
DUBLIN – Joint Meeting of the ICANN Board and the ccNSO
Tuesday, October 20, 2015 – 09:45 to 10:45 IST
ICANN54 | Dublin, Ireland

STEVE CROCKER: Welcome, everybody. Pleasure to be here once again. As I usually say, these meetings are time-constrained and we like to make best use of it by getting right into serious and important issues, whatever it is, and have frank and direct interactions.

Before we do that, in recognition that this is the time of year when we make changes to the board and changes to the councils, let me introduce the new board members coming in this year.

Lito, Lousewies, and Ron, would you just stand up and let people --

[Applause]

Thank you. Byron?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Actually, just before you do, Steve, if I could -- I'm sorry, Byron. If I could just apologize on Mike Silber's behalf for not being here this morning. He's a little unwell. He'll be -- he hopes to be back

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

in the room later on today, but he's a little unwell, so he sends his apologies. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you. Okay. The agenda is really your agenda, but there is one question that we've been putting before each of the groups that we're meeting with.

Everybody's keenly aware of the intense activity of the CCWG. The proposal is hopefully coming together. The next formal step will be that the proposal will be put in front of the chartering organizations, of which this is one, and the -- each chartering organization will be asked to ratify it and then it will come formally to the board.

We've been -- at the board level been deeply engaged in watching and more recently actively participating in the process.

To what extent, if you want to comment on it, are the proceedings within the CCWG visible and actively considered by the ccNSO, and more pointedly, perhaps, the views and positions taken by the appointees of the ccNSO in line and consistent with the thinking in the ccNSO?

So we'll let that question hang there and let me turn things over to you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Steve, and good morning, everybody.

We always look forward to this exchange, and certainly there is a lot on the agenda, as you can imagine.

To partially answer your question, we have a very, very full agenda within the ccNSO meetings today and tomorrow around the work of the CCWG, so we'll come back to your question on the second agenda item, but first, I wanted to turn it over to Keith, who is going to provide us with an update on the status of ICP-1 and GAC principles and possibly even some FOI implications.

Over to you, Keith.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Thank you and good morning. Keith Davidson, for the transcript.

The FOI implementation process was approved by the ICANN board at the last ICANN meeting, and at that meeting also, Becky Burr and I were appointed to be the points people on the ccNSO to be available to help with any implementation issues.

I can report back that we had a very productive session with IANA staff and made some good progress along the way. We are

very grateful to see already some aspects of implementation, including the removal of references to ICP-1, News Memo 1, and the GAC principles 2000 from the IANA Web site. Some of the ccTLDs had wanted to see that actually archived and disappear as part of their approval for the names proposal for the IANA transition, so we're grateful that's done, but it would be useful for us just to have a formal acknowledgment in some form that it has been done.

That may be coming, but our IANA report isn't until late this afternoon, so this could be chickens and eggs.

And secondly, what would be very useful for those ccTLDs who gave their approval to the names proposal on the basis of this work being completed, it would be nice to have a completion date or an anticipated completion date for the implementation. And I'm not expecting an answer here and now, but, you know, if it could be forthcoming over the next few days, it would be most useful. And that's our report. I don't know if there's been any --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah. Can I -- Byron, can I respond to that briefly?

BYRON HOLLAND: Please go ahead.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks.

So thank you, Keith. It's Chris Disspain.

You're seeing IANA staff this afternoon, right?

Okay. So you'll be asking Elise, slash, Kim (a) about the archiving process and (b) about the time lines.

If you -- if you're not comfortable or you need some more input on that, then let me know and we'll see what we can do.

I don't know what the -- I don't know what the process is to archive and I'm not sure that we've ever done it before, so let's see what Elise has to say and then if you need help, let me know.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Thank you so much.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Are there any other questions or comments on this particular topic?

So in terms of the agenda that you see before you, the other -- the second agenda item that we wanted to get the board's input or feedback on, I know it's early days in the discussion for this week, although some might argue it's midweek, but is the

potential need for an intersessional meeting regarding the CCWG accountability final proposal.

Certainly it would seem that there will be some fairly material changes to the proposal in its potential third iteration, and we'd like to get the sense of the board on if substantive changes are made, do you think there will be a need for an intersessional proposal -- or intersessional meeting, and if so, are there any views on how that might take shape?

