

ICG F2F Meeting 5 - Day 1
ICANN 53 Buenos Aires – Thursday 18th Jun 2015 - 09:00-17:00 UTC-3
Chat Transcript

Jennifer Chung: (6/18/2015 19:59) Welcome to the ICG Face-to-Face Meeting 5! 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>

Daniel Karrenberg: (20:03) are we starting? or did i do my timezone conversion wrong?

Jennifer Chung: (20:13) We are on the first agenda item now - CWG names proposal pre-assessment

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (20:27) The hope and expectation this week is that the Chartering Organizations will review, discuss and APPROVE the CWG Transition proposal. As Patrik has clarified, the public comment periods have been concluded and the proposal is the result of that public input, including from Chartering Organization participants.

Mary Uduma: (20:30) Hello All. soory I came late,

Joseph Alhadeff: (20:31) My audio cut out is it working for others?

Stacy: (20:31) Audio has been cut out here as well.

Mary Uduma: (20:31) Mine too

jcurranarin: (20:31) no audio here (US)

Jordan Carter: (20:31) audio failure

Jahangir Hossain /BD: (20:32) no audio

Alissa Cooper: (20:32) working on the audio

Joseph Alhadeff: (20:33) audio back...

jcurranarin: (20:33) audio back (US)

Alissa Cooper: (20:33) good. adobe connect crashed on our end.

Mary Uduma: (20:34) Audio back

Mohamed: (20:35) Good Adobeconnect is working now

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (20:42) Alissa makes a very important point. There are dependencies between the CWG and CCWG proposals.

Mohamed: (20:42) +1

Lynn St.Amour: (20:42) agree, good point Kavouss and Alissa

Mary Uduma: (20:43) +1 Kavous and Alissa.

Mary Uduma: (20:48) Agreed Patrik

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (20:50) I support the ICG Co-Chairs raising this issue with the Co-Chairs of the CWG Transition as soon as possible.

Lynn St.Amour: (20:51) @Keith, or the Numbers and PP communities go back to the CWG.....

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (20:51) I think both.

Mary Uduma: (20:52) The Communities should talk to each other. and find a way to resolve the issues.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (20:54) I agree the communities should work together. But I think it's appropriate for the ICG Co-Chairs to flag the issue and facilitate the engagement. An area of conflict has been identified and the ICG needs to assist in resolving it.

Jari Arkko: (20:57) I would be happy for the ICG to send issues as they are identified Incremental good. Early good.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (20:57) I also support Mohamed's

recommendation that we develop a list of items we've identified.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (20:58) I recommended "sooner than later" because I think it's important to flag the issue before the CWG chartering organizations complete their assessments and approvals.

Mary Uduma: (20:58) Add Mary to the Group

Lynn St.Amour: (21:01) @ Kavouss, Good question re legal. Keith Davidson, could you expand on your comment?

Jari Arkko: (21:03) I think the communities need to lead the process, and instruct their legal teams. The legal teams are not the ones to lead in the IPR question, for instance, the communities need to come together and decide for themselves what they want to achieve, and then it is time for the legal teams to "implement" those wishes

Joseph Alhadeff: (21:07) yes me

Joseph Alhadeff: (21:07) That's why my hand had been raised :-)

Paul Wilson: (21:08) yes me too.

Mary Uduma: (21:09) What part will the Secretariat be playing?

Mary Uduma: (21:09) be*

Joseph Alhadeff: (21:10) As to legal issues, the one which would be most important to review, not denovo, it should have been done by the community, but the legal authority and backing for the new company. Essentially that lawyers have determined that its correct and can operate without issue as that is the most novel of the features...

Joseph Alhadeff: (21:16) Very hard to understand paul with echo...

Mary Uduma: (21:17) I have problem hearing Paul.

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (21:17) Read the transcript, that is at least for me easier than listening to Paul.

