

ICG F2F Meeting #7 – Friday 23 October 2015
ICANN Dublin – 09:00-17:00 UTC+1
Chat Transcript

Yannis Ii: (10/23/2015 09:00) Welcome to the ICG F2F Meeting #7 Day 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>

Daniel Karrenberg: (09:03) for the record: I *like* Alissa's

suggestion. ;-);-);-) It means I could get some research done today.

kavouss arasteh: (09:04) The names portion of this proposal is subject to confirmation from CWG to indicate that ICANN-level accountability mechanisms currently under development in the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability (CCWG). Before sending this proposal to the NTIA via the ICANN Board, the ICG will seek confirmation from the CWG that its requirements have been met.

Jennifer Chung: (09:13) @Everyone, the document is available on dropbox here:

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/jiy4gat7nv0amyp/Public%20Comment%20Summary%20-%2023Oct15jha.docx?dl=0>

023Oct15jha.docx?dl=0

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (09:24) agree to Manal that "harder" is just quoting the comment

Lynn St.Amour: (09:26) Joe's email: Dependencies: A number of comments highlighted concerns that there were issues external to the Transition Proposal that could impact the proposal - collectively these were referred to as Dependencies. Four main dependencies were highlighted. A small minority of comments were concerned that all of the parallel accountability work in the CCWG needed to be concluded before the proposal was finalized. Another small minority of comments highlighted the importance of resolving the RZM as essential to finalizing the proposal. The two most prevalent dependencies highlighted, though still an overall minority of comments, focused on the need to resolve the outstanding issues related to IANA IPR as well as the need to finalize the accountability external dependency issues of the Names proposal. A number of comments on the dependency on the Names proposal, did not raise

issue with substance, but rather a concern that the proposal could not be considered complete without CWG assurance that there were no

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (09:27) "harder" could be replaced by "more difficult" or "more complicated" but this doesn't change anything; so I prefer to leave it as is

Daniel Karrenberg: (09:28) that is the correct one

Keith Drazek 2: (09:31) Apologies but I will have to attend parts of a parallel meeting today, so I will be popping in and out of today's ICG session. I'm now on the GNSO Council and they have a full day of meetings today.

Milton Mueller: (09:32) Joe isn't there a law against driving and transitioning at the same time?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (09:32) I'll have to work similar to Keith, sorry
Lynn St.Amour: (09:33) @Keith, congratulations! ?
Keith Drazek 2: (09:33) Thanks Lynn...the question mark is appropriate I think!
Lynn St.Amour: (09:33) Only the good get assigned :-)
Paul Wilson: (09:34) counted -> considered
Paul Wilson: (09:34) +1
Paul Wilson: (09:35) ok to delete
Milton Mueller: (09:36) agree to delete
Keith Davidson ccNSO: (09:37) Hi all
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (09:39) @Martin +1, remove "flatly".
Daniel Karrenberg: (09:39) okok, lets get rid of the flatly, even though Martin quite correctly read the subtext here. ;-)
Alissa Cooper: (09:45) I do not think we should cite the public forum statement. we should stick as closely as possible to this document being a summary of comments.
Daniel Karrenberg: (09:46) +1 to alissaa
Mohamed: (09:46) I think the broad community support has been demonstrated via by the summary of comments and OC proposal process
Milton Mueller: (09:46) agree with Alissa
Milton Mueller: (09:48) agree with Alissa that some of the subsections lack an overall assessment of the thrust of the public comments
Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (09:49) @Alissa +1
Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (09:49) (And Demi's comment too!
Daniel Karrenberg: (09:51) i have to handle an operational interrupt for a while, so i will step away for about 20 minutes
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (09:53) @Milton +1, something like: "A first remark needs to be made: whatever their more detailed comments, supportive or critical, an overwhelming majority of commenters stated their belief in the value of the Multi-Stakeholder Model".
Narelle Clark: (09:54) I am opposed to the use of percentages or tallies in these parts of the comment analysis as it gives inappropriate significance to the number. Any tally of submissions is not a one to one correspondence with the true quantity of persons or organisations as there are aggregated submissions (ie submissions representing more than one person or organisation).
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (10:00) @Martin, to take up your point, here's a modified proposal: "A first remark needs to be made: across almost all the comments received, the Multi-Stakeholder Model was not put into question, although there were a wide variety of views on the rationale for Transition, and the way to ensure its success".
Milton Mueller: (10:04) JJS: I think that's still a bit weak.
Narelle Clark: (10:04) I am okay with removing the ISOC reference. It isn't quite in context there anyway. If it was to be used, it should be cited as a guiding framework in the analysis.
Milton Mueller: (10:05) instead of "across all the comments received the MSM was not put into question" I would say something like: "Nearly all of the comments addressing the issue affirmed that the proposal was consistent with the MSM."
Milton Mueller: (10:05) or "consistent with and supportive of..."

