

IANA CWG Meeting #12 (30 December)

Attendees:

Members: Lisa Fuhr, Jonathan Robinson, Fouad Bajwa, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Fatima Cambronero, Eduardo Diaz, Erick Iriarte, Staffan Jonson, Elise Lindeberg, Wanawit Ahkuputra, Greg Shatan, Graeme Bunton, Avri Doria, Donna Austin, Robert Guerra

Participants: Brenden Kuerbis, Chuck Gomes, Jiankang Yao, Martin Boyle, Phil Corwin, Carolina Aguerre, Guru Acharya, Allan Greenberg, Sibasubramanian Muthusamy, Bertrand de La Chapelle, Gary Campbell, Kurt Pritz, Steve Crocker, Gary Hunt, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Milton Mueller, Yasuichi Kitamira, Stephanie Duchesneau, Suzanne Woolf, Tomohiro Fujisaki, Allan MacGillivray

Staff: Bart Boswinkel, Bernard Turcotte, Berry Cobb, Brenda Brewer, Grace Abuhamad, Marika Konings, Theresa Swinehart

Apologies: Jaap Akkerhuis, Seun Ojedeji

Please let Grace know if your name has been left off the list (attendees or apologies).

Agenda

1. Welcome & Roll Call
2. Status Updates
3. Summary & Analysis of Public Comments
 - introduce methodology for summary and analysis (Bernard Turcotte)
 - comments and feedback
 - points of agreement
4. Way forward
 - methodology and approach
 - consider polling concept
5. Review of Action Items
6. AOB

Notes

1. Welcome and Roll Call

- Start meeting at 14.01 UTC
- **All present in Adobe room recorded as present**
- Audio only:
 - Eduardo Diaz
 - Olivier Crepin-LeBlond
 - No comments on agenda

2. Status Updates

- **Update RFP 3**
 - Greg Shatan (coordinator): Working through questions and details of structure and functions of MRT and CSC
 - Need to clarify functions MRT, before getting back on structure, recognizing Public comment could have a major impact.
 - Smaller issues resolved.
 - Major issues not being resolved: size and composition of MRT. Large size of MRT (27) not really supported by participants on the calls, smaller size trending.
 - Also dependent on mandate of MRT (including whether role for other functions)
 - CSC composition: dominated by "customers". Role of CSS technical /operational, hence largely "customers" assuming accountability and transparency.
 - Additional comment: MRT or MRT like structure, shows up in a lot of comments. Composition (structure) dependent on function (to be further defined)
- **Update RFP 4**
 - Robert Guerra (coordinator)
 - Summary of text available of other proposals (for Numbers and Protocol functions)
 - Work area 1: test the proposal, focus on technical operational testing. Waiting for output RFP 3
 - Work area 2. Transition path. Outline for documentation
 - Work Area 3. Outline
 - Minutes and working documents available RFP 4
 - Next call 6 January 14.00 UTC
- **RFP 5 Update**
 - Cheryl Langdon-Orr (coordinator)

- Awaiting outcome RFP 3 and 4.
- Next call 30 December 21.00 UTC

3. Summary & Analysis of Public Comments

- introduce methodology for summary and analysis (Bernard Turcotte)
- comments and feedback
- points of agreement
- Initial Summary, Analysis and Categorization comments received.
- Presentation by Bernie will be shared with group after the call

Statistical snapshot of comments received

Responses on questions classified as yes, no, no comment, and yes with reservations

No comments were put aside, to get a more meaningful set. However risk of bias in favour of substantive comments. Weight added to mitigate bias risk. Analyses and validation will

be completed over next day with CWG.

Responses looked at in first column

Number of responses in row under Y, N, NC and YR

Number of NC overwhelm results

Weight: Mean of all substantive comments (Y + N, + YR) / Total number.(Y+N +NC + YR)-> weight. If above weight, significant issue

Major Agreement across comments based on analysis in second table.

Question 1: weight of respondent?

Response: all answers have been considered at same level. In second iteration by source group and how

Question 2: How to calculate negative responses?

Response: it was fairly clear if questions asked not responded, assigned no comment

Small team Chuck, Greg, Berry and Bernie to classify comment.

Question/Comments 3: MM did own classification. Discrepancies -> Support overall proposed comment, but need additional refinement.

Response: not color and depth of comments received.

