ICG F2F Meeting #7 – Sunday 18 October 2015
ICANN Dublin – 09:00-12:00 UTC+1
Chat Transcript

Yannis Li:Welcome to the ICG F2F Meeting #7 Day 2. Please note that chat sessions are being archived and follow the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior: http://www.icann.org/en/news/in-focus/accountability/expected-standards
Narelle Clark:Adobe sound now working thank you.
Alissa Cooper:https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1HcUUDn5DHSVo7lLo-FWU_QMa8PG gfZWTP_kGo1EXNQs/edit#gid=1327274628
Narelle Clark:Sound intermittent on adobe connect... phone excellent today. Go figure.
Yannis Li:@Narelle, we will relay that to the tech team. Thanks.
joseph alhadeff:I finally got in to adobe connect..
Jari Arkko:I want to understand better the timeline. If an additional public review is needed, will that happen before or after chartering organisation review? I.e., which is done first.
joseph alhadeff:@ KAvouss - the offer of providing the three models would be very helpful. Also a note of thanks to Keith and Kavouss for all of thier work and excellent reporting to us.
Jari Arkko:I strongly favour increasing ICANN SO/AC ability to discuss intersessionally, as sopposed to adding new physical meetings. Or waiting for Marrakesh. As nice as that city is, I'd rather we be done with this before that.
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries):+1 Jari
Alissa Cooper:@Jari I believe the chartering org decision is the final step, after public comments
Milton Mueller:Oh so we have video today.
Milton Mueller:just what we need, to see our own sleep-deprived and hung over selves instead of the documents
Alissa Cooper:we can close it if people prefer
Milton Mueller:Our vast public following probably prefers it remain open
joseph alhadeff:It's before 5AM in DC so am very happy for you not to see my less than shining face :-)
Milton Mueller:no we must have video, Joe. turn on your webcam
joseph alhadeff:No you would see the caffeine IV...
Milton Mueller:Close up on Martin
Milton Mueller:what's wrong with this cameraman?
Narelle Clark:It's a quite respectable 7:30pm here, sun has set. Frogs croaking in my yard so will stay on mute.
Michael Niebel:+1 Martin
Narelle Clark:On a more serious note, I am opposed to us submiitting an incomplete proposal. The proposal is incomplete while CWG relies on CCWG and CCWG is in a state of disagreement. I would prefer we hibernate, revise via email and call timed for CCWG timeline. If all goes well, then that call will finalise and submit.
Manal Ismail:+1 to announcing where we stand , and what we consider the

final proposal pending CCWG dependencies ..
J:Couldn't agree more with Martin
joseph alhadeff:+1 JJ
demi getschko:Agree with Martin and others about it is innapropriate to us to send an incomplete proposal... ccwg and icg have both to send complete proposals in this phase...
Keith Davidson ccNSO:We are required to provide a proposal, not a partial proposal. It seems inappropriate to consider doing anything other than submitting a full proposal
Milton Mueller:+1 Jari
Milton Mueller:Release of public comments is something we need to do
Jari Arkko:and release of final version of the proposal (pending of course possible future changes re: ccwg and cwg work, but it is important to have a clear ending to our current discussion)
Milton Mueller:we can release public commentswithout the proposal
joseph alhadeff:If we publish the interim finding of where we are it's the same as an informal submission to NTIA.
Milton Mueller:???
Paul Wilson:+1 Daniel.
Jari Arkko:Daniel: that is correct - we are waiting for confirmation, NOT changes. But what I meant was: we need to publish a document, and consider it final, pending exceptional circumstances. The expecatin is that we will get a confirmation and will move forward with the tiffinal version of the document
joseph alhadeff:Daniel is exapling the concept of interim publication. NTIA can take notice of whats in the proposal without formal submission and p[rovide feedback.
Paul Wilson:Regarding "completion" of our proposal, it seems strange to say that the proposal will be "completed" when some external event occurs, when that event has no effect on the proposal content.
Jari Arkko:+1 to interim publicaton
Paul Wilson:the proposal is complete when it its conent is complete. if we chose not to formally submit it until an expternal event happens, then that's our choice.
Paul Wilson:+1 to publication when we regard the proposal as "complete". irrespective of the state of CCWG discussions.
Jari Arkko:+1 to concluding public review comments, +1 to publishing interim (likely final) version, +1 to not submitting yet for NTIA but having a document out, +1 to setting an alarm clock and monitoring external events.
Jennifer Chung:@Everyone this scenario was shared on the CCWG list here:
http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/attachments/20151007/8b6e1418/ProjectManagement-scenariosv1.1-0001.pdf
Paul Wilson:Thanks Jennifer.
Jari Arkko:+1 to considering shorter public review periods
joseph alhadeff:@PAul - "complete" subject to existing dependency - we should not submit until complete absent a needed deadline and that should be in consultation with NTIA.
Lynn St.Amour:Agree with what Alissa just summarized. For us to submit