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (10:06) @Milton & Martin: I agree with Milton's suggested change.

Narelle Clark: (10:07) Yes, there is a difference between "free speech and freedom of expression".

Narelle Clark: (10:08) Thank you Manal and Joe. This is a lot of effort.

Daniel Karrenberg: (10:08) i am back on

Narelle Clark: (10:10) A big yes, to this document being purely and simply a summary of what people contributed.

Narelle Clark: (10:12) TYPO on front page of proposal: "The names portion of this proposal is conditioned on ICANN-level" should be "conditional"

kavouss arasteh: (10:12) Alissa, I have a proposal for the chapeau of the proposal, The names portion of this proposal in regard with the ICANN-level accountability is subject to further coordination with CWG in regard with the works currently being finalized by the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability (CCWG). to confirm that CWG requirements have been met.. ICG will therefore seek confirmation from the CWG Before sending this proposal to the NTIA via the ICANN Board, the

Keith Drazek 2: (10:12) Agree with Alissa. Let's keep the focus on any remaining substantive issues or edits

Jennifer Chung: (10:13) @Everyone, the version we are projecting right now is available here:

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/04m9hwme4xc0isz/IANA-transition-proposal-v6.docx?dl=0>

Jennifer Chung: (10:13) We are currently on the agenda item "remaining transition proposal edits"

Narelle Clark: (10:14) "?"Conditioned

Narelle Clark: (10:14) Not conditional?

Narelle Clark: (10:17) Brilliant header, Lynn. [re spreadsheet]

Daniel Karrenberg: (10:18) 107 is fine with me.

Jennifer Chung: (10:18) @Everyone, the spreadsheet that Lynn just referred to can be found here:

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/51dwftu9jr00yhe/ICG%20Action%20Item%20Inventory%20-%20Final.xlsx?dl=0>

Daniel Karrenberg: (10:19) @milton: enable "track changes"

Daniel Karrenberg: (10:20) agree to not pull the additions into the exec summary.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (10:21) Secretariat @ Alissa: in the "Document Status" and throughout, please put capitals for the OCs: Names, Numbers, Protocol Parameters. Thanks.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (10:25) @Lynn +1, like "A brief reminder of the historic background is provided (add link)" ?

kavouss arasteh: (10:27) Alissa, pls consider adding an additional bullet to the list, Any other items arising from CCWG proposal WORK Stream 1 relating to transition

Lynn St.Amour: (10:28) @Milton +1

Lynn St.Amour: (10:28) to keeping section 7

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (10:28) @milton +1
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (10:28) @Milton & Lynn +1, retain.
Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (10:29) section 7 is important
Daniel Karrenberg: (10:29) nooooo problem
Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (10:33) 'Kavouss: not really happy with that
Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (10:33) It introduces unknown unknowns
Alissa Cooper: (10:37) Coordination of staffing of PTI including transfer of resources to PTI
Narelle Clark: (10:38) No. Sorry, "coordination" doesn't do it for me. I prefer the previous statement as PTI needs to be staffed. Whether it is with existing staff of ICANN remains to be seen.
Milton Mueller: (10:39) Elise I guess I missed the part of the meeting yesterday where the staffing of PTI was discussed, can you tell me what the issue was?
elise gerich: (10:39) or perhaps say "assigning appropriate staff and resources to PTI"
Narelle Clark: (10:39) @Elise - works for me
Narelle Clark: (10:40) @Milton - staff are autonomous beings and have choices.
Mary Uduma: (10:40) +1 @ Elise formulation.
RussMundy-SSAC: (10:41) I think that we should also move the current para "E. ICG Recommendation" (including the sub-paragraphs) to a new section VIII since it is the culmination of the proposal and the real bottom line
Milton Mueller: (10:41) @narelle: got it
Russ Housley: (10:42) I can live with the language that was coordinated with CWG Chairs
Narelle Clark: (10:42) @Alissa - without wanting to dial in to say this, there is a "No" to coordination from me.
Milton Mueller: (10:42) Kavouss is correct linguistically but "political" we may want to leave it alone
Narelle Clark: (10:43) @Alissa thank you.
Daniel Karrenberg: (10:43) no objection
Narelle Clark: (10:45) "Staffing and resourcing of PTI" works, but yes, accept that we cannot in principle quote CWG then change the wording. [Unless you use square brackets.]
Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (10:45) fully agree patrik
Jari Arkko: (10:45) +1 to Patrik
Jari Arkko: (10:45) +1 to keeping it as is if they don't want to change text
Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (10:46) @Paul +1
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (10:46) @Paul +1.
RussMundy-SSAC: (10:47) +1 yes, let Alissa work out the wording should be and if its not feasible, I would agree with deleting section VII
Patrik Fältström - ICG Co-chair: (10:47) Hmm....someone said that "This section, section VII, is not contentious"? ;-)
Daniel Karrenberg: (10:48) resourcing does not cover "transfer of resources" is important
Daniel Karrenberg: (10:48) shall i re-suggest to drop the whole section VII?

