Transcription ICANN Copenhagen
ccNSO GNSO Councils meeting
Monday, 13 March 2017 at 12:15 CET

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The recording and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Donna Austin: Hello, everybody. We're going to kick this show off kind of now I guess. So this is the Joint Meeting of the GNSO and ccNSO Council. James can't join us today because he has a meeting with the Privacy Data Commissions, I think. So Heather and I will be deputizing for him.

Mary, Mary? Mary? Do we have an agenda on the – or is it…

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: Oh, what I am I looking at? Can we start the recording please? This is like a stage production, I've never done this before. We good? Okay. All right. So I think we are good to go on the agendas on the screen. Do you have anything you wanted to say? Or we just get into it now?

Katrina Sataki: Hello everyone. It's great to be here today again with you. We have a very full agenda and many issues we would like to discuss with the GNSO Council. And while you are still trying to refill your levels of energy, I think we will start by the first agenda item and that is an update on the current state of play from our Cross Community Working Group on the Use of Country and Territory Names. As you know, they have published their interim report.

And apparently they will expect something from the two councils in their near future and we have Annebeth Lange from the ccNSO and Heather Forrest from GNSO and they will fill us in.

Heather Forrest: Thanks very much ,Katrina. Heather Forrest, and very conveniently sitting next to two of the cochairs - two other of the cochairs of the CCWG on the Use of Country and Territory Names. No substantive update. I will leave that for you to explore in the form of our interim report, which was posted for public comment prior to our arrival here in Copenhagen.

The group has had a significant amount of difficulty in coming to agreement on the conclusions that have been reached after roughly three years of work. With that in mind, I can emphasize to you that community input and feedback is even more important than usual in a sense that the group had difficulty on its own in coming to agreement, and this is where we look to you that were not with us on that journey to help us see where to go next.

What I will do as I will post in the chat the link to the interim report and the public comment notice so that you know where to find it, that it's readily at hand. I encourage you to have a look at that. And they also will say in that it's related to this topic, that the youth of country and territory names at the top level falls within the scope of the ongoing GNSO PDP that we call subsequent procedures.

And it has been announced over the weekend, for those of you joining us today, that were not involved in weekend sessions, it was announced over the weekend that an intercessional webinar will be held on 25 April to establish, let's say the current state of policy and law and positions in relation to country and territory names and their use at the top level of the DNS.

And that will be, if you like, a foundational exercise to get the context agreed upon in advance of what we hope will be lengthy cross community session in

Johannesburg, ICANN 59. So with that in mind, that group's work will of course be reviewing the interim report here of the Cross Community Working Group and so the effort that you can feed into that public comment period into that report would be very helpful to the Subsequent Procedures PDP.

To make it very clear, Annebeth, Carlos and I and the Cross Community Working Group have nothing to do with those sessions that will be run by the Subsequent Procedures PDP, but since it is relevant to our work we've been asked to make that announcement. So I'm happy to answer any questions but barring that I will put in the chat for you the link to the initial report in the public comment period. Thank you.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much. Any of cochairs would like to add something?

Annebeth Lange: Annebeth Lange speaking here. I just would really like to encourage you to look into the report even if it's long and seem complicated. It gives quite good information about the background for why we have ISO 3166 and why it started the discussion. So at least try to read the summary and ask - read the questions in the end and try to consider it. It will help us very much in the future work. Thank you.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you. Are there any questions from the councils or from the room?

Donna Austin: Thanks, Katrina. Donna Austin. Just following up on something Heather said about the intercessional on geographic names that will be conducted to assist with the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group, the intent is to, you know, in addition to the CCWG work that's being conducted in this area, we are also, when I say we, that PDP working group chairs are also aware of some other efforts that are going on on geographic names particularly within the GAC.

So the intent is to bring those discussions together under the one umbrella with the intent that after the, you know, having the intercessional via a

webinar that we will have a more substantial conversation in Johannesburg around the issue of geographic names. So just some context on how we intend to – how the PDP working group intends to discuss geographic names on an intercessional basis but also in Johannesburg. Thanks. Thanks, Katrina.

Katrina Sataki: Go to the next one.

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: So we don't have any questions. The next item on the agenda is that CCWG on Internet Governance progress update on the charter. So this is something that we discussed in Hyderabad. And it's a -- what we agreed at that meeting is that we felt that it would be helpful for the CCWG to update their charter. And I believe the GNSO Council is getting an update on that during our meeting on Wednesday. I'm not sure – Rafik?

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: Did you want to – or Rafik, want to take that? Thanks.

