

ccNSO Council Telephone Conference  
9 February 2017

Attendees :

**AF**

Abibu Ntahigiye, .tz  
Souleymane Oumtanaga, .ci

**AP**

Debbie Monahan, .nz  
Hiro Hotta, .jp

**EU**

Katrina Sataki, .lv  
Peter Vergote, .be

**LAC**

Alejandra Reynoso, .gt  
Demi Getschko, .br

**NA**

Stephen Deerhake, .as  
Byron Holland, .ca

**NomCom**

Christelle Vaval  
Ching Chiao  
Jian Zhang

**Liaisons/Observers**

Maureen Hilyard, ALAC Observer to the ccNSO  
Wafa Dahmani, ccNSO liaison to ALAC

**Regional Organizations**

Leonid Todorov, APTLD  
Barrack Otieno, AfTLD  
Peter Van Roste, CENTR

**ICANN Staff**

Bart Boswinkel  
Kim Carlson  
Joke Braeken

## 1 Apologies

Nigel Roberts, Pablo Rodriguez

## 2 Minutes and Actions

Minutes from the January 12 meeting were distributed and published – no comments were received.

Three action items from the last meeting, 2 complete, 1 is ongoing.

## 3 Overview inter-meeting Council decisions

- Selection ccNSO liaison to ALAC
- Decision to support limited scope ATRT 3 review
- Support for Nigel Roberts's suggestion to seek additional information (see further item 8 of agenda)

## 4 Appointment volunteers

### 4.1 Appointment ccNSO Liaison to GNSO

The ccNSO Chair discussed the process in selecting the liaison, mentioned the Secretariat had to send out several reminders to the Councilors. There is a proposal to not only track attendance but to also voting records. How a Councilor voted will not be recorded, simply whether or not they voted.

The Chair went on to note, Patrick Myles was the liaison for several years, but unfortunately was unable to continue – a new liaison must be appointed. A call for volunteers was made, closed 7 February and 2 candidates brought their names forward: Ben Fuller (.na) and Biyi Oladipo (.ng).

### *Action 126-01:*

Secretariat to start selection process on 10 February 2017.

Councilors are reminded to submit name of preferred candidate and their vote will be tracked on the Council wiki. This is for transparency and to encourage Councilors to be more active.

## 5 Specific reviews

### 5.1 Update on current state of play specific reviews

- SSR 2
- Directory Services (WHOIS)

- o ATRT 3

The Chair noted, as a reminder, 3 preferred candidates were selected for SSR 2 and also provided 4 additional names for the pool potential members, should there be a need (decided by SOAC chairs). On Tuesday, there was a call with the SOAC chairs regarding the reviews and there was a decision (currently there are 15 members directly appointed, plus the pool of potential members) to move forward with just the 15 members and the review team will then decide whether they need additional members. According to the bylaws, they can also invite external experts.

## 5.2 Directory Services and ATRT 3 selection process

The Chair further noted discussion on the Registry Directory Services and scope of the review. GAC believes this review may include issues already covered by the RDS PDP effort, but the GNSO thought that the review should exclude issues already covered. No decision has been made, after a guideline is produced, scope will then be discussed. It will be the review team's decision on scope. There are already applicants and some have indicated wanting ccNSO endorsement, but guideline has not yet been developed.

Regarding ATRT 3, the Chair stated it was agreed to limit its scope, with no objection – and not to conflict with work of CCWG on Accountability. Operating Standards have not been released, but there are 2 webinars scheduled.

In respect to SSR 2, there were very few candidates (6) from the LAC region and none were selected to SSR 2. The Chair asked the Councilors from the LAC region to reach out to their community and urged them to participate. Largest number of applicants were from North America.

Question in chat from Byron Holland: What are the next steps for SSR 2?

The Chair answered, the expectation is for the team to meet in Copenhagen. ICANN.org will inform members who were selected and will move forward from there.

## 6 Organizational review of the ccNSO and its timeline.

The Chair stated the beginning has not started out promising, as it has been difficult to organize a webinar. There will be session to inform the community during the ccNSO Meeting Days.

*Action 126-02:*

Secretariat to reschedule webinar review webinar

## 7 Update Guidelines

7. 1. Date Council elections

The Chair remarked the guideline on Council elections are being currently worked on – the Guidelines Review Committee would like to hear from the Council before moving forward. Currently, the Council elections are run in the Autumn, meaning the newly selected/reelected Councilors will take their seat in March (first meeting of the year). According to ICANN’s bylaws, new/reelected Councilors must be in place by the last meeting of the year (AGM). The current practice is contradictory to ICANN’s bylaws – however ICANN legal has not objected so far. The GRC would like to know the opinion of the Council – should the ccNSO elections be run as noted in the ICANN bylaws or keep as it has been?

Voting was done within the Adobe Room – questions posed “Do you agree to change the election timeline to run as noted in the ICANN bylaws?”

Debbie Monahan asked regarding “meeting B” and the expectation of attendance. She noted “meeting B” last year, participation was as it usually is and has no problem using that meeting to question candidates. But if the ccTLD managers start opting out of that meeting or sending other people, that would be the only issue for her.