Daniel Karrenberg: (10:48) ;-) !
Narelle Clark: (10:49) @Patrik agree BUT it is essential that staff are respected, and are seen to be.
elise gerich: (10:49) Sounds like a plan to me, Daniel - re:section VII
Daniel Karrenberg: (10:51) +1 to russ.
Narelle Clark: (10:52) Yes re .arpa here also
Daniel Karrenberg: (10:54) .arpa solution is elegant and i agree with it
Jari Arkko: (10:54) I agree with JJ that we should ?????focus on more substantive questions.
Daniel Karrenberg: (10:55) lets get the substance done before we talk about form
Alan Barrett (NRO): (10:55) From my comments, th text in paragraph 069 may need discussion.
Milton Mueller: (10:56) I propose random capitalization throughout the document
Narelle Clark: (10:57) Have you ever read Winnie the Pooh? It's a Very Good Read.
Jari Arkko: (10:57) Lets put all editorial work to the secretariat/chairs/editors rather than spend any group time on that. As a participant in one of the OCs, I give you my full support in deciding how editorial issues are resolved, including Capitalization.
Russ Housley: (10:57) We cannot touch the words in the proposals from the Operational Communitiies
Narelle Clark: (10:57) @Yari +1
Jennifer Chung: (10:58) @Everyone, we are now taking a break until 11:30
Narelle Clark: (10:58) And given the time we have, I am happy to assist.
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (10:58) @Narelle & Milton: I'm glad to laugh along with you, but please think about non English native speakers... after all, that's a majority of the global Internet users... ;-)
Narelle Clark: (10:59) @JJS I agree with you re the form of capitalisation you are proposing. Remember, I write consumer documents for a living.
Milton Mueller: (11:04) I have read Winnie the Pooh although Winnie was Disneyfied recently and then I lost interest in him. I have also read Thomas the Tank Engine, who was a Very Useful Engine
Yannis li: (11:30) @everyone we are resuming the meeting now
Daniel Karrenberg: (11:31) While we are on sugested reading: Cyril Northcote Parkinson: "Parkinson's Law: The Pursuit of Progress" (London, John Murray, 1958)
Milton Mueller: (11:32) Daniel: Does it have pictures?
Daniel Karrenberg: (11:32) yes in fact it does, at least the issue i have on my shelf
Yannis li: (11:35) @everyone, the edits Daniel referring could be found at:
http://mm.ianacg.org/pipermail/internal-cg_ianacg.org/2015-October/002116.html
Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (11:35) that looks fine to me
Daniel Karrenberg: (11:37) further further reading: Harry Frankfurt: "On Bullshit." Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2005

Milton Mueller: (11:38) I have a well-used copy of "On Bullshit" in my living room!

Jennifer Chung: (11:39) @Everyone, the email that Mary is currently discussing can be found here

:http://mm.ianacg.org/pipermail/internal-cg_ianacg.org/2015-October/002135.html

Jennifer Chung: (11:39) The formatting has been lost on the archival version, so looking at the version in your inboxes or the one on screen may be easier

Milton Mueller: (11:40) I like the proposal

Alan Barrett (NRO): (11:47) para 66 in this version is what I referred to as 069 in my email last night. Numbering seems to depend on the software used to view the document.