Young Eum Lee: Well the charter was delivered to you actually very recently, but the charter actually reflects a series of things that the working group has been involved in so it is a specification or a clarification of the things that the working group has been involved in.

The things that may have been added is that with the support of the SOs, there is a suggestion that the SOs appoint additional members to the group's, although the membership of the group is still very open for participation by other members.

And we will be continuing the public comment process and be looking out for things outside of ICANN that are happening especially with the ITU or within

the ITU or the UN that may have to do with Internet governance topics. Thanks. And Rafik, if you can add?

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks. Rafik speaking. Thanks, Young Eum. So what we tried to do is to do a kind of comparison between the current charter and using the model template from the uniform framework to try to see the area where there are the (unintelligible) or not aligning. And we tried to work on this area in particular like this call of objectives and so on to elaborate more to clarify what we are intending to do in the working group. And also mostly we try to use the language in the template so it will be aligned and you can find that it's similar to other cross community working group and so on.

In fact, we didn't - in several area we didn't find out much difference because of the time when the uniform framework for cross community working group was under discussion, we used that text at that time, even it was not finalized. So we tried to do that and we created two documents just to highlight the difference because it's more, make it more readable for everyone.

So you can find the first document is to compare between the revised charter with the new amendments against the template. So you can see the kind of area that we have to fill. And also to compare between the revised charter and the current charter.

In addition to that, we have also the activity reports which is more like kind of to summarize what we were doing at the last year and to explain what we did and so one, it's more like for information and communication. So now we have - we are suggesting several amendments and I think what was expected in term of reporting the findings. And we are suggesting several revisions and we are hoping for a discussion and input on that so to see how we can move forward.

Donna Austin: Okay thanks, Rafik. Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Donna. Heather Forrest, but I'm happy if there are others who want to go first. Rafik, I wonder if you could help us, I think these documents are fairly recent that they were delivered while we were on sort of planes and in transit. One of the concerns that we raised here in the GNSO and ccNSO Councils, I looked at our notes from our last meeting, was tangible deliverables; things that the CCWG intended to do. Could you report on that please

Rafik Dammak: Okay thanks, Heather. So as said, we tried to kind of elaborate about the activities and the objectives and also the idea, how say, the deliverable and the work plan which was kind of missing. So in term of deliverable we put several kind of interim or final deliverable we are expected to work on light position paper and statement.

We also do - we kind of organized workshop what we see as deliverable from them is reports that we can share with the community. Also the annual report summarized all the discussion and the activities. And we are expecting, because the thing how say, what we are covering it's always ongoing, there are several events and so on, is to working kind of progress report that we can share with the wider community.

Another thing is we find out that we have to work more on the work plan, and this is my kind of identify the possible consultation or policy process. We should monitor and participate. And so we can do that like in the beginning may be for one year to identify what is coming, and we can adjust later.

So what we thought is we need more, something concrete to share like, to share is like position paper and the reporting on a regular basis, but also to have – to work in the kind of work plan based off of what we see as coming. And we are insisting on that we have to keep the community and our chartering organization informed in what's happening. So that was kind of a focus on our side.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Rafik. Do we have any other questions from anybody on this topic? So, Rafik, Young Eum, something from my perspective, so this is - the CCWG doesn't have a finite end date to it or deliverable, you see it as a rolling proposition?

Rafik Dammak: So we know that the issue is that – yes, we need a kind of start and end. And so we spent some time to think about. What we have as a provision is like for two years timeframe and the possibility at the end to, by the AGM, that the chartering organization to review, to assess about the work of the working group. But then if we want a new cycle to start we have to submit a work plan to explain why we are saying in future we have to cover. So that kind of tried to do the next. We understand that there is this idea you have to close.

But we can renew after an assessment in the review by the chartering organization, and to do that from our side. We have to deliver like all the kind of deliverable at the end and all the reporting. So that was kind of input for a review by the chartering organization.

And then we have to submit a work plan for the next phase, and that's how we can - the ability to renew for a new cycle and so on. So that is not kind of continuous understanding, but do you have kind of two years timeframe that we will have to better planning and to get all those kind of expectation from working group in term of work plan, and deliverable and so on.

At the end we can review, if chartering organization are okay, we can start the next cycle and having the plan what we are expected to do otherwise, we can justify close off.

Young Eum Lee: I would just like – sorry, this is Young Eum. I would just like to add that the things that this group is proposing to deal with are things that we cannot expect. For example last year there was a dotAfrica issue that was raised within the ITU that propose that ITU deal with the CC (unintelligible) and the

names of territories and so that was something that really concerned a lot of people within the ICANN community.