The Chair responded it’s still unclear how the “meeting B” will evolve and if there is space for normal ccTLD work.

Bryon Holland asked if this issue could be used symbolically, to remind the broader ICANN community of the relative independence of the ccNSO. Is there a reason this change should happen?

The Chair explained for the ccNSO, there is no reason to change. Only benefit would be seating all the Councilors at the same time. Also, down the road legal may decide this is no longer acceptable and ask the ccNSO to adhere to the bylaws.

In chat, Stephen Deerhake and Demi Getschko agreed with Byron Holland’s statement on independence.

*Action: 126-03:*

The Chair to report to GRC, the Council decision on elections (no change)

### ***7.2 Adoption Council Practices Guideline***

The Chair noted this is an updated guideline with a revised title, changed from ccNSO Council Meetings Guideline to Guideline: ccNSO Council Practices. Changes/additions included transparency (inform community week before the next Council meeting). The initial draft was sent to the ccNSO Council, then to the community for comment. No comments were received.

***RESOLUTION 126-01:***

The ccNSO Council adopts the ccNSO Guideline: ccNSO Council Practices as proposed by the ccNSO Guideline Review Committee (GRC WG)

### *Action 126-04:*

The ccNSO Secretariat is requested to publish the Guideline as soon as possible on the ccNSO Website and inform the community accordingly. The adopted Guideline will be effective 7 days after publication of the Guideline on the ccNSO Website.

Moved by: Byron Holland

Seconded by: Stephen Deerhake

Resolution pass unanimously.

### **8 ccNSO Travel funding**

The Chair stated this issue was raised by Nigel Roberts after the last Council call. To date, the ccNSO has 12 travel slots, which include travel, hotel accommodation and per diem. The guideline is currently being worked on and is a “hot topic” for the GRC. The number of slots is one of the smallest among SOACs, which shows independence from ICANN but may make participation from smaller ccTLDs problematic.

If the ccNSO wishes to increase the number of slots, it should be asked during public comment period when the Operational Plan and Budget is out for public comment. For FY18, this will need to be done beginning of March otherwise will have to wait until FY19. The ccNSO Finance working group worked on the guideline for financial contributions that ccTLDs make to ICANN, they took into account only 12 travel slots. If the number of slots are changed, it might impact financial contributions.

The Chair posed two questions to the Council:

Does the Council want to request an increase in travel slots? If yes, there will be a ccNSO statement procedure according to the guideline.

How many slots are necessary?

Nigel Roberts, who was unable to join the call, had done some research on this subject.

Peter Vergote asked if the 12 travel slots were on an annual basis or per meeting?

The Chair confirmed it is per meeting.

Debbie Monahan stated she would like to see more flexibility. Within the Asia-Pacific region, Hiro Hotta and herself are funded by work and decline funding. It would be great if there was a pool where funding would be reallocated (she is unsure if this is done this way or not) – she would like the funding made available to another Councilor in a more transparent way.

The Chair mentioned that the ccNSO must fund 3 NomCom Councilors, 1 slot per region and remaining slots are distributed. If a Councilor in particular region does not use their funding, the slot is allocated to someone in the region, but if there is no volunteer from the region its offered

to others (4 slots for non-Councilors).

Peter Van Roste asked what problem is trying to be resolved? Has there been instances where people who would have been contributing couldn't make it because of funding?

The Chair expressed for smaller registries, it is a challenge to participate – they have great knowledge and sometimes unable to contribute and participate in the meetings directly.

Maureen Hilyard noted in chat: ALAC has 27 slots, for ALAC members and regional leaders, and ccNSO/GNSO liaisons. Alan Greenberg has just requested another travel slot for GAC liaison.

Ching Chiao asked in chat: would it be possible to free these spots from the ccNSO so that it's directly sponsored via the ICANN general pool?

Bart Boswinkel commented that as far as he knows, NomCom appointees are always funded as part of the slots. Initially, all SOACs had 12 slot but the other increased their numbers over time.

### *Action 126-05:*

Travel funding discussion to continue on mailing list (all), including to prepare for ccNSO Statement as part of the public comment process

## **9 Updates CSC, RZERC and EC AC**

- CSC (Byron Holland) – Byron Holland informed the Council the regular monthly meetings are typically held the second week of the month. The next one will be the week following the Council call. Thus far, each meeting has gone a little bit smoother than the previous. Metrics that are being monitored are satisfactory in terms of IANA performance, and SLAs. There has been some minor metrics that have been outside the defined requirements, but have been readily and reasonably explained. The CSC continue to work on escalation procedures and an annual survey (around quality and performance of IANA in terms of a satisfaction index). The IANA team has been relatively responsive to inputs and queries.

The Chair noted she continues hearing positive feedback regarding the work of the CSC, with special note of contribution from Byron Holland and Jay Daley. She further noted not being able to “say the same for RZERC” as it doesn't seem to be much progress there.

