ICANN

Moderator: Brenda Brewer
May 19, 2015
8:00 am CT

Coordinator: The recordings are started already.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: All right then, we're off.

Alan Greenberg: All right, can we have a roll call? We can actually - we have few enough people we can actually have a roll call today. That would be exciting.

Bart Boswinkel: So - I don't know how to do this. On the call today we have Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Chuck Gomes and Jaap Akkerhuis. And from staff we have Brenda Brewer, Grace Abuhamad, Kim Carlson and Bernie Turcotte and my name is Bart Boswinkel. Over to you, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you very much. I love a good roll call. The task on the list today, it's a very short agenda, we're looking at how do we replace the NTIA administrative oversight, essentially the approval process that now goes along with substantive changes to the root zone or to the root zone management process.

We decided in the earlier meetings of DTF and nobody - I don't think anyone had really disagreed with us - that we do need some level of oversight. The oversight is not so much the approval itself as convening a process to make sure that all the issues have been addressed properly before we dare to make any major changes. It has been suggested that we try to define what substantive means. And I'm not quite sure we can do that. But we could certainly give it a try.

I have put together a proposal which was based on somebody's comment, and I can't remember who it was, it may have been Donna Austin or it may have been someone else, who suggested why don't we just have the ICANN board do this. And I think that the board is as good a place to put the actual go or no go decision. But the really important part is how do we make that decision, how do we convene the discussion among interested parties.

And I've put together a draft of something I called a board committee. We don't normally in ICANN have board committees that are composed largely of non-board members so the title itself may not fly. But I don't - the substantive reasoning behind it says we want someone from the board, because ultimately the board will be making the go, no go decision. And we want at least one board member there as part of the process.

We want to involve a representative - at least one representative from all of the - I won't say interested parties but the people who are going to be involved in implementing many of these changes. And lastly, we may want - we want the ability to bring in other people as necessary depending on what the specific subject is that we're looking at and making this change which could be something as significant in terms of real operation as DNSSEC or it could be a major procedural change within IANA - within the IANA function operator.

But anything which is going to rock the foundation so to speak should be looked at with a certain amount of due care and trepidation, I guess. That's about I have to say about it. I don't think we want to do the specification in a lot more detail. And my preference at this point is to not - for us to not try to document what - what substantive is and what substantive is not but I'm certainly willing to go that route if people feel it's necessary or possible.

And at that point I've pretty well run out of things to say that I haven't already put in writing. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. And thanks for doing this. I think it's very helpful. Let me start by saying I agree with you, I'm not sure we can define substantive because there are just, you know, if we try to do something like that before we ever got to the DNSSEC issue we might have been able to predict it because DNSSEC had been worked on for so long. But until that got some traction it would have been hard.

So I think using the examples of DNSSEC and IPv6 are illustrative of some of the kinds of things that might happen. But beyond that I don't think we can predict the future enough to define that.

Going on, while I've got the mic here, on the list of committee members, and I don't know if this is a board committee or not, that's I think just semantics because if it only has one board member I'm not sure that's called a board committee, but maybe staff can help us there but, again, I think that's just semantics.

But I wonder, do we need any involvement by the ASO, the RIRs in this committee? And a lot that I'm going to say today isn't that I'm pushing for

particular ideas, it's just questions that entered my mind that maybe will help us refine it. I'll stop there.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I see Cheryl - several hands up. Yes, I'll give you very quickly my opinion. In terms of calling it the board - a board committee since it was - making recommendation directly to the board I thought it was a good name but, you know, it is semantics.

On defining substantive, it - one of the things that it included in the past, and perhaps should in the future, is the major automation push and revamp of the systems within IANA with one of those issues. And that's something which can make, you know, there's enough involved in it that it could mess things up and/or make things better. And it went through this process.

And one of the reasons I really don't want to define things is when you define things you end up with a situation if it's not on the list then it's not covered. As you were speaking it dawns on me that just maybe we want to say, you know, if in doubt go to the committee or words to that extent. And on ASO I suspect that's another group I didn't think about probably should be there. And, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. A couple of things just on this very first section. I agree, absolutely, Chuck, I think some examples are worthwhile popping in and Bart's busy doing some pretty formatting in another world that we're working in and using little, you know, color background text boxes and things so we could do all sorts of things to make the example pop.