And so one of the main purposes of this group is not to come up with a standard or anything but to support the ICANN community in making itself known to outside sort of forces like the ITU that may have initiated activities that may encroach upon what ICANN is doing. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Young Eum. Thanks, Rafik. Any other questions from anybody? Okay. You want to go to next one? Yes? So our next topic is CCWG on Auction Proceeds and the progress to date. I don't know who put this on the agenda. Ching, can I turn this over to you? Thanks.

Ching Chiao: Thank you, Donna. This is Ching Chiao from the – sorry – ccNSO. Hi. It was a couple years ago so fast forward. Thanks. I was hoping that Jonathan could be here, and I understand that up to this point we are still having him as a cochair. I understand that he intends to step out of this leadership position which most of the members feels like that is probably not the best decision for the community but we understand that he himself could have some constraints to serve.

So for me probably to make some updates and probably one or two question for the GNSO just to let us know where you're at for the leadership position on the cochair selection. But anyway, so the group has met for four or five times since late January this year pretty much setting the tone for this important group that set up by the Board to kind of design the framework for the new gTLD auction proceeds.

So pretty much in the first few meetings we asked the members, participants, and also the observers to make sure that they understand that there are rules for this, I mean, although it's very inclusive, we like everybody to participate but just to make sure that everybody declares the interests, are you going to

be - actually on the designing the process, the mechanism part or will you be interested in receiving the funds in the future?

And also we received a note from the Board last month indicating that they also need the group to set a very clear separation for what I just said. So that's one.

And in terms of the logistics, we did start to work on making sure that we understand the members' expertise, their areas of expertise, so as you can probably find out, and later we will be posting on the chat, is about the members' expertise. We do have a -- we did have a survey for that.

We also, since last meeting, we did send out also another survey to ask members to offer initial response for the 11 chartering questions. The question ranging from why do you think about the structure looks like, would they be under the ICANN umbrella or would they be a separate fund? How do you envision this to happen, given ICANN, it has its own legal and fiduciary constraints. And that's one.

And the other is that for my role as interim cochair from the ccNSO, we did seek for the more contribution from the more experienced ccTLD managers who have in the past few years or decades on managing a large sum of funds as a nonprofit. So that would be another round of work which we do envision this will take place pretty soon.

But the first few meetings, just to set things straight and make sure the group is up and running, which we do. But maybe let me stop now and maybe ask the GNSO where are we standing in terms of selecting the cochair or are you in the position to answer this? Or maybe I'll just stop here. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Ching. If people are watching the chat I think Rubens is already announced, so it's on the council agenda for discussion on Wednesday. And

Erika has volunteered, so we will be discussing that during the Council meeting on Wednesday.

Erika, I notice that you're down as GNSO lead on this so did you have anything you wanted to say on the actual working group itself?

Erika Mann: I think the - was already covered the history. Maybe a very few points may be to add. We had a drafting team already set up for the charter, so we have a document ahead of us. The drafting team primarily looked into the principles for the charter so how shall the charter operate and function, which shall be the guiding principles for this future operation. And now we will have under the umbrella of the CCWG we will have to look into more precise, entering and more precise phase.

We have to become much more clearer how the future – the future whatever it is going to be, it can be a fund, it can be something else, how this will be set up, how it shall be operate, but it's still a preliminary phase then because we will probably want to have a different umbrella which will then guide that can create allocation of the fund for a precise project. But these are the things we will have to discuss. And so far we are entering a very important period, and it will be interesting for everybody of you to give us ideas, whoever is going to work on this, we attend as much as possible and guide us and help us to define this process as clearly as possible.

Because they think we want to avoid conflict in the end phase, it wouldn't make any sense. So your input will be super important that it comes as early as possible. And yes, we will have the (unintelligible) when we will decide upon the chairman, chairmanship from the GNSO.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Erika. Does anybody have any questions on the auction proceeds? Okay. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele Neylon for the record. A couple of things, first off in common with a lot of other people I think it is a problem that Jonathan feels he has to step down, but the conflict of interest or potential conflict of interest was something that had to be addressed. And I think this is one of the more problematic aspects of this entire discussion is going to be how on earth you can move forward with this and to be honest and say, no I'm not conflicted, I don't want any of this money? I mean, that's one of the reasons why I would never volunteer because my first thing would be just give me all the money, I'm sure I can give it a good home.

But joking aside, it is going to be a fascinating process to follow. And if it comes out well, well done everybody. But if we screw this one up, it's massive, it's much bigger than anything else, because it's just the sheer amount of money involved. You know, ICANN has just gone through an entire process of breaking itself away from the US government, with the change of administration in the US and in other countries, a lot of things are probably going to be under scrutiny for the next few years.

