.
- Uduma asked about the framing of the questions. She stated that it starts with a yes/no format and noted that people who do not want to give an explanation may not further elaborate.
  - Cooper stated that people can provide whatever they want to in the comment boxes. She explained that the ICG is asking for explanations to help build a public record that thoroughly demonstrates how the proposal meets the criteria.
- *Adobe Connect chat*: Clark stated that for accessibility, the captcha has to go. Clark also requested a plain word doc version for screen readers. Barrett noted that there are accessible versions of captcha. e.g. http://simplyaccessible.com/article/googles-no-captcha/.
  - Cooper responded that the solution on the accessibility issue is providing an email submission option and explained that people could choose submission through email or public comment web form.
- Wilson asked whether ICG will have a downloadable fillable version of the public comment web form to accommodate collaborative responses from groups or organizations.
  - Chung confirmed that the Secretariat team will create this form. See Action Item 4.
- Ismail highlighted her previous suggestion to add a question asking whether people agree ICG report and executive summary accurately reflects the overall proposal.
  - Alhadeff suggested a modification of Ismail's proposed question to giving a broader opportunity for people to provide comments on the ICG report and executive summary. *Adobe Connect chat*: Ismail stated she was fine with Alhadeff's modification. Wilson and Subrenat agreed.
  - Cooper confirmed that Alhadeff and Ismail's input will be reflected on the public comment web page. See Action Item 5.
- *Adobe Connect chat*: Clark suggested an amendment to Q6: "...If not please list the aspects of the proposal which do not and what proposal modifications you believe are necessary."
- Lee requested that the ICG use the ISO 3166 country codes on the web form.
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: Wilson agreed that it is better to use ISO 2-letter code and also suggested that it is better to have "Country/Economy" instead of "Country".
  - *Adobe Connect chat*: Barrett and Alhadeff suggested a compromise of ordering the list ISO code with the country name near the ISO code. Uduma and Subrenat agreed.

Based on the input, Cooper asked the Secretariat to use the Country/Economy and ISO country code and cross-reference IANA website first. She added that if it is too complicated to be resolved by the web team within 24 hours, then ICG will delete the field. See Action Item 6.

4. Q&A matrix

Cooper noted that the Secretariat has added documentation of the questions and answers discussed regarding the names proposal to the matrix. She asked if the ICG members had any last comments before the matrix is published on the ICG web site.

- Boyle asked why the issue raised by Richard Hill under the names section of the matrix was removed.
  - Cooper responded that the matrix is intended to be an internal discussion for ICG, and there were also external questions on the other proposals that were not included, thus the issue raised by Richard Hill does not belong in the matrix. She further noted the ICG report contains text that explains that the ICG received comments and how the ICG dealt with them in terms of interfacing with the communities.
    - Boyle responded that as long as the ICG is aware of the reason for its removal, he is okay with it.
- Niebel proposed a streamlined question for section 2.3 and 2.5 of IETF section and offered to send it to the internal-cg mailing list. See Action Item 7.

5. Wrap up

Cooper thanked everyone for their hard work. She concluded that the ICG public comment will go forward as planned (See Decisions Taken 4) and reminded the ICG that all materials for the public comment will be on a 24 hour review before finalization (see Decisions Taken 3). She stated that the communications plan (including the webinar slide deck) for the public comment period will be shared on the internal-cg list (see Decisions Taken 5) and also suggested taking the minutes approval on list as well (see Decisions Taken 6).

Summary of Action Items:

1. **Secretariat to correct figure (percentage of Numbers-related transactions) in the IANA transactions graphic in combined proposal.**

2. **Boyle to extract and send wording to the internal-cg list regarding paragraph 11.**

3. **Cooper to ask XPLANE to add details for the Names portion in the IANA graphic (slide 28 in the webinar deck). Cooper to draft some text accompanying the graphic for additional clarity.**

4. **Secretariat to create a downloadable fillable version of the public comment web form.**

5. **Secretariat to ensure that latest version of the public comment web materials is reflected on the public comment web form and ICG public comment web page.**

6. **Secretariat to change web form field to Country/Economy and order them by ISO 3166 2-letter country code.**

7. **Niebel to send in suggested edit to the internal-cg mailing list to the Q&A matrix regarding IETF section 2.3 and 2.5.**

Summary of Decisions Taken:

1. **ICG members to send in any edits to the ICG FAQ by Friday July 31 with the aim to finalize document on the internal-cg mailing list mid next week.**

2. **Edits to language in flux in paragraph 62 of the combined proposal to be parked until after CCWG-Accountability discussions on this issue concludes.**

3. **ICG members to send any last comments regarding the Executive Summary, ICG report, public comment web site materials to the internal-cg mailing list before Thursday 30 July 07:00 UTC.**

4. **The ICG public comment period will go forward as planned to be launched on Friday 31 July.**

5. **ICG Communications plan for the public comment period launch will be shared on the internal-cg mailing list.**

6. **Minutes approval to be taken on the internal-cg mailing list.**