ccNSO Council Telephone Conference
13 April 2017

<u>Attendees :</u>

AF
Abibu Ntahigiye, .tz
Souleymane Oumtanaga, .ci

AP
Young Eum Lee, .kr
Hiro Hotta, .jp

EU
Katrina Sataki, .lv
Peter Vergote, .be
Nigel Roberts, .je, .gg

LAC
Alejandra Reynoso, .gt
Demi Getschko, .br
Margarita Valdez, .cl

NA
Stephen Deerhake, .as

NomCom
Jian Zhang

Liaisons/Observers
Ben Fuller, ccNSO liaison to GNSO
Wafa Dahmani, ccNSO liaison to ALAC

Regional Organizations
Leonid Todorov, APTLD
Barrack Otieno, AfTLD
Peter Van Roste, CENTR (late)

ICANN Staff
Bart Boswinkel
Kim Carlson
Joke Braeken

1 Apologies

Abdalla Omari, Debbie Monahan, Byron Holland, Christelle Vaval, Ching Chiao, Maureen Hilyard

Did not attend/no apologies: Pablo Rodriguez

Agenda Item 16 Next meetings

The Chair chose to advance ahead to this agenda topic – due to the number of Councilors who leave before the end of the call. This is an important topic and concerns everyone. The Chair noted regarding the face to face meeting in Johannesburg, it's a shorter meeting "meeting B" and the Council must decide, should the meeting be held Wednesday in the afternoon (block 5) or Thursday morning (block 1). The Chair asked if the Councilors had a preference and to let that preference be known before the end of the call.

Stephen Deerhake noted in chat either option worked for him.

Bart Boswinkel added there are some Councilors attending only on the phone and not in the Adobe Room, and suggested they "speak up" if they have a question/comment.

2 Minutes and Actions

Minutes from the 15 March meeting were distributed and published – no comments were received.

One open action item:
Action 127-05:
Once details are better understood the Secretariat is requested to send out an appropriate call for volunteers (GAC Underserved region WG) – on going

3 Overview inter-meeting Council decisions
None

4 ccNSO Travel Funding: ccNSO Council request to increase number travel slots

The Chair started by thanking the drafting team for an excellently written document.

TIMELINE:

1. Call for volunteers: closed on Tuesday 28 March 23:59 UTC
2. Initial drafting: 29 March – 10 April 2017
3. Initial draft shared with Council: 11 April
4. Discussion initial draft Council: Council call 13 April + closure Council comments 17 April
5. Update Draft: 18 April – 21 April
6. Council vote on the draft: 22 April - 27 April

7. Submission statement by ccNSO Council chair: 28 April

Nigel Roberts was not on the call at the time this agenda topic was raised and unable to provide a summary and update.

Nigel Robert will be asked to update the Council once joins the call

Nigel Roberts noted the document has gone through several iterations and was circulated to the drafting team, no negative comments were received (no comments were received at all), therefore it was presented to Council for consideration.

The Chair cited the draft requests a significant increase in travel slots. Currently there are 12 slots and the proposal is to increase to 26.

Nigel Roberts suggested being diplomatic because in the interest of openness and transparency, the Council meetings are entirely open and one does not negotiate by "holding the cards face open". There are principles that are important, first that the Council should have the resources to do its work, irrespective of whether the Councillor is from a "rich" registry or a developing world country. The Chair and all the Council members should be funded. If the Council member chooses not to take the funding, it can be released to other deserving causes. While the ccNSO should not compare themselves to the GAC or ALAC, the fact remains, the ccTLDs contribute and they do not.

The Chair noted, the ALAC and GAC contribute in work and knowledge and they gradually asked for an increase, and the ccNSO is asking for an immediate increase of more than twice.

Nigel Roberts explained the reason for asking for the higher number is because more than likely that number will be cut in half.

The Chair urged the drafting team to ask for gradual increasing within 3-4 years.

Nigel Roberts agreed with this point saying the draft can be amended to include "it can be phased in" – and not be specific.

The Chair advised the Council to review the draft document and to provide feedback.

Bart Boswinkel clarified the document was only circulated the day before the Council call. Council will have until Monday, 17 April to comment (will be extended to Tuesday because of Easter weekend).

Action Item 128-01:

Bart Boswinkel to circulate current draft (increase number of travel slots) to Council for comment.

5 Update Approval Action Process: the ccNSO as Decisional Participant

Stephen Deerhake updated the Council – regarding the forum to be held in Johannesburg and where the Empowered Community Administration's preparation is regarding the forum. He noted the Chair sent out a "heads up" email to the ccTLD community, introducing the Board intentions regarding a bylaw change – received several responses. The website and wiki has been updated to include content and additional information (on approvals). The rejection portion will come later. He stated the Council is in a good position to archive documents, reports and correspondence. Regarding the ccNSO preparations, the Draft Approval Action Guideline has been circulated to the Guidelines Review Committee for editing/review. He noted the group should come to a consensus and circulated to Council prior to May's meeting, to be adopted at that time.