Daniel Karrenberg: (11:50) fine with Kavouss' suggested edit to 68

Daniel Karrenberg: (11:54) i used "legacy" in 06 consciously to express "something that has been built over time and is valuable" but i could live with lynn's change if it is widely supported

Daniel Karrenberg: (11:54) has been built

Jari Arkko: (12:04) For what it is worth, I understand Elise's issue, but I would like to note that there are very important other things in this piece of text, and I would like to retain those. So let's not at least delete the paragraph.

Narelle Clark: (12:05) Agree with Jari.

Jari Arkko: (12:08) I don't object to upleveling ??????the language and saying resources, rather than the full list of details from CWG. However, the language would remain in the rest of the document. And, there are parts that are important, like the transfer of the registry information, and we should remain clear that those indeed are moved.

Narelle Clark: (12:09) How about: "They proposed that the existing IANA functions and necessary resources (processes, data and know how) be legally transferred to PTI. ICANN would then enter into a contract with PTI to act as the IANA Functions Operator (IFO) for the naming functions, including service level agreements for the naming functions.

Daniel Karrenberg: (12:09) am I the only one that is unsure what we decided about lynn's proposed edit to 06?

Milton Mueller: (12:09) Under the combined transition proposal the IANA functions operator would become a separate legal entity, PTI.

Daniel Karrenberg: (12:11) we should not duck that resources need to be transferred to PTI, why not just remove "staff" and move on.

Narelle Clark: (12:11) Under the combined transition proposal the IANA functions operator would become a separate legal entity, PTI, and be resourced appropriately.

Milton Mueller: (12:11) "The necessary resources would be transferred to PTI."

Milton Mueller: (12:11) done

Alan Barrett (NRO): (12:12) Under the combined transition proposal the NECESSARY resources, processes, data, and know-how associated with all of

the IANA functions currently covered by the NTIA contract would be legally transferred to PTI.

Milton Mueller: (12:12) The necessary resources would be transferred from ICANN to PTI.

Mohamed: (12:13) The necessary resources would be transferred from ICANN to PTI, which will be properly staffed and resources secured.

Narelle Clark: (12:13) Yes, Alan's works also.

elise gerich: (12:15) Many people do not react past the first two pages or get to the detail.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:15) @Mohamed +1, the word "resources" of course covers human resources.

Milton Mueller: (12:16) Under the combined transition proposal the IANA functions operator would become a separate legal entity, PTI, with the necessary staffing and resources.

Jari Arkko: (12:16) not that I usually want to refer to people as resources, but yes, "necessary resources" does cover all the necessary :-)

Jari Arkko: (12:16) "all associated resources"? might actually be a good formulation

Jari Arkko: (12:17) gets you away from a discussion of "what is necessary" (but you don't really need, say, databases or some other thing, as long as you can access it... I'd like PTI to have everything)

Alan Barrett (NRO): (12:17) The necessary resources would be legally transferred, and staff would be given the opportunity to transfer

Narelle Clark: (12:18) s/requisite/necessary

Jari Arkko: (12:18) why are we adding the word "staffing" again????

CW: (12:18) The IANA staff will need to be reassured that the transfer is without prejudice to their acquired rights, e.g. seniority and pension rights. CW

Narelle Clark: (12:19) @CW - indeed, but we as the ICG cannot guarantee that.

Narelle Clark: (12:20) The guarantee of such rights can only come from the management of ICANN and PTI via their respective boards. I would hope that principle is there.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:21) @CW and Narelle: IMHO, Christopher's proposal reaches a level of detail which goes beyond the ICG's remit, and beyond what Accountability has come up with so far...

Narelle Clark: (12:21) @ALan - No, you cannot @JJS agree. Not in our remit.

Jari Arkko: (12:25) I thought it was very clear

Jari Arkko: (12:25) let's not change that

Jari Arkko: (12:26) and it is the right way, because splitting them would likely be causing more organisation, more friction, less information flow

Lynn St.Amour: (12:26) Elise, each OC has clearly said they expect PTI to perform the IANA functions!

Jari Arkko: (12:26) what Alissa said. moving on...?

Daniel Karrenberg: (12:26) *as Alissa says*!

Jari Arkko: (12:26) I think it is clear

Lynn St.Amour: (12:27) It is clear.

Patrik Fältström - ICG Co-chair: (12:28) It is absolutely clear

Lynn St.Amour: (12:31) I like this paragraph now. Good suggestion Michael!

