

---

DUBLIN – ccNSO Council Preparatory Meeting [C]  
Sunday, October 18, 2015 – 11:00 to 12:00 IST  
ICANN54 | Dublin, Ireland

BYRON HOLLAND:

As you can see, the overall project's success really is determined by how long it takes to get the proposal out and done. Essentially, the date can be made, at least according to [inaudible] as long as there is some sort of proposal out by [inaudible]. Beyond that, it starts to get very difficult. Currently that is the way the overall big picture timeline looks.

If we go to the next slide, the project plan has blocked out and significantly more [inaudible] not to go through this in any kind of granular [inaudible]. But it does provide a sense of some of the issues that have been blocked out and that roll up to that high level [inaudible]. But I just wanted to give you a sense of the various elements that comprise the high level timeline. Also just to highlight the fact that the time is relatively tight. Back to the first slide.

Phase two, the blue part, is time required by NTIA to go [inaudible] of what's required, congressional days. That is a relatively fixed amount of time. Really, the only adjustable time is the proposal stage, or I guess the implementation [inaudible].

---

**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.**

---

To get us all on the same page around the timelines, what we're looking at, and also to have any discussion [inaudible] anybody can weigh in on [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I just pointed out that there are some people who think that Larry's estimate is optimistic, encouraging us to, or basically saying, "We don't get it." Deliver it by the end of the year.

BYRON HOLLAND: I think, just looking at it from a basic project [inaudible], I'd certainly agree with that. Every Friday before the meeting gets started SO/AC chair and leadership [inaudible]. It's interesting to note that people in that group are very unclear on what the timelines [are]. As long as we get a proposal out by Marrakech, we should be okay [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I [read] it's very [inaudible].

BYRON HOLLAND: Any other comments or questions on the...

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Do we have a worst-case timeline? For me with the project management hat, it looks kind of potentially optimistic. [inaudible] in terms of the US potential.

BYRON HOLLAND: I'm certainly not aware of a plan B. I have approval by each community. They indicated to me that they don't [lax] in the timeline to get [inaudible]. As he said, everything has to go perfect. What are the changes of everything going perfectly in Washington in the political season? Right. I think putting your project manager hat on, you're absolutely right. The likelihood of it going perfectly is [inaudible]. We as a community are going to deal with it when we receive it. [inaudible] made a comment here. Nigel? Which we'll come to that discussion later.

NIGEL HICKSON: Just a comment. Not only is [inaudible] ICANN meeting, but no sign of any coherent proposal. How do we as a community react to that [inaudible] on the project management [inaudible]?

BYRON HOLLAND: That's probably a great segue, Nigel, to welcoming our guests – our well-known guests – to give us the current [inaudible] on both CWG and CCWG. I'm sure a coherent proposal is well on its way.

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Do you want the CWG first?

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes. The one we've already approved, yeah.

LISE FUHR: Well, thank you very much. Thank you for inviting us here. I think it's great to have these meetings in order to understand what's going on. CWG has an improved proposal. We're waiting for the accountability group [inaudible] meet our requirements.

I must say I'm really confident that they will be met. We're in close contact with the chairs all the time. We of course have some issues on the budget where there is a requirement for a veto. That's getting very much into the details.

We had some about the appeal mechanism. We replied during the public comment that we saw some issues that the IANA stewardship [inaudible] IANA decisions or non-decisions should apply [inaudible] mechanism.

Furthermore, the group is working with implementation and we have a face-to-face meeting on Wednesday where we will of course discuss the requirements with the accountability chairs.

---

We hope [you'll] join our meeting depending on where they are and how to [inaudible] the requirements.

In parallel, we're also... The CWG are working with the bylaws that relate to the IANA part. The requirement [inaudible] so we have [inaudible] as lawyers working on writing those bylaws. They will be discussed in the [inaudible], and they will be coordinated with the accountability.

Then we have two very important outstanding issues that also relate to the implementation. And the implementation as such is not [inaudible]. We have on the agenda on Wednesday to discuss what is the CWG role and what is the [inaudible] role, too – if we have a role in the actual implementation.

Personally, I think we should have a role in the implementation so [inaudible] but we need to find out how to deal with this and how to actually communicate and agree with the chartering organization about our role. The charter is not that clear on that issue. So that's going to be discussed on Wednesday.

The two outstanding issues is the SLE that has created a lot of discussion on our list this last couple of weeks. So Jonathan and I are going to have a meeting with ICANN staff and some of [inaudible] who are involved in creating the SLEs about this in order to find out what's up and down in this case. We will work with this and ensure that the SLEs are taken care of.

---

Another one is the IPR where we have the other operational communities setting requirements, and we need to set these requirements, too, in the CWG – what requirements needed for the body who's taking care of the IPR in relation to IANA.

