

ccNSO Council Telephone Conference
15 December 2016

Attendees:

AF

Abdalla Omari, .ke
Abibu Ntahigiye, .tz
Souleymane Oumtanaga, .ci

AP

Debbie Monahan, .nz
Hiro Hotta, .jp
Young-Eum Lee, .kr

EU

Nigel Roberts, .gg & .je
Katrina Sataki, .lv

LAC

Alejandra Reynoso, .gt
Margarita Valdes, .cl

NA

Pablo Rodriguez, .pr
Byron Holland, .ca
Stephen Deerhake, .as

NomCom

Christelle Vaval
Celia Lerman Friedman

Observers/Liaisons

Maureen Hilyard, ALAC Observer to the ccNSO

Regional Organizations

Leonid Todorov, APTLD

ICANN Staff

Bart Boswinkel
Kim Carlson
Joke Braeken

1 Apologies

Apologies were noted from Demi Getschko, Peter Vergote, Peter Van Roste

Introduction

The call was quorate at the start of the call.

The Chair welcomed the new ccNSO Councilors, Jian Zhang, Abdalla Omari and Pablo Rodriguez

2 Minutes and Actions

Minutes 7 November 2016 are published. No comments received and minutes were adopted.

All Action completed (see: Council wiki space,

<https://community.icann.org/display/ccnsowkspc/Action+Items+2016>)

3 Overview inter-meeting Council decisions

- Adoption Election report special Election North American region
- Adoption ccNSO Council response SO/AC Accountability survey CCWG-Accountability.

No comments from the Councilors.

4 Appointment volunteers

The Chair reminded the ccNSO Council it was decided to participate in the cross-community working group on Auction Proceeds and according to the charter, at least two and not more than five, need to be appointed as members. Others can also participate but not as official members. The Chair stated the ccNSO Council must approve appointment of members (names were circulated in prep material) and if the ccNSO wants to appoint a co-chair.

The Chair suggested taking this decision offline by email decision.

Nigel Roberts proposed to accept the draft decision as worded now, and take the matter of co-chair online/email decision as suggested, after discussing with the three by-then appointed members, to see if one of them wishes to serve as co-chair.

The Chair clarified that the co-chair does not have to be one of the appointed members. She agreed to proceed as suggested by Nigel Roberts.

No objections were made by any of the Councilors.

Abstention was noted by Ching Chiao

Resolution was passed.

RESOLUTION 124-01:

The ccNSO Council appoints Ching Chiao, Peter Vergote and Mathieu Weill as ccNSO appointed members to the CCWG new gTLD Auction proceeds, and request the secretariat to inform both the volunteers and CCWG accordingly.

Action 124-01:

Secretariat to inform both the volunteers and CCWG New gTLD Auction Proceeds of appointments.

Action 124-02:

Secretariat to ask members if one of them is willing to become the ccNSO appointed co-chair (CCWG New gTLD Auction Proceeds)

4.2 Appointment ccNSO Liaison to ALAC

The Chair noted, a call for volunteers was conducted and closed on 7 December. Two indications of interest have been brought forward, but no formal application has been received yet.

Nigel Roberts suggested adopting the draft decision as written without further discussion and encourage council members to identify people to suggest volunteer.

RESOLUTION 124-02:

The ccNSO Council decides to send out a call for volunteers again and closes the former call. The Secretariat is requested to send out this call as soon as possible and leave it open until 10 January 2017.

No objections were brought forward by Council.

Resolution was passed.

4.3 Appointment volunteers drafting team charter ccNSO PDP working groups

The Chair noted the list of those who volunteered.

RESOLUTION 124-03:

The ccNSO Council appoints all persons, just listed and who applied as member of the charter drafting team for the charter of the WG review mechanism and WG retirement of ccTLDs. The newly appointed members together with the PDP Issue Manager need to appoint a chair and vice-chair. The Council expects the drafts to be ready by the Copenhagen meeting for discussion with the ccTLD community. The Secretariat is requested to inform the volunteers.

Action 124-03:

PDP Charter Drafting Team – Secretariat is requested to inform volunteers.