Milton Mueller: (12:31) =1 kavous

Lynn St.Amour: (12:31) +1 Kavouss
Milton Mueller: (12:31) +1
Mary Uduma: (12:31) +1 @ Kavouss
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:32) @Kavouss, Lynn, Mary +1.
Narelle Clark: (12:33) So 45mins?
Alissa Cooper: (12:33) yes
Milton Mueller: (12:34) Feed the Observers!
Narelle Clark: (12:34) Sorry, we ate all the dinner here. My kids were hungry.
Yannis li: (12:34) @everyone, we will have a lunch break now until 13:15 local time. Thanks
Yannis li: (13:21) @Remote Participants, we will be resuming shortly.
Narelle Clark: (13:21) Ack
Yannis li: (13:21) in 2 minutes.
Alissa Cooper: (13:26) long 2
Narelle Clark: (13:27) Four in Australian minutes
Jari Arkko: (13:31) for what it is wort,that works for me. But I would all occurrences of "would" to "will"
Patrik Fältström - ICG Co-chair: (13:31) Thanks Alan!
Alan Barrett (NRO): (13:31) Wow
Lynn St.Amour: (13:31) Great suggestion Alan.
Daniel Karrenberg: (13:32) excellent on both alan's words and the bullet points
Mary Uduma: (13:32) Thanks Alan.
Narelle Clark: (13:32) |Looks great.
sivasubramanian M: (13:33) could someone please confirm if the meeting will go on till 5 or end at 3 15?
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (13:34) @Siva: to the best of my knowledge, 15:15.
Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (13:36) I think that the wording is correct
Jari Arkko: (13:39) i agree with milton's wording
Narelle Clark: (13:42) I think Kavouss is appealing for my support here...
Alan Barrett (NRO): (13:42) There is no need to explicitly mention budget. It's included under "resources"
Daniel Karrenberg: (13:43) i was not going to point that following bullet out!
Jari Arkko: (13:45) this text looks good to me?
Alissa Cooper: (13:45) Based on information gained here at the meeting I would propose to replace the following (inaccurate) sentence in paragraph 96 of Part 0: ³The CWG understands that those relationships will be defined by a separate and parallel process coordinated by NTIA.² I would want to replace it with this, more accurate statement: ³ICANN and the NTIA have made it known that prior to the transition those relationships will be worked out through a contract between ICANN and Verisign.²
Russ Housley: (13:45) Milton's proposed language (with Alissa's friendly ammendment) seems fine ot me
Milton Mueller: (13:47) Three questions were asked about this at the ICANN public forum yesterday

Lynn St.Amour: (13:48) I think the additional text helps.

Narelle Clark: (13:48) Could there be an explicit reference to the place/date of that "made so known"?

Lynn St.Amour: (13:48) have agreed?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (13:49) Secretariat: I suggested "those relations to be specified by contract between ICANN and Verisign".

Milton Mueller: (13:50) "made it known" is actually more accurate than "agreed"

Lynn St.Amour: (13:53) Thanks Milton and Keith, I am fine with the text as is.

Milton Mueller: (13:53) There was almost 10 minutes of discussion by Fadi about the contract

Jennifer Chung: (13:55) @Jean-Jacques - may we confirm that your suggestion is regarding paragraph x027 the yellow highlighted text currently being projected?

Daniel Karrenberg: (13:56) I have a *real* real world interrupt and have to leave soon.

Daniel Karrenberg: (13:57) I wish to make two points before I go:

Lynn St.Amour: (13:57) sorry, thought we had closed on the yellow section

Lynn St.Amour: (13:57) I saw Russ Mundy nodding agreement...

elise gerich: (13:57) the CWG proposal and their response to the ICG inquiry said what the CWG was OK with. This sentence is really a point of additional information from outside of the formal communications ICG has received

Daniel Karrenberg: (14:00) 1.) In para X031 In what is now section VIII "ICG Recommendations" I proposed language. I am happy with Alan's revisions of that. I feel it should be short and to the point. I am happy to drop "unanimously" if that causes any discussion although I think it is very strong if we can agree on it.

Michael Niebel: (14:01) @Alissa +1

Daniel Karrenberg: (14:01) 2.) We should be careful to use our own "Guidelines for Decision Making" process to agree on the final text, and I trust our chair is planning to do just that.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (14:02) @Lynn's comments: maybe the term "public REVIEW" is too strong. I propose "public comment", so that if there are clauses which, under law, do not need to be made public, they will not be "reviewed".

