

## **ICG Meeting #4 – Day 1**

### **Friday 6 February 2015 09:00-17:00 SGT at ICANN52 | Singapore Chat transcript**

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (2/6/2015 08:30) Hello Scribes, Secretariat, Staff!

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (08:30) Hi Interpreters!

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (08:31) I'll raise my hand to see if that function works.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (08:31) seems to.

Yannis li: (08:32) Welcome to the ICG face-to-face meeting # 4! 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: (08:33) Staff, could you please enable my laptop microphone for a try?

Benny /Nordreg: (08:42) yes

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (08:42) Thanks.

demi getschko: (08:52) Hi everybody!... Will try to follow the meeting as long as could - almost mid-night here in São Paulo.

Alissa Cooper: (08:56) could I test my audio too?

demi getschko: (08:57) Some for me, please

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (08:58) (There's an echo on Alissa's audio)

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (08:58) Yes Demi

demi getschko: (08:58) Thanks you!

Alissa Cooper: (08:59) no video this time I guess

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (09:02) yes Lynn

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (09:02) (and hear you typing)

Lynn St.Amour: (09:02) thank you Jean-Jacque

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (09:10) @Patrik: I intend to attend the whole meeting (it's only 02:10 here ;-))

demi getschko: (09:10) (no audio now. - at least for me)

Josh Baulch: (09:11) At Demi - you should hear audio ..

demi getschko: (09:13) now it is back!

Jennifer Chung: (09:21) All, the link to the live scribe text is here:

<https://www.streamtext.net/player?event=Olivia-7Feb15>

Lynn St.Amour: (09:24) Thank you Patrik!

Lynn St.Amour: (09:25) It is not easy for many of us to comment/volunteer others if they are not ready/willing to present earlier.

Alissa Cooper: (09:26) we could do timeline first and then maybe jari will be ready?

Jennifer Chung: (09:27) The minutes have been unsynced for your review, you may scroll through.

Sivasubramanian M: (09:29) Hello Lynn, you are not in Singapore?

RoomOp(David): (09:35) Please mute microphones if you're not speaking...

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (09:35) (There's an echo on Patrik's audio)

demi getschko: (09:35) (some echo...)

demi getschko: (09:36) ok now!

Alissa Cooper: (09:45) would help to show the flow chart that the CWG has created  
Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (09:51) +1 Joseph...the output of the CCWG Accountability  
\*could\* have impacts on the recommendations of all 3 operational communities.

Jennifer Chung: (09:51) All, the flowchart currently projected is also available here:  
<https://www.dropbox.com/s/b4nfxqar1b3vl8j/Link%20with%20CCWG%20Accountability.pdf?dl=0>

Alissa Cooper: (09:52) +1 Milton

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (09:53) The CWG and CCWG will need to work together to ensure the CWG and the CCWG Work Stream 1 are in sync prior to the finalization of the CWG recommendation to the ICG. That's reflected in the latest timeline as projected.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (09:57) @Daniel +1 about the necessity for ICG to make a statement at the end of our meeting tomorrow, on the subject he just addressed.

Yannis li: (09:58) Timeline Graphic link is also at

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/tul206au2owf81t/TimelineGraphic-v6.xlsx?dl=0>

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (09:59) The CWG has communicated a revised timeline that, in the best-case scenario, allows for meeting the September 30, 2015 target date. We should be working toward delivering our work product based on that communication from the CWG. Unless and until we hear something different.

Sivasubramanian M: (10:06) After months, ICG hasn't stopped discussing the process to develop the process, about realignment of the flow of work etc.

Alissa Cooper: (10:06) Fair point re talking about the timeline tomorrow, although I think it's good that we have a little discussion today and return to it tomorrow

Milton Mueller: (10:07) yes, that's true but let's not get bogged down

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (10:19) @Keith +1

Lynn St.Amour: (10:19) I support Keith's position -- unless/until we hear something different from the CWG

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (10:20) +1 for coffee.... ;-)

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (10:20) CWG delivering is one of the conditionalities

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (10:21) And a second +1 for Keith :-)

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (10:24) @Narelle....the CWG has put out a new timeline which assumes a best-case scenario. It's aspirational at this time. There's a possibility it could slip for a number of reasons, including public comments, etc. My point is we have a new targeted timeline from the CWG that we should be referring to.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (10:26) But we must recognize that it could slip further. The key for the ICG now, to Alissa's point, is how we as the ICG complete our obligations and final consolidated recommendation based on the newly posted CWG timeline.

Alissa Cooper: (10:29) We could put out a statement of "what we know:" we're going to spend the next months of IETF+RIRs, and we will re-evaluate the rest when we receive the names proposal.