Something like this is the kind of fodder for the mainstream media that they would actually care about. It's very hard to talk to the media about domains, IP addresses and things like that, but when you're talking about large amounts of money it's very easy to get them to wrap their little heads around it. So good luck everybody, and hopefully we can help you. And thank you to Erika for stepping up. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Erika.

Erika Mann: I think Michele mentioned the most problematic area we will have to deal with and where we already see some conflicts coming up because there are different ideas how conflict of interest shall be - shall guide the operation in the next phase.

Just to give you to ideas which are the most conflictual, and again your advice will be important in this phase, so for example shall the next phase where the charter will be more defined and the guiding principles and everything else which will be – need to set up for the allocation of the funds, shall there already be a clear understanding that nobody whoever wants in the future wants to have access to these kind of funds will be not allowed to participate in shaping the ideas? Or, is this then left to the next phase?

So I think Michele is absolutely right, we have to be clear about how we think this operation shall work and shall function. It's – I'm very neutral on this one, I must say. I've seen different environments operating with totally different guiding principles. There's not a single idea out there which one can copy. But we have to be clear what we want. And the Board might have different ideas, I know, because I was sent to the drafting team from the Board and we already had, without going into details, debates in the Board. So the Board might have a different understanding.

Donna Austin: Thanks Erika. Ching.

Ching Chiao: Just quickly build on what Michele and Erika said, and fully understand and fully agree the level of importance on this. Probably in my personal capacity and some of the contribution I would like to get the groups to really to focus on what would be really useful, you know, because this large sum of money can really make a good impact to the Internet ecosystem and also development.

So from time to time we try to urge people to think of how serious it is, how important it is, that being on the quote, unquote positive side just, you know, when this sum of money we do really hope that change can be made.

So I also therefore, there is some legal, as I said, legal and financial constraints but also the scope is also up for design by the members of the community. So yes, please participate. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Ching. Anybody else? Thanks. It's certainly going to be a pretty sensitive topic over the next couple of years I think. We will move onto the next one which is the scheduling of ICANN meetings and how do we improve the process.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, I think we agreed to put this on agenda before we knew that there is going to be a breakfast meeting this Thursday when we start, already start our planning for the meeting in Johannesburg. But yes, still about the principle, first question to you, GNSO folks, are you happy with the process?

Donna Austin: Very. Extremely happy.

Katrina Sataki: Extremely happy, yes. That's good. Because we have some proposals too. But we think that the current problem is that too many people are involved in discussions, so our proposal is to limit the number of people and create something like a program committee with clear mandate. And for example, one person per SO/AC, and that's the responsibility of the person to foster views from their community and then discuss it with others.

We believe this might be a good way forward, and that is going to be our proposal. But our chair of our Meeting Program Working Group, Alejandra, could you please a little bit more?

Alejandra Reynoso: Yes, this is Alejandra speaking. Well, another improvement that we see is a little bit more indications with the ICANN Strategy Team, and try to not make last-minute changes, I would say that would sum it up. And if you have any suggestions on how to improve the process, I'm happy to hear them.

Man: I have a suggestion on last-minute changes, and that is take into account all of the review team meetings and the CCWG meetings that are the last-minute additions to the schedule. I mean, you're scheduling probably only 60% of ICANN meetings, I mean, there are a ton of other meetings that are

not scheduled, that are unconnected to the three main meetings and create a lot of problem to volunteers who are in the CCWG, in the review teams, etcetera.

So whatever, I think it's a great idea to have less people, but let's try to cover a higher percentage of the volunteers meetings over the year with this group, not only the three official public meetings, because what really creates problem is when you are participating in a review team and you don't know if you are going to be connected or not connected to the public meeting. And then two weeks before you are expected to arrive, three days earlier that you don't have a hotel and they are not ready to change your ticket. Thank you very much.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you. I agree, this is a problem definitely. Another problem is that for some reason somebody thinks that they can wait until the last moment and then finally decide - we receive a lot of requests, one, two weeks before the meeting, I would like to have a presentation. Sorry, our agenda is published a month, at least a month, even almost 2 months before the meeting. So and it's already packed, we cannot accommodate it.

And then for the bigger ICANN Schedule I think the problem is even bigger. The number of rooms is limited, number of staff who can deal with all the incoming requests is also limited. In time that we have for the planning is also limited. So definitely there is a need for some improvement and on Thursday we are going to talk about that. So this is - we just wanted to share with you what we are going to propose so that you can think about it, have some counter arguments are on the contrary, maybe you think it's - it could work. And then support this idea, but that's what we wanted to share with you.

Donna Austin: Avri.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, Avri please.