No comments/objections were brought forward by Council.

Resolution was passed.

5 Volunteers Ethos Award committee

The Chair discussed the need to identify ccTLD community members who, together with members of other communities, will identify people to receive this award. A call for volunteers is needed.

No comments/objections were brought forward by Council.

6 Appointment members SSR 2

The Chair again reminded the ccNSO Council of the history -ICANN issued the call for volunteers to this Security Stability Review team according to the former rules and procedures under the Affirmation of Commitments. Applicants submitted their names and supporting documentation. They also indicated with SO/AC they considered to be associated with. Since then, new bylaws came into effect and the ccNSO Council must review the names that were submitted. There are new guidelines in place (ccNSO Guideline Nominations Special Review teams). Each SO/AC may appoint up to 7 members, but the total composition of any review team should not exceed 21 members. Three seats per SO/AC are guaranteed should they decide to select all three but can suggest more. At that point, the chairs of each SO/AC will come together and the final selection.

On Monday, the SO/AC Chairs had a call and this was one topic discussed. There is a strong wish from some chairs to keep the review teams as small possible, therefore, some want less than 3 appointed per SO/AC. She noted they believe the smaller teams would be more efficient – 21 people on a team would not be wise.

The ccNSO Council must decide how many to appoint/endorse. There are two draft decision, the first is to determine if the ccNSO should participate or opt-out. Secondly, should the ccNSO Council use the selection method described in the guidelines, and list candidates in order of preference.

Bart Boswinkel expressed if the ccNSO Council decides to select members, the draft resolution states either to nominate 3 or up to 7 – so Council must decide whether to nominate 3 or up to 7.

RESOLUTION 124-04a:

The ccNSO Council decides that the ccNSO will participate in the Security and Stability Review 2 process, a specific review as foreseen in Section 4.6 of the ICANN Bylaws.

No comments/objections were brought forward by Council.

Resolution was passed

RESOLUTION 124-04b:

The ccNSO Council decides to use the selection method described in the ccNSO Guideline: ccNSO Nominations Specific Review Teams (<https://ccnso.icann.org/about/guideline-ccnso-nominations-specific-review-final-07nov16-en.pdf>) to nominate 3 candidates / up to 7 candidates in order of preference.

No comments/objections were brought forward by Council.

Resolution was passed.

The Chair informed the ccNSO Council the question of how many to select/endorse still remains.

Bart Boswinkel noted there are six candidates that claim to have a relationship with the ccNSO, with some having the support of a ccTLD manager.

Byron Holland asked in chat: is there a reason not to enable all six?

The Chair clarified the ccNSO Council can nominate all six, at which time the SO/AC chairs will then make

a final decision on appointment.

Bart Boswinkel responded three are certain to be appointed the other three would be determined by the SO/AC chairs. An order of preference must be made. So whether it's 3 or 6, the candidates should be ranked in order of preference. If three endorsements are made, they are assured to be selected.

Byron Holland asked if the ccNSO is guaranteed three and the candidates are ranked in order, is it to "our detriment" or benefit to have a larger pool of candidates? Can we indicate the top three who will be selected and put forward additional names for the SO/AC chairs to pick from should they find the need? He suggested the larger pool of candidates, assuming the Council is comfortable with them, giving the SO/AC chairs the flexibility to pick additional strong candidates if there is a necessity.

The Chair noted there are two prerequisites for the chairs to contemplate the excess candidates – first other communities appoint less than three and the SO/AC chairs must agree to have 21 members.

Alejandra Reynoso added she believes the ccNSO Council should evaluate all the candidates and use a point system and if one of the candidates does not qualify, they will not be given any points. This way they will be ranked in order of preference.

The Chair confirmed the ccNSO Council will nominate up to 7 in order of preference.

No objections were brought forward by Council.

Action 124-04:

The Secretariat is directed to initiate the process on Friday 16 December (SSR2 nomination)

7 Review Practices Council meetings

7.1 Review Council meeting Hyderabad

The Chair noted, at the meeting in Hyderabad, the ccNSO Council resolved many things and finished in record time (45 minutes). After the meeting Byron Holland pointed out that observers to the meeting did not understand the process – they did not know there was a productive prep meeting earlier. Should the ccNSO Council introduce consent agenda? Would grouping items under administrative part and substantive part be helpful? What are the Council's impressions of the public face-to-face meetings? Should it be more interactive and interesting for audience observers?

