ccNSO Council Telephone Conference
18 February 2016

<u>Attendees:</u>

AF
Abibu Ntahigiye, .tz
Souleymane Oumtanaga, .ci

AP
Keith Davidson, .nz
Young-eum Lee, .kr

EU
Lesley Cowley
Katrina Sataki, .lv

LAC
Alejandra Reynoso
Demi Getschko, .br

NA
Byron Holland, .ca

NomCom
Christelle Vaval
Celia Lerman-Friedman

Observers/Liaisons
Ron Sherwood, ccNSO Observer to the ALAC

Regional Organisations
Leonid Todorov, APTLD
Barrack Otieno, AfTLD

ICANN Staff
Bart Boswinkel
Joke Braeken
Kim Carlson

1 Apologies

Apologies were noted from Hiro Hotta, Stephen Deerhake, Nigel Roberts, Carolina Aguerre, Peter Van Roste, Debbie Monahan, Peter Vergote, Margarita Valdes
Absent, no apologies received: Becky Burr, Ching Chiao

Chair reminded Councilors, attendance will be published on the website.

Note: Meeting was quorate

2 Minutes and Actions

Minutes from the last Council call were distributed on 5 February 2016

The Chair asked for comments to the minutes, no comments were noted and they were approved.

Only one pending Action Item from last call. Bart Boswinkel provided an update regarding the PDP and sending a note to the list regarding status. He noted this subject is on the agenda in Marrakech, and the opportunity to inform the ccTLDs as well as the broader community as to status.

3 Stewardship Transition and Accountability Processes

The Chair provided an overview – the CCWG will submit their final proposal shorty – 18 February, 18:00 UTC and asked the Council to provide feedback at that time. The Chair continued by noting, one of the challenges of the CCWG is the conditionality requirements imposed by the CWG – after discussion with Lise Fuhr, Mathieu Weill (as well as others), that it's likely the elements put forward by the CWG will be satisfied in the soon to be release proposal – this cannot be confirmed as the proposal has not been released, but this is the indication from both Mathieu Weill and Lise Fuhr. If all goes as planned, the CWG will make its comments on the conditionality requirements around 23 or 24 February.

The Chair also noted another element that has surfaced, has been costs associated with the entire process (transition, accountability). He stated he had a call with ICANN staff and other SOAC chairs last week. The call was organized by Steve Crocker and Cherine Chalaby, they wanted to step the chairs through the costs associated with these processes and the cost escalation – the process started after the announcement from by NTIA. He noted the initial budget for the entire process was 7 million dollars, but believes that was a "loose" estimate and they did not have a clear understanding of how this endeavor would unfold. Currently, costs are at about 15 million dollars, and expectation is by the time "the dust has settled", the total cost could be around 25 million dollars – far greater than initial budget. The Chair wanted to let the Council know, the costs will most likely be an issue in Marrakech. The Chair stated, Mathieu Weill has suggested Giovanni Sepia include this topic in the work of the SOP.

The Chair asked for comments – no comments were made.

3.1 CWG Stewardship

The Chair noted there was an ISTACC call (ccNSO members on CCWG, CWG, and ICG), the focus of the call was around costs as well as outstanding elements and how to start thinking about implementation. The group is not a decision making group, but rather information sharing. He stated one of the issues raised was around the final design team of the CWG IANA Transition, that Paul Kane is leading, which is around the service level expectations. Paul Kane raised the issue that they are having challenges in getting some data from IANA regarding transaction times (how long a given request takes to work its way through the system and responded to). The Chair expressed he thinks some believe this is IANA not being willing to provide the data, and framing the negative – it is his understanding that there is an independent consultant engaged by ICANN to help unpack that data set – ICANN is working on this and it's his

understanding there isn't a consistent dataset around all the IANA relegated requests, because some of them are significant like re-delegations, which tend to happen via email as opposed some timestamp transaction – so taking longer than hoped for, some of the data is very sensitive and ICANN, for privacy reasons, is not willing to simply give the full dataset. The Chair continued as a result, the work of the design team on SLEs is not yet complete. This has been picked up on by the CWG, and Jonathan Robinson and Lise Fuhr are aware and working with both IANA and Paul Kane, to try and resolve those outstanding issues. This topic will be covered in the Members meeting in Marrakech.

3.2 Update CCWG Accountability

The Chair reported the expectation is the latest proposal will be made available 18 February. This will be a key topic at the Council meeting on Wednesday in Marrakech. ICANN has specifically asked to have a decision on Tuesday, 8 March by all chartering SO and ACs – because this is before the Council meeting on Wednesday, he noted the ccNSO will not be in a position to provide a decision on Tuesday, short-circuiting the process will only cause more problems than it will solve. The Chair noted, the other SO and ACs are, to varying degrees, in the same situation, and ICANN will most likely have to wait for the other SO and ACs as well. This will be the central component of the Council meeting.

No comments or concerns were made.

3.3 Update ICG, if any

Keith Davidson provided a written update via Adobe Room Chat:
ICG will be meeting on 1 March, to consider the inputs from CWG and CCWG on Accountability and I'm hopeful ICG will be able to deliver the full and final plan (with ccNSO approval) to ICANN Board at Marrakech. There is no formal meeting at ICANN of the ICG, but the ICG will be reporting in to the ICANN community on the Monday at Marrakesh.