STEVE CROCKER:

I guess I'm slightly puzzled.

From a board perspective, we're here to be responsive but I don't think it would be our job to make the decision or come to the conclusion that an intersessional meeting is needed except in the sense of hearing things from different sources and trying to facilitate that.

Certainly the board does not need to call an intersessional meeting in order for the board to do its work, so it's really a question of what the community needs.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Okay. Maybe I could follow up on that a bit.

It would appear that a third proposal would be in the offing and that there would be fairly substantive changes included in that potential proposal.

Now, I am making some assumptions here, to be sure, but that would certainly seem to be the flavor of the moment.

Would it -- would the board want -- would the board be more comfortable if there were face-to-face intersessional meetings where there was a fulsome discussion about whatever is in proposal 3 or would it be comfortable without any kind of face-to-face intersessional meeting?

Chris, you wanted to add to that?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Yeah. Just -- just a little bit of background as well.

I think, Byron, the -- the CCs have said consistently that they would be uncomfortable -- I'm paraphrasing here but they would be uncomfortable signing off on the final document other than at a face-to-face meeting. In other words, having had an opportunity to sit in a room and discuss it in some detail. So I think there are two aspects to this.

One is, what does the individual constituency -- the individual SO or AC want, which is one thing. Because we could always

organize a gathering of that individual SO or AC, either on its own or with the board, and we've done that with the GAC before in respect to the new gTLD program. That's one thing.

And then the second thing is, does the community generally feel a need to have a final meeting, at which the final report, if you like, is -- is discussed. And I think the answer -- from my point of view, the answer to that is: Yes, if that's what needs to happen, then that's what needs to happen. We can always make things happen. It's just a question of making sure that there's a need and a desire for it.

Is that -- does that kind of deal with what you're saying?

BYRON HOLLAND:

Absolutely it does.

So I guess from -- what I take from that is that depending on what the various community groups request from the board, the board would be willing to suggest or ICANN would be willing to facilitate an intersessional meeting?

FADI CHEHADE:

Yes. We will wait for direction from the chartering organizations, if they wish to meet in person. Some already indicated that they are okay with meeting virtually, especially now that we have

honed in a little bit our video interactions and we can do them a lot better than before, so they could do that. Others prefer to meet in person.

The only thing I would add is, some of these requests are coming focusing on the first half of December as a time for this, so just, again, it's not for us to decide, it's as the requests come in, and we -- after this meeting, we'll be giving our meetings team some direction to start at least thinking through what it would mean to do that.

But again, the direction will come from the SOs and AC chartering organizations. We will execute as they see fit.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Yeah. If I could just add one more thing to that, which is I think that just from a logistics point of view, I think that, you know, one request is one request and that could be dealt with. If we're starting to get like two or three or four, then the logical thing to do would be to have an actual meeting, as opposed to having individual meetings.

So it's a -- the answer is a function of what -- of what -- how many requests we get or if we're getting requests for an actual meeting, as opposed to a series of individual meetings.

STEVE CROCKER:

Let me -- let me -- this has been interesting. Let me cover the same things but with -- just dig into what I'm hearing as a couple of nuances.

As this proposal, next proposal, comes out, it could be that there are some highly controversial issues in there that is creating a certain amount of discomfort in some places, in which case the purpose of a face-to-face meeting would be to engage in more of the direct -- I was going -- about to say "negotiation," but intense investigation of each of the consequences and sorting all that out. Or, it could be that there is a -- that the proposal that comes out is -- generally represents a convergence towards consensus and that what is really desired is the ability to gather around, feel comfortable, and go through sort of the combination of understanding and the ceremonial process of bonding across all of that.

Those are two, in my mind, somewhat different elements of what a purpose of the intersessional meeting is.

With respect to what happens to the next proposal, one of the more commonly asked questions, more often asked questions is, "Are we going to need another public comment period?" And so this relates to a timing issue of, you know, how long is this process going to go on and so forth.

So all of those, I think, are the substantive part.

With respect to the logistics side, I think our staff, which has been working enormously hard, meetings team and internal support teams and everything, have been coached that this is just the dry run of what we've been doing here, so we're ready. Just call it and they're all geared up. They know how to do this now on the drop of a pin.

