ICG F2F Meeting 5 – Day 2
ICANN 53 Buenos Aires – Friday 19th Jun 2015 – 09:00 – 15:00 UTC-3
Chat transcript

Jennifer Chung: (6/19/2015 08:59) Welcome to Day 2 of the ICG Face-to-Face Meeting 5! Please note that chat sessions are being archived and follow the ICANNExpected Standards of Behavior:
http://www.icann.org/en/news/infocus/accountability/expected-standards

Joseph Alhadeff: (09:31) Sorry to have joined late.

Joseph Alhadeff: (09:31) I have dialed in, solved the probelm

Jennifer Chung: (09:31) Welcome Joe - we are now on the Planning for public outreach agenda item

Milton: (09:43) Patrik said "we in SSAC" - did he mean "we in ICG?"

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (09:45) @Patrik: good summary, thanks.

Daniel Karrenberg: (09:46) yes he meant ICG,

Milton: (09:47) ....he's on too many committees

Daniel Karrenberg: (09:48) we discussed this already at length in london and patrick summarised quite well. it is a matter of "I cannot speak for ICG as a group but my perspective on our discussions is ...."

Daniel Karrenberg: (09:49) @milton: it is too early in the (local) morning. i guess #committees is roughly equal for both of you ;-)

Daniel Karrenberg: (09:51) I agree with Alissa on making clear who is talking and with what hat. Also see above ;-).

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (09:54) @Daniel on "...but here his my perspective" : +1.

Daniel Karrenberg: (09:56) that was not fair alissa ! ;-) ;-) ;-)

Daniel Karrenberg: (09:57) @milton: my favourite search engine du jour 'qwant.com' has our website first! ;-)

demi getschko: (10:00) what about a RAQ? (rarely answered questions)? :-)

Manal Ismail: (10:01) lol .. we can think of that as well Demi :) ..

Joseph Alhadeff: (10:02) @ Jean-Jacques I will not be able to attend meetings this week, but am happy to follow up with you after the fact.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (10:03) Secretariat: we should ask to meet Sally Costerton and those she designates.

Milton: (10:03) Presumably Rarely Answered Questions are even rarer than Rarely Asked Questions ;-)

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (10:03) @Joe: with pleasure.

Milton: (10:04) Rarely Answered Question #1: How can we make iCANN more accountable?

Lynn St.Amour: (10:06) Managing this comms. process well is the BEST opportunity we have had in a long time to help improve awareness of the communities and organizations involved as well as better understand what distributed community processes mean and their strength..

Mohamed EL Bashir: (10:12) +1 Lynn

Daniel Karrenberg: (10:13) @milton: of course this question has 101 versions when properly formulated specifying accountable *to whom* ;-)

demi getschko: (10:17) agreed, Daniel...

demi getschko: (10:19) +1 to Russ Housley

Alan Barrett (NRO): (10:19) "without permission" implies wrongfulness, or

that permission was needed but was not obtained, at least to a layman like me.

Joseph Alhadeff: (10:20) Not wishing to pen scabs, but has there been a legal analysis of the need for permission regarding use of trademark or wheter it is within the perview of CWG to determine this?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (10:21) Suggestion: "For historic reasons, the name has been used without any need for authorization or permission". This would address Milton's concern, but also Russ H's.

demi getschko: (10:21) good compromise, JJ

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (10:22) @Demi: and we could add a link to a more thorough explanation, as a footnote or an annex.

demi getschko: (10:23) Yes. It seems to we are overcomplicating an historic and non-problematic issue... IMHO

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (10:25) @Milton: or "...has not precluded...é"

Alan Barrett (NRO): (10:27) that text with "may not be compatible" is OK for me

Daniel Karrenberg: (10:31) just delete the words "reconsider this aspect of its proposal"

Lynn St.Amour: (10:31) @ JAridelete " aspect of this proposal" - would that work?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (10:32) @Daniel +1.