a "final proposal" while the CCWG discussions are ongoing (and given the CWG dependencies) would not be understood by anyone not deeply involved in these processes. ie.those responsible for evaluating the proposal.
A report of where we are coming out of this meeting would be helpful though.
Jari Arkko:but milton, i think the people who sent public comments, also deserve to see the edited result.
Jon Nevett:Milton +1
Keith Davidson ccNSO:+1 Milton. It either is, or isn't a proposal. It is not a proposal until it is complete. Strickling has already made it abundantly clear that there is a need for a single, complete proposal
joseph alhadeff:What we are talking about interms of interim publication is that we are allowing people to look at the latest version of the proposal where it is. That allows people to consider the document in process. It is not a suggestion of a final proposal, but a continuation of trasparency. People are getting hung up on publish. It is assuring that the current version of the rpopsal is accessible.
Milton Mueller:Agree with Michael
Jari Arkko:joe, it is not only that. we have to communicate the status of the draft, and clearly state that we've done the edits we believe we needed to do based on the public review.
Jari Arkko:i think it definitely needs to be a part of the public comments analysis announcement.
joseph alhadeff:+1 Alissa - would strongly object to not making the document easily accessible.
Jari Arkko:it really needs to
Milton Mueller:why does it need to?
Lynn St.Amour:@Milton -transparency
Jon Nevett:No objection to posting a clean version of the current version of the document
Lynn St.Amour:we should reference it as the current draft
Keith Davidson ccNSO:+1 Lynn - it remains draft at this stage...
Jari Arkko:not just transparency. we actually do want to communicate where we are. and the honest explanation of that is that we have a proposal that ?is for now interim, but to our knowledge addresses all feedback placed on it, except the dependency to the accounability changes that affect 1/3 of the proposal
Milton Mueller:who is going to be referencing the proposal?
Milton Mueller:as for transparency, as Alissa noted, the documents are there
Milton Mueller:OI am not for hiding it, you just don't "release" it or "announce" it
Lynn St.Amour:@JAri, yes
joseph alhadeff:Milton - what if it was called a process update with a link to the revised proposal, with a celar statement of continued dependency?
Milton Mueller:A process update is OK with me. As long as the FRONT page of the proposal is clearly marked as incomplete and pending finalization
Jari Arkko:lets not try to confuse the role of the document too much.

it is an interim proposal, believed to be ready in all other respects except the depdendency
joseph alhadeff:I think we are in agreement then...
Milton Mueller:I don't think you folks rea;ize how many documents arefloating around out there in multiple versions and how confusing this is to people
Milton Mueller:even people closely following the process
Jon Nevett:seems like we have consensus to announce a current snapshot of where we are
Jari Arkko:we may be in agreement, but I would suggest being very clear on the nature of the incompleteness: be specific. This is not a random update of the proposal from the ICG. It is a proposal that the ICG believes addresses all community feedbak and work to date, except the dependency to CCWG work.
joseph alhadeff:Perhaps this should be aprt of our report from the Dublin meeting... Attached please find... Summary Doc, current version of proposal awaiting finalization of dependencies...
Jean-Jacques Subrenat:@Lynn +1, "hibernation" should be avoided.
Jari Arkko:+1 to no hibernation word
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben:QLynn: fully agreed
joseph alhadeff:+1 no hibernation, thinking this over sleeping bears when awoken are of porr demeanor...
Milton Mueller:right now I am in favor of "hibernating" ;-)
joseph alhadeff:ICANN Board should be commenting in real time as all others, they should not be waiting for the final proposal to comment.
Alissa Cooper:I think we are good on that front, we got constructive coments from them in the public comment period. Re implementation plan, in particular.
Jennifer Chung:@Everyone, here is the link to v4 on the dropbox https://www.dropbox.com/s/ltikwpkv58j4zb5/IANA-transition-proposal-v4.docx?dl=0
Jennifer Chung:We are now discussing paragraph 2 on page 9.
Jari Arkko:a one sentence addition to exec summary on OCs co-operating might be good.
Alan Barrett (NRO):in para 03, "is comprised of" should be "is composed of"
Patrik Fältström:This is a good proposal from Joe
Lynn St.Amour:good idea Joe...
Jean-Jacques Subrenat:@Joseph +1 on the usefulness of summarizing the different parts, up front.
joseph alhadeff:call it how we got here...
Jennifer Chung:@Everyone, the current discussion is on paragraphs 55-58, page 22-23 in the document
Patrik Fältström:I think para 02 should be new section "Background" which includes todays 02 plus the two paragraphs Joe refer to.
Alissa Cooper:which two paragraphs? that is what I am missing.
Jean-Jacques Subrenat:Agree with Patrik on having 1) Introduction, 2) Background, 3)...
RussMundy-SSAC:the one piece of public comments statements the I think should remain in the Exec Sum is the % that support the proposal