BYRON HOLLAND: Fadi?

FADI CHEHADE: Thank you, Byron.

I think also now, the optimistic note here, that this week hopefully we will conclude that most of what's coming out actually was in proposal 1 or proposal 2; that we are just coming together to figure things out. There may be details to be done after that, but I am optimistic that this week, we will start moving towards the broad lines of where we will be. And I hope the communities will have a chance in the next 48 hours to also talk about these broad lines and make sure we have that kind of dialogue.

But again, we are standing ready, as my boss said, and we will somehow make a facility for a thousand people available instantly when we need to, and frankly, we will -- we will do our

best to make sure that's available, that the community has all it needs to deliberate. You have our commitment on that.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you.

Are there any comments or questions on this issue?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Do you mean specifically on logistics or do you mean on the transition generally?

BYRON HOLLAND: Transition generally, before we get into implementation, but...
Nigel?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: And I know George had a couple of questions as well.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Specifically on the logistics and the suggestion that there might be some kind of face-to-face, I want to agree with a hundred percent and underline and perhaps expand upon what Chris said.

Chris identified two areas not just within the ccNSO but also maybe there's a need for communication within the community.

But the ccNSO is kind of unique because there's a third element that wasn't considered in those two, which is those ccTLDs who are neither in the GNSO -- because there aren't any -- or in the ccNSO. And as part of the outreach, there needs to be some kind of serious final rubber-stamp effort to engage those ccTLDs who -- perhaps some of which we've never ever even spoken to.

I mean, there are one or two ccTLDs who aren't members of the ccNSO, but nonetheless play an active part, but they're very much in the minority of that third group. We need something that gives legitimacy and includes all ccTLDs if there's going to be any major change that affects all ccTLDs.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I thought Paul Kane spoke for all of them.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Only on Tuesdays.

[Laughter]

BYRON HOLLAND: George?

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thanks. You raise an interesting point.

I guess the question I have is: To what extent is the -- are the things that are being represented as ccNSO points of view in the CCWG procedures representative of the large -- the universe of ccTLDs?

And I think your point indicates that some of these people don't even know or may not be aware of what's going on and don't understand how it affects their interests.

So what is the -- what is the sense of that?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Can I just -- before -- Byron, can I just say something before you say something?

BYRON HOLLAND: Sure.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. George, you're right, but I think there is a tendency to slightly overlap this.

The CC -- as we all know, ccTLDs are sovereign. They run their own thing. ccTLDs belong to the ccNSO entirely voluntarily. There's no contractual basis. It's not like the gTLDs who are, in effect, obliged to be around.

So I think if -- and we have ccTLDs who are not members of the ccNSO who still come to the meetings and still participate.

So really, I'm not suggesting that we don't need to outreach to those who have nothing to do with us at all, but given that they have every opportunity to involve themselves at any time that the ccNSO does global policy, which isn't often, given that they have every opportunity and we always enroll them as much as we can, I wouldn't want to push it too far from -- because you end up with sort of the 80/20 -- beyond the 80/20 rule. It gets ridiculous. But it's a point worth noting.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Okay. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Just to pick up on the two points there, I would remind everybody that there was extensive outreach to the entire ccTLD

community, whether they were ccNSO members or not, during the CWG process, and that all ccTLDs worldwide were very much kept informed to the extent that they were willing to pay attention. We can lead the horse to water but we cannot make them drink.

However, they were provided with significant opportunities to participate in the process, and certainly a number of non-ccNSO members did. I would point to the fact that the ccNSO-nominated co-chair of the CWG working group is, in fact, not a member of the ccNSO, as an example.

That said, so I think there has been much outreach to the broader ccTLD community. Within the ccNSO, there are 155 I believe is the current number out of 193 ccTLDs out there and representing the broad, broad, significant majority of all domain -- ccTLD domain names as well.

In terms of part 2 to your question, George, which was, do the members -- do the ccNSO members inside the CCWG accurately reflect the general thinking of the ccNSO at large, I would say that there is a diversity of opinions both within our nominated members as well as within the ccNSO community.