Wajdi Alquliti (OIC): (21:17) The voice not clear is totally dreft and not understandable

Yannis li: (21:17) Tech is working on the echo issue now

Alan Barrett (NRO): (21:17) scribe text feed is good, but I can't easily hear Paul

Mary Uduma: (21:17) Vey difficult to understand what he is saying.

Mary Uduma: (21:17) Very bad audio

Daniel Karrenberg: (21:20) I strongly suggest to deal with this agendapoint later when remote participation is possible again.

Daniel Karrenberg: (21:20) I can hardly hear Paul in any way.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (21:20) To me, the "transition" is effected by the expiration or termination of the IANA functions contract with NTIA. NTIA has said that won't happen until everything is consolidated and submitted and approved, including the ICANN Accountability work.

Mohamed: (21:20) Paul, we can't clearly hear you, maybe you can disconnect/reconnect again

Daniel Karrenberg: (21:20) The problems have nothing to do with Paul. It is the bridge!

McTim: (21:21) @Mo, if you read his email on screen, you get the thrust of his argument

Daniel Karrenberg: (21:21) IT IS NOT ON HIS SIDE!!!!

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (21:21) I agree with Daniel, the audio is problematic and not fair to Paul or any of us. Can we dial out to Paul?

Milton: (21:21) or is it just Paul's thick Australian accent? ;-)

Joseph Alhadeff: (21:21) Patrick one of the bullets see,med to indicate that there was no object to the severability of the proposals. I think there was substantial objection. I think there is no objection to different speeds of implementation after the joint proposal is accepted by NTIA

Jari Arkko: (21:22) given the quality, maybe we should get comments here instead...

Yannis li: (21:22) Dear All, there will be a break now until 11am local time

Daniel Karrenberg: (21:28) Audio: The way it looks from here is that the anyone talking on the adigo bridge gets an echo from the room. Since this echo has a RTT of about 1s it is not caught by any echo suppression mechanism. Of course that is very hard to talk against. This is not - repeat not!- caused by the remote people also listening on adobe connect.

Daniel Karrenberg: (21:30) Secondday problem is that the room gets breaks in the audio because of the original echo triggering echo suppression the other way. Result: unworkable.

Yannis li: (21:31) @Daniel, thanks for your note, the tech is now reestablishing the bridge and testing

Daniel Karrenberg: (21:32) clarification: the room gets breaks in the audio coming from the remote participants because the echo mentioned before suppresses the audio from the remote participant frequently

Daniel Karrenberg: (21:32) i am here for another 5 minutes, will re-connect to the bridge

Yannis li: (21:33) The phone bridge will keep open.

Daniel Karrenberg: (21:35) i disconnected, was going to walk the dog ;-)

Daniel Karrenberg: (21:36) which i will do now as the problem seems to be resolved.

Yannis li: (21:37) Yes it should be resolved now. Thanks Daniel.

Yannis li: (22:00) We will be resuming the meeting now

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (22:01) Much better!

Milton: (22:02) Yes, it was all unintelligible

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (22:06) Also, referring to NTIA's latest blog post, they do not intend to split up the IANA Functions agreement into its component parts.

Lynn St.Amour: (22:07) @Keith - not sure how to interpret your comment above., they are "managed" separately today

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (22:08) Manal, Martin, Joe, Daniel, Jari, Kavouss, Russ M, Wulf-U, J-J

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (22:08) @Lynn, yes, but it's a single agreement between NTIA and ICANN, correct?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (22:08) @Patrik, could you add me? Thanks.

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (22:08) @J-J, you are in the queue, as "J-J" ;)

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (22:09) thanks Patrik, I had not noted.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (22:09) Question: What steps for numbering and protocol parameters could be implemented prior to the termination of the IANA functions contract?

jcurranarin: (22:09) A single transition plan does not have to be implemented in a single "big bang" transition. The point would be for the ICG to provide a single transition plan, but also have the ICG make clear that the implementation itself can be phased, i.e. as each community achieves its prerequisites, its "stewardship" would transition from NTIA to the that

community.