Byron Holland stated it was his impression that some of the audience felt that the ccNSO Council just voted yes to all resolutions (without the perspective of the discussions at the prep meeting). Suggested having a consent agenda for the items agreed upon during the prep meeting, then to have open discussion with the floor to participate. Simply by having a consent agenda there is a recognition that the topics have been debated and discussed versus the way it may be perceived.

Debbie Monahan, Stephen Deerhake and Young-Eum Lee expressed support.

7.2 Adoption ccNSO Guideline Council Practices

- ccNSO Guideline: Council practices

The Chair noted this guideline has not yet been submitted to the ccNSO Council for adoption. During the

Guidelines Review Committee update in Hyderabad, the group noted it would send the final draft to the community for public comment. Currently, there is a guideline on ccNSO Council meetings but it does not properly show the current practices. The guideline should cover more than just meetings – including how the ccNSO Council preps for the meeting, adoption of minutes, etc. The GRC wanted the ccNSO Council to look first at the guideline before sending to community for comment.

8 Adoption Final report and closure WG EPSRP, submission of Final report to the ICANN Board of Directors

The Chair discussed receiving the reply to comments from SSAC. They have attempted to address some of the issues highlighted in the Council document. The proposal is to have the EPSRP to review the responses received from SSAC and amend final report if deemed necessary and appropriate – then resubmit final report to the ccNSO Council.

RESOLUTION 124-05:

The ccNSO Council requests the WG EPSRP to review its Final Report to take into account SSAC 088 if deemed necessary. It is further requested to include and document process steps since its final report was produced (for example the meeting in Hyderabad). Finally, the WG is requested to provide a brief analysis of SSAC 088, including but not limited to, whether the points raised have been addressed and other relevant observations.

No objections were brought forward by Council.

Resolution was passed.

9 Organizational review of the ccNSO and its timeline.

The Chair informed the ccNSO Council she had an initial call with ICANN staff that is responsible for the organizational reviews of the ccNSO. The ccNSO must appoint a working party. The ICANN Reviews Team will provide a draft request for proposal. Then the working party will work on the feedback. It will start early 2017. In May, the Reviews Team will select an independent examiner and in June the review process will begin, which will include interviews, surveys and analysis of data. They will then propose a draft report to the working party and community for comment. May 2018 final report will be issued.

A working party needs to be selected and it's suggested using the same methods as used before: one Councilor per region, and one NomCom appointed councilor.

In preparation, it's suggested the working party has a webinar with ICANN staff to provide more information in detail.

Suggest asking Chris Disspain his observations/advice/suggestions since he was chair during first Review.

A review must be conducted according to the bylaws.

The Chair asked for comments regarding composition of working party then having a webinar with ICANN staff to discuss in more detail. This will be discussed at the next ccNSO Council call in January and the ccNSO Council should know the names of the WP candidates and additional details on what will be required.

Programme Working Group will have a session during the Members Day in Copenhagen to inform and

discuss with the community.

10 Updates CSC, RZERC and EC AC

10.1 Update CSC (Byron Holland)

Byron Holland told the ccNSO Council that the CSC had their first face-to-face in Hyderabad organizational meeting. Since that meeting, the CSC has released their first report on the first reporting of the PTI since the transition from the US government. The first report was shared with the SO/ACs and the regional organizations (and a number of other lists). The CSC rated the PTI “satisfactory” (in a three tier rating: excellent, satisfactory and needs improvement), which meant it met all the metrics. The few metrics that were not met, were satisfactorily explained. The second meeting of the CSC took place recently, at which time they received the second report from PTI. PTI showed improvement and the second report from the CSC will go out 16 December, which again rated the efforts of PTI “satisfactory”. Byron Holland went on to mention, the PTI (Elise Gerich, Trang Nguyen, Kim Davies) has been very accommodating and very responsive to the suggestions and requests of the CSC. He also noted, now that the CSC has the basic reporting structure in place, they will address other subjects such as a complaints process and annual survey/reporting (and some of the other requirements of the CSC).