Daniel Karrenberg: (14:02) I do not wish to interrupt the current discussion with those two points. However, I wish that they should be read into the record. So if one of you would do me the favour at the appropriate time I would buy them a beverage at a later time.

Lynn St.Amour: (14:03) JJ - I do not think there is any public comment planned -- or public review...

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (14:03) @Keith: the term "review" is in fact stronger than "comment"...

elise gerich: (14:04) @Keith - let's delete the word "input"

Lynn St.Amour: (14:05) agree we should not delete the entire sentence

Daniel Karrenberg: (14:06) i have to go. we are almost there. keep at it!

Keith Drazek: (14:07) Replace the word "input" with "consideration" or "feedback." Using the word "input" or "comment" is potentially misleading that there will be a public comment period in the ICANN sense.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (14:07) @Keith: I can go along with "consideration" or "feedback".

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (14:10) @Milton +1.

Mohamed: (14:10) Kieth proposal to remove "Input" seems a compromise/way forward

Milton Mueller: (14:11) but what about the short-term/long-term distinction?

Lynn St.Amour: (14:11) I would support feedback vs.input.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (14:11) In the ICANN context, "review" is connotated: it means a precise process. Here, "feedback" would be more appropriate.

Keith Drazek: (14:14) I agree with Milton here. Leave it at review for the current phase. Make a statement about community review for any future/renewal phases.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (14:18) Alissa & All, having heard you all, I propose "In line with the requirements of transparency, the agreement should be made available to the public prior to execution".

RussMundy-SSAC: (14:18) I think that two sentences would be better since these are two different issues

Jari Arkko: (14:24) FWIW, my disclaimer was a proposal on content. There could be some variants on editing it. We could also do a 2 paragraph version with first para on names second on the other two.

Lynn St.Amour: (14:25) delete "already" in 2nd para.

Lynn St.Amour: (14:25) it is duplicative...

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (14:27) "receive confirmation"

Narelle Clark: (14:27) 'requires'

Narelle Clark: (14:27) sorry - 'requires' ?

Jari Arkko: (14:27) ... require confirmation ... before...

Keith Drazek: (14:27) I suggested the word "secure" instead of seek earlier in the week. It's one word instead of two.

Keith Drazek: (14:28) instead of seek and obtain

Narelle Clark: (14:28) secure is good.

Jari Arkko: (14:29) I would suggest s/complete/complete and ready for implementation/

Mohamed: (14:29) +1 Kieth

Lynn St.Amour: (14:29) +1 to secure

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (14:29) @Keith +1, "secure".

Jari Arkko: (14:29) ... are complete, ready for implementation, and have no dependencies

RussMundy-SSAC: (14:31) @Jari: +1

Milton Mueller: (14:31) +1

RussMundy-SSAC: (14:31) good addition

Russ Housley: (14:31) +1

Jari Arkko: (14:32) lets be correct and say what we believe

Lynn St.Amour: (14:33) stop after dependencies

Lynn St.Amour: (14:35) this document is going into a process!

Jari Arkko: (14:36) I think it is good to be explicit, I like

clarifying that we have no CCWG or other dependency.
Lynn St.Amour: (14:37) fine. I like Kavouss' edit and can suport that.
Milton Mueller: (14:37) I think it's good to be explicit too, but the censors might not like the results if I am
Lynn St.Amour: (14:37) +1 to Kavouss
Milton Mueller: (14:49) +1 Jean-Jacques
Manal Ismail: (14:49) +1 Jean-Jacque
Mary Uduma: (14:50) +1 MM, MI and JJ
Alissa Cooper: (14:50) we already have consensus to remain consituted as a group
Milton Mueller: (14:50) I thought we did, too, but it builds team spirit
Alissa Cooper: (14:51) the question is if anyone is still asking for us to do anything proactively, rather than reactively to questions from others
Lynn St.Amour: (14:51) @Mllton :-)
Manal Ismail: (14:51) I believe the problem is with the term 'hibernate' ;) ..
Russ Housley: (14:51) Yes, I thought we already agreed to stay constituted as a group until NTIA approves the proposal or we reach the end of Sept. 2016
Milton Mueller: (14:52) zzzzz
Lynn St.Amour: (14:52) and not use the word hibernate
Manal Ismail: (14:52) @Milton exactly :) !!
Lynn St.Amour: (14:52) Time to move to finer points of our role going forward....
Milton Mueller: (14:52) yes
Manal Ismail: (14:52) agree Lynn
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (14:53) @Lynn, thank you, but the position we expressed is not trivial...
Mohamed: (14:53) if we not in hibernate, do we need to play an active role (e.g recieve implementation progress)
Milton Mueller: (14:53) I thought your articulation of the reasons was excellent, JJS
Lynn St.Amour: (14:54) JJ: never said it was trivial, but part of that was covering ground we had already agreed
Keith Davidson ccNSO: (14:54) I don't beleive a committee of 30 people will be helpful to the implementation!
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (14:54) @Mohamed, our role is to remain at the disposal of the NTIA, and our communties, until Transition is accepted.
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (14:55) @Milton, thanks.
demi getschko: (14:56) JJS +1
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (14:56) @Lynn: agreed, we will go to the finer points.
Keith Davidson ccNSO: (14:57) I am unable to use microphone, but agree with Martins comments. I feel confident that our role concludes with the delivery of the Proposal, and very concerned that a group of 30 "overseeing" implementation will impede implementation...
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (14:58) @Keith Davidson: the community I represent here does not consider itself as "impeding implementation".