Avri Doria: Hi. Avri Doria speaking. I wanted to ask a question, how often does it happen that there are extra meetings that need to be added or extra agenda items that need to be added? And if it's a common occurrence, is there a practice of leaving agenda line items open for the last minute emergent issues, leaving a couple meeting slots open for the last minute emergent meetings? If this happens all the time, and is always a problem, is it the kind of thing that can be planned for?

Katrina Sataki: I think it's a very good question. And probably this is not the question that should be asked here to us. Probably we should ask those people who come up with last-minute changes, could you have planned it before? Yes but apparently they cannot, yes, and that's probably a deeper problem there.

But my understanding is that there are 300 meetings are so during the ICANN week, and I do not think we have the possibility to leave a slot or two because 300 meetings you just have to, you know, schedule them around those meeting days. Well my feeling in Hyderabad was that the longer the meeting, the last time we have for meetings. So yes.

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: Yes, Donna Austin. So we did have some discussion with the Board about this yesterday. And this was an expression of my views on how we should think about the meetings. We think of them as individual meetings whereas I think we should start thinking about the plan for a 12 month period. We have 16 days that we meet face-to-face throughout the year, how do we get the best use out of that time?

The GNSO Council doesn't have an opportunity to do any kind of strategic planning throughout the year, and one of the things that we've actually sought some funding for is to allow us to have, you know, maybe a two-day session at the beginning of each year so that we can, you know, do some planning for what the 12 months is going to look like. And hopefully that will help us feed

into what the priorities are and how we manage our time for the 12 month period.

And, you know, the Board has actually developed their priorities for 2017. I don't know if the ccNSO actually goes through that process, and maybe be ALAC as well. But one of the things that Chris Disspain mentioned is that if we did all have that process then we could, you know, collectively work together to understand what's the best way to use that 16 days that we have as a face-to-face time.

Certainly going into Johannesburg, being somebody that was part of the Meeting Strategy Working Group, I have a strong preference that we keep that format very similar to what we had in Helsinki. I think from a GNSO perspective, the feedback has been that the policy format seems to work pretty well so we'd like to keep that in place.

So for Johannesburg if we can maintain that policy focus and be very strict in terms of what we - what meetings actually take place during those four days I think that would be helpful. Thanks, Katrina.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you. Anybody else would like to add something to this? Yes, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, thanks. Rafik speaking. Maybe if we try to do some analysis, is it possible to know how many session are requested by a group because maybe you are thinking GNSO and ccNSO what we are submitting as proposal. But I think even the ICANN staff and like GDD and so on, they are having several session because we hear the number of 300 that can be misleading somehow because some session are like for newcomer and so on.

So if we can have kind of a breakdown and see how much session we have per meeting and see how we can maybe improve that, maybe just kind of the idea like having cap or something like that. Maybe it's to try to push people to

be (unintelligible) in term of what they are requesting, because when we have an ICANN meeting I think there is kind of the wishful thinking let's try to fix all issues, let's discuss, and we will have a lot of internal meetings, and that never ends.

Katrina Sataki: Yes thank you. And I think another thing that we need to accept with this number of meetings during a one-week period is that conflicts are unavoidable. There always will be conflicts. And it is not possible to solve them all. Solving conflicts for one group will cause conflicts or other groups. And there must be some balance found for that.

Donna Austin: Yes, thanks Katrina. If I can just channel James Bladel for a minute. One of the realities is that we come into these meetings with a very different purpose in mind. So you know what the ccNSO does, what the GAC has on their agenda, with a GNSO is trying to achieve, what the ALAC once out of these meetings, I think we can manage from a very different perspective.

So it might be - there may be some value in actually getting a better understanding of what the ccNSO wants and what do they need to get out of these meetings. And if we could share the same with the ccNSO. I know that a lot of, you know, those outside the GNSO don't understand the importance of constituency day for us. The GNSO is not a homogenous group, we are disparate and so we separate on Tuesday and have the meetings among our own constituencies, so that's pretty important to us in terms of the scheduling that we do actually have not constituency day available to us.

Whereas the ccNSO, I think you meet for three days or two days together…

Katrina Sataki: Three days…

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: Yes, so, you know, we have different objectives when returning to these meetings. And I think if we had more discussion about what it is that we think the purpose of the meeting is and what we need to get out of it personally we might be able to be a little bit more possible in terms of coming up with a schedule.

You know, Tanzi does a tremendous job I think in terms of getting 300 sessions into a five day period but it's not optimal. I think Rafik, to your point, I'm sure that data is available but nobody has actually kind of sat down and analyzed it and try to work out, you know, how we can, you know, get the most out of that.

