Welcome to the ICG F2F Meeting #7 Day 2. Please note that chat sessions are being archived and follow the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior:

Adobe sound now working thank you.

Adobe Connect...

we will relay that to the tech team. Thanks.

joseph alhadeff: I finally got in to adobe connect..

I want to understand better the timeline. If an additional public review is needed, will that happen before or after chartering organisation review? I.e., which is done first.

joseph alhadeff: @ KAvouss - the offer of providing the three models would be very helpful. Also a note of thanks to Keith and Kavouss for all of thier work and excellent reporting to us.

I strongly favour increasing ICANN SO/AC ability to discuss intersessionally, as soposed to adding new physical meetings. Or waiting for Marrakesh. As nice as that city is, I'd rather we be done with this before that.

Alissa Cooper: I believe the chartering org decision is the final step, after public comments

Milton Mueller: Our vast public following probably prefers it remain open

joseph alhadeff: It's before 5AM in DC so am very happy for you not to see my less than shining face :-)

Milton Mueller: Close up on Martin

joseph alhadeff: No you would see the caffeine IV...

On a more serious note, I am opposed to us submitting an incomplete proposal. The proposal is incomplete while CWG relies on CCWG and CCWG is in a state of disagreement. I would prefer we hibernate, revise via email and call timed for CCWG timeline. If all goes well, then that call will finalise and submit.

Manal Ismail: +1 to announcing where we stand, and what we consider the
final proposal pending CCWG dependencies..
J: Couldn't agree more with Martin
joseph alhadeff:+1 JJ
demi getschko: Agree with Martin and others about it is inappropiate to
us to send an incomplete proposal... ccwg and icg have both to send
complete proposals in this phase...
Keith Davidson ccNSO: We are required to provide a proposal, not a
partial proposal. It seems inapppropriate to doing anything other
than submitting a full proposal
Milton Mueller:+1 Jari
Milton Mueller: Release of public comments is something we need to do
Jari Arkko: and release of final version of the proposal (pending of
course possible future changes re: ccwg and cwg work, but it is important
to have a clear ending to our current discussion)
Milton Mueller: we can release public comments without the proposal
joseph alhadeff: If we publish the interim finding of where we are it's
the same as an informal submission to NTIA.
Milton Mueller: ???
Paul Wilson:+1 Daniel.
Jari Arkko: Daniel: that is correct - we are waiting for confirmation,
NOT changes. But what I meant was: we need to publish a document, and
consider it final, pending exceptional circumstances. The expection is
that we will get a confirmation and will move forward with the tiffinal
version of the document
joseph alhadeff: Daniel is exapling the concept of interim publication.
NTIA can take notice of whats in the proposal without formal submission
and provide feedback.
Paul Wilson: Regarding "completion" of our proposal, it seems strange to
say that the proposal will be "completed" when some external event
occurs, when that event has no effect on the proposal content.
Jari Arkko:+1 to interim publicaton
Paul Wilson: the proposal is complete when it its content is complete.
if we chose not to formally submit it until an expternal event happens,
then that's our choice.
Paul Wilson:+1 to publication when we regard the proposal as
"complete". irrespective of the state of CCWG discussions.
Jari Arkko:+1 to concluding public review comments, +1 to publishing
interim (likely final) version, +1 to not submitting yet for NTIA but
having a document out, +1 to setting an alarm clock and monitoring
external events.
Jennifer Chung:@ Everyone this scenario was shared on the CCWG list
here:
http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/accountability-cross-community/attachments/2
0151007/8b6e1418/ProjectManagement-scenariosv1.1-0001.pdf
Paul Wilson: Thanks Jennifer.
Jari Arkko: +1 to considering shorter public review periods
joseph alhadeff: @ Paul - "complete" subject to existing dependency - we
should not submit until complete absent a needed deadline and that should
be in consultation with NTIA.
Lynn St. Amour: Agree with what Alissa just summarized. For us to submit
a "final proposal" while the CCWG discussions are ongoing (and given the CWG dependencies) would not be understood by anyone not deeply involved in these processes. ie.those responsible for evaluating the proposal. A report of where we are coming out of this meeting would be helpful though.

Jari Arkko: but milton, i think the people who sent public comments, also deserve to see the edited result.

Jon Nevett: Milton +1

Keith Davidson ccNSO:+1 Milton. It either is, or isn't a proposal. It is not a proposal until it is complete. Strickling has already made it abundantly clear that there is a need for a single, complete proposal

Joseph Alhadeff: What we are talking about in terms of interim publication is that we are allowing people to look at the latest version of the proposal where it is. That allows people to consider the document in process. It is not a suggestion of a final proposal, but a continuation of transparency. People are getting hung up on publish. It is assuring that the current version of the proposal is accessible.