joseph alhadeff:@alissa - thanks covers it.
joseph alhadeff:@ russ - maybe we can put that in process section related to meeting the NTIA requirements?
Yannis Li:We will have a 30min break now until 11:10am local time.
Lynn St.Amour:One final comment - should we move the ICG Recommendation
paragraph to after the items to be completed not just before.
Yannis Li:We will be resuming shortly
Jennifer Chung:@Everyone we have resumed and are now discussing this email
http://mm.ianacg.org/pipermail/internal-cg_ianacg.org/2015-October/001932.html
Yannis Li:We are currently on the agenda item Transition Proposal Discussion
Jean-Jacques Subrenat:@Joseph +1 about web of relationships AND PROCESSES...
Alan Barrett (NRO):Should we add some date? date Postel started performing IANA function, date of the ISI contract, date of the ICANN contract?
joseph alhadeff:@Patrick - perhaps we can address the concern of Kavouss in a footnote explainig that in ICG discussions these include Operational Communities which are further defined in... otherwise it would interrupt the flow. But Kavouss is right, absent that anchor people mught think we are discussing something else...
Jean-Jacques Subrenat:@Russ M, something like "...shared resources (generally managed by Internet Registries)..." ?
Alissa Cooper:"(including operational communities as described in sub-section III below)"
Jean-Jacques Subrenat:@Alissa, as the person who brought up the question about "others than OCs", I can accept your proposed amendment.
joseph alhadeff:Jeenifer
joseph alhadeff:Jenifer, can we substitute the cleaner charts into the summary doc if that hasn't been done already?
Jennifer Chung:@Joseph - absolutely, I'll switch them out on the latest version and upload to dropbox . I'll project the new version for discussion as well.
joseph alhadeff:@Alissa - will you be asking for real time input from the audeince on our role?
Jari Arkko:+1 to daniel. I would suggest that we just say "We will remain in existence until Sept 2016, but obviously most of the work is on implementation, by the OCs."
Lynn St.Amour:I like Daniel's approach as well
Lynn St.Amour:and +1 to Jari's comment
Lynn St.Amour:and +1 to Paul's comments.
Narelle Clark:Where is the slide deck? I can't find it under 'slide decks' on drop box...
Narelle Clark:@Daniel - to your point on asking at the public forum about any future role of the ICG, we should flag what we had consensus on.\
Narelle Clark:And that is that we are open to a further role, and are

open to input or even direction from the community.
Narelle Clark:Particularly viz a viz for implementation and its co-ordination.
Jennifer Chung:@Narelle, I have uploaded the current slide deck to the subfolder now, it can be found here : https://www.dropbox.com/s/oom3e9v54gdyv5s/ICG-ICANN54-v2.pdf?dl=0
Narelle Clark:Thanks Jennifer
Narelle Clark:@Alissa, all, I agree with "WE HAVE FAIRLY GOOD AGREEMENT
THAT THE INITIATIVE FOR US DOING ANYTHING SHOULD COME FROM THE
COMMUNITIES. " but the better word might be 'impetus'
Lynn St.Amour:further refine
Jari Arkko:my opinion: i'd prefer to? present it but add some words to explain the context. but i'm also fine with JJ's words.
Alan Barrett (NRO):I'd like to see "oppose" divided into "oppose the entire idea" versus "support the idea, but oppose this proposal". Support can also be subdivided into "support it all", "support most of it but with some criticism", etc
Lynn St.Amour:@Alan, agree and/or "support with some conditionality"
Jean-Jacques Subrenat:Alissa, I like the proposal you just made.
joseph alhadeff:@Daniel - by opposing the diagram, you are not oppossing the paragraph JJ suggested?
Narelle Clark:Re the graphics - in my experience, people like to see concrete signs of analysis, and tallies say this. It needs a bit more granularity thatn this to be truly meaningful. But this is a fair bit of work if not already done.
Daniel Karrenberg:option 1
joseph alhadeff:@Alissa I can hum for either...
Jean-Jacques Subrenat:@Alissa, the pie should include the following slices: agree with Transition Plan; agree with Plan, with questions or reservations; disagree with the very idea of Transition; agree with Transition but against this Plan.
Narelle Clark:My statemetn says option 1 but that is a fair bit of work. Who has the time?
Lynn St.Amour:I guess my deadlne just moved...
joseph alhadeff:@ Alissa:
joseph alhadeff:@Alissa: can we ask folks to send any comments they have on the summary document so we can improve it before Thursday???
Jean-Jacques Subrenat:Jennifer, could you look at my proposal (above) on Alissa's suggested new pie?
joseph alhadeff:Alos there are soem summary elements missing can folks see if they had covered those issues in LA and provide us some text?
Narelle Clark:JJS It also needs an 'unrelated answer' or better category for the - shaell we say - absurd one(s).
Narelle Clark:Bye all
Daniel Karrenberg:bye
Yannis Li:Thanks everyone for joining. The ICG F2F meeting #7 Day 2 is now concluded