McTim: (22:12) That would certainly make it simpler it seems

jcurranarin: (22:13) There is no doubt that the entire stewardship transition proposal (including the implementation plans) must be submitted as one, and must be reviewed and accepted as a single transition plan. I believe that Paul is referring to the implementation that happens after the proposal is accepted by NTIA.

McTim: (22:14) that is my understanding as well

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (22:15) I fully support the concept of phased implementation post-NTIA approval of the single proposal (to include the ICANN accountability proposal).

Joseph Alhadeff: (22:15) Yes, clarification on Daniel's recent point, our work is finished with the approval of NTIA, A submission to NTIA.

jcurranarin: (22:16) Remember, once the single ICG IANA Stewardship transition proposal is provided to NTIA, it is likely to be several months for the USG (in all of its richness) to review and approve. It would be useful if implementation could move briskly once there is approval, and that should not require lockstep implementation plans.

Joseph Alhadeff: (22:16) my comment should read not just submission to NTIA...

Joseph Alhadeff: (22:18) Should we ask the communities for a clarification related to Jarri's question about what is sequential, parallel or non-dependent? I am not sure we should presume the ability to identify those elements correctly.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (22:19) As I mentioned above, I don't see NTIA terminating portions of the IANA Functions Agreement and keeping others. Of course, that will be up to NTIA, not the ICG or the operational communities. But if there are opportunities for implementation that can be accelerated for numbers, for example, after NTIA accepts/approves, I think that's very reasonable.

Daniel Karrenberg: (22:21) I forgot one important point So if there is time I request another turn of about 30-60s please.

Jari Arkko: (22:21) As one example of the kinds of parallel/independent processing that we can use, I believe _CCWG results are not required for IETF or RIRs to move forward.

jcurranarin: (22:21) Keith - Once the plan is submitted, a community should be able to take implementation steps that it sees as warranted in preparation for NTIA releasing its role.

Narelle Clark: (22:22) It is quite normal for new processes and systems to be implemented in phases. Even where there is a sunset date, prudent operation would include an approach that is phased. Is that something we should take IANA's advice on?

Jari Arkko: (22:22) I like John Curran's formulation. "Communities should be able to take implementation steps that they see as warranted, in preparation for NTIA releasing their role"

Jordan Carter (.nz): (22:22) The U.S. authorities won't be able to accept a proposal by 30 Sep, so there seems no chance of them allowing some parts of the contract to expire

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (22:23) Thanks John. It might be helpful if we could discuss a specific example for illustration. But in principle, I agree

that preparatory implementation work should be allowed to proceed.

jcurranarin: (22:23) If the IANA stewardship plan for a given set of IANA registries truly represents the affected community for those registries (e.g. IETF for the protocol parameter registries), then preparatory implementation steps, such as any MOU adjustments with ICANN, should be undertaken once the plan is submitted.

jcurranarin: (22:23) I think we are in "rough agreement"

McTim: (22:24) @Keith, CRISP is at: <https://www.nro.net/wp-content/uploads/ICG-RFP-Number-Resource-Proposal.html>

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (22:25) Referring to NTIA's recent blog (on the screen), they see the ICANN Accountability recommendation as a dependency for approval and transition and termination of the IANA functions contract.

McTim: (22:25) I can see several things that could be done starting soonish

Daniel Karrenberg: (22:25) John Currant typed the seesence of what I was saying earlier. In terms of negotiating the specification of the technical work one could already make progress before the final proposal is submitted, if one assumes that the same people will be doing the work afterwards and tif ICANN is prepared to do that.

McTim: (22:25) Service Level Agreement with the IANA Numbering Services Operator; and •Establishment of a Review Committee, with representatives from each RIR, to advise the NRO EC on the review of the IANA functions operator's performance and meeting of identified service levels.