So these two issues are still outstanding. We are working with these. Then we need to find out how do we proceed as the CWG in the actual implementation. These are the [inaudible] group at the moment. Any questions?

BYRON HOLLAND: [Peter]?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Would it be possible, Lise, to give some examples on the IPR issues that are being raised by the other stakeholders? Thanks.

LISE FUHR: If you think of the requirements or what the IPR are, it's more... Well, the requirements. This is not about IANA, actually. It's about who are in charge of securing the IANA as a brand and how to use it. So it's only in relation to who's the registrant of the IANA domain name, issues like that. So it's not at all going to be IANA policy in relation to the IPR. It's only who's going to be in charge of it?

---

There was a decision to move away from ICANN because they should not be in charge of this. That is the issue.

BYRON HOLLAND: Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON: [inaudible] the Internet brand [inaudible] IPR that supports the IANA function.

BYRON HOLLAND: [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Byron. Hello, everyone. It's a group of [inaudible] ccTLDs. Reasonable... Mostly. I'm not looking at you, Nigel.

So, update from the CCWG. A lot of things are moving. It's certainly [inaudible] very aware of [inaudible] being heard needs to be double-checked at this point. We published our second report in August, 90+ comments. They have been now analyzed as an [inaudible] meeting very thoroughly by [inaudible] very, very impressive and [inaudible] really, really taking a leading role [inaudible] one of the work parties. Jordan Carter [inaudible]. Nigel has been really involved in work party that's ccTLD implication in this [inaudible].

---

Out of this analysis, basically, if you remember [inaudible] building blocks. The main requirements that have been [inaudible] since March. [They're] still here. They're getting support that is reinforced compared to the first comment round. It's been heard in this public comment that we've made progress. [inaudible] progress. That's [felt] as a progress.

There are still... At the end of the public comment analysis, there are still a few areas of concern. That's our work this week, to find ways forward on these areas. We're making very good progress.

The concerns that were raised were about concentration of power, reallocation of the power, balance within ICANN, the risks of capture. That's what we're working out right now. Yesterday we had a very fruitful collaborative session with quite a high engagement from all around CWG on the one side, but also board members who have been joining very, very effectively and in a collaborative effort [inaudible] work.

Out of the four items that we know we have to resolve, we had breakthroughs on three. Budget veto, which is one of the requirements from the [inaudible] way forward. There were a lot of discussions about the board removal progress, when we want to remove Chris Disspain and Mike Silber.



---

This process has been worked out. And basically on those two, at the end, Cherine who is [inaudible] George Sadowsky who was very vocal against [inaudible] board removal. They both said, “We’re happy with this.” [inaudible] on the record.

The voting wait that has been a concern, including amongst [inaudible] being adjusted to a more consensus-based decision-making. [inaudible] part where we’re making [inaudible]. Basically, there is going to be some form of assessment of the [inaudible], but it’s [no longer] going to be number of votes to be allocated based on the SO and ACs.

One final part that is going to be controlling our agenda probably on Monday is if at the end of everything, after all we’ve done in terms of comments, of community discussions, the board were to say, “We heard the community object to this. We’re moving forward anyway.” Even if in the bylaws that we have to follow the community.

In this narrow case, we still have to resolve [inaudible], how it’s designed, and [how the] lawyers say, enforceable. That’s one aspect we need to fine-tune. And it has a lot of implications, so it’s very important. That’s the one item that [inaudible].

I am encouraged by the fact that we’ve now set up a collaborative tone in the group. We’re hearing a lot of feedback from the different parts of the community that people are now

---

more open-minded to engage into this conversation. Hopefully by Monday [inaudible]. It remains to be seen [in action].

That's the overall progress. That shift around this [inaudible] principles, not much of the requirements we've been explaining and explaining again is changing. So we'll have a key decision to make in this week about the timeline. There is a need, based on the way forward, that is being drafted for another period for finalizing a report and sending it for endorsement to the SO and ACs, or whether our group feels that it's sufficiently [inaudible] and has received sufficient input. One of the key decisions [inaudible] this meeting.

Finally, we are aware of the timeline, and as a consequence, we've already started some implementation work. And one of the outcomes that I hope we get out of this meeting is to [inaudible] significant other chunks of our proposal is preparing implementation.

Preparing implementation means some bylaw drafting, but not only. One of the key [inaudible] is the independent move – officially move – into implementation. We, our group, sees its role not as the implementation group, but certainly in steering mode. A steering committee mode. Implementation, governance. We need to have a governance for the project of

---

implementation and define the roles [inaudible] needs to be discussed with the SO and ACs. I can go to any [inaudible].