Regarding the Empowered Community Administration, he noted he wrote to his colleagues offering to assume that management responsibility for this upcoming Approval Action – favorable responses were received from GNSO and ASO representatives, nothing from GAC or ALAC. He also noted being in contact with ICANN staff regarding the timing and scheduling of the forum.

Links for the wiki and webpage were provided in the Adobe Room chat.

The Chair cited concern that after her initial email to the community, the community started expressing their support for the proposed changes. To her understanding, first there is an announcement that will trigger the approval action, then there is a public comment period. During the public comment period, people are encouraged to submit a comment, after which time, the comments are consolidated into a staff report. The ICANN Board will then make the final decision, inform the EC and the EC Administration will direct ICANN to organize a community forum. After the community forum, there is a 21-day long period during which the ccNSO Council will need to express either support or rejection, or stay neutral. She stated the issue she sees is that the current proposal may differ from the final one adopted by the Board, which means the community will need to again comment during the 21-day period, which may cause confusion. The intent of the initial email was to inform and not necessarily to seek approval/comments.

Stephen Deerhake added he does not see this as a problem because those who made comments, responded to the proposal as it was presented initially. Then afterward, if the Board has made any changed, ask those who responded if their opinions have changed.

6 CSC charter review

The Chair reminded the Councilors there was discussion with RySG in Copenhagen, and jointly produced the schedule and terms of reference (see below) and agreed to have a "lightweight review" utilize a small review team (3 members from each the RySG and ccNSO).

- *May- June 2017: draft terms/parameters review (ccNSO and RySG team).*
- *mid – June 2017: Propose terms of reference review to RySG and ccNSO*

- *June agreement/adoption terms of review at ICANN 59.*
- *October 2017 kick-off review*
- *Annual meeting (ICANN 60). Public consultation*
- *Preparation final report, include proposed changes charter*
- *Adoption Final report RySG and ccNSO January/February 2018*
- *Submit updated charter to GNSO and ccNSO Council for adoption by ICANN 61*

Terms of reference as discussed:
- *Small review team (3 members RySG, 3 members ccNSO)*
- *Include appointed CSC members as advisors*
- *Check with full CSC potential areas of improvement*
- *Lightweight approach*

The Council was asked to comment on the composition of the review team (3 ccNSO, 3 RySG) – the ccNSO representatives on the CSC (Jay Daley and Byron Holland) should not be members of this review team, and used only as advisors. Should these three members be from Council or should there be a call for volunteers from the community? No comments made by Councilors, and the Chair noted this is a decision that should be made soon. Actual decision has been deferred.

7 CCWG IG updated charter

The Chair mentioned there was some discussion around this Charter in Hyderabad and less than a week before Copenhagen, the Council received the updated charter. There was not sufficient time to review, and therefore discussion was deferred to today's meeting.

The Chair noted the group is very active and there is a lot of email exchange, but when looking the actual emails, there are not many active participants from the ccNSO. The Chair asked should the ccNSO remain a chartering organization? This group has proven to be useful and the Council has expressed support. However, the lack of active participation from the ccTLD community, raises question. If the ccNSO remains a chartering organization, how can participation be improved? A call for volunteer as there are several active participants on IGF and other local regional government forums. How can we ensure the view of the ccTLDs community are considered? Is this process of gathering information properly reflected in the charter? The Chair is not sure that it is properly described in the current version of the charter.

Peter Vergote asked in chat if a decision is needed today.

The Chair responded that it's not necessary today, there is not a resolution to present.

The Chair proposes to Council to consider these questions, put them in writing and ask Young Eum Lee to convey to the working group – after which time new wording to the charter will be addressed if necessary.

Action Item 128-02:

Chair to remind Councilors to consider CCWG IG questions and chair forward those to Young Eum Lee to present to the WG.

8 Limited scope RDS (Whois 2) review and nomination of members' review team

The Chair cited this is yet another specific review, there was a call for volunteers and many people applied and several are seeking endorsement from the ccNSO. There are other "things" going on in parallel, for example, there is a PDP on WHOIS run by the GNSO. Since November 2016, there has been discussion on the scope of the RDS-WHOIS2 review and there is no decision. Scope of the review has not been defined.

There are two options for the Council to consider - General data protection regulations of European Union will come to force and many registries and registrars, ccTLDs will be required implement the requirements from this regulation, which will affect WHOIS. There are many things which can affect this review, the ccNSO can disregard all of them and provide list of people who seek ccNSO endorsement and use guideline to select. If this option is picked, the Chair encourages the Councilors to read carefully statement of volunteers. Secondly, the Council can write a letter to the Board stating the scope should be defined first (listing why) and listing all the items around the EU requirements. Knowing the scope and workload, the ccNSO would be able to select the appropriate people for the review team.

No decision needs to be today. ICANN staff has requested nomination to this specific review team.

The Chair proposed that her and Bart Boswinkel will draft a letter to the ICANN Board seeking clarification and scope prior to selection of candidates to this review team.

Action Item 128-03:

Bart Boswinkel and ccNSO Council Chair to draft a letter to the ICANN Board regarding clarification of the scope of the RDS-WHOIS 2 review.