But I think if we had a sentence - and for me I'm sort of seeing it in a box rather than as slow part of the text which is, you know, substantive changes

include but is not limited to the following examples, blah, blah, blah. I think that's be well worthwhile putting in a "but" before we get to the recommendation part.

And to that end I think, Alan, your last word slightly (unintelligible) which was along the lines of if in doubt go to the committee is probably a good thing to include. And I absolutely agree that ASO needs to get a (unintelligible) as well.

And I did have a jarring, with it being in inverted commas, board committee and my proposal would be that it's called an advisory - I don't want it confused with other advisory committees but some sort of advisory Council or some other name which gives it the same line up but feed directly as the ground worker for the resulting material which will go for final board approval.

So I'm happy with Recommendation 1, final board approval - final approval going with the board, but I think we need to talk about the grouping in another terminology and perhaps Legal can help us come up with a name. I mean, advisory committee or something similar is used elsewhere so we just need to be careful that it's not easily confusable but I'm sure we can come up with a title there that Point 2 would work. Thanks.

And it could be an IANA advisory committee, why not? I mean, that could work. Yeah, sure. Thanks for that, Chuck.

Alan Greenberg: If we call it another advisory committee then we go back and change everything else in ICANN.

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: I actually called it a board committee because I thought introducing the concept of having non-board members on board committees was a really good idea so this was my opportunity to try to change the world. But we will go on, yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, right.

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl, I presume that hand is not down.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It will be shortly.

Alan Greenberg: And we have Mr. SSAC.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yeah, for the record, this is Jaap. Since it came up that we're talking about things like IPv6, DNSSEC and so on, I actually spent some time chasing how the whole IPv6 decision was made. And (unintelligible) over lifetime of five years to complete. And everybody was involved including the NTIA. And there was not really anything close to committee, I mean, it was more building of whether or not this was possible.

And slowly from phasing everybody and the rest of community that it was no (unintelligible). It took about five years. And then in the end the board just says let's do it and actually it was already there before the board said that. And similar with DNSSEC, that decision involved the NTIA itself and everybody was remotely concerned about the subject.

And if you now look at the current substantive change going on, which is all over of the (unintelligible) again, there is not a real committee looking at this. These are a bunch of people organized now by (unintelligible) this time and not by the community itself. And which involves people from outside

ICANN, its involved NTIA itself, it's involved everybody and they come up with a proposal which will call for public comments hopefully (unintelligible).

What you see in the past is that it actually being done by ad hoc - by the community itself then finally the community (unintelligible) discussion and board signs off on it and - but everybody was involved as well.

I mean, if you now going to - I wonder whether it's worth to have a standing committee for doing this because it will just add to more bureaucracy and committee meetings and things like that while the real - these decisions are always made at just once, you know, we're not going to decide that IPv6 will be out of the root at least, not any time soon. And these are all special occasions and maybe that's - is something we should actually dealt with there.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Bernie, I see your hand up. Just one quick comment before. I was thinking of this not so much as this committee is the place where all of the discussion happens but this is the committee - and, again, I'm not wedded to the name - is the super structure under which the decision can be made.

I certainly was envisioning for any given subject, for any given issue, that some - I don't know if - you know, I hesitate to call it a task force, but some grouping of individuals - and it's going to be different based on who's involved on what the subject is rather, will sort of coalesce and this committee perhaps is the instigator of that.

But the committee itself is not necessarily the technical discussion goes on and the refinement of the idea to the point where it's implementable. Bernie.

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you, Alan. Jaap, I understand what you said, that goes versus the committee. Maybe we can just clear up - are you okay with the board taking the final decision however we get to it, just trying to clear that up in the first.

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yes, I mean, I'm fine with that. And, I mean, I'm not against having some formalization of how these decisions are made. I just want to more on that we not create yet another structure for things which just happen very seldom.

Bernard Turcotte: Thanks for that, Jaap. I think part of the issue then becomes, you know, what's the process to actually get it to the board so it can make a decision. Obviously that's part of the issue I guess we're trying to get to. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you...

((Crosstalk))

Alan Greenberg: Go ahead, Jaap.

Jaap Akkerhuis: ...IPv6 it was actually RSAC and SSAC together which were pushing at a board that you should do that and it took a while before it finally catched up on the board. But that was after we - I mean, so up to now these changes have been actually started from a community itself. That's - so I'm not sure whether if there was - if there was some committee whether that would help. Maybe support the innovation committee or whatever or another buzz word, something like that.