Over the next day and a half of our constituency meetings, we will certainly be getting a very accurate view of the room and we will, of course, be reminding our members that they are there to

listen to the will of the room and represent that will back to the CCWG, as well as reflect the CCWG's current thinking back into the ccNSO.

Their role is a two-way role, but we will absolutely be reminding them that they are there to listen to the ccNSO and reflect that back to the CCWG.

Peter?

PETER VAN ROSTE:

Thank you, Byron. Following the same format in my response, on the first question, in addition to the ccNSO efforts to reach out to ccTLDs worldwide, not just those but in their membership, there has also been significant effort by the regional organizations. And I can speak on behalf of my colleagues from APTLD, LACTLD and AfTLD that in addition to the ccNSO messaging to the regional organization's mailing list but more in particular during their face-to-face meetings has been incredible amount of time spent on discussing these matters.

In terms of numbers, this probably adds 20 to 30 ccTLDs that are not -- for instance, we have 12 members that are not members of the ccNSO and it's roughly (indiscernible) 40 other regions.

In answering the second part of the question on how far do CCs have a joint view already or how are the CCWG representatives speaking on behalf of everyone in the community, as we pointed out, there -- they have expressed their opinions in those debates and from what I can see from CENTR those opinions reflect the discussions that were held in the communities. We've had joint statements, not just at our last meeting in Brussels two weeks ago but also from the General Assembly at Copenhagen where the General Assembly of CENTR consisting of the 52 members unanimously support a specific point of view. And from where I'm sitting I see that this point of view has consistently been carried across the process. Not just in the CCWG but also in the CWG process. Thanks.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you, Peter, and thanks for highlighting the work of the ROs. Going back to the CWG effort in particular, the ccNSO worked very collaboratively with all the ROs who, as Peter mentioned, did extensive outreach above and beyond what the ccNSO was doing. And I think that in part goes back to the original question, you know, every ccTLD I think has had the opportunity to participate in this process. Any other comments or questions on this agenda item number 2?

Then perhaps we'll move on to agenda item number 3 around the implementation processes with regards to the proposals of the CWG and CCWG. We would just like to get a sense of how ICANN intends to begin and manage the implementation process. Of course there is a fundamental assumption that underlies that question which is, there will be a successful proposal. But assuming that to be the case in the near future, how does ICANN envision the implementation process? How do you see working with the CWG and CCWG in terms of roles, responsibilities, and the broader community and also in terms of timing, as I think we're all aware we have enough time but there's not a lot of time. So what is the sequence of events and will it be consistent with what the NTIA is thinking in terms of doing work before any possible actual certifications.

STEVE CROCKER:

Let me -- I like the question a lot. Let me suggest that particularly with respect to the CWG aspects there are operational implementation issues of how the root zone is updated and so forth and what changes take place there versus the kind of contractual and accountability and procedural changes in terms of how ICANN operates and how it reports and so forth. And all the more so in the CCWG with bylaw changes and so forth. So there's -- in broad terms I would divide it up into kind of two interesting baskets of implementation.

I can speak some about the bylaw changes and the speed in which we can do that and so forth. Let me call on Fadi about the operational aspects, first. Unless you want to refine the question and focus where you want the attention, otherwise I'll just take it as a broad thing that has all these different parts to it.

BYRON HOLLAND: It's a broad question to begin with, but Fadi, did you have a comment?

FADI CHEHADE: Yeah. At the broadest level, we have now established a program management office for the implementation of the proposals. That program management office reports to Akram and is led by Trang, who I'm going to invite to just give you some details now. So we have staffed that office. That office has now laid out what I would call a full program view of what needs to be implemented, divided, as I showed in my opening ceremony slides, into these three main buckets of work. The first one related to the root zone management system is the one where we have made the most progress because it involves some complex discussions with the U.S. government and with VeriSign. So we have been engaged on that. The -- it's very important to remember that our hands are a little bit tied as to how much we can do now, how much we can do when the

proposal is handed to NTIA, and how much we can do after. And so it -- it's not simply a question of resources and, you know -- it's a question of one, contractual limitations on what we could do today versus what we could do after NTIA has given us the approval to do that and there are also political implications if we appear to be implementing the transition before the transition is approved. And so we're balancing these two things. That's the big picture. If you want just another two minutes of detail, I could ask Trang to chime in and just kind of go deep a little bit into the components of that and how they plan to work with the CWG and the CCWG. But it's -- it's up to you.