Lynn St.Amour: (10:32) +1 Daniel

Xiaodong Lee@ccNSO: (10:32) +1 Daniel

Daniel Karrenberg: (10:33) and i am guilty as charged for "succumbing to the temptation of editing in committee" :-(

Jari Arkko: (10:33) I like Milton's words

Daniel Karrenberg: (10:34) We need to be specific, i.e. do not agree with milton

Jon Nevett: (10:34) +1

Daniel Karrenberg: (10:35) w *do not* need to be specific, is what i meant

Jari Arkko: (10:36) current edit on the screen works for me

Milton: (10:36) I think Alissa's edits got it perfect

Daniel Karrenberg: (10:36) what is on the screen is ok, let's move on

Alan Barrett (NRO): (10:36) looks good to me

Jon Nevett: (10:37) approaches

Daniel Karrenberg: (10:37) i'd like to make a general statement about communications with the communities

Milton: (10:37) yes, "approaches" would do it

Milton: (10:37) agree with Lynn

Daniel Karrenberg: (10:39) @chair: when this paricular "editing in committee" is done, i'd like to have a short discussion about principles for comms with the operational communities

Yannis li: (10:39) We will have a break now until 11:15am local time.

Alissa Cooper: (10:40) ok daniel, after the break

Daniel Karrenberg: (10:51) i just sent mail to the list. hopefully we can quickly get agreement on the principle. if not i fear this will be a longer discussion we will have to schedule.

Yannis li: (11:15) We are resuming the meeting shortly

Yannis li: (11:21) We are on the agenda item "NTIA response" now

Daniel Karrenberg: (11:21) to expain myself: i had the impressinthat we were

dangerously close to acting against the principle mentioned in our "draft in committee" episode before the break.

demi getschko: (11:22) +1 to Daniel. Are we assuming that CWG is incomplete? Could be that the other 2 proposals are dealing with overdatailed issues? I'm not realy even a rough expert on trademarks... I think we can only appoint that there are discrepancies, not take sides

Eric Evrard: (11:23) We are currently facing an issue with the Adobe Connect Audio, it will be back shortly.

Daniel Karrenberg: (11:24) bridge works

Daniel Karrenberg: (11:24) for audio

Eric Evrard: (11:24) Yes, the issue is only with the Adobe Connect audio + Streams.

Eric Evrard: (11:32) Audio is back. Working on the streams.

Patrik Fältström - SSACt: (11:35) Thanks Eric!

Daniel Karrenberg: (11:40) i am succumbing to the drafting in committee temptation again. watch your mailboxes. ;-)

Daniel Karrenberg: (11:40) this in refernce to what Alissa just said.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (11:47) @Patrik: good résumé. Actually, you are suggesting we use a "rule of subsidiarity": we should look at the longest required time, the others will fit into that.

Daniel Karrenberg: (11:54) what alissa just said makes sense to me

Milton: (11:56) Let NTIA decide what contract extension time it needs. Not up to us

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (11:56) @Milton +1.

Daniel Karrenberg: (11:56) +1 to milton it is not our job!

Jari Arkko: (11:57) @Milton + 1

Yannis li: (11:59) We will start lunch early and reconvene at 1pm local time

Yannis li: (11:59) The next agenda item will be Talking points for ICANN meeting week

Yannis li: (11:59) @remote participants, we will have lunch now. Please come back in an hour time.

RussMundy-SSAC: (12:03) No need to get in a long discussion about this but It looks to me like the bottom paragraph on the first page "to assist us with our planning for the fall" is an invitation for the ICG to say something about the contract extension if we think we should.

RussMundy-SSAC: (12:04) My view is that it would be useful for the ICG to say that having shorter extension periods might facilitate the transition

Daniel Karrenberg: (12:05) @russ, i do not read it as such and i remain convinced (by milton) that it is not our job to draw conclusions for NTIA's planning. when they have our answer they can make their decisions.

Daniel Karrenberg: (12:07) @russ: a statement like this also implies that the pressure of a deadline is needed. on the other hand we are saying that everything is in full motion. contradicting statements.

Daniel Karrenberg: (12:09) and just so that everyone knows: this meeting is keeping me away from the RIPE NCC annual barbecue. A pity!

Daniel Karrenberg: (12:09) ;-)

Yannis li: (13:05) @remote participants, we are waiting for more members to come back and will reconvene soon in 5mins.