Milton Mueller: Agree with Michael

Jari Arkko: joe, it is not only that. we have to communicate the status of the draft, and clearly state that we've done the edits we believe we needed to do based on the public review.

Jari Arkko: i think it definitely needs to be a part of the public comments analysis announcement.

Joseph Alhadeff: +1 Alissa - would strongly object to not making the document easily accessible.

Jari Arkko: it really needs to

Milton Mueller: why does it need to?

Lynn St.Amour: @Milton - transparency

Jon Nevett: No objection to posting a clean version of the current version of the document

Lynn St.Amour: we should reference it as the current draft

Keith Davidson ccNSO:+1 Lynn - it remains draft at this stage...

Jari Arkko: not just transparency. we actually do want to communicate where we are. and the honest explanation of that is that we have a proposal that is for now interim, but to our knowledge addresses all feedback placed on it, except the dependency to the accountability changes that affect 1/3 of the proposal

Milton Mueller: who is going to be referencing the proposal?

Milton Mueller: as for transparency, as Alissa noted, the documents are there

Milton Mueller: OI am not for hiding it, you just don't "release" it or "announce" it

Lynn St.Amour: @JArri, yes

Joseph Alhadeff: Milton - what if it was called a process update with a link to the revised proposal, with a clear statement of continued dependency?

Milton Mueller: A process update is OK with me. As long as the FRONT page of the proposal is clearly marked as incomplete and pending finalization

Jari Arkko: lets not try to confuse the role of the document too much.
it is an interim proposal, believed to be ready in all other respects except the dependency
joseph alhadeff:I think we are in agreement then...
Milton Mueller:I don't think you folks realize how many documents are floating around out there in multiple versions and how confusing this is to people
Milton Mueller: even people closely following the process
Jon Neveett: seems like we have consensus to announce a current snapshot of where we are
Jari Arkko: we may be in agreement, but I would suggest being very clear on the nature of the incompleteness: be specific. This is not a random update of the proposal from the ICG. It is a proposal that the ICG believes addresses all community feedback and work to date, except the dependency to CCWG work.
joseph alhadeff: Perhaps this should be apart of our report from the Dublin meeting... Attached please find... Summary Doc, current version of proposal awaiting finalization of dependencies...
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Lynn +1, "hibernation" should be avoided.
Jari Arkko: +1 to no hibernation word
Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: QLynn: fully agreed
joseph alhadeff: +1 no hibernation, thinking this over sleeping bears when awoken are of poor demeanor...
Milton Mueller: right now I am in favor of "hibernating" ;-) 
joseph alhadeff: ICANN Board should be commenting in real time as all others, they should not be waiting for the final proposal to comment.
Alissa Cooper: I think we are good on that front, we got constructive comments from them in the public comment period. Re implementation plan, in particular.

