

**ICG F2F Meeting #7 – Thursday 22 October 2015**  
**ICANN Dublin – 10:30-12:30 UTC+1**  
**Chat Transcript**

Jason Polis: (10/22/2015 09:32) Is ICG on at 9:30 or 10:30 ? as per the session info or the full schedule ?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (09:43) I too thought the ICG session was starting at 09:30 in Liffey B. I don't know...

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (09:43) Am presently in Liffey B.

Jennifer Chung: (09:50) @Everyone, the ICG session scheduled for 10:30-12:30 IST and will be starting in roughly 40 minutes time.

Narelle Clark: (09:51) @Jennifer Okay thanks. Wa following the ICANN 54 schedule. Silly me. :-)

Narelle Clark: (09:54) How's the weather in Dublin?

Daniel Karrenberg: (10:19) Weather Dublin: EIDW 220900Z 26016KT 9999 FEW017 BKN050 11/07 Q1016 NOSIG

Daniel Karrenberg: (10:22) 11 centigrade, humidity about 80%, quite sunny

Daniel Karrenberg: (10:28) the phone bridge still has music .....

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (10:31) Best wishes to Brewer & Darrenougue, long time no see!

Narelle Clark: (10:31) Raining in Sydney. Light drizzle. 17degC

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (10:32) Narelle, around 14° here...

Daniel Karrenberg: (10:32) i still hear music on the phone bridge .....

Daniel Karrenberg: (10:33) bridge seems active now

Yannis li: (10:34) Welcome to the ICG F2F Meeting #7 Day 3. 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>

ICANN Scribes 2: (10:34) The Scribes here in LA say thank you Jean-Jacques

Daniel Karrenberg: (10:35) are we talking about Public Comment Summary - 15Oct15-with-chart-JJS LSA?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (10:36) @Kavouss, yes that would be very useful, after the Public Comment Summary.

Jennifer Chung: (10:37) @Everyone, the document has been unsynced for your review

Lynn St.Amour: (10:41) Isteh document also in Dropbox? I cannot find it and it would be easier to read there.

Narelle Clark: (10:41) Yes, the new graphs are in the document.

joseph alhadef: (10:41) Lynn - your shoid be the latest...

Narelle Clark: (10:42) @Lynn It is in dropbox - pulic comment -> Summary Document

Narelle Clark: (10:42) You were the last to edit!

Lynn St.Amour: (10:42) ok, I thought they had pulled together another version. thanks!

Jennifer Chung: (10:42) @Everyone, this is the link to the version we are projecting  
<https://www.dropbox.com/s/rs09dpyuhkxxb3i/Public%20Comment%20Summary%20-%2015Oct15-with-chart-JJS%20LSA.docx?dl=0>

Alissa Cooper: (10:42) agree with Daniel, that sentence should be deleted

Alissa Cooper: (10:44) and generally there should be no forward-looking statements in this document

Lynn St.Amour: (10:44) I would support including responses received.

Lynn St.Amour: (10:44) That will be more helpful as a record.

Daniel Karrenberg: (10:48) agree with changing tenses of the words.

Narelle Clark: (10:48) @All - the summary of the public comment period \*must\* be a summary of the public comments and the process undertaken. ie no forward looking statements, and quotes where relevant and necessary.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (10:48) Secretariat: my proposed small change is for the chapter after the pies, starting with "Six volunteers of the ICG...", is for the last line on that page: read "In OTHER cases..." (instead of "some" a second time).

Jennifer Chung: (10:49) @Jean-Jacques, noted and apologies. We will ensure your suggested edit is added to the text.

joseph alhadeff: (10:50) LA may have seemed like it was several months ago, but it has not been that long :-)

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (10:51) @Jennifer, thanks.

Narelle Clark: (10:53) @Everyone, this is the link to the version we are projecting

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/rs09dpyuhkxxb3i/Public%20Comment%20Summary%20-%2015Oct15-with-chart-JJS%20LSA.docx?dl=0>

joseph alhadeff: (10:56) Milton is correct in terms of the improper changing of the sense of the word. JJ new formulation is fine.

Narelle Clark: (10:56) Re comments on jurisdiction: It could make reference to merely preserving the existing jurisdiction, and referring any future changes to jurisdiction to ICANN processes ie the CCWG Workstream 2.

Narelle Clark: (10:58) That the IANA stewardship transition process is merely taking the existing system and adding new processes according to the community specification to facilitate that transition, ie maintaining the status quo to the extent appropriate in that context.

Alissa Cooper: (10:58) fyi, in the proposal para 66 we say: "While there was some opposition to the proposal among commenters because it involves the US government releasing the IANA functions contract, a similar number of commenters opposed the proposal on the basis that ICANN and IANA should be subject to international law and jurisdiction. "

Narelle Clark: (10:59) @Alissa - brilliant. Please use that comment in this piece.

Narelle Clark: (11:00) @Joe - nice piece of description.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (11:04) @Kavouss +1, well summarized.