BYRON HOLLAND: I think that would be very helpful. Please.

FADI CHEHADE: Trang Nguyen, our new senior director responsible for the program office on implementation of the transition reporting to our president Akram Atallah. Please.

TRANG NGUYEN: Thank you, Fadi. So from an implementation perspective and working with the CWG and CCWG through the implementation phase, we're starting to hear at the Dublin meeting engaging with leadership of the ICG, CCWG, the CRISP team as well as the

IANAPLAN team and the CCWG team to discuss how we may continue to engage with them throughout the implementation phase and understanding what their requirements are with regards to oversight and reporting needs. Obviously there's some elements of the proposal that we may require additional clarification on. So we'll be looking to work with them to continue to refine that.

Right now, as Fadi say, we're sort of in a -- what we call an administrative prep phase. And what that means is we're starting to look at the elements of the proposals that we may need to eventually implement and based on that sort of figure out a high-level timeline. We do have a session scheduled for Wednesday afternoon, tomorrow afternoon, where we'll be sharing that implementation timeline and some additional details around that. But that's just sort of the work that we've done thus far in this administrative prep phase, is to take a look at potentially what we would need to implement, come out with some high-level timelines at this point, identify internal resources that will be supporting all of this work, and then starting the work that we're doing in terms of engaging with the community to figure out how we may continue to work with them throughout the implementation phase.

FADI CHEHADE: And needless to say, the faster the community gives us the proposal, the more those wanting to get things done would be in a position to harden their timelines and so on. So clearly, the -- if the community's timeline to get the contract to the U.S. government to sunset on the 30th of September still stands, and that's the community's timeline as delivered to the U.S. government, then every day you give us to implement helps. And right now we're getting into a tight zone, as we had shared with the leaders before.

STEVE CROCKER: Let me add, at the board level, as a matter of form at least any changes to the bylaws require a formal action through our existing processes. So there will be an orderly process of drafting the bylaws, passing a resolution, usually may we adjust it for the specific -- because of the peculiar circumstances that we have here. But normally we'll pass a resolution suggesting that the -- to the point of posting the bylaws for public comment. It's been suggested maybe that's no longer necessary, given all of the run up to these, and then a formal resolution adopting the bylaws, and then it depends on the specifics of the bylaws when they take effect and what it takes to implement those changes. Some bylaw changes don't require any implementation per se, they simply become a law on the books, so to speak, that get invoked at the time. Other bylaw

changes you have to actually lay in the processes underneath that that implement that and put in all that. So a lot of attention is being put to that. And there will be a lot more as soon as the -- the pieces are clear.

I'll -- I'll just add one thing that I find of concern, and I'm speaking personally without a lot of coordination. I've now had to dive in to various details of the bylaws, totally unrelated to the kinds of things we're talking about. The bylaw -- the bylaws as a document is a somewhat barnacle encrusted thing that has evolved over time and it's -- it's not the most tightly crafted thing, and my fear is that a whole bunch of things are going to get jammed into it and we will have something that is even creekier and more unwieldy. So my hope -- and I don't know whether we'll have the opportunity -- is that without doing any violence at all to the intentions, that we put the pieces together. Let me just put one little piece of color into this. We have elements in our bylaws that put obligations on organizations that are outside of ICANN. This is, to me, just a broken, you know, piece of business. There's no -- we can't -- we can't pass laws that apply to somebody else and then have any attempt at enforcing them. We can have intentions, we can have desires and so forth, so it's crafting errors that I have a concern about, not so much intention. And I see Fadi wanting to jump in here.