Comment: Analysis is helpful, not decisive

No comment, implies did not say anything about it.

Analysis is trending information.

Question 4: Some of the items different names (in Report and response)

Team who did coding, Judgement call of the team

Question/Comment 5: Comments on comments

Support for weight of contribution

Tool to check trends on level of consensus

Question to all further input: constructive criticism on methodology used, further question whether alternative methodology shows different trend (which would be a concern).

Additional Analysis (to be expected over next days)

Detailing the input by different categories

Individual responses, divergence

Most difference looking at for example ccTLDs versus others

MS in CSC

MS in MRT

Major difference replace Authorization role NTIA , vast majority no, others majority in favor.

Comment: result confirms difference between ccTLDs position as known.

Comment: difference between ccTLD and gTLD, could reflect differences in position and not in different assessment of architecture

Significant expression of concerns in model should be taken very seriously, and taken into account, and therefore CWG should not rush into conclusion

Comment Steve Crocker: ccTLD delegation go through NTIA approval process, gTLD delegation and redelegation are NOT affected by NTIA authorization.

Question Jonathan: Clarify NTIA play an Authorization role in delegation and redelegations?

Response: ccTLD decisions go through Board and NTIA. gTLD go through ICANN's GDD contracting process.

At finer grain level all transactions go through NTIA

MM: comment on findings re ccTLDs and difference in analysis

Classification of no comments should be carefully treated.

Comment/Questions Alan Greenberg: who is doing alternative analysis.

Response: IGP analysis

Note the difference between ccTLDs

Question: Authorization role replaced is operational role of NTIA in workflow? (according to NTIA presentation clerical)

Response: although clerical, they may take a decision

4. Way forward

- methodology and approach
- consider polling concept
- Part of comments propose alternative approach/ models. How to reconcile the models?
- Way forward could be break down proposals /models in composite parts (for example MRT). Take out module and build on module and rebuild model
- Issue: time line and reconcile current model with public comments
- Question: What is process moving forward?
 1. Understanding that proposal needs to be with ICG around mid January and what time does this group have to refine proposal post submission, also in context of accountability work.
 2. Response Jonathan: at least coordination with co-chairs with accountability.
 3. Lise: avoid creating deadlock between the two groups.
 4. Accountability group request input on what they should work on.
 5. Accountability group is looking at work of this group
- *Module approach*

From architecture perspective the modules under the different proposals look similar/ are different in details.

Alan Greenberg Timing:

Need for additional comment period to ensure consensus. take away artificial timeline

This group should work in concert with CCWG, and ensure timely Board participation.

Some proposals/parts of details could be detailed at later stage.

Staffan Jonson: support of module approach.

If no consensus on extending time line: detailed sentence by sentence drafting, to produce consensus output

Elise Lindeberg: Assumes ICG will come back with detailed questions after submission in January

Support modular approach, also look on consensus parts such IANA performance is satisfactory.

- Issues to be discussed in following order:
 1. Composition and scope CSC
 2. Scope of MRT
 3. Composition MRT
 4. Binding IAP, but what is scope
 5. Is Contract Co right solution or alternative approach?
 6. Dormant Contract Co, or absent Contract Co.
 7. Proposal to ICG should be relatively short (current report to extended)

5. Review of Action Items

6. AOB

Transcript

[CSG IANA #12 Dec 30.doc](#)

[CSG IANA #12 Dec 30.pdf](#)

Recording

The Adobe Connect recording is available here: <https://icann.adobeconnect.com/p3ecerr2z0j/>

The audio recording is available here: <https://icann.box.com/shared/static/zflayin1cfmke7vhio12.mp3>

Documents Presented

[Analysis_30Dec.pdf](#)

[Analysis_30Dec\(type\).pdf](#)

Chat Transcript

Brenda Brewer: Good Day Everyone! Welcome to the CWG Stewardship 12th Meeting on December 30 @ 14:00 UTC.

Yasuichi Kitamura (At-Large): Hi, all.

Jonathan Robinson: Hello All.

Allan MacGillivray: Good day everyone

Bertrand: hello everyone

Philip Corwin: Good morning to all - or whatever time of day it is for you...

Robert Guerra: Hello All.

Bernard Turcotte - staff support: hi all

Steve Crocker: Hello, everyone

Milton Mueller: Good morning

Alan Greenberg:Hello all

Alan Greenberg:And the Echoes have begun.