McTim: (22:25) That was a quote from the CRISP paper

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (22:25) Thanks McTim

jcurranarin: (22:26) It might be important to emphasize "_preparatory_ implementation steps", i.e. that which can be relatively easily refreshed or updated if necessary due to any changes that come out of the USG review of the plan.

Lynn St.Amour: (22:26) @John and Keith, there is the rub -- there are differing views of the current relationship/responsibility of the USG to Numbers and PP communities...

McTim: (22:26) those 2 bullets are expanded further inthe CRISP proposal

Lynn St.Amour: (22:27) and then there is the issue of USG approval...

Jari Arkko: (22:27) I very much agree with John that the communities should be in charge of determining what steps are reasonable. One are of potential contention is whether this should begin at proposal submission or approval. There are arguments on both sides, but we for instance at the IETF have taken the position that we have and will improve our IANA arrangements on a continuous basis. A freeze on such improvements would be harmful to the stability of the system in the long term_. But we don't mind waiting for a few months. In general, I would trust the communities to in the best position to decide what can and should happen.

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (22:28) J-J and Daniel, old or new hands?

Jordan Carter (.nz): (22:28) Aren't these different questions to Paul's essential suggestion which seemed to be seeking the end of the contract in respect of numbers and protocols?

Daniel Karrenberg: (22:28) new hand, after paul

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (22:28) ack

Daniel Karrenberg: (22:29) j-j was before

Daniel Karrenberg: (22:29) i mean j-j was in *this* round
jcurranarin: (22:29) (Umm - USG Agencies have significant freedom in dropping items from existing Statements Of Work, i.e. there is a huge difference between changing/resoliciting a contract, and striking items from an SOW.)

Daniel Karrenberg: (22:30) my experience are similar to jcurran's statement rather than russmundy's

Sivasubramanian M: (22:36) What is the URL for the NTIA blog please?

jcurranarin: (22:37) Even with a Sept 30 NTIA submission, there is going to be several months for approval. The real question faced is whether or not we actually achieve any meaningful implementation transition, and how soon. Things will be rather challenging politically in the USG starting in January, and it might be prudent to have some of the implementaiton completed.

Yannis li: (22:37) @Siva, you may find the blog post at

<http://www.ntia.doc.gov/blog/2015/stakeholder-proposals-come-together-icann-meeting-argentina>

Alan Barrett (NRO): (22:37) <http://www.ntia.doc.gov/blog/2015/stakeholder-proposals-come-together-icann-meeting-argentina>

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (22:37) @Siva:

<http://www.ntia.doc.gov/blog/2015/stakeholder-proposals-come-together-icann-meeting-argentina>

Jari Arkko: (22:37) Once again I agree with John Curran.

Joseph Alhadeff: (22:37) I am not sure that we can say that the communities have sole determination of what can happen and when. I think that is the case for things within the community organization remit, but not anything that is dependent on other communities of contracts. In those cases there needs to be some community review or input. The question is how to put these phased plans forward. That was why i asked if we should ask the communities to provide input on what phased implementation would look like. Yes the communities shoud create the phased implementation plan, but interdependent parts need to be considered beyond the community.

Sivasubramanian M: (22:37) Thanks Yanis, Alan and JJS

Jari Arkko: (22:38) Agree with Joe that there are (obviously) interdependent parts. And some sequencing constraints. For instance, IETF would like to see SLA completed before NTIA actually removes the contract.

Joseph Alhadeff: (22:39) Jari - can you address the question of how we go about doing this?

Joseph Alhadeff: (22:41) A fragemented proposal would be seen by some as an even greater failure

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (22:41) My reference to NTIA's blog was in no way intended to shut down discussion or proposals from anyone. But it's rather important to understand their current position. That said, I fully support the concept of post-approval phased implementation as discused today, which in my view, is NOT in conflict with NTIA's blog.

Joseph Alhadeff: (22:42) While most may not be fully aware of our timeline, I think there is no great surprise that September was unlikely.