FADI CHEHADE:

Byron, just one last comment, and this is important because it's a change. We thought all along that we will need to have the bylaws written and completed in the proposal we send to the U.S. government. That requirement is now relaxed. So we could deliver the proposal to the U.S. government without all the bylaws written, which means we -- we relaxed a little bit the requirement that our chairman just talked about, that we could go for a public comment period, if need be, if the board decides that it should put out all the final bylaws for public comment, after we delivered the proposal to the U.S. government. So just to put it in context for those who have not been following the timeline very closely, in the -- if the CCWG chairs and the rapporteurs turn out to be the heroes we all know they will be and deliver to us a proposal -- pressure on you here, Mathieu and Jordan, no pressure -- and deliver a proposal to the community in November and in December the chartering organizations go through it, we could potentially wrap all of this up with the ICG proposal and deliver it to the U.S. government at the end of the year. If we do that, we could still after that go out for a public comment period with the bylaws changes, normally as our board does, and this decoupling is frankly a huge relief of pressure on us, which we had before. Just to be clear. I hope this is helpful.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Fadi. Just so I can understand it better, how did -- how did they become decoupled?

FADI CHEHADE: We don't have enough time for this, but the -- the bottom line is, we take instructions. I mean, we're right now still in the mode of taking direction from lawyers in the NTIA and our lawyers discussing things and kind of clarifying where -- this is back to my point earlier, how much can we implement, how much do we need to implement, at what point in the process is it is something we're working on with them all the time, given that the whole timeline has been squeezed. So we're constantly going back to them. Must this be here? Can we move with this? So -- and I don't know if anyone from NTIA is in the room, but -- but I can at least -- I'm conveying what we've been clearly told now. And that's a good thing, by the way. That gives us some relief.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Thank you. I'm going to go to Jordan who had raised his hand.

JORDAN CARTER: Good morning. Jordan Carter .NZ and one of the CCWG participants who's looking forward to speaking with many of

you about the state of our work and where we go next in the next few days. A question about the implementation, Fadi and Trang. When you're implementing a proposal that's been drawn up by big diverse multistakeholder groups there's often a kind of convention of working with a subset of them to be a check-in point during implementation, and in my experience of implementing projects, when someone else has defined the requirements and then you have a really time pressured implementation, it's easy to kind of accidentally go down a rabbit hole or drift away from maybe what was intended. So I wondered if you could share with us any concrete steps or at least concrete intentions you've got in your approach to this project implementation that will make sure you keep in touch with the groups that have developed these proposals and make sure that your implementation stays in full faith with what was done. Thanks.

STEVE CROCKER: We have an office with your name on it, Jordan, in Los Angeles, for you to be in permanent residence to oversee the implementation process.

JORDAN CARTER: That's got Mathieu's name on it, not mine.

TRANG NGUYEN:

Hi, Jordan. So that's exactly what we're trying to work out by all of these meetings that we're having this week with the community leadership teams. You know, we've had some preliminary conversations with Jonathan and Lise with regards to the CWG proposal and how we may continue to work with them. I think some of these communities have not yet actually thought to think about the implementation phase and how they would stay intact and/or what subgroup of those teams would be in place to support implementation or what their role would be during implementation. So we're trying to get that conversation started with them and so that they can then in turn have those conversations with their own respective teams.

So our intent is that during the implementation process we'll work with the communities because the last thing that we would want is to go off and implement something and then four or five months down the road find out that that's not the direction that we should be -- we should have gone in. So we want to work as much as possible with the community to ensure that we're implementing what was intended in the proposals.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you. Bruce.

BRUCE TONKIN:

Thanks, Byron. Just a comment about, you asked a question, I think, if I understood correctly, how the bylaws became decoupled. I don't think they're decoupled. It think it's the reverse. They're tightly coupled. I think what the NTIA is saying they have a process that's going to take them months to actually evaluate the final proposals and during that process we can be working on refining the bylaws. What they've said though is they won't finally sign off until we've signed off on the bylaws changes. So they actually are coupled all the way through. It's just what they've said is that they don't need the bylaws to be finalized at the time that we submit our report to them. But those bylaws must be finalized at the time they will sign off on the change. So they are coupled.

Just to respond to Jordan's comment, normally what you would do from a project management perspective is you'd actually establish some form of steering group that actually sort of oversees and is involved in the implementation. So I think using bylaws as an example, I think you would need a smaller steering group of people that would work with the staff, and I know the CCWG is working on that anyway as you refine those bylaws. Even as you go into implementation, such as some of the IANA transition staff, you know, setting up the PTI and things, I would expect that we'd probably ask for a steering group to be formed

for the community members and that group might just meet by phone once a week to look at if there's any points of clarification the staff have, et cetera.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. And I think that was a helpful clarification around the notion of decoupling.