Martin Boyle, Nominet, ICG:Hi all!

Staffan Jonson:Hi all

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:in here now ...thanks :-)

Gary Hunt UK Govt.:Good day to you all!

Brenden Kuerbis:Good morning all

Milton Mueller:Regarding the notes being taken, I hear Greg to say that the RFP3 group did come close to resolving in favor of a smaller MRT

Fatima Cambronerero:hello everyone, sorry for being late

Avri Doria:I would just note that I do not believe RFP3 is anywhere as close to consensus points as the report gives hope of.

Alan Greenberg:@Avri, I agree.

Milton Mueller:Avri, what report are you referring to? Greg's?

Avri Doria:Milton, yes, Greg's report on RFP3

Bertrand:@Alan and Greg : +1 : functions, scope and periodicity of any Review Team need to be decided before discussing composition, as the former should determine the latter.

Milton Mueller:But we did decide that smaller is better

Grace Abuhamad:RFP4 is Jan 6 at 14:00 UTC

Milton Mueller:e.g., one per SG rather than 1 for every constituency from GNSO

Avri Doria:I did not believe that RFP3 had decided anything yet. Yes on yesterday's call the smaller is better did seem to be trending.

Alan Greenberg:Saying that small is mandatory ignoring what it does and who is represented there is interesting in light of our (out being ICANN) discussions on the size of the ICANN Board.

Milton Mueller:yes, Avri, "decided" is not the right word, "trending" is better

Grace Abuhamad:I gave you all scroll control

Grace Abuhamad:We will send out document after the call

erick iriarte:sorry for delay

Grace Abuhamad:Y= Yes / N= No / NC= No Comment / YR= Yes with reservations

Bertrand:thanks for the scroll control :-)

Chuck Gomes:@ Bernie - Extremely well done in very short order.

Bertrand:congrats @Bernie, very useful

Carolina Aguerre:@Grace, thanks, most useful to have the document after the call

Milton Mueller:The chart is too small, can anyone read it?

Avri Doria:yes, i can you can enlarge your view.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:it should be possible for each person on the call to scale it up to the size they want

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:it is here

Milton Mueller:right, just saw that

Guru Acharya:if someone does not comment on not complex, i guess that means he didn't feel it was complex. the person doesn't need to explicitly state it.

Guru Acharya:shouldn't exclude no comments for that

Chuck Gomes:I don't think that it is fair to conclude that if someone didn't comment on complexity that we should conclude they didn't think it was too complex.

Guru Acharya:but only a person who didn't find it complex would stay quiet about complexity.

Guru Acharya:a person who didn't find it complex would stay quiet about complexity.

Sivasubramanian M 2:100% yes to stronger separation, 82% yes to CSC... @ Olivier We may need a new counting process

Milton Mueller:I am not seeing my voice work, please put me on a line

Brenden Kuerbis:We can hear you

Alan Greenberg:Who is "WE"

Alan Greenberg:Please, @ Milton, Who is the "we" you are referring to as doing this alternate analysis?

Brenden Kuerbis:Alan, many of us have been reading the comments

Avri Doria:Alan, I thin he means IGP, his research group.

Alan Greenberg:Brendan, *I* read them too, but Milton is not speaking for me. I am just asking for clarity.

Alan Greenberg:@Avri, my guess as well, but a bit opaque to not say that.

Avri Doria:alwasy good to have data analysis in a bunch of different ways, since all data analysis starts from presumptions.

Philip Corwin:Milton, when will you be sharing IGP's analysis?

Guru Acharya:milton. it would be great if you could share your data for us to understand.

Milton Mueller:we will

Bart Boswinkel: MM analysis can be found at: <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1eC0qwH1-MrwJ8oj3NL2sMB5e3zNBwfNYHUdXNQ8uFQQ/edit?pli=1#gid=0>

Milton Mueller:Corwin: in a few days

Philip Corwin:Good. Look forward to reviewing it.

Milton Mueller:I am losing Chuck's voice inermittently

Milton Mueller:Call failed

Grace Abuhamad:@Milton would you like a dial out?