But I think, you know, everybody has competing agendas and staff is put in the middle of that trying to resolve it, and then they get blamed for, you know, not meeting everybody's needs. So it's a - it's a very difficult position for them to be in. But certainly I think if we were a little bit more tolerant of one another's needs, and had that conversation about what we want to get out of this we might get a little bit further down the path of getting something that's more acceptable.

Katrina Sataki: Alejandra…

Alejandra Reynoso: And this is Alejandra. Following understanding each community needs, I think having this small group of program committee for the ICANN strategy will be a really good idea so maybe seven people and say okay, this is what everyone brings to the table, and then try to make a better way of a map of how meetings should be laid out instead of having likes a poor Tanzanica figure it out on the way. So – for that.

And the other thing that I would like the GNSO to think about for the Thursday breakfast meeting is regarding the cross community sessions because those have, well, very well received in Helsinki because it was the first time but then in further meetings they lose a little bit of their, I will say, magic. So it's

something that please think about it, seeing what would you like them to be or how they can be improved if they should continue, and how they should continue please.

Katrina Sataki: Yes thank you very much. So if there's no further input, let's move to the next agenda item, it's about the review of our Customer Standing Committee charter. According to the bylaws, we are supposed to do that. So two groups, ccNSO and RySG, they do the review and then both councils have to opt - adopt the updated charter if there are any needs for updates.

But okay we had the meeting a couple of days ago. Donna, would you like to…

Donna Austin: Sure.

Katrina Sataki: …highlight?

Donna Austin: The GNSO Council had an update from the CSC yesterday, I think it was the first update that we received. And I think we are pretty with happy with how things are going, Byron, we think the team is doing a great job. But in terms of the CSC charter itself, there is a review requirement after 12 months of the first meeting of the CSC, so that comes up in October.

So Katrina and myself and Paul Diaz and Bart met during the week and we've kind of scoped out a plan for the timeframe that we need to work through to try to make that happen. And then so we will try to kick that off in the next couple of months. We expect that the review committee will probably be three members from the Registry Stakeholder Group, three members from the ccNSO, and then once we complete out - there will be, you know, some kind of public comment period in there as well, so to involve all of the community.

And then it will come back to the ccNSO and GNSO to approve any changes or amendments to the charter. So I think that's all.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you. Byron, would you like to add anything?

Byron Holland: Sure, thank you. And speaking of conflicts between meetings, that's why I was late because it was the CSC meeting, which conflicted with this one. But just I know the GNSO had an update, and I know the ccNSO was going to have an update tomorrow.

But I think the short story here is from an operating point of view for the CSC, we haven't felt ourselves constrained by the charter. It seems to be providing what we need. And certainly from the design teams that were part of that process, the actual SLEs themselves that we are monitoring separate and distinct from of course the charter review but related, are also working quite well, though we will have some suggestions and be putting those back to our respective communities in the coming months. But overall I would say the charter itself is serving the CSC well.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much. And when charter serves well, the committee also serves very, very well, so thank you. Any other comments, questions, suggestions? If no, then we moved to the last item on our agenda today, very exciting, right? It's about empowered community. And probably if we talk about that, maybe even its extended to the implementation of new bylaws.

I would like to give the floor to Stephen, our colleague from the ccNSO Council, who is also our representative on the EC administration, and who is by now an expert on ICANN bylaws because he's the one - probably the only one I know who can understand what's written in there. Stephen, please.

Stephen Deerhake: Stephen Deerhake for the record. I do not claim a full understanding of the bylaws by any stretch of the imagination. But since James is not here, who is the GNSO rep on the ECA, I thought I should give you guys an

overview of what we expect to have happening between now and through and after the next ICANN meeting in Johannesburg.

The Board is likely to make a change to a fundamental bylaws, seeing that they cannot leave anything alone, and a change in a fundamental bylaws under the new bylaws that came into effect October 1, triggers what's known as an approval process. Specifically the Board needs to come to the community and seek the approval of their bylaw change, for not one, not two but three of the SO/ACs. So they have a bit of a sell-job ahead of them.

It's actually a very noncontroversial by law change, and it will give us our first test of how all this is supposed to work going forward. As a result of this, the ECA will have to hold, if the Board goes, according to the plan I've heard today, the ECA will have to hold at the Johannesburg meeting, a public forum in which the Board will present to the community a rationale for this bylaw change and the community can debate this change with the Board.

The role of the ECA at this forum is simply to facilitate the interaction between the community, either the community individuals, community as SO/ACs, and the Board. There is then a 21 day period after the conclusion of the forum, where the respective SO/ACs need to make a decision as to whether or not they approve of this proposed change.