Keith Davidson ccNSO: (14:58) I've made my point in chat
Keith Davidson ccNSO: (14:58) I dont have microphone !!!
Keith Davidson ccNSO: (14:58) Thanks Patrik
Russ Housley: (15:00) Implementation belongs to the Operation
Communities, but we are not at implementation yet. However, we already
agreed to stay constituted as a group to handle any questions that come
from NTIA as they do their evaluation.
Alan Barrett (NRO): (15:00) ... and to revise the proposal if necessary
Milton Mueller: (15:02) what is the definition of "accepted"?
Milton Mueller: (15:02) (by NTIA)
Russ Housley: (15:02) approved
Alan Barrett (NRO): (15:02) perhaps "approved" is a better term.
Mohamed: (15:03) +1, Lynn for a light wieght role on the proposal
implementation process, interfacing with ICANN/OC community
Jari Arkko: (15:03) implementation is more than what ICANN staff does
(although they are implicated in most implementation tasks).
Russ Housley: (15:04) Names has a long list of tasks; others will be
done with implementation quickly
kavouss arasteh: (15:05) Remained constituted with the current Charter
at lease until the transition is taken place 9 Proposal accepted by
NTIA) .After that ,should the retention of ICG felt to be necessary , it
requires modification of the existing charter or having a new Chater
Milton Mueller: (15:06) NTIA approval: likely but potentially endless
kavouss arasteh: (15:07) kavouss arasteh: Remained constituted with the
current Charter at lease until the transition is taken place (Proposal
accepted by NTIA) .After that ,should the retention of ICG felt to be
necessary , it requires modification of the existing charter or having a
new Chater
Milton Mueller: (15:07) Sept 2015: well-bounded but potentially not the
right time
Alan Barrett (NRO): (15:07) The NRO already has an implementation
tracking checklist.
<https://www.nro.net/nro-and-internet-governance/iana-oversight/checklist>
Russ Housley: (15:07) @Milton: Last month?
Milton Mueller: (15:08) eh. 2016 :-)
Milton Mueller: (15:08) End of ICANN-NTIA contract: potentially endless
also
Milton Mueller: (15:09) of those three, I go for Septem 2016
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (15:16) @Lynn & All: I'm afraid we cannot accept
the suggestion that we modify the composition of the ICG, for instance by
inviting its constituents to withdraw, and simply designate Liaisons.
Lynn St.Amour: (15:16) JJ - huh?? that was not my suggestion.
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (15:17) @Lynn, sorry if I misunderstood, but did
I hear you suggest that our communities designate "Liaisons" to work
alongside the OCs?
Lynn St.Amour: (15:17) No, will clarify
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (15:18) Thank you Lynn, and sorry if I
misunderstood.
Jari Arkko: (15:18) it may not be a surprise, but I am also concerned
about the mission statement. the ICG could observe that the this

particular piece in the CCWG is not in perfect sync yet with the scope of activities as outlined in the ICG proposal (and current reality). Hence an ICG comment to CCWG would be appropriate, IMHO.

Lynn St.Amour: (15:18) +1 to JAri's comments above and Milton's comments now

Jari Arkko: (15:19) consistency with the ICG proposal and real-world division of work is very important.

Lynn St.Amour: (15:19) + 1000 :-)

Narelle Clark: (15:20) @RussH - thank you for raising this. You have my support, and my support for an ICG communication to the CCWG in its activity to reframe the post transition ICANN bylaws.