Guru Acharya:while statistical data is helpful, consensus should be determined by the absence of a convincing and reasoned disagreement

Milton Mueller:calling back

Milton Mueller:guru - correct

Brenden Kuerbis:agree with guru, quant analysis is helpful first step,

Milton Mueller:agree with Chuck here - it is good to count no comments, but we cannot interpret all NC's as lack of interest, a lot of comment may be implicit in what was said

Gary Campbell:Guys my two cents worth.....I strongly support any quantitative approach to analysing the data

Chuck Gomes:I approached my review similar to the way Bernie did.

Carolina Aguerre:I agree that the response "NC" for many of the proposals that represent collective actors is not because there is an absence of interest in that specific issue, but because there were simply too many issues to address, particularly when you need construct a collective position. I would suggest that for some of the most contentious issues the CWG moves forward with a more closed questionnaire if it wants specific input on these from the community.

Staffan Jonson:Alan & Carolina: +1

Fatima Cambronero:+1 @Carolina

Brenden Kuerbis:Yes, multiple issues related to MRT were identified in comments

Chuck Gomes:@ Carolina: Because the CWG has very broad representation I think we could probably get a good sense of community support by surveying the CWG participants.

Carolina Aguerre:@Chuck, agree

Gary Campbell:@Chuck, explain the nature of the survey

Avri Doria:Chuck, broad representation is one of the advantages of large diverse groups.

Bertrand:@Chuck +1

Gary Campbell:@Chuck, and who would develop the survey instrument?

Chuck Gomes:@ Gary: -We could ask questions like this: Should the IANA functions be transferred away from ICANN at the beginning of the transition?

Grace Abuhamad:All -- just for background information, this Google Doc is the starting point the Drafting Team used: <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1NjTOG7sN524zZYDCybm3NceAUXbqXv8137v5thwG2TU/edit?usp=sharing>. Bernie used this information to build the analysis that you see now.

Guru Acharya:i guess this is a learning for the next request for comments

Chuck Gomes:Agree with Guru.

Gary Campbell:Agree with Guru as well. ANd it does present opportunities

Gary Campbell:@Grace, thanks for the info

Milton Mueller:Yes we are getting echo

Philip Corwin:Will you be showing the spreadsheet you are discussing?

Milton Mueller:Agree with Philip we would like to see what Bernie is discussing

Jonathan Robinson:@Philip - Grace is preparing the spreadsheet for presentation now

Grace Abuhamad:The Document is up. You all have scroll control. Apologies for the size... I did my best.

Milton Mueller:Again, Bernie, the NTIA role was NC for 6 of the 10 ccTLDs and 7 of the 8 individuals

Brenden Kuerbis:Thx Grace

Milton Mueller:Large number of no comments does not permit much conclusion from this

Fatima Cambroneroyou can download the doc on the top

Grace Abuhamad:@Fatima -- I don't think you can for this one. We will make sure to send out when complete as Bernie said

Fatima Cambroneroyou're welcome :)

Grace Abuhamad:oooh! Cool. You just taught me something about Adobe that I didn't know! Thanks!

Fatima Cambroneroyou're welcome :)

Robert Guerra:Milton makes an important point that the # of responses may be too small to make a firm / statistical conclusions from the data. APlease keep that in mind.

Robert Guerra:The summary presented - helps a great deal, and IMHO helps our discussion

Sivasubramanian M:It might require the questions to be sent out as a survey to assess support for classified components of all proposals, count yes no no comments.If the exercise is to summarize substantive comments, There needs to be a method of counting ALAC or other AC SO or organizational concurrence from an individual opinion. This is a complex and contentious area, but a simple undistinguished count might not suffice. Also, the substance of an agreement or disagreement also 'counts'

Donna Austin, RySG:@Steve, could you clarify, gTLD delegations do go through NTIA

Brenden Kuerbis:Go ahead

Sivasubramanian M:An alternate method is to group statements under different headings for eg CSC and gather exact quotes with the name of the commenter. That way if we see a comment, so to speak, with Jon Postel seen as the commenter, it is up to the reader to weigh it over 99 contra comments Now substantive comments are quantified by a somewhat unscientific method.

Gary Campbell:Note Steve's comments

Philip Corwin:Yes, I have been downloading the docs as well...great Adobe Connect feature

Chuck Gomes:Re. counting individuals vs groups, it is less important if we are trying to develop at least rough consensus rather than voting. When it comes to confirming final consensus, it may be more critical then.