So that's the approval process on that, so with the scheduling for the Johannesburg meeting, somewhere in there they're going to have to add the public forum, if things go according to what we believe the plan is. I don't know what shape that would take. I suggest maybe it's going to be an hour plus, given Board presentation and community questions, but questions as to, A, how big of a room, when they should be held, who knows what the answers to those are at this point; it's completely uncharted territory.

The other thing that is coming up on the ECA's agenda is the fact that we are getting fairly far along in the ICANN budget cycle for FY 18, and when the

Board adopts that budget, which they will do before June, that triggers a rejection petition period which is the period in which a member of the community can file an objection with their SO/AC that they're a member of, which then triggers the petition process. The end result here could be rejection of the community - of the ICANN budget.

In any event, we will have to hold a teleconference call after the budget is adopted, assuming we get an objection, if the period expires, the petitioning period expires without an objection from the community member, any community member, then the budget is finalized and we can all go our merry way.

If we do get an objection we will have to hold a teleconference call. We will also have to hold a forum. The teleconference call with optional, the forum is not. But the forum can also take the form of a teleconference call. And again, I'm not sure, we don't know at this point what format that would take etcetera, etcetera. It will be facilitated by ICANN is the extent of what we know at this point in time.

The timeframe for that, it looks like the Board will adopt the budget around 24 June at the Joberg meeting, which means the rejection petitioning period will end around 15 July so we will know around the middle of July whether or not we are continuing down the path towards holding forums on the budget etcetera, etcetera. So sometime over the summer we may see some action there as well.

And that's it for me.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much, Stephen. Are there any questions, comments?

Donna Austin: Thanks, Katrina, Donna Austin. So from a GNSO Council perspective, we've been, you know, working through what the bylaw changes mean in terms of our operating procedures. And we had a drafting team that worked through

that and the Council signed off on it and staff in the process of, you know, working out an implementation plan. So we are working through that.

James is appointed as the interim GNSO appointments to the EC, and we're in the process of trying to stand up - you probably are to have one of these – a Standing Selection Committee. We've come to find that we are called on quite regularly these days to fill certain positions, so once we stand up the – our Standing Selection Committee then we will have a more formal process for that position that will run through that committee. So James is the interim, and hopefully we'll provide a permanent representative in the near future.

Stephen Deerhake: Near future meaning before Joberg or after Joberg or do we not know?

Donna Austin: I think the interim appointment - so we confirmed that at the last Council meeting. I think James's expectation was that that would be for another three months, so, you know, I'm not sure of the timing, Stephen, that could be hopefully before Joberg.

Katrina Sataki: Yes. Thank you. So that's around EC things. But there are also some other things that we need to pay attention to. And just maybe you knew that already but we learned about only yesterday from David, who is the chair of IRP implementation something – team, team, yes. Right. That's correct. IRP Implementation Team, that pretty soon ICANN is going to announce a call for expressions of interest to serve on the IRP panel – sorry, standing panel.

And so there might be even like 1000 potential candidate. And SO/ACs are supposed to select at least seven of them. At least we have no idea about the process, and the bylaws are not very clear either. So this is something that SOs and ACs have to figure out how we are going to do that. And apparently we do not have much time to do it.

Donna Austin: We actually have a – David McAuley from the Registry Stakeholder Group has been working on this issue. And he will be providing us an update at the

Council meeting on Wednesday. So I guess if there is any information from that that may be helpful for you in understanding maybe we could share some of that.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, thank you Donna. We learned that from David who gave a update. So I – well I'm a little bit doubtful that you might learn something more from the same update. But yes, so he just warned us and it came as, you know, one of those pleasant ICANN surprises.

Donna Austin: Yes.

Katrina Sataki: And so this is something we – together SO/AC leaders apparently have to figure out. So are there any more comments, and maybe somebody would like to share your excitement about implementation of the new bylaws within the GNSO?

Donna Austin: There's a lot of excitement about it. I think we have our first - there will be a meeting here on Wednesday or Thursday just to start walking through the implementation part of it, so yes.

Katrina Sataki: Stephen, please.

Stephen Deerhake: Stephen Deerhake for the record. Donna, it's my understanding that most if not all the GNSO decision-making is actually done in face-to-face format, and I was wondering what kind of the impacts some of these timelines have on GNSO decision-making with respect to be empowered community rights?

Donna Austin: We do make most of our decisions either on conference calls or at these meetings so in formal Council meetings, but we do have the ability to do email, you know, vote by email, make decisions by email. And I think we did do that last year for some reason, I can't remember why, but we do have the ability to do that. I mean, you know, the implementation of the things that have come out of the transition are putting pressure on us as well.