RussMundy-SSAC: (15:20) absolutely agree with getting the mission statement right

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (15:21) Lynn: thanks for clarifying.

Keith Davidson ccNSO: (15:22) +1 Lynn

Manal Ismail: (15:23) +1 Lynn

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (15:26) @Patrik: that goes without saying, nothing new. Currently, that's what each one of us is with her/his community.

Yannis li: (15:26) @Remote Participants, we will resume at 15:40 local time.

Keith Davidson ccNSO: (15:43) Clap clap clap

Keith Davidson ccNSO: (15:43) Thank you very much secretariat ladies!

Keith Davidson ccNSO: (15:44) Thanks Patrik too !

Lynn St.Amour: (15:45) That is very good. Thank you!

Lynn St.Amour: (15:46) Such eloquence..

Jari Arkko: (15:47) I'm happy with this paragraph. I'm not the expert on this topic, but I wonder if "needs to and is expected to be in place" might be a slightly more positive framing of the same thing. Just an editorial suggestion. Just a suggestion, feel free to ignore.

Jari Arkko: (15:54) Looks very good to me, thank you! (And I still don't care about capitalization :-)

Keith Drazek 2: (15:56) I'd be fine iwth that edit Jari. I'd be fine with "must be in place." Means the same thing.

Alan Barrett (NRO): (15:57) As a result, matters relating to X, Y, Z, amongst other matters, have been clarified.

Milton Mueller: (15:57) must would be better, but "needs to be and is expected to be" is needlessly long and complicate

Milton Mueller: (15:57) d

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (15:57) @Lynn: yes, delete "already".

Jari Arkko: (15:59) i thought we had decided on this text (the one on screen)

RussMundy-SSAC: (15:59) @Alan: +1

Keith Drazek 2: (16:00) agreed milton

Milton Mueller: (16:00) agree with Lynn to delete "already"

Milton Mueller: (16:02) support Paul's amendment

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (16:02) @Paul +1: "Preparation for implementation..."

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (16:03) @Kavouss +1.

Keith Drazek 2: (16:04) Just a heads up: I sent an email summary update

on the CCWG Accountability to the email list.

J: (16:05) Very good summary, Keith. Thank you

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (16:06) I prefer Paul's amendment, "Preparation for implementation..."

Milton Mueller: (16:08) Exactly. If people are complaining that Numbers is implementing ultra vires we need to leave "Preparation for" in there

Mohamed: (16:08) i support leave "preperation"

Jari Arkko: (16:09) I think we can live with the "preparig implementation" wording.

Jari Arkko: (16:11) I propose a compromise: use "preparing implementation" wording, but include the explicit note about not having to wait for CCWG

Russ Housley: (16:16) We want to say that numbers and protocol parameters are done, and we are waiting for CCWG

Alan Barrett (NRO): (16:16) I don't think we need to say "no dependencies on the CCWG"/"not waiting for the CCWG" twice in the same paragraph.

Mohamed: (16:16) +1, Jari, the message might need to be restressed again .. the text is fine for me

Jari Arkko: (16:20) in any case, i'm happy with the stuff we have.. but i have to leave for the airport in a couple of minutes. thanks all, been an incredible journey! can't thank everyone enough. been a privilege to work with you all.

Paul Wilson: (16:20) +1 +1 +1

RussMundy-SSAC: (16:21) I hope that we have REACHED BORING :-)

Jari Arkko: (16:21) ok, i'm bored and out of here :-)

Milton Mueller: (16:21) We reached that early this morning

Milton Mueller: (16:21) we have gone beyond boring to enervating

Bobby: (16:21) So long Chuck....

elise gerich: (16:21) privilege working with all of you - Jari, are you really going to the airport or going skiing?

demi getschko: (16:22) Safe trip, Jari!

demi getschko: (16:28) An outstanding group! I'm proud to have been on this group. Special thanks to the Chairs and the Secretariat

Lynn St.Amour: (16:29) THANKS TO CHAIRS!!!

Keith Drazek 2: (16:30) Well done all!

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (16:31) good working with you all!

Mary Uduma: (16:32) G30 is really a great Group. Well Done.

Manal Ismail: (16:32) A Big Thank You to each and every one who have participated to the work of the ICG :) !!

Lynn St.Amour: (16:34) Kavouss, very well said!!

elise gerich: (16:37) Bye to all in the room and all who are remote!