3.4 ccNSO decision-making process

The Chair mentioned there has been significant discussion about this over time, and the decision making process commenced well before the Dublin meeting and two special Council calls were added, which is unusual, to continue the discussion around the CCWG proposal – there has been a fair amount of effort devoted to it. He noted the Programme Working Group has devoted significant time, during the Tuesday and Wednesday meeting, to this topic. Mathieu Weill will provide a "lay of the land" on the latest from the CCWG proposal and most of Wednesday afternoon will be focused on CWG / CCWG related topics – significant time will be allocated for education, questions and some debate. A decision will be expected during the Council meeting – similar to the decision making on CWG-Stewardship Proposal.

No questions or comments were made.

4 Council Updates

4.1 Chair Update

The Chair reported on the ISTACC call and the notes of the call have been made available.

He also noted, there was a call organized by the ICANN Board members, including Cherine Chalaby, finance committee chair. The discussion was around costs and continued escalation. He noted the call was particularly interesting because 1, the fact that due to the size of the overrun, the Board apparently has to approve it (special or supplementary request to the Board for the funding). The Chair stated it was unclear to him, to what extent and at what time the Board knew of this overrun. The Board was unclear, the Chair stated Cherine Chalaby started by saying it was a "few weeks ago" they were made aware, Xavier Calvez, CFO, then said a number of times he has presented this material many times in public and beyond. Even between Board and staff there is a lack of certainty of when and how the information was shared – it is shared now, and they are fairly clear they expect that it will about 25 million USD, total cost.

Secondly, there has been discussion on who is responsible for the costs and how costs demanded by working groups, are allocated and who is responsible – so this has ICANN thinking about who is responsible for costs that are a result of working group activities and how is it managed and approved. The Chair continued by noting he believes these are reasonable discussion points, and thinks ICANN is pushing those responsibilities and project plans on to community members (chairs of working groups). There was some pushback by the SO/AC chairs, cultural change on how bottom-up processes have worked, and there is something to be said for more disciplined costing and project management – it's still unclear how this discussion will play out.

Lastly, the Chair stated ICANN reached out to him to him through stakeholder engagement, in terms of getting a better understanding of how they can encourage volunteerism and community participation – which is an ongoing issue, and concerned about volunteer burn-out, getting more people engaged, keeping them engaged and to participate more actively.

4.2 Vice-Chair Updates

No updates were noted.

4.4 Regional Organization Update

Barrack Otieno, AfTLD provided an update via Adobe Room chat. He invited all members of the ccNSO to The African Domain Name System forum, March 4-6

Action 115-01:
The secretariat is requested to inform and invite the community, on behalf of AfTLD, to The African Domain Name System Forum, from 4-6 March 2016

5 Work Group Updates

5.1 GRC (Guideline review committee)

Katrina Sataki was not available – Bart Boswinkel provided an update. He noted the GRC has been concluded review of the work plan, triage committee guidelines, roles and responsibilities and a few others. These will be presented to the community in Marrakech and to Council for adoption, this will replace the existing ones. The GRC is now focusing on the appointment rules and ccNSO meetings and Council meeting guidelines – then they will move into the additional work.

No additional comments were provided by Lesley Cowley

5.2 CCWG Updates

Use of Country and Territory names: see agenda

CWG on CCWG Principles: see agenda

5.3 Programme WG update (Katrina)

Katrina Sataki was not available – The Chair stated the work group provided a very robust agenda for Marrakech, with opportunities to discuss key issues – balanced with a program that is not just CWG / CCWG.

5.4 EPSRP WG

Bart Boswinkel provided an update, noting that the EPSRP has been working on the guidelines for the second similarity review panel. They are now into the second reiteration and hope to be able to resolve some open issues at the Marrakech face to face meeting. Good progress is being made, with GAC members, ICANN staff and ccTLD members involved – they are reaching out to SSAC as well.

No question or comments were made

6 Liaison Updates

Written updates
6.1   GNSO Liaison (Patrick Myles, written updates, to follow).
6.2   ALAC Liaison (Ron Sherwood, written updates, was send on 16 February).

7 Work plan

Work plan update. To follow Council meeting

In Marrakesh Annual plan session and set priorities. All are encouraged to attend the Sunday session.

Action 115-02:
Bart Boswinkel to circulate output March Singapore 2014 meeting to Council

8 Date of Next Meetings

8.1 Council meetings during Marrakesh meeting (5 – 10 March 2016)
- ccNSO Council Workshop Marrakesh, Sunday 6 March 2016, 10-12.00 local time
Roles and Responsibilities, Annual Work plan
- ccNSO Council prep meeting, Sunday 6 March 2016, 12.00-12.30 local time
Session throughout week are covered
Assigning Council members
- ccNSO Council – ALAC, Sunday 6 March 2016, 17.00-17.30 local time

Opportunity of two of chartering organizations
- ccNSO-GNSO Council meeting, Monday 7 March, 12.15-13.45 local time
- ccNSO- Board meeting, Tuesday 8 March, 10.00 - 10.45
Topics: To be suggested on list to Byron or Bart

8.2 Council meeting 9 March 2016 Marrakesh, 17.00-18.00 local time (17.00 – 18.00 UTC)
Need start thinking about time of Council call and the need to accommodate all time zones.

9 AOB

None

10 Adjourn

Council meeting closed at 12.40 UTC