Lynn St.Amour: (22:43) I think we all agree on one combined proposal - can we definitively close on that? We are not talking about fragmmented or disjoint proposals.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (22:43) +1 Lynn

McTim: (22:43) +1 from me too!

Jari Arkko: (22:43) Agreed with Lynn

RussMundy: (22:43) Lynn: Yes, +1

Joseph Alhadeff: (22:44) Russ +1

McTim: (22:46) ""I recognize that some stakeholder groups have finalized their proposals and are anxious to move forward. But NTIA will only review a comprehensive plan that includes all elements, and we must let the multistakeholder process run its full course" is the operative bit of the NTIA post AFAIAC

Lynn St.Amour: (22:46) and we should trust the communities to understand the distinction between evolutionary business-as-usual improvements and those fundamentally changing current formal agreements

Joseph Alhadeff: (22:46) We ask the communities to provide the proposal for phased input, they can comment on the suggestions to suggest where dependencies or impediments might lie. Then we provide them as options to NTIA and they are addressed as part of the acceptance where they implicate contractual relationships.

Mohamed: (22:51) My understanding Manal, its ICANN implementation which is after the US Gov. approving the proposal and its sign off to ICANN to proceed to the implementation

Lynn St.Amour: (22:52) It will be important to recognize the community processes and the "real reach" both the USG and ICANN have in these community operational processes -- as it is not as "commonly understood" as some would have us believe

Paul Wilson: (22:53) I agree with Alissa on all 3 points.

Jari Arkko: (22:54) That's a good list of 3 items. I also think that we should make the actual implementation sequencing a responsibility of the communities. (respecting real-world constraints and inter-dependencies, of course)

McTim: (22:54) they seem obvious to me as well

Mohamed: (22:54) point 3, gives ICANN and the communities time to consider the implementation at an early stage when the proposal is finalized/submitted

Joseph Alhadeff: (22:55) Lynn, I don't disagree, but this is not as solely determined by the Community, solo but by the communities writ large who may have a different point of view on dependencies/interactions may need to have a way to be heard.

Lynn St.Amour: (22:55) @Jari +1

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (22:55) I support Alissa's summary.

Daniel Karrenberg: (22:55) alissa summarised well

Alan Barrett (NRO): (22:55) good summary

jcurrenarin: (22:55) Good points. I believe that the only really that the ICG needs to discuss implementation is to avoid having those reading the proposal bring different assumptions to mind in their reading of the plan.

Daniel Karrenberg: (22:57) while icg's role ends when we have submitted our plan that document describes what is going to happen afterwards. so we need to make a plan that *allows* for a staged implementation if we agree that this is best

Daniel Karrenberg: (22:58) and, as john says, our plan should be somewhat

explicit about this possibility.

Mohamed: (22:58) Paul explained why Sept. deadline, the summarized points covers the agreement on the phased approach suggested

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (22:59) + Daniel, I support including a reference to allowing staged preparatory implementation post-approval.

Joseph Alhadeff: (23:00) Patrick my hand has been up for a while...

Mohamed: (23:00) +1, Daniel and Kieth for including a reference our ICG preference of a phased implementation approach

Yannis li: (23:00) @Joe, your hand raised has been noted

Lynn St.Amour: (23:05) I think we need to come back on Martin's last point - at another point in the agenda?

Lynn St.Amour: (23:05) It seems important to get that clear given we are so far into this discussion already :-)

jcurrenarin: (23:06) Each community probably needs to make clear i to the others of the preparatory implementation steps that they propose to undertake.

Yannis li: (23:07) Dear all, we will go for lunch now and the meeting will be reconvened at 1pm (local time)

Daniel Karrenberg: (23:07) one observer can have my food ;-)

Paul Wilson: (23:07) If there is lunch available for me, please donate it to an observer. :-)

jcurrenarin: (23:08) We need to have a Buffet/Luncheon Transmission Protocol (BLT-P) ;-)

McTim: (23:08) Specified Lunch Transfer Service?