Alan Greenberg: I guess, although IPv6 and DNSSEC are sort of the poster children that we're working around, they're probably atypical. There are certainly other ones, and its unfortunate we have no one from IANA here, to give us perhaps a little bit more examples and the range of things we're talking about. Certainly the

overall major automation push of IANA's processes I think also fits into this category. And that's a very different one and probably had a far fewer number of players involved in...

Jaap Akkerhuis: Yeah.

Alan Greenberg: ...the discussion. But I suspect there's a whole bunch of other ones. And I'm not sure we want to use IPv6 as - ever use IPv6 as the example of how to do things. You know, the life of IPv6 decisions in the universe has gone on for an awful long time and is probably not the best one to use as the - as a typical example.

So I think - I don't think I hear any disagreement that - to try to put into words that this committee or whatever is the convener but certainly is not the - the reference to other experts being involved is not necessarily an exception but the rule. Anyone disagree with the major public consultation for architectural changes? No disagreement but Chuck's hand is up so we'll go to Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan. This is Chuck. And I'm not sure whether I understand your last little comment there about public consultation but maybe we can come back to that.

I wanted to suggest that it seems to me it would be really good sooner rather than later, in fact hopefully before we finish our work in Design Team F, to reach out to the chairs of the various organizations that were suggesting appoint a representative and just explain to them what we're proposing and ask them whether they have any concerns or any suggestions, whether it makes sense to them since their organizations would have a representative on this committee.

That I think would be a good thing to do right away just to reach out to them and see if they could give us their feedback for five days just to see mainly that they don't see any problems with going this direction or if they do what they are so that we can have their input before we get too far down the road on this, certainly before we finalize our recommendations to the full CWG.

Alan Greenberg: Good idea, Chuck. That will be - once I get the next revision that this group approves or at least doesn't disagree with, I'll reach out and make sure that that's done. Again, it - I was hoping that there'd be wider discussion here so at least some of those groups were actually already involved if not their chair then somebody from it.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah and then I think - this is Chuck again. And I think that once we kind of maybe even after our call today that we have a reasonable enough feel among those of us that are participating that we're comfortable with where we're going, that's good enough probably to get their initial input with the understanding that we're continuing to refine this.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

Chuck Gomes: But again, knowing that they're kind of at least semi on board with where we're going would add a level of confidence I think to what we're proposing.

Alan Greenberg: Good point.

Chuck Gomes: And that may - by the way, we may want to include the chair of the ICANN board on that communication as well.

Alan Greenberg: I had already included that. I have talked to a number of board members and they said this was not a, you know, this did not sound unreasonable but I haven't actually talked to the chair of the board. Bernie.

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you, sir. As I'm going through this the question that came to my mind is the initiation. I'm not talking about whether trying to define substantive or not but maybe it's indirectly related. It makes sense to avoid spurious demands if there's no process for initiating (unintelligible) at this committee that there be a minimum threshold of one or two SOs or ACs requesting this.

Alan Greenberg: Are we talking SOs or - sorry, you're finished? I'll presume you are. Are we talking SOs or ACs or one of the two groups listed in the charter membership so to speak?

Bernard Turcotte: They're looking pretty similar to me. And I'm not saying it has to be one or another but these things sound like they're big processes if they're going to get kicked off and therefore you probably want some sort of gating factor before you actually get this group together to look at it. And it would seem to make sense to me that if you've convinced one or two of either the chartering groups or two SOs or ACs that that would meet a threshold.

But that's just an idea but just the notion of a gating factor to get this going would seem to be reasonable.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, no I don't disagree at all. And I think that makes some sense. And certainly if you can't get at least some of the participants in this group interested then perhaps it doesn't fit there. If none of the people in this list are worried that a change is something that needs to be more widely discussed than just the decision within IANA because that's the alternative then certainly

that makes a lot of sense. I'm not quite sure how to word it but I'll give it a try. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. Good discussion so far. Now following up with what Bernie is talking about there I guess there's a little higher level of question. I'm assuming, and I don't know if I'm assuming correctly or not, that this would probably be a standing committee, not necessarily one that meets regularly but only meets as needed. And I think that's part of what Bernie was getting to. So I guess I need confirmation on that assumption.

But then as we're thinking about okay when does this committee meet or when do they come and schedule a meeting, I thought of some proposed organizations from the CWG that might also be in a position to possibly request a meeting of this committee.

