

ICG F2F Meeting 5 – Working Session 3
ICANN 53 Buenos Aires
Thursday 18th Jun 2015 - 09:45 - 13:00 UTC-3
Chat Transcript

Yannis li: (6/25/2015 09:47) Welcome to the ICG working session 3 at ICANN 53! 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>

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (10:00) Suggested change for Phase 1, end of 1st paragraph: "... in time for the ICG to deliver the final proposal to the NTIA, via the ICANN Board, in the time frame...".

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (10:04) @Alissa: I suggest "Based on the indications the ICG disposes of at this point, it seems that the earliest possible period for Transition..."

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (10:07) @Kavouss +1.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (10:16) If this can help, after Kavouss' latest remark, I suggest "The ICG has noted that the ICANN Board considers implementation time frames are consistent with these indications from the operational communities, and that the IETF and RIR proposals could be implemented..."

RussMundy-SSAC: (10:31) @Patrik: I fully support this approach

Alan Barrett (NRO): (10:31) OK with beginning to work according to this draft communication plan, even though it is not formally approved yet

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (10:38) @Alan +1

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (10:40) @ Alan and Martin: thank you.

RussMundy-SSAC: (10:44) +1

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (10:46) All: thank you for your support for this afternoon's Communications meeting.

Daniel Karrenberg: (10:58) >4weeks in August makes a lot of sense, that's inevitable

Yannis li: (11:04) @remote participants, we will have a break now and resume at 11:45am local time.

Yannis li: (11:45) We are now resuming the session

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (11:55) @Milton: exactly. We should not place all this in our overall Introduction or Exec. Summary, but in commenting the proposals. And provide links to appendices.

Alissa Cooper: (11:58) daniel did your hand go down?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:02) @Daniel: your analysis is valuable, some things are aimed mainly at others (Accountability).

Daniel Karrenberg: (12:05) thank you jj for calling it "changing the rules", i had intended to use those words and forgot to do so!

demi getschko: (12:05) + 1 to Daniel

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:05) @Daniel, I hesitated between that and "moving the goalposts"...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: (12:05) Jean-Jacques, I agree

RussMundy-SSAC: (12:07) I was going to describe this as changing the size of the playing field (pick your sport) so you have to further to reach the goalposts

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:08) @Keith: you make an interesting point, but it is not in the ICG's mandate to simplify the task of the US administration.

Although there are many US citizens in the ICG, there are also other nationals, to whom all due attention must of course be given to the US authorities, but while retaining our independence.

Daniel Karrenberg: (12:12) xiaodong is absolutely right: it is our job to create a document that gets implemented in order to preserve the multi-stakeholder model

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:14) @Xiaodong +1.

Daniel Karrenberg: (12:17) @kuo: we aske the questions about the ntia criteria in the rfp

Daniel Karrenberg: (12:17) asked

Daniel Karrenberg: (12:17) so that is in hand

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:24) @Manal: the record.

Lynn St.Amour: (12:24) I think Milton makes a very good point --- this is where we need to bridge this community process and USG expectations

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:26) @Russ: +1.

demi getschko: (12:30) We should document widely, but not judge or reaccess the way the inputs were produced inside their communities..

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:30) @Daniel +1.

Daniel Karrenberg: (12:31) lynn, "bridging" has the big danger of adding stuff that causes problems.

Daniel Karrenberg: (12:32) and causes either side, especially the communities to feel mis-represented

Daniel Karrenberg: (12:33) russ was putting it quite well, that is the direction i was trying to advocate

Jon Nevett: (12:34) Sounds like we are getting to consensus on this -- report on how the proposals tie together and meet the criteria, but no independent assessment

demi getschko: (12:36) Jon +1

RussMundy-SSAC: (12:38) Jon +1

Daniel Karrenberg: (12:38) @milton: i said it was possibly the a slip of the tounge but you said "... and then chose the right one ..."

Lynn St.Amour: (12:39) @Daniel, I was not suggesting the ICG write the "bridge" but there are things we can do to ensure a fuller record.

Daniel Karrenberg: (12:40) is it heating up?

Lynn St.Amour: (12:40) particularly as much of this is tied to the accountability and their work is still underway. They too, are eaware of these "expectations".

Daniel Karrenberg: (12:40) ah, cooling down. that is a good direction at this point it seems to me ;-)

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:41) @Manal +1, ICG can ask its communities to document that for the public record. But otherwise, I wouls not agree on changing our remit, as long as we don't have written instructions to that effect.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:42) (would)

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:43) to be clear: "I would not agree to changing our remit, as long as..."

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:54) At end of Action Item 3, I suggest adding "..., for the purpose of consolidate the public record".

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:55) sorry, I reformulate: "...for the purpose of consolidating the public record".

Daniel Karrenberg: (12:59) i can live with parking it