McTim: (23:08) Specified Lunch RIGHTS Transfer Service?

McTim: (23:09) The acronym for Specified Lunch Transfer Service could be SLUTS!

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (23:44) We should digitize the food, put it on the web so that you can download it and print it on your own 3D-food-printer
Daniel!

Joseph Alhadeff: (23:53) I'm not sure the taste will translate, and feel sorry for you if it does :-)

James Gannon: (23:54) Was there any progress on the IoF chapter Patrik?

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (23:57) Yes James. We are starting a "special interest group" on IoF. The charter is currently under review by ISOC.

Yannis li: (23:57) @Remote participants, we are reconvening in 3mins time

Daniel Karrenberg: (23:59) thanks

jcurrenarin: (6/19/2015 00:00) good audio here (East Coast USA)

Mary Uduma: (00:01) I will be out for 30 minutes to check in at the Abuja Airport. Shall join back when I am done.

Joseph Alhadeff: (00:01) Remote participants are at their seats :-)

Milton Mueller: (00:01) prove it!

Mary Uduma: (00:01) I am a prove.

Yannis li: (00:01) Dear all, the meeting is starting now

Mary Uduma: (00:02) proof** @ Milton

Paul Wilson: (00:03) Audio is breaking up badly, pausing and echoing. Is that just me?

Paul Wilson: (00:04) i'll try the bridge.

Yannis li: (00:06) Does the others hear adobe ok?

Joseph Alhadeff: (00:06) Bridge is clear...

McTim: (00:06) adobe is fine for me

Daniel Karrenberg: (00:14) @joe: when we need comments and where as part of the *proposal*? we won't send that to NTIA, will we?

Daniel Karrenberg: (00:14) so it should be in the "website material".

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (00:15) Create an appendix?

RussMundy: (00:18) I'd be fine with an appendix providing as much process information as the ICG thinks is appropriate

Narelle Clark: (00:20) I would like to see the url material as appendices.

demi getschko: (00:21) +1 to RussMundy

RussMundy: (00:27) @Martin: I'm concerned that if the ICG tries to provide the "next steps" and these steps are not already in the OC proposal, the ICG may be "creating new material" which I think we've agreed that we would not do

Jari Arkko: (00:29) I think the text is fine. With headings properly nested we should be ok.

Daniel Karrenberg: (00:31) @joe: clear now, understand, agree

RussMundy: (00:33) +1 to Jon's comment - we need to give NTIA as useful an input as possible

Jari Arkko: (00:33) I think the crucial part in Larry's blog is that we should ensure the proposal explains how the three parts tie together, criteria are met, and the long-term institutionalisation is guaranteed. I don't think that necessarily ties into the USG FNOI and NOI processes.

Jari Arkko: (00:34) in other words, we should give NTIA useful material, but I think we know how to do that. just explain what larry was asking for.

Mohamed: (00:34) The secretariat will be a leading role in the final proposal finalization

Lynn St.Amour: (00:39) Jari: +1

Narelle Clark: (00:41) @Joe excellent point - it is really important to constrain the comment to specific pieces of the document we produce. Otherwise we will get lengthy pieces of text that make it very difficult to pull out the points required.

Mohamed: (00:45) I think Wolf-Ulrich proposal of a structure format (e.g form) its very useful

Joseph Alhadeff: (00:46) I have no problem providing with a free form space and someone may decide to put the entire comment in free form, but I think that providing spaces under topics is not overly constraining if we don't make it the only path.

Mohamed: (00:46) but not limiting input to it, we can accept comments in different forms (e.g email submitted comments)

Jari Arkko: (00:55) FWIW, I agree with Milton.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (00:56) @Milton +1. The purpose of Public Comment is just that, not to make our job easier.

Lynn St.Amour: (00:56) Milton +1, let's try and close on that!