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (10:30) +1 Alissa

Yannis li: (10:56) The meeting will be reconvening in 5 mins

Yannis li: (11:06) The current draft parameter assessment form could be downloaded at  
<https://www.dropbox.com/s/poo5ah10lnx2wgs/individual-proposal-assessment-parameters-v05.docx?dl=0>

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (11:07) @Jari, yes I'm willing to continue.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (11:18) @Michael: good last question.

Milton Mueller: (11:24) The transcriber has changed Jari's identity into Russ Housely

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (11:30) @Daniel +1.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (11:32) @Daniel: I meant "agree with Daniel, we need to respond to IETF..."

Alissa Cooper: (11:33) RFC 2860, not 2826

Milton Mueller: (11:34) ok

James Bladel-GNSO: (11:37) <https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc2860>

James Bladel-GNSO: (11:37) In case others, like me, need to look it up.

Milton Mueller: (11:42) there are many references to a "contract" - what is the jurisdiction of this contract?

Alissa Cooper: (11:43) The current agreement does not specify a jurisdiction.

Milton Mueller: (11:46) very helpful intervention, Russ

Milton Mueller: (11:46) Alissa: can we fill this gap?

Alissa Cooper: (11:47) I can speak to it when my turn comes up.

Mohamed EL Bashir: (11:54) @Alissa, +1 - a set of Questions or clarification points to be sent to protocol community to get an official response

Milton Mueller: (11:55) an unspecified jurisdiction is not an answer

Milton Mueller: (11:55) we will get a different answer if we make it clear that there has to be a real answer

Alissa Cooper: (11:56) I'm not sure how the existing answer is construed as "not real."

Milton Mueller: (11:57) simple. because it doesn't specify a jurisdiction, it avoids the question

Alissa Cooper: (11:58) I disagree, but you know that I think. ;) We didn't set a standard that said they had to write down the name of a country.

Milton Mueller: (11:59) we didn't say they needed to specify a country but there must be an answer which can be operationalized in a proposal and that provides a level of confidence that there is actually a path forward in the case of a dispute

Lynn St.Amour: (12:00) I don't understand why they need to be the same -- the IANA functions operator (rassuminf they all stay together) could have individual contracts with differing jurisdictions.

Alissa Cooper: (12:00) The consensus was that that confidence exists. But since this chat is kind of a side channel we should probably talk about it by voice instead.

Milton Mueller: (12:01) :-) it is archived and open! who could complain?

Lynn St.Amour: (12:02) Milton's restatement is more helpful than the earlier formation: "we didn't say they needed to specify a country but there must be an answer which can be operationalized in a proposal and that provides a level of confidence that there is actually a path forward in the case of a dispute?

Lynn St.Amour: (12:03) Can we focus on his restatement?

Mohamed EL Bashir: (12:04) Its will provide clarity and sets expectations

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (12:05) I like Joseph's term, "Ecosystem of Obligations." It will be up to the ICG to ensure that ecosystem is healthy, sustainable and non-conflicted...once we receive all 3 operational community proposals.

Milton Mueller: (12:13) Russ M: can you provide a link to the SSAC report 68 and 69? doesn't pop up for me on search engines?

Alissa Cooper: (12:14) <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-069-en.pdf>

Alissa Cooper: (12:14) <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-068-en.pdf>

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:17) And thanks Daniel for answering my question.

Milton Mueller: (12:22) I will formulate some questions. We need not do it here on the fly

Milton Mueller: (12:23) the questions can be vetted on the list

Milton Mueller: (12:24) Alissa, the "whims of Congressman" phrase is not helpful. Even NTIA has said that we need to make sure our proposal meets "stress tests"

Narelle: (12:27) Can the questions come from the assessment team? Or another working group?

Alissa Cooper: (12:27) agreed that we need to be responsive to the criteria we've all been given, which come from NTIA

Alissa Cooper: (12:27) I think we should all iterate on potential question(s) and come back to them later/tomorrow

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:28) But Milton, I agree with Alissa on another aspect: our duty is to transmit a plan to NTIA, not to the US Congress. It follows therefore that we do not need to, nor should we, anticipate or try to accommodate any "whims".

Mohamed EL Bashir: (12:30) The proposal assessment group could initiate the questions list, which will be circulated to ICG for review and update ( if needed ), then to be submitted to the OC

Yannis li: (12:30) The meeing will be reconvened at 1:30pm

Yannis li: (13:36) Meeting started and on the agenda of Numbers Proposal

Sivasubramanian M - in room: (13:45) Q: RIRs do not have / visualize a participative / supportive role or visualize a post-transiton role in IANA functions operations?

Elise Gerich: (13:55) Here is the existing MOU between ICANN and the RIRs - <http://archive.icann.org/en/aso/aso-mou-29oct04.htm>

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (14:10) @Wolf-Ulrich "outisde of the current incumbents...", interesting formulation/question.