- EC AC (Stephen Deerhake) – Stephen Deerhake updated the Council on 3 issues. They are finally getting organized with help from ICANN staff, there is a mailing list now. With respect to developing the guideline, focus has been on Annex B, section 2 rejection petition. The outline has been reviewed by Jordan Carter and Ben Fuller, it is being discussed, language is being put in place as well as a glossary, which will go before the guidelines committee. Hope to have it ready for the Council to at least “peek” at, if not a vote in Copenhagen. The last issue is the recent ICANN Board meeting, Board Governance Committee (chaired by Chris Disspain) requested a new Board committee to handle accountability mechanisms. Chris Disspain feels the BGC is getting overwhelmed and wants to spin this off to a separate

committee. This is a change to a fundamental bylaw, which is going to trigger an approval action request to the community. This request will require at least three SOs to approve this before this can go into effect. The community, as an SO, needs to inform the larger community of this and as Council, make a decision about this. This is a non-controversial issue; the Board wants to spin off responsibility dealing with independent reviews. He noted he does not see an issue but Council will need to act “nimble” about it Annex B, section 1.

- RZERC (written update Peter Koch)

## 10 WG updates

### 10.1 Update CCWGs

- CCWG Accountability (no material changes since previous Council update)
- CCWG Use of country and territory names (written update Annebeth Lange)  
The CCWG hopes to publish its Interim Paper for public comment by 17 February 2017. The comment period will remain open well beyond the Copenhagen meeting.
- CCWG Internet Governance (Young Eum Lee)
- CCWG Auction Proceeds (Ching Chiao) – Ching Chiao updated the Council – noted there would be a more formal process after they have their second meeting. He will have a more information to share in Copenhagen. One piece of “breaking news” – the GNSO appointed co-chair sent a note with his intention to step down as co-chair, due to various reasons, but primarily because of conflict of interest. He will stay on until the GNSO appoints a new co-chair.

### 10.2 Update WG

GRC (Katrina Sataki) – The Chair mentioned work continues on the Council elections guideline, in addition to travel funding and a few others including things that will need to be implemented with the new bylaws

Update Programme WG (Alejandra Reynoso) – Alejandra Reynoso updated the Council on changes to the member meeting days. Confirmation on joint sessions from Board and GAC. Thursday morning is the cross-community session proposed by the ccNSO.

Update Drafting Team& PDP (Nigel Roberts, Bart Boswinkel) Bart Boswinkel noted the drafting team met earlier in the week. They discussed the two draft charters. Topics have been identified after a second reading. Over the next two weeks, the hope is the drafting team will be able to finalize the two charters, which will be included in the issue report, and distributed prior to Copenhagen.

## 11 Council Updates

11.1 Chair Update

11.2 Vice-Chair Update – no updates were brought forward

11.3 Councilors Update – no updates were brought forward

11.4 Regional Organizations Update – no updates were brought forward

11.5 Secretariat update – no updates were brought forward

## 12 Liaison Updates

12.1 GNSO Update.

12.2 ALAC Update (Interim: Maureen Hilyard) – The Chair welcomed Wafa Dahmani, the new ccNSO liaison to ALAC.

## 13 Next meetings

Copenhagen meetings

- Sunday, 12 March 2017, Workshop and prep meeting f-2-f meeting, Copenhagen ICANN 58, Sunday 12 March, noon local time, lunch included.

Workshop to discuss:

Roles and responsibilities ccNSO Councilors, includes prep chair and vice – chairs election, membership standing committees

Annual Work Plan

Prep meeting: Prep discussions and assignment of leads on core topics meeting.

- ALAC-ccNSO Council meeting (tentatively) Sunday 12 March 17.00 local)
- ccNSO-GNSO Councils meeting, Monday 13 March, 12.15-13.45 local time.
- Board- ccNSO meeting. Most likely Tuesday 14 March 2016 in the morning. TBC'ed.

Suggested topics:

Implementation of 1 October 2016 Bylaws:

Implementation of operation of processes and mechanisms related to the Empowered Community.

Board Designations by EC AC

Clarity around roles and responsibilities of all parties involved with respect to Budget and Operational Plans

- ccNSO-GAC meeting, tentatively Tuesday 14 March.
- Meeting with current ccNSO appointed Board members and Becky Burr, to start succession plan on replacement of Mikel Silber. Mike's term ends October/November 2018. His replacement will need to be selected and nominated starting August /September 2017. The Board members will provide initial overview of their roles and responsibilities, time commitment etc.
- Council meeting 15 March 17.00 Local time
  - Chair, vice-chair election

## 14 Work Plan

Updated work plan is included.

## 15 AOB

Peter Van Roste added regarding the liaison for the GNSO, Patrick Myles mentioned he enjoyed the opportunity but at the beginning he was a bit lost regarding what was required of him.

There was no guidance on expectations. He suggests for incoming liaisons to have a sit-down

with chairs/vice chairs to better understand their role. Second point he made, he was unable to find on the ccNSO website the latest financial contributions from ccTLDs to ICANN.

*Action 126-06:*

Schedule an onboarding/briefing with new incoming liaisons

*Action 126-07:*

Bart to add financial contributions to the to the ccNSO website.

**16 Closure**