Kavouss Arasteh: (11:06) Hi everybody

joseph alhadeff: (11:06) A number of comments highlighted the issue of Jurisdiction as important. A minority objected to transition at all because they perceived that US was relinquishing jurisdiction. Another minority point of view raised concerns that the jurisdiction was not international or outside of the EU. Some comments also suggested that CCWG Workstream 2 might be a place to address some of the continued concerns about jurisdiction. The majority of comments did not find jurisdiction as a limiting factor to the proposal.

Alan Barrett (NRO): (11:06) A minority of commenters [percentage?] were opposed to the very notion of transition away from US government oversight,

and a similar-sized minority argued in favour of oversight by an international organization [such as ...]. However, the majority supported the transition from NTIA oversight to community oversight. [then talk about CCWG work stream 2]

joseph alhadeff: (11:07) sorr in my question not EU ,US...

Alissa Cooper: (11:07) could we just say that this will be discussed in the future? the point of this document is to summarize the comments, that is all.

Narelle Clark: (11:07) @Alan Nice and clear.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (11:08) @Alan, I would avoid a reference to any specific international treaty organization (your phrase "such as...").

joseph alhadeff: (11:09) The clarification that Kavouss and Keith raised was not vident in the comments.

Daniel Karrenberg: (11:11) should have been "MI6" ;- ) ;- ) ;- )

epg: (11:11) LOL

michael niebel: (11:13) Joe, you are right, the challenge is also that today we are in an advanced state of reflection as opposed to the state of play during th econsultation.

Lynn St.Amour: (11:14) At the time, MArtin leaped into the breech :- ) Thank you Martin!

Keith Drazek: (11:15) @Joe: "Jurisdiction" can mean different things to different people.

Jandyr Santos Jr: (11:16) I know the feeling, Joe!

Alissa Cooper: (11:16) agree with milton, we only need the comment summary here

Narelle Clark: (11:18) Milton I fear is correct with respect to the RZM piece being intended for the proposal... I suspect that needs a cross check.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (11:19) @Keith Drazek +1, good catch about "trustworthiness".

Keith Davidson ccNSO: (11:19) +1 Keith

Daniel Karrenberg: (11:19) +1 to keith, well spotted

Paul Wi: (11:20) A more ususal term would be around "confidence" in a process, if we need an alternative to "trustworthiness"

Jandyr Santos Jr: (11:20) Yes, Keith. "Jurisdiction" can mean different things to different people. But I do not believe we would be in a position to prejudge the discussions that will happen on the issue in WS2. All options will be at the table then. That's why the discussion on "Jurisdiction" under WS2 should not be seen as limited to dispute settlement issues.

Paul Wi: (11:20) (I agree trustworthiness is not really appropriate)

Milton Mueller: (11:21) I think the word is actually quite appropriate, but I think Keith is correct that no one in the public comments used that word specifically

Milton Mueller: (11:22) The reason you want transparency is that you don't necessarily trust the actors involved to do the appropriate thing in secret

Milton Mueller: (11:23) Less explicitly and indirectly, I heard a lot of nervousness about whether the US would manage to somehow stay in control of RZ based on secretly negotiuated arrangements between ICANN and Veisign. Those concerns may or may not be justufied, but they do exist

Milton Mueller: (11:23) exist

Keith Drazek: (11:26) @Milton: Agree that transparency is absolutely necessary.

Milton Mueller: (11:27) I know you do, Keith I was just explaining the connection between transparency and "trustworthiness"

Keith Drazek: (11:33) Understood, thanks.

Daniel Karrenberg: (11:36) i support moving to the transition proposal.

RP - Tech: (11:37) Is someone on speakerphone? Please mute.

Narelle Clark: (11:42) Sound has a major feedback issue.... please mute if not speaking.

Narelle Clark: (11:45) @Alissa - can you please ask that people mute their computers and phones if not speaking. The adobe sound is fading in and out.

Keith Drazek: (11:46) Kavouss and I will continue to update the ICG on the important topic of enforcement of PTI separability.

Paul Wi: (11:49) document link?

Jennifer Chung: (11:49) @Everyone, this is the version we are going to be live editing <https://www.dropbox.com/s/6sex97onq9nlr8n/IANA-transition-proposal-v5-karrenberg-mundy-alc.docx?dl=0>

Paul Wi: (11:49) thanks :-)

Jennifer Chung: (11:49) As circulated by Alissa this morning to the ICG mailing list

Jennifer Chung: (11:51) As circulated on this email [http://mm.ianacg.org/pipermail/internal-cg\\_ianacg.org/2015-October/002081.html](http://mm.ianacg.org/pipermail/internal-cg_ianacg.org/2015-October/002081.html)

Narelle Clark: (11:53) So edits to the mailing list by midnight tonight - that gives me 2hrs ;-)

Joseph Alhadeff 2: (11:53) jennifer, manal can you send me the most recent version of the summary doc if any edits were made today?

Jennifer Chung: (11:55) @Joe, we were not live editing during the session but the Secretariat has noted a list of edits to be made to the document and will circulate this to you and Manal sometime this afternoon.