Stephen Deerhake asked if the CSC was tracking bug reports or if post transition IANA owning up to bugs in the RZM code. Secondly, he asked “what is a reasonable length of time to wait for a reply from IANA staff concerning a policy question?”

Byron Holland replied the CSC is not tracking bugs, the mandate requires reviewing and monitoring what was in the SLE, which is metrics driven. He continued, as far as the policy request, it is not something the CSC is tracking, but he believes more than a month is beyond what is reasonable.

10.2 Update EC AC (Stephen Deerhake)

Stephen Deerhake updated the ccNSO Council on the activity of the Empowered Community Administration. He noted there has been no formal contact with any of the other EC representatives. There have not been any formal actions, and have not received any requests for action. Work continues on the ccNSO Guideline for ECA, the difficulty is the number of documents that must be consulted. A lot of reading has been required and he is developing a “road map”, which will capture interactions, requirements, guidelines, bylaws, etc. Once there is a “road map” draft, Ben Fuller will review, then the actual writing of the guideline will begin, with consultation from Jordan Carter and David McAuley. Goal is to have a draft prior to Copenhagen. He noted some concerns: a fairly tight timeline associated with the various community powers, ccNSO decisions making process is relatively slow, it is likely the decision making process will need to be re-visited regarding community powers in order to adhere to timelines mandated by the bylaws, lastly the ECA needs organize soon and tend to some administrative matters.

10.3 Update RZERC (written update Peter Koch)

11 WG updates

11.1 Update CCWGs

- CCWG Use of country and territory names (written update Annebeth Lange)
- CCWG Internet Governance (Young Eum Lee)

11.2 Update GRC (Katrina Sasaki)

The Chair noted there is one Guideline ready for public comment regarding Council practice, and has

asked for preliminary input from the community on liaisons. Stephen Deerhake and his team provides regular updates to the GRC on the progress regarding the empowered community administration documentation.

11.3 Update Programme WG (Alejandra Reynoso)

Alejandra Reynoso first discussed the proposed block schedule. She noted there was a meeting with the ICANN meetings team and all the SO/AC leaders regarding the scheduling. It was agreed there should be a constituency day, which will be day 4 (full day). It was also agreed upon during this call to have less cross community sessions (or HITs), three sessions were decided – two on day three, and one on day five. There may be parallel session, if the topics chosen are not of ccTLD interest. The ccNSO Council will be either Wednesday afternoon or Thursday morning, dependent on what the HIT topic will be in conflict on Wednesday.

She continued with the Members Days draft agenda review. Highlights include - it is being considered having the legal session as a forum, less presentations and more conversation/discussion. On Wednesday, possible joint session with ICANN Board. The regional organizations updates will have additional time. If the HIT topics are not of ccTLD relevance, possible parallel sessions could include internet governance.

The Chair asked if the ccNSO Council will be comfortable moving the face-to-face Council meeting to morning of Thursday (day 6). She noted this was done previously and some were unhappy, but if there is an HIT topic of interest during that block, it may be necessary to move to day 6.

12 Council Updates

12.1 Chair Update

12.2 Vice-Chair Update

12.3 Councilors Update

Pablo Rodriguez noted confirmation officially of Puerto Rico in March 2018.

Stephen Deerhake stated he just returned from visiting Dotty Sparks de Blanc, who is recovering from surgery – she sends her regards.

12.4 Regional Organizations Update

13 Liaison Updates

13.1 GNSO Update (Patrick Myles).

13.2 ALAC Update (Interim: Maureen Hilyard).

14 Next meetings

- December 2016, early January 2017: Informal meeting on ccNSO review (TBC)
- 12 January 2017, 19.00 UTC
- 9 February 2017, noon UTC
- 12 March 2017, Workshop and prep meeting f-2-f meeting, Copenhagen ICANN 58, noon local time)
- 15 March (TBC), Council meeting 17.00 Local time

15 AOB