Erika?

ERIKA MANN: Byron, I'm interested actually in hearing from you, if you have any new concerns on new topics you want to raise and the phase we are quite at the end of debating with the CCWG what's going to happen and how this will impact implementation topics you raise. So I would be interested actually to hear from you if there's anything fresh you think we should consider which concerns your ecosystem.

BYRON HOLLAND: It's a great question, and I don't want to skate on the question. But we have not had our constituency days yet. So we have a very full program that will allow community members to voice their opinions. So I'm not really in a position to say what the community has said clearly yet. But certainly there is a -- I would

say a broad notion that there's a potential to move towards a designator model. And I don't want to presuppose the outcomes here. But let's just say I potentially have been hearing.

And I haven't heard any -- I haven't heard much strong resistance to that. There's certainly pockets and there's certainly issues to still be worked out. Certainly enforceability in that kind of a model has issues to be worked through that are unclear at this point. But I haven't yet been hearing any strong rejection of what I see is the path of travel.

So I know there was a lot of conditional statements there. But, like I say, we haven't had our constituency days yet. I hope that's somewhat helpful.

ERIKA MANN: Do we have the time for followup?

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes, we do.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much. Would it be possible when you have your constituency days and you will debate it and you see a diversity of opinions arising, that we would get -- all of us, I assume, that

we will get a clear indication of where concerns are with regard to certain options or even maybe other topics which come up.

Not everybody can probably be in the room and can participate. I would appreciate this, if a short summary would be quickly available.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Erika, Mike and I will be there for almost all of the afternoon.

ERIKA MANN: You will be there? Wonderful.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So we will report back.

ERIKA MANN: You will report back. Thanks so much.

BYRON HOLLAND: Just to be clear, Mike and Chris will be joining us at the end of today and we will have had half a day's discussion on the topic. And most of tomorrow is dedicated to this topic. But I know we will keep Mike and Chris very informed of our --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Tomorrow afternoon, right, the whole afternoon?

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah.

BYRON HOLLAND: Any other questions or comments on this?

I recognize that this session goes to 10:45 so we have a few minutes left if there is any -- before we go to your thing, Chris, if there are any other general questions or issues that anybody would like to raise, or comments to be made.

Okay. Then we'll probably give you back a few minutes of your day.

I would just like to note that we have a couple of new members in the ccNSO, Alejandra Reynoso. Are you in here? Welcome. A new councillor for us.

[Applause]

And Christelle Vaval, our NomCom appointee. Is she here?

[Applause]

Thank you. And we also have a resignation from a longstanding member, and I'm going to hand it over to Chris to speak about that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you, Byron. Actually, I'm going to say a few words about a couple of people, if I may.

At this meeting, we're saying good-bye to a few people. We are saying good-bye to Martin.

Martin, I can see you hiding there in the back of the room. He has finally decided to wander off out of the ccTLD land. Stand up, Martin.

[Applause]

He has finally decided to wander off and get a life.

Keith is also standing down, although Keith is contrived to hang around a little bit longer because of the ICG. But you are standing down from the council at this meeting. And it's been -- we've been working on stuff together for longer than I care to remember. So I just wanted to say a personal thank you to you, and I'll miss you.

And, finally -- go on, give him a clap.

[Applause]

And, finally, I learned this morning that Dotty Sparks de Blanc has decided to stand down from the ccNSO Council. I have known her for 15 years, since 2000. Even then she was somebody that had been around for an incredibly long time in the Internet.

Dotty is a founder of the ccNSO. She was one of the people involved at the very beginning with me and Bart and Bernie. And Dotty has very much been our mother for a very, very long time. And with all mothers, she provides us with love and she provides us with wisdom and she provides us with the occasional extraordinary weird comment.

And we all love her very much. And I'm very sad to see her go. Thanks very much, Dotty.

[Applause]

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes, thank you very much.

So if there are no other questions or comments, we'll call this to a close and give everybody a few minutes of their day back. Thank you very much.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you, Byron. Thank you, everybody.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]