Gary Campbell:@Chuck, I absolutely agree with that

Alan Greenberg:Did NTIA get involved in the .ORG redelgation to PIR? I presume it was purely contractual.

erick iriarte:please take care the answers: is not the same a cctld under a government office in a country that out that office (and is different relation between cctlds under a gov than out, and difference in relation what the relation with the government, is not the same france or finland than a country in lac or africa)

Milton Mueller:Oh was NTIA ever involved in the .org redelegation!!!

Milton Mueller:IGP analysis

Milton Mueller:big deal, Alan

Greg Shatan (GNSO/CSG/IPC):I believe the IANA Functions Contract calls for a delegation report to be sent to NTIA for each new gTLD where ICANN self-certifies that all policies have been followed.

Donna Austin, RySG:@Greg, that is correct.

Chuck Gomes:The .org transition was contractually driven.

Robert Guerra:how firm is the ICG deadline in Jan 2015?

Bertrand:@grace: please remind me when and where are the upcoming face-to-face meetings for the ICG (and the CWG if any)?

Martin Boyle, Nominet, ICG:Face to face is in Singapore, Bertrand

Bertrand:thanks

Martin Boyle, Nominet, ICG:we have conference calls before then

Grace Abuhamad:CWG is doing meetings. No planned F2F at this time. For the ICG, there are conference calls and a F2F in Singapore as Martin said.

Grace Abuhamad:The CWG meetings are listed here: <https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocwgdtdstwrdsdp/Meetings>

Robert Guerra:@alan - Wouldn't necessarily agree with your comment that "mood in washington has changed". It's more nuanced ..

Alan Greenberg:I was suggested that discussions need to be held by all three group to alter the timing.

Jonathan Robinson:@Alan. Understood. Thanks

Alan Greenberg:@robert, yes, but pretty clear the 15 Sept is not viable.

Bernard Turcotte - staff support:too soft

Philip Corwin:I agree with Alan that this CWG cannot claim community consensus for a refined proposal that takes comments into account unless it is put out for a second comment period

Greg Shatan (GNSO/CSG/IPC):@Alan - why do you think it is "pretty clear that the 15 Sept is not viable"?

Steve Crocker:I need to leave the call. Apologies.

Jonathan Robinson:Thank-you Steve

Alan Greenberg:NTIA has clearly said that the deadline is not a hard one, just a target, and congressional action may push that deadline into 2016.

Alan Greenberg:Perhaps "not viable" was too strong.

Philip Corwin:There is the provision in the FY 2015 USG funding bill that prohibits DOC from taking any action to transition IANA functions prior to 9/30 /15, and to provide 45 days notice of any intent to transition

Philip Corwin:That would seem to preclude a transition by Sept 2015 -- unless Administration just plans to ignore and risk the confrontation that would spark

Bertrand:for the note taking: please keep the order: Scope of the MRT, and THEN its composition, rather than the reverse as is presently written.

Bertrand:actually the first point was: composition and scope of CSC

Donna Austin, RySG:Jonathan, I don't have audio, but I wonder if we need to explore what it looks like absent a 'Contract Co'?

Bertrand:right

Avri Doria:i think that the other proposals have at least a shadow contract co function

Donna Austin, RySG:Does that include the internal to ICANN option?

Avri Doria:Donna, I believe so.

Sivasubramanian M:Way Forward could include a closer and receptive look at alternate proposals

Donna Austin, RySG:thanks Avri

Brenden Kuerbis:Do we have any update on having legal analysis of Contract Co.? Or for that matter, legal analysis of any other proposed alternatives?

Avri Doria:Donna, now i need to show it somehow. (:

Philip Corwin:Great discussion. very useful

Chuck Gomes:I believe the internal solution includes a Contract Co. if needed

Lise Fuhr:Thank you Jonathan and the comment's team

Chuck Gomes:Thanks to all

Carolina Aguerre:A big thank you to the team who worked on this.

Carolina Aguerre:Bye all

Staffan Jonson:thank You all!

Allan MacGillivray:Thank you

Sivasubramanian M:bye

Fatima Cambronerio:thanks @Jonathan, all- bye.

Bernard Turcotte - staff support:thnaks and happy new year

Eduardo Diaz - (ALAC):Adios a Todos

Graeme Bunton - RrSG:thanks all

Brenden Kuerbis:thanks all

Gary Campbell:Bye everyone