Sivasubramanian M - in room: (14:10) Going by the ASO MoU and other arrangements, If RIRs have a direct or indirect role/interface in IANA functions / ICANN already or visualized for post-transition, how could RIRs form a Review Committee of functions that they are a part of ?

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (14:14) In light of the ongoing conversatoin, I think it's helpful to consider two levels of accountability... "Big A" Accountability of ICANN/IANA to the entire community in light of NTIA's disengagement, i.e. replacing the USG's historic backstop role. And "little a" accountability that is the operational accountability of IANA to its direct customers and indirectly impacted parties. The ICG is responsible for compiling the recommendation for "little a" operational accountability to NTIA. The CCWG Accountability is responsible for delivering the "Big A" Accountability recommendation to the ICANN Board. There may very well be overlap between the two, so it's reasonable to expect there could be opportunities for the ICG and CCWG to interact to ensure no conflict or unnecessary duplication of functions.

Sivasubramanian M - in room: (14:15) Two layers of accountablity Big A and small a is good.

Sivasubramanian M - in room: (14:15) That makes it possible for RIRs to have a Review Committee or even do the same embracing the CSC as proposed by Registries

Sivasubramanian M - in room: (14:16) that would be the small a, that guarantees operational integrity

Sivasubramanian M - in room: (14:17) Which leaves the question of how the Big A oversight is to be constituted.

Sivasubramanian M - in room: (14:27) There could also be more than two layers of Accountability.

Sivasubramanian M - in room: (14:39) What are the five different accountability mechanisms that Lars-Johann was talking about? At RSSAC?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (14:55) DE-STRUCTURING

Yannis li: (14:58) Meeting will be reconvened at 3:30pm after the coffee break

Yannis li: (15:34) The meeting is resumed now

Keith Drazek (gTLD Registries): (15:35) FYI, I will need to depart today's session at 1600 local time to attend a conflicting meeting in my capacity as RySG Chair.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (16:10) Patrik, can hear you.

RoomOp(David): (16:10) Yes, it is capturing audio

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (16:12) Jari's audio breaking up...

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (16:12) Alissa's audio very clear.

Lynn St.Amour: (16:12) @Alissa - loud and clear

Lynn St.Amour: (16:13) and +1 to prioritizing any possible questions for the Parameters and numbers proposals

Lynn St.Amour: (16:15) Those ICG members that seem to have questions - it would be really helpful to try and frame them as questions.

Alissa Cooper: (16:20) if a group is going to stay in the room and use the microphones, it would be helpful to tell the remote people

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (16:21) Patrik & All: I've been on this call since 02 a.m. and it's now 09:20 my time. When Patrik call this general session to a close, I'll be signing off for today.

Alissa Cooper: (16:22) a true hero!

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (16:22) @Alissa, I missed a few minutes of audio, what's coming up just now?

Alissa Cooper: (16:23) discussing agenda for tomorrow

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (16:23) thanks Alissa.

Lynn St.Amour: (16:24) I also cannot stay on past our scheduled time (no matter how much I might like to :-). It is nearly 3:30 AM here now.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (16:25) @Patrik: I'm signing off, as soon as you call the current general session to a close.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (16:28) Thanks all!

Lynn St.Amour: (16:30) Thank you Patrik, all!

Yannis li: (16:30) For remote participation, the formal ICG working session is adjourned now.

Yannis li: (16:31) The informal working session will be reconvened at 17:00 until 19:00 SGT

Yannis li: (16:31) There will be 30 mins break now.

Alissa Cooper: (16:36) 30 mins? or 5 mins?

Alissa Cooper: (16:41) something is wrong with jari's mic

Alissa Cooper: (16:41) ton of buzz on the audio

Yannis li: (16:42) Is it still the case now?

Alissa Cooper: (16:42) yes

Alissa Cooper: (16:42) maybe he could switch mics

Alissa Cooper: (16:42) it's really bad

Yannis li: (16:42) Let me check with the tech team

Alissa Cooper: (16:43) it was happening a bit before too

Alissa Cooper: (16:43) oh it's happenning for everyone

Alissa Cooper: (16:43) not just a problem with jari's mic

Alissa Cooper: (16:45) getting worse

Yannis li: (16:45) Tech team is workingon it

Alissa Cooper: (16:45) thx

Audio: (16:45) Working on audio issues

Alissa Cooper: (16:46) fixed. thanks~

Alissa Cooper: (16:46) !

Alissa Cooper: (16:53) problems again

Audio: (16:54) continuing to have audio problems.

Yannis li: (17:26) The session is closed now. Thanks all for participating