And we are struggling a little bit with the timeframes, and a very compressed timeframes that we have to work in, so we do struggle with that. And, you know, in addition to the impacts from the IANA transition and the new bylaws, we are even struggling a little bit with just filling vacancies for the review team, you know, better hitting us up as well.

So we are, you know, struggling a little bit under workload at the moment because it's really hard to understand, you know, that's probably if we had the ability to plan on a 12 month cycle we would be better at this. But we're kind of doing these things as they, you know, oh God, we've got to deal with this, what's the timeframe and how are we going to manage it. So doing the best we can but sometimes we are not meeting the expectations of others.

Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Donna. Michele Neylon for the record. Just on this point as well, this was mentioned at the opening of the session, the ccNSO in some respects you're a fairly contiguous homogenous group, in many respects, I know you're not in others. For us on the GNSO Council, the vast majority of us represent other groups and constituencies and stakeholder groups.

So for example, I'm on as one of the three GNSO councilors for the Registrar Stakeholder Group; Donna is one of the three on for the Registry Stakeholder Group. So while we all need individually have strong opinions, beliefs and feelings about various things, when it comes to taking actual formal decisions, I am directed by my stakeholder group. So we have to go back to our stakeholder group and explained to them what the issue is as best we can, and then hopefully get direction from them.

Now being honest about it, for some things they might not get terribly excited about it, but for other things they will definitely get the very, very, very excited and they will have very strong opinions. And I think other GNSO councilors

are going to be in a similar position. So in terms of the timelines, you have to allow for that.

Personally, I would find it helpful to get information about this in a fashion that I can digest quickly and easily, because the sheer volume of content we get from all the different PDPs and IRTs and IRPs and reviews and, I can't even remember half the acronyms, trying to actually make sense of a lot of that at times, my brain can't cope. So anything around the digestible slices, treat us like we are slightly stupid in some respects, it might help. Thanks.

Donna Austin: Mary.

Mary Wong: Hi. This is Mary Wong from ICANN staff. So just a couple of comments from this staff and where we are trying to help the community work through these new bylaws because of all the implementation issues associated with them, the emphasis is for each decisional participant, and in this case it be the ccNSO and the GNSO, within their community come up with the relevant improvements, additions or changes in your internal processes. And from the discussion today it is apparent that that is being done in both communities, so that's number one.

Number two, and I'm going to be cautiously optimistic in saying that hopefully this is somewhat good news, I'm looking at Stephen because he gave a great rundown of what you will have coming down the pike. But of the new community powers in the new bylaws most trigger the processes that we are talking about only if something actually happens. So if for example, a petition is successfully submitted for one of the new powers to go through the process.

So the good news, relatively speaking, is that you don't need to expect to go through this every other month or every ICANN meeting to have a public forum and last indeed one, two or more of the community powers are

successfully invoked all at the same time with the exception of the budget, that being probably the one recurring annually.

The last thing I will say is that we on the policy staff do talk to one another a little bit, so what we actually have done is come up with a set of slides, Stephen, I think you've seen them, that attempt to summarize the new community powers, the role of the decisional participants versus the role of the EC administration, which is the administrative body for which Stephen is now the ccNSO rep and James is the interim GNSO rep.

So the difference between the roles of a decisional participant as well as the EC administration and the whole EC at large. So we will circulate these slides, hopefully Michele, it's not that it's all that much but it is quite a lot to digest all at once, so we will be happy to take any questions from anybody, and obviously we're always here to help clarify. Thank you.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Mary. Any other comments or questions on this one? No? That it? Any other business anyone wants to raise? Nice to see you back in the room, Keith.

Katrina Sataki: Michele.

Donna Austin: Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Donna. Look, this is completely unrelated but we are in kind of AOB. Wearing my hat as one of the vice chairs of the RDS PDP, just to give you a heads up, we might be in touch formally with the ccNSO to ask you for your help and guidance since you've all tell with Whois, and you've all - and none of you have imploded or exploded, yet ICANN seems to have a terrible problem with Whois. Don't know why. So just a heads up we might be in touch with you. Thanks.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you, Michele. We are always open to any requests from the GNSO.

Michele Neylon: And I always enjoy those sessions with the ccNSO because of they're less agitated and conflictual compared to some of the ones within the GNSO.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much. And it was, as always, a pleasure to be here with you, share our exchange, our opinions, and give some insurance that we can work successfully together in the future. But thank you very much. Thank you for having us here. Have fun with the rest of the meeting.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Katrina. Thanks, everybody.

END