Daniel Karrenberg: (11:55) i suppor x001 as it is.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (11:55) +1 to Kavouss' clarification: add "domain name".

Lynn St.Amour: (11:57) what about: before sending this proposal to the NTIA via the ICANN Board?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (11:58) Alissa, Secretariat & All: I draw your attention again to the need to put Capitals on Names, Numbers, Protocol Parameters. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: (11:58) I suggest we replace the word "seek" with "secure". "Before sending this proposal to the ICANN Board for submitssion to NTIA, the ICG will SECURE confirmation from the CWG..."

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (11:59) @Keith Drazek +1, "secure" is better than "seek".

Narelle Clark: (12:00) @Lynn I recall use of the term 'relay' as in 'for relaying to the NTIA'

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:00) @Lynn +1: "to the NTIA via the ICANN Board".

Narelle Clark: (12:01) or 'the expectation that it will be relayed by ICANN to the NTIA'

RussMundy-SSAC: (12:01) Just to clarify, I'd be fine with either keeping or\_ editing later, I just think that it would be a good idea to now what we plan to do later when we call it done & forward it

Daniel Karrenberg: (12:01) deja-vu: hasn't paul said this a few months ago already?

joseph alhadeff: (12:01) how about finalized instead of complete?

Jennifer Chung: (12:01) @Jean-Jacques - noted regarding the capitalization request.

Alan Barrett (NRO): (12:01) I suggest "This proposal should be read in conjunction with [the CCWG work]"

Lynn St.Amour: (12:02) @NArelle: relay is fine. You understand the more meta point.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:02) @Narelle: as the author of the solution agreed by the Board very early on (TO NTIA VIA ICANN BOARD), there is no justification for a mere "expectation". It has been agreed.

Mary Uduma: (12:06) Jennifer please send the link for the current version, it seems I have the old version.

Jennifer Chung: (12:07) @Mary and everyone, this is the version we are live editing <https://www.dropbox.com/s/6sex97onq9nlr8n/IANA-transition-proposal-v5-karrenberg-mundy-alc.docx?dl=0>

Mohamed EL Bashir: (12:07) submssion arrangment has been agreed earlier

Daniel Karrenberg: (12:12) i withdraw my suggestion then and apologise for the entropy it caused.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:12) @Alissa: again, agree.

joseph alhadeff: (12:12) At the first mention of a complete proposal add this footnote or parenthetical - which can be more easily removed. The proposal is complete as to all the necessary elements but remains subject to an external dependency related to some accountability elements the Names proposal.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:13) @Martin's suggestion +1.

Manal Ismail: (12:14) +1 to Martin's suggestion on including a hyperlink to the CCWG proposal

RussMundy-SSAC: (12:14) I agree that the discussion has led us to the position that we will have to edit what we do today/tomorrow later after the CCWG is actually finished

Narelle Clark: (12:14) @Alissa - the text you have just proposed is Scenario A (all good, everyone agrees, stuff settled); Scenario B (all bad, no agreement, impasse); Scenario C (some other case not quite conceivable). There is no point in drafting text for all scenarios, let's stay optimistic, but refer to the situation being in progress, and keep it highlighted for future resolution.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (12:15) @Martin +1, provide link.

Narelle Clark: (12:19) Is the spreadsheet on the dropbox right now?

Jennifer Chung: (12:20) @Narelle, it is circulated by Lynn as attached in this email [http://mm.ianacg.org/pipermail/internal-cg\\_ianacg.org/2015-October/001881.html](http://mm.ianacg.org/pipermail/internal-cg_ianacg.org/2015-October/001881.html), I will upload and provide a link to the doc in dropbox presently if it is not already there.

Narelle Clark: (12:21) Err @Jennifer a typo? "404 Not Found"

Alan Barrett (NRO): (12:22) remove the comma from the end, then the URL works

Jennifer Chung: (12:23) apologies for the extra comma!

Jennifer Chung: (12:23) The spreadsheet is now on Dropbox here : <https://www.dropbox.com/s/nuulmcaip9z4a1x/ICG%20-%20Action%20Item%20Inventory%20->

[%20Draft%20w\\_CWG%2014%2010%2015.xlsx?dl=0](#)

Narelle Clark: (12:23) Thks - all good.

Jennifer Chung: (12:24) And for those in Dropbox, the spreadsheet is currently in the 'Public Comment' subfolder

Martin Boyle, ccNSO: (12:25) Also @Lynn+1

Lynn St.Amour: (12:26) Thanks Jennifer, and that still needs to be edited according to previous suggestions. Will do so this afternoon.

Narelle Clark: (12:29) Elise's point is quite appropriate from an Human Resources perspective.

Narelle Clark: (12:31) These are normal management and employment issues: we could roll up the language into one point, ie 'establishment of PTI and its operations'

epg: (12:32) Thank you Narelle

Yannis li: (12:33) Thank you very much for attending. The ICG F2F #7 Day 3 session has concluded.