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (00:59) Alissa : as indicated in a conference call, I volunteer to be in the team for the Introduction or Executive Summary of whatever it's going to be called.

Paul Wilson: (01:01) good point manal.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (01:04) @Narelle +1.

Mohamed: (01:19) +1 Russ

Mohamed: (01:20) when and how the CCWG issues in CWG proposal be flagged at early stage

Joseph Alhadeff: (01:36) @Kieth, can you take a guess at how much of the CWG proposal may be impacted by a failure of the accountability element for ICANN? And would that impact interoperability with the other proposals?

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (01:37) I believe the key points are clearly outlined in the CWG Transition proposal, so we can depend on that for reference. I'll have to take that as an action item, Joe, I'm not sure.

Milton Mueller: (01:37) Joe: all of it

Joseph Alhadeff: (01:38) That's what I was afraid of...

James Gannon: (01:39) Yes 100% of WS1

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (01:41) For the record, the DOTCOM Act Milton referenced has nothing to do with the .com TLD.

RussMundy: (01:42) good point, Keith, thanks for clarifying this

Milton Mueller: (01:44) Actually these complications surrounding CWG/CCWG make Paul's phased implementation idea look a lot more attractive, no?

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (01:44) Keith, this?

<http://dailysignal.com/2015/06/18/new-dotcom-act-addresses-short-term-concerns-about-the-icann-transition/>

Milton Mueller: (01:45) But the problem is, Will NTIA allow them to be decoupled?

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (01:46) While the CCWG Accountability work is complex, there is a tremendous amount of good quality work underway.

James Gannon: (01:46) HR.805 (DOTCOM Act) Was passed by full committee this morning, next step will bring it to the house for consideration.

James Gannon: (01:46) <https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/house-bill/805/all-actions>

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (01:46) @Patrik: Yes, that's the proposed legislation.

Yannis li: (01:49) We are having a break now until 3:15pm local time

Yannis li: (01:50) FYI. We are 30mins ahead of the agenda. The next item will be Time Frame Discussion

Paul Wilson: (01:51) I will take time off at this time. Hope to join the meeting for an hour or two, tomorrow afternoon (your time) from Santiago.

Yannis li: (01:52) noted Paul

demi getschko: (01:55) Thanks, Paul

Joseph Alhadeff: (02:09) I think we need to consider how to reflect the CWG CCWG dependency on the timeline in a better fashion and determine whether any further comments periods (either open or for the community (ies)) may need to be envisioned, even if only conditionally. Takes me back to if/then for/next loops :-)

Yannis li: (02:18) @remote participants, we will continue the break until 3:30pm (local time)

Mary Uduma: (02:18) About to take off, I am signing off. Will join again as soon as I have access.

Daniel Karrenberg: (02:18) Ah, had I known earlier! ;-)

James Gannon: (02:20) Lots of people just showed up in the ICG meeting so introductions all round hence delay I think =)

Mohamed: (02:24) For remote participants, the meeting will resume 15:30 (after 6 mins)

Yannis li: (02:30) @remote participants, we are resuming the meeting in a

min

Daniel Karrenberg: (02:30) Thu Jun 18 18:30:02 UTC 2015

Yannis li: (02:32) We are on the agenda item Time Fram Discussion now

Jordan Carter: (02:33) what happened to the -Accountability agenda item?

Yannis li: (02:33) That has been discussed before the break already

Mohamed: (02:34) @Jordan, we have finished the CCWG agenda item

Jordan Carter: (02:34) the update from CCWG? or did I misunderstand what it was about? Because I certainly heard no update

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (02:35) As the ICG liaisons to the CCWG, Kavouss and I gave an update before the break.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (02:35) The agenda item got moved up as we were ahead of schedule.

Jordan Carter: (02:37) I see

epg (elise): (02:40) Ditto to what Martin just said. Thank you.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (02:54) +1 Alissa....an informed and coordinated ballpark estimate.