Eric Evrard: (13:08) For those who are on the Audio Birdge, can you please identify to me so i unmute you ? We had to mute you because of some noise.

Daniel Karrenberg: (13:09) no remote sound on either bridge or adobeconnect

Daniel Karrenberg: (13:09) sound back

Paul Wilson: (13:16) +1 Lynn. Its a great start and fast work overnight. Thanks.

Paul Wilson: (13:17) Same could be said for the Numbes proposal.

Lynn St.Amour: (13:19) @Paul, yes -- and this would be helpful for folks here to understand. There has already been some "mis-statements" re the RIR and IETF position on PTI,

Lynn St.Amour: (13:22) good catch Milton

Paul Wilson: (13:22) Thanks Lynn. I or others may have missed some of those mis-statements, so could you possibly share pointers to those you are aware of? it may be useful to respond individually where possible.

Milton: (13:25) We could rename the ICG as the "steering" committee ;D

Lynn St.Amour: (13:25) very good point Manal

Milton: (13:25) +1 Manal

Lynn St.Amour: (13:26) @Paul, they were hallway conversations here- and when I come across them I do try to correct them

Paul Wilson: (13:28) ok, thanks.

Mohamed EL Bashir: (13:30) Assambled proposal can be used

Lynn St.Amour: (13:32) airport...

Paul Wilson: (13:34) hand.

Paul Wilson: (13:35) agree with milton - they must be able to put objections on the record.

Paul Wilson: (13:36) but ICG has limited ability to respond to complaints, except where related to ICG's role.

Paul Wilson: (13:36) other issues should be expressed and find redress through the communities, and the ongoing processes in those communities (which I assume will be ongoing).

Yannis li: (13:36) your hand is noted Paul

Mohamed EL Bashir: (13:39) Q: Are people able to object on the submitted indiviual Operational communities proposals during the final ICG comments period ?

Mohamed EL Bashir: (13:40) A : No, the submitted Operational Communitnites proposal undergone extensive consultation and comments periods reviews and its the results of the community consenus

Daniel Karrenberg: (13:41) i have to leave to a prior engagement. strength to all of you for the coming week!

Lynn St.Amour: (13:41) thanks Daniel.

Milton: (13:41) You can express support or opposition for the proposal as a whole, or for any part of it. But if some part of the proposal does not obtain the needed public support to go forward, the ICG cannot modify it, it can only send it back to one of the operational communities for modification. Thus critics must be mindful of the amount of support their proposed modificatiob would get from the affected operational community.

Alissa Cooper 2: (13:42) pleae paste the question as well

Lynn St.Amour: (13:42) I like it Milton.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (13:42) @Xiaodong: 人民

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (13:42) ;-)

Milton: (13:43) Q: What if I don't like the final proposal?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (13:45) @Martin: +1, that's a very important element to be made public!

Joseph Alhadeff: (13:51) Alissa's answer looks good.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (13:53) @Elise +1.

Joseph Alhadeff: (13:53) Elise +2

Lynn St.Amour: (13:54) substitute "review" for "modufication", would that work?

Mohamed EL Bashir: (13:55) +1 Martin

Lynn St.Amour: (13:56) these are talking points correct? That makes shorter -- better...

Patrik Fältström - SSACt: (13:58) yes

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (14:03) @Lynn +1.

Eric Evrard: (14:16) For those on the bridge, please mute yourself if you do not talk.

Yannis li: (14:29) We will have a 15min break now and reconvene at 2:45pm to wrap up

Alissa Cooper 2: (14:34) Joe are you sending text for the answer to your question?

Paul Wilson: (14:40) I need to board my flight. Thanks all, see you soon (er or later).

Paul Wilson: (14:40) ciao

Mohamed EL Bashir: (14:43) Safe travels

Joseph Alhadeff: (14:44) I'm going to need to cut and past it in. The connection is subject to interruption as ans such I've lost three different drafts.

Yannis li: (14:46) We have resumed the meeting and wrapping up the Action Items and Decisions taken

Yannis li: (14:49) The meeting is adjourned now. The next working session will be on Thursday from 9am - 1pm local time.