



# ICANN 55: NCSG Policy Committee Meeting

06 March 2016 | 17:00 – 18:30 UTC

# Agenda

1. NCSG Policy Committee leadership elections. The voting will take place during the meeting as the first agenda item, so please try to be at the meeting on time. There are three candidates on the ballot who are nominated as a bloc. This means that members of the PC will have the option to vote for all three of them or NOTA.

The three candidates are:

Marilia Maciel (Candidate for PC Chair)

Matthew Shears (Candidate for PC Co-Vice-Chair)

David Cake (Candidate for PC Co-Vice-Chair)

If the new leadership team is willing, I plan on asking them to take over chairing tomorrow's Policy Committee meeting following the announcement of the results of the election.

2. Discussion on the motions scheduled to be voted on at the GNSO Council public meeting at ICANN 55 on March 9th, 2016:

a) Motion on CCWG-Accountability Supplemental Final Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations.

b) Motion to Approve the Charter for the Working Group to conduct a Policy Development Process (PDP) on a Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in All Generic Top-Level Domains (gTLDs).

c) Motion to adopt the GNSO Review Working Party's feasibility and prioritization analysis of the GNSO Review Recommendations.

# Agenda

Details on the motions are posted on the GNSO Council wiki page here:

<https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/Motions+9+March+2016>

3. Discussion of topics to be discussed during the NCSG meeting with the ICANN Board on March 8th, 2016.

A number of potential topics to bring up during the NCSG meeting with the ICANN Board have been suggested on NCSG-DISCUSS. Maryam has collated these into a document that is attached to this email.

In addition to these suggestion, Ed has also suggested an interesting potential question to the Board here on the PC list that we should also consider:

Were the transition not to take place for whatever reason, Congressional opposition for example, would the Board still consider proceeding with the accountability mechanism reforms (IRP, reconsideration, transparency) independently of any transition? More than a few people were asking that question. The flight from Washington was not particularly full of optimists in this regard.

Marilia had also suggested that we hold a discussion with the Board regarding the implementation of the recommendations coming out of the GNSO Review. This could probably be covered along with the motion to to adopt the GNSO Review WP's analysis of Westlake's final report and recommendations. A copy of the WP's review of the Westlake recommendations is attached to this email.

4. AOB