Jennifer Chung: @Everyone, here is the link to v4 on the dropbox https://www.dropbox.com/s/ltikwpkv58j4zb5/IANA-transition-proposal-v4.docx?dl=0
Jennifer Chung: We are now discussing paragraph 2 on page 9.
Jari Arkko: a one sentence addition to exec summary on OCs co-operating might be good.
Alan Barrett (NRO): in para 03, "is comprised of" should be "is composed of"
Patrik Fältström: This is a good proposal from Joe Lynn St. Amour: good idea Joe...
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Joseph +1 on the usefulness of summarizing the different parts, up front.
joseph alhadeff: call it how we got here...
Jennifer Chung: @Everyone, the current discussion is on paragraphs 55-58, page 22-23 in the document
Patrik Fältström: I think para 02 should be new section "Background" which includes todays 02 plus the two paragraphs Joe refer to.
Alissa Cooper: which two paragraphs? that is what I am missing.
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Agree with Patrik on having 1) Introduction, 2) Background, 3)...
Russ Mundy-SSAC: the one piece of public comments statements the I think should remain in the Exec Sum is the % that support the proposal
joseph alhadeff: @alissa - thanks covers it.
joseph alhadeff: @ russ - maybe we can put that in process section related to meeting the NTIA requirements?
Yannis Li: We will have a 30min break now until 11:10am local time.
Lynn St.Amour: One final comment - should we move the ICG Recommendation paragraph to after the items to be completed not just before.
Yannis Li: We will be resuming shortly
Jennifer Chung: @Everyone we have resumed and are now discussing this email
http://mm.ianacg.org/pipermail/internal-cg_ianacg.org/2015-October/001932.html
Yannis Li: We are currently on the agenda item Transition Proposal Discussion
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Joseph +1 about web of relationships AND PROCESSES...
Alan Barrett (NRO): Should we add some date? date Postel started performing IANA function, date of the ISI contract, date of the ICANN contract?
joseph alhadeff: @Patrick - perhaps we can address the concern of Kavouss in a footnote explaining that in ICG discussions these include Operational Communities which are further defined in... otherwise it would interrupt the flow. But Kavouss is right, absent that anchor people might think we are discussing something else...
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Russ M, something like "...shared resources (generally managed by Internet Registries)..." ?
Alissa Cooper: "(including operational communities as described in sub-section III below)"
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Alissa, as the person who brought up the question about "others than OCs", I can accept your proposed amendment.
joseph alhadeff: Jenifer
joseph alhadeff: Jenifer, can we substitute the cleaner charts into the summary doc if that hasn't been done already?
Jennifer Chung: @Joseph - absolutely, I'll switch them out on the latest version and upload to dropbox. I'll project the new version for discussion as well.
joseph alhadeff: @Alissa - will you be asking for real time input from the audience on our role?
Jari Arkko: +1 to daniel. I would suggest that we just say "We will remain in existence until Sept 2016, but obviously most of the work is on implementation, by the OCs."
Lynn St.Amour: I like Daniel's approach as well
Lynn St.Amour: and +1 to Jari's comment
Lynn St.Amour: and +1 to Paul's comments.
Narelle Clark: Where is the slide deck? I can't find it under 'slide decks' on drop box...
Narelle Clark: @Daniel - to your point on asking at the public forum about any future role of the ICG, we should flag what we had consensus on.
Narelle Clark: And that is that we are open to a further role, and are
open to input or even direction from the community.
Narelle Clark: Particularly viz a viz for implementation and its
co-ordination.
Jennifer Chung: @Narelle, I have uploaded the current slide deck to the
subfolder now, it can be found here:
https://www.dropbox.com/s/oom3e9v54gdyv5s/ICG-ICANN54-v2.pdf?dl=0
Narelle Clark: Thanks Jennifer
Narelle Clark: @Alissa, all, I agree with "WE HAVE FAIRLY GOOD
AGREEMENT
THAT THE INITIATIVE FOR US DOING ANYTHING SHOULD COME FROM
THE
COMMUNITIES. " but the better word might be ‘impetus’
Lynn St. Amour: further refine
Jari Arkko: my opinion: i’d prefer to? present it but add some words to
explain the context. but i’m also fine with JJ’s words.
Alan Barrett (NRO): I’d like to see "oppose" divided into "oppose the
total idea" versus "support the idea, but oppose this proposal".
Support can also be subdivided into "support it all", "support most of it
but with some criticism", etc
Lynn St. Amour: @Alan, agree and/or "support with some conditionality"
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Alissa, I like the proposal you just made.
Joseph Alhadeff: @Daniel - by opposing the diagram, you are not
opposing the paragraph JJ suggested?
Narelle Clark: Re the graphics - in my experience, people like to see
concrete signs of analysis, and tallies say this. It needs a bit more
granularity than this to be truly meaningful. But this is a fair bit of
work if not already done.
Daniel Karrenberg: option 1
Joseph Alhadeff: @Alissa I can hum for either...
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: @Alissa, the pie should include the following
slices: agree with Transition Plan; agree with Plan, with questions or
reservations; disagree with the very idea of Transition; agree with
Transition but against this Plan.
Narelle Clark: My statement says option 1 but that is a fair bit of
work. Who has the time?
Lynn St. Amour: I guess my deadline just moved...
Joseph Alhadeff: @ Alissa:
Joseph Alhadeff: @Alissa: can we ask folks to send any comments they
have on the summary document so we can improve it before Thursday???
Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Jennifer, could you look at my proposal (above)
on Alissa’s suggested new pie?
Joseph Alhadeff: Also there are some summary elements missing can folks
see if they had covered those issues in LA and provide us some text?
Narelle Clark: JJS It also needs an ‘unrelated answer’ or better
category for the - shall we say - absurd one(s).
Narelle Clark: Bye all
Daniel Karrenberg: bye
Yannis Li: Thanks everyone for joining. The ICG F2F meeting #7 Day 2 is
now concluded