And I'm probably a little less sure about the CSC but maybe, but the IFRT might possibly if they're thinking about some maybe significant changes to process or whatever or new technology or something, they may want to - we may want to give them the ability to request a meeting of the - of this committee.

And in cases - and I guess then what I think Bernie's getting at, the confirmation then I think it is important to have some sort of a - we don't just have the committee meet at just the request of any one entity but I think some sort of a confirmation that, yeah, it might be good for the committee to meet and could the committee itself be the one that does that? Because we've got a nice mix of expertise there.

And they could - they're all representative of the kind of organizations we're talking about. But I don't know, I'm thinking out loud so I don't have a strong leaning on that.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, thank you Chuck. I'm having difficulty with your describing as the issue being whether they meet or not. I mean, this committee might never meet.

Chuck Gomes: Exactly.

Alan Greenberg: But that doesn't mean they don't adopt a subject that they now own and are taking through the process. So I think you're raising the real question of where do ideas come from? And, yes, ideas may well come from an - from the review process or from the CSC or from an individual within, you know, who lives in the world, the root zone maintainer may well say, hey, this is not working very well or I think we can make it better. Let's convene it - let's start a discussion to, you know, to see if we can flesh it out and whether it makes any sense or not.

So I think the ideas are going to come from enough people. And I agree with the concept that at least one - at least two of the people on the group should be convinced it merits their attention before it goes further. But that means we need a process by which we can raise it with the people in the group. You know, it shouldn't - it presumably shouldn't be just something you do in the corridors privately.

You know, I think this needs to be relatively informal. The last thing we want to do is there not being a process by which something important goes to this group and therefore either doesn't get done or at all or gets done on a less formal basis and perhaps with repercussions because of that.

Anything else that needs to be - anyone else here can contribute or do you want to send me away to do some drafting? I know we did schedule 90 minutes but I don't particularly feel guilty if I turn people back and let them have their lives again. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, I got - have several other things, let me go to the next one.

Alan Greenberg: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: You asked a couple questions that I think we can talk about briefly like who's going to name the gTLD operator rep or the ccTLD operator rep. I thought I'd throw out a couple ideas. In the case of the gTLD operator rep what about - what's wrong with the Registry Stakeholder Group naming one and possibly if we think it's important it could be endorsed by the broader GNSO, I mean, I think that would be okay.

And in the case of the ccNSO, and I don't want to speak for them, but why not have the ccNSO appoint the committee member with the assumption that there would be consultation with non-ccNSO members?

Alan Greenberg: I'm happy to put that in the draft.

Chuck Gomes: And I welcome other ideas. I'm just trying to help us get more meat to this.

Alan Greenberg: I'm not sure we really want to over-think this. I think we need to make sure that the various people who may have a problem with what we're doing are on board. And I don't - I wouldn't pretend that a single person has all the expertise of gTLDs or ccTLDs, but presumably that person will consult as necessary.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

Alan Greenberg: We just don't want to forget them. You know, I'm not even convinced that we need to differentiate between gTLDs and ccTLDs for this purpose. But it's a political minefield not to so I put them both in.

Chuck Gomes: This is Chuck again. Going on to Number 4 in your list when we're talking about wide public consultation I think it would be helpful to provide a little bit more direction in terms of that. Would that be though a cross community working group that might be a good vehicle to use for the public consultation.

                 But to - and it could, I mean, I guess it could just be a public comment period although I'm leery of just using public comment periods and then say we did multi-stakeholder because I think that's done sometimes and is not a good direction to go, although I support public comment periods. So that's I think the only other thought I had on your proposal here.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I guess as an answer, since I seem to be providing answers, at least my opinions, I would very - I would certainly hesitate to mention the concept of a CCWG although conceivably for some issue in the future that might be the appropriate vehicle. But we're generally talking things where I think we can trust the experts to represent the various issues.

                 So, you know, I'm not worried about building the process, you know, if this group convenes a - for the want of a better term a taskforce I think that taskforce must include all of the really interested parties. You know, there's always hecklers on the side, and I'll, for instance say the, you know, At Large is often a heckler on the side. I'm not using it in a derogatory term, but they're

not really part of the implementation or the solution they're simply perhaps looking at the impact of that on other communities.

I think it is important to get not - to not only have the technical people involved because sometimes there's a case of tunnel vision. And I think we need to protect against that. But I think we had - to some level we have to trust this group to bring in the right people.