Nigel Roberts has joined the call. See agenda item number 4

9 ccNSO Liaison to ALAC

The Chair recounted in December 2016, Wafa Dahmani was appointed ccNSO Council liaison to ALAC. Recently, it was highlighted an aspect in the guideline (liaisons and observers). The language in the guideline comes from the bylaws – it clearly states liaisons to not become members of the Council and do not vote as council members. As Wafa Dahmani pointed out, she was a councilor before becoming a liaison.

Wafa Dahmani asked why there wasn't a liaison to GAC.

The Chair answered that is a complicated question and must be addressed another time.

The Chair will reach out to the ALAC Chair and ask for his opinion.

Action 128-04:

ccNSO Council Chair to reach out to ALAC chair to discuss ALAC liaison.

10 Roles and responsibilities of Councilors and Work plan

The Chair noted after the meeting in Copenhagen, the Guidelines Review Committee decided to revise the guideline on roles and responsibilities of the ccNSO Council. The Guideline states the Council assigns roles and responsibilities during its first face to face meeting of the year. This action was deferred to Johannesburg.

The Secretariat is requested to assist the Chair – creating a table with each meeting of the year and define what needs to be done by Council at each, in accordance with internal guidelines.

Action Item 128-05:

The Secretariat is requested to assist the Chair – creating a table with each meeting of the year and define what needs to be done by Council at each, in accordance with internal guidelines.

Council committees include travel funding and triage committees, as well as a councilor who oversees membership applications.

Bart Boswinkel stated with respect to the roles, normally the Secretariat will reach out to the Council to fill a role. The reason it wasn't discussed in Copenhagen, was because there was some unclarity whether to include the chair and vice chair elections and document the procedure as well. He suggested he and the Chair revisit this and propose to Council before next meeting, including reaching out to individual Councilors to fill the different committees.

The Chair notes agreement and stated the Wiki will need to be updated as well. The charter states rotation of people to ensure workload is evenly distributed.

Action Item 128-06:

Bart Boswinkel and ccNSO Council Chair to revisit Council Roles, including reaching out to Councilors to fill different positions. Update wiki as needed.

11 PDP update

The Chair updated the Council – the Secretariat issued a call for volunteers. During next call, Council will approve appointment to the working group. Email was sent to ALAC, GAC, GNSO and SSAC, inviting regional members of these organizations to become participants. Letter was also sent to the Board Chair formally requesting deferral of decisions on retirement of ccTLDs

until PDP is in place. The Chair of the GAC was asked to offer opinion – the acknowledge receipt and asked for clarification of timeline (initial advice is sought by Johannesburg).

Action Item 128-07:
Bart Boswinkel to publish issue report for public comment

12 Council Updates
12.1   Chair Update – The Chair stated she participated on a call with registries and registrar stakeholder groups, during which time European regulations on personal data protection was discussed.
12.2   Vice-Chair Update – no updates from the vice chairs
12.3   Councilors Update – no Councilor updates
12.4   Regional Organizations Update – none brought forward
12.5   Secretariat update – Bart Boswinkel noted document is to advise the Council as to what the Secretariat does. Please review document which was circulated.

13 WG update
13.1 Programme WG – Alejandra Reynoso updated the Council on the ICANN block schedule as well as draft agenda of the Members days. She pointed out Block 4 is not considered "non-conflicted" which opens the opportunity to run another meeting in parallel. Five cross-community sessions were submitted on behalf of the ccNSO.

Stephen Deerhake asked about the community forum for approval action.

Bart Boswinkel noted this forum will be organized by ICANN org, what is being presented is just the ccNSO related schedule.

Stephen Deerhake expressed concern and noted the cross-community sessions on Day 1 needs to have the forum in place and as non-conflicted as possible. The forum must be scheduled as early in the week as possible.

Bart Boswinkel stated he sees the forum happening either Block 1 or Block 2 on Day 1.

13.2 GRC update – The Chair mentioned the Guidelines Review Committee is reviewing the guideline for roles and responsibilities, to include *inter alia* elections. Council elections guideline is also being updated to reflect discussions in Copenhagen. The approval action guideline is also being reviewed.
13.3 SOPWG update – written update
13.4 TLD-OPS update – written update

14 Liaison Updates
    14.1   GNSO Update (written update to follow).
    14.2   ALAC Update (written update to follow).

15 AOB

The Chair pointed out ICANN posted the ccNSO proposal to defer ccNSO review for 12 months, for public comment. If someone decides to submit a comment – should the ccNSO submit more details explaining why the deferment was requested?

Peter Vergote and Stephen Deerhake noted in chat, they do not think it is necessary.

16 Next meetings
- 18 May 2017, 12.00 UTC
- June 2017 (f-2-f) to be confirmed, depending on ccNSO meeting schedule at
  - Alternatives:
    - Wednesday 28 June, 17.00 Local time (block 5)
    - Thursday 29 June, 09.00 local time (block 1)

The Chair asked if it was acceptable to have the face to face Council meeting on Thursday, Day 1.

Peter Vergote, Demi Getschko, Hiro Hotta and Alejandra Reynoso noted in chat – Thursday.

Peter Van Roste noted in chat – Wednesday.

Meeting adjourned