Daniel Karrenberg: (02:54) "how long it will take to finalise the transition plan and implement it after it is approved"

Daniel Karrenberg: (02:56) hand is up

Yannis li: (02:56) @Daniel, your hand is noted

Joseph Alhadeff: (02:58) I have to drop off the call, but I was supporting Martin's first intervention. I think that it is imperative that we include more detail in the possible consitions that could extend our process especially in light of the linkage between CWG and CCWG. So perhaps this documents needs a preface fore than a box which provides more detail on the variables.

Alissa Cooper: (02:58) thanks Joe for joining

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (02:59) Thanks Joe!

Jari Arkko: (03:08) +10^6 to what Daniel is sayig. This is a key issue.

demi getschko: (03:09) Agree with Daniel re keeping the technical operation as it is now..

Joseph Alhadeff: (03:10) I'm reading only now (multitasking in another meeting ;-)

Jari Arkko: (03:12) I would like to propose that we close (and have closed) the issue about multiple public comment periods. I support the proposals made earlier that we go ahead with the optimistic model and prepare for various contingencies where the optimistic does not hold true.

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (03:12) +Demi, +Daniel: I agree. I am assuming no changes to the technical framework

Daniel Karrenberg: (03:15) Elise, can you pleasebe more specific about hte additional load on the IANA Team you expect from the transition?

Jari Arkko: (03:16) I support the proposal from Milton on paralleising legal advice, bylaws text creation, and the rest of the CWG/ICG process. (I might ask why this hasn't been done from day 1...)

Daniel Karrenberg: (03:18) We have to give a clear answer to NTIA otherwise there will be an implicit loss of confidence in the tranistion all around.

epg (elise): (03:18) Daniel - the Service Level Expectations that are being defined by the CWG will require changes in our systems, tools, reporting and therefore training

Daniel Karrenberg: (03:18) ok, that's what i feared. thanks.

Daniel Karrenberg: (03:19) last was @elise

Daniel Karrenberg: (03:20) personal: how can cwg get the idea of changing the pilots and the engines at the same time?

Joseph Alhadeff: (03:20) While in flight you mean? ;-)

Daniel Karrenberg: (03:21) in flight of course. or should we land the internet for maintenance?

Jordan Carter: (03:22) Elise: the SLE group have said they are simply defining requirements based on current performance, have they not?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (03:23) @Kavouss & Keith D about detailed draft: +1.

Jordan Carter: (03:24) from a CCWG point of view, I do not see how we can possibly get bylaws changes ready in time for our next draft proposal/public comment, given the timeframe we are facing for it -- but we'll be discussing the timetable in the CCWG tomorrow

epg (elise): (03:25) Jordan - yes the SLE group is defining measurements. My understanding is that there is an expectation that once the SLEs are defined they will be implemented. Please do not misunderstand me. It is good to refine the SLAs that we have today and define other SLEs that are desirable.

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member in CCWG): (03:26) I disagree with kavouss on this - the notion of the proposal proposing bylaws changes is perfectly legitimate, regardless of whether it's a formal part of the process these days or not

Jordan Carter (.nz, ccTLD member in CCWG): (03:27) Elise, ta. Agree. Look forward to understanding precisely where this is at after this week :)

Yannis li: (03:29) We will have a 10-min break now before wrapping up.

Yannis li: (03:29) The meeting will be reconvened at 4:40pm local time

Yannis li: (03:42) We will be resuming shortly

Daniel Karrenberg: (03:49) i'd like to be added to #3 too.

Patrik Fältström - SSAC: (03:50) Ok Daniel, noted

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (03:58) Here's the agenda for the CCWG Accountability meeting tomorrow:

<http://buenosaires53.icann.org/en/schedule/fri-ccwg-accountability>

Yannis li: (03:59) The meeting is now adjourned.

Yannis li: (04:00) The ICG working session Day 2 will start at 9am (local time) tomorrow at San Telmo.

Yannis li: (04:00) Thanks all for joining.