And what we're trying to do right now is make sure that on this core group we have enough people with enough range of ideas that we will be inclusive when the particular subject comes up. Bernie.

Bernard Turcotte: Thank you, Alan. As I listen to this conversation I'm struck with the following thought. In effect, if I sort of boil down what I've been hearing for the last few minutes, aren't we sort of saying that this - and I'll use the term committee not to classify it - isn't what we're talking about the job of this group to pick the right tool for the problem meaning it can be a cross community working group, maybe it's not, maybe it is just a bunch of experts.

Maybe what we're talking about is a group that defines who's going to look at the problem for real instead of just trying to - the way we've got it phrased now is this group may be augmented by technical people. What I've been hearing the last few minutes is maybe this group should pick a cross community working group or another structure to look at the given problem that's past the threshold gate. Just a suggestion.

Alan Greenberg: I think so. I'm not quite sure I have better words than you just used. It strikes me that if we think of some day in the future we may come up with something to replace DNS as we know it today, what would the process be by which we decide how to integrate it in a way that allows the transition without being

exceedingly disruptive to everyone with a smart phone or a computer in the world as the transition is made.

You know, in theory we're looking at something as substantive as that. So I don't think - it's certainly not a one-size fits all. And I think you're right, this group is the one that oversees - try to find the right tool to make sure it's done properly. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks. And, Alan, I want to follow up on your comments about making sure the right people are involved, the impacted parties and so forth. And I wanted to suggest to you, and I can do this because you're on - in the working group I'm going to reference and that is the language in the Policy and Implementation Working Group with regard to implementation review teams in terms of composition, I think might be - you could probably take from some of that in terms of making sure the right expertise is involved in any given case.

But I just leave that up to you because you're familiar with that and it fits in what you were saying in terms of making sure in any given instance that the right experts are there.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. I will look at those words and see if there's something I'm proud of or not. I hesitate to take things from that group. We may end up with designing the horse that looks like a camel if we're not careful. Anything else, people?

Not seeing any hands. Having talked I think about all of the numbered items in the document I sent out let me do another go of it and we'll see where it goes from now. I suspect we will end up having to have another meeting but the - one of the - actually there's one more question I do have.

If the CWG has its way we're going to meet intensively for a day or two and have a final document ready for approval in Buenos Aires. Are we trying to flesh this out sufficiently by them or say this is our overall intent and it will need to be fleshed out going forward but not in the proposal? My instinct tells me we are not going to have something that's completely clean and finished by the time that proposal is going to go out if indeed we are going to be able to meet that target at all but that's a different issue that I don't think we can talk about.

Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Yeah, just to respond, Alan. I think it would be very good if we're able to at least include the kind of things we're talking about today assuming we get no objections from the chairs of the various organizations in terms of the direction we're going.

But I don't think there's any reason why some of the details of this, the implementation details of setting up this committee and so forth, couldn't be worked out as long as there's support for the overall concept and approach after the proposal gets approved and before the transition happens.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I tend to agree. If nothing else it's only so much work, it's worth doing before we know what's actually going to be used. And we all know there's enough ifs, buts and ands associated with the transition that I'm not sure I want to dot all the Is or dot all the Ts and cross all the Is or something like that before ewe actually know this has some merit.

All right then I'll try to word it in such a way that we can make a formal proposal but not have all the details in it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Just indicative stuff is what we need to do.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, I couldn't spell indicative.

Alan Greenberg: And actually when I saw that line pop up I thought you said indicative level staff and I wasn't quite sure what you meant.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Stuff.

Alan Greenberg: I think we have staff that are indicative, whatever that means.

Chuck Gomes: Are the staff on this call indicative?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: They're more than that.

Alan Greenberg: First we have to define whether it's a flattering term or not.

Chuck Gomes: I have no idea.

Alan Greenberg: Does that mean they should be indicted?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, all right we're getting to silliness now.

Alan Greenberg: Hey, you get me up after 4.5 hours sleep you get silliness automatically. All right, folks, anything else we need to do?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think we're okay.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you all for attending and I will try to get a document out not in the next two days because there's this little thing of a comment period which we're supposed to respond to by Wednesday but it will come out some time after that. Thank you all and I turn the day back to all of you or the night for some of you.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you, bye-bye.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks very much. Bye all.

Bart Boswinkel: Bye-bye.

                              END