BYRON HOLLAND: Maybe I could just ask everyone to start doing things regarding implementation [inaudible] conflict or issues there?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think implementation is not just [inaudible] it's implemented. It is a project in itself. Launching the project, preparing the work. The NTIA has been clear that any bylaw change [induced] by the various proposals – ICG or [CCWG] – will need to be submitted [inaudible] of the Congress certification effort.

So they will require this before they get into... I don't remember the [inaudible] slide. One of the phases that [inaudible]. As soon as we are 90% ready on requirements, let's get that drafting in so that we actually do that in sequence and [inaudible] delay to delay.

Certainly some of the implementation in terms of putting it into production, some of it cannot happen before the transition. Maybe some things could happen before the transition. It's more of a political thing that it might not be perceived as adequate. I mean, the [inaudible] proposals don't need any change in the current setup. You can have an IANA contract in place and

---

change the accountability framework within ICANN. It doesn't matter. But it [inaudible] not be appropriate for Congress or NTIA to say, "Oh, and by the way, we've done that already," [inaudible]. But certification is welcome. That's always good. But we're saying that we're ready to do that and we only have to [inaudible] enforced and in place certainly would be useful.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

I just want to stress that I think the implementation phase is also very important because, as I say, we need to have it as a package for the NTIA and for the Congress. And a lot of bylaws, they're not... Well, they're agreed upon, the CSC (the Customer Standing Committee). A lot of those can be drafted without any problems. And I think it's very important in the phase now [inaudible] that we keep focus on [inaudible] with intent. That's been written in the proposals. So to let go of that at this stage would be a mistake.

So to follow this closely, and actually to do it in parallel, even though we haven't [inaudible] might do work that has to be redone. But it's better to be [inaudible] than to not being very [inaudible].

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's very much driven by delays right now. [inaudible] quality that is quite high. Redo, redo, redo, but at least we'll [inaudible] solid orange bordering on red.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] for updates, and congratulations on your center of work in this area, because it was very much deserved. Mathieu, you trailed just now that there was some thinking about the approval process and I wonder if you could just give us a bit more on that, please, because I [inaudible] the ICANN budget will be [inaudible].

MATHIEU WEILL: The ICANN budget discussions are getting very good traction around actually separating three things. There's the five-year strategy plan and budget, and there's agreement for these particular decisions from the board being [supported]. Of course if there's a veto, then you still have time to [inaudible] engage into the conversation and redo something.

Then there's the PTI budget. For CWG requirement, everyone agrees [inaudible] and there have been, in the CWG recommendations, to shift the timeline for [defining] this budget so that it actually takes into account the potential for veto [inaudible].

---

Then there was the remaining item, which was the one-year operating plan. That's where many [inaudible] raising concerns about the possibility of veto and the impact it would have on [inaudible] contractual commitments. The [inaudible] yesterday was that Xavier Calvez, the CFO, said he would investigate on the possibility to [correct] the ICANN one-year budget in one part, which is the existing commitments, and one part that would be the new commitments, or at least the commitments where there would be flexibility. And the veto could be [inaudible] take place, it would affect only the part that's not already committed, so that contractual commitments. It's not putting the board in a position [inaudible] deny its prior commitments.

That's what's currently investigated. [inaudible] obviously to the community [inaudible]. Many in the community have a requirement to be able to [inaudible]. That would be outside of the five-year plan. So far it's really getting some support. [inaudible] balanced approach. And really, Xavier was instrumental.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you very much for joining us on a Sunday morning. Final comments before...?

---

MATHIEU WEILL:

We have a lot of sessions, a full agenda on accountability. I think in light of the timeline as well as to make sure everyone's sessions provide a concrete benefit to everyone in the room, I think it would be extremely helpful to use this session to craft [inaudible] summaries of what ccTLD managers think is important in the accountability reports and proposals. It would be points they would have, so that it could be used as a framework for reporting about the final report.

There's a concern that, for instance, the appeals process do not apply to the delegation revocations. ccNSO input saying we want the vocabulary to be used based on the FOI Working Group. Those kind of requirements [will be] highlighted as a list of bullet points. It will be useful in two ways. Number one, [it sets] guidelines for the members of [inaudible] by the ccNSO. Number two, once the final report is out, [inaudible] used as a way to report about [inaudible] give the ccTLD managers a way to read the report, or actually understand decisions have been made on which, on what. And for the Council [inaudible] consideration. I'm not drawing this idea from myself. It's actually something that I've seen at play [inaudible] meeting about the CWG. Extremely useful.

I would suggest that maybe that would be an extremely valuable way to conclude [inaudible] outcome such as this that could be drafted.

BYRON HOLLAND:

[inaudible] online we'll have that additional [inaudible]. It's just the way it looks. Any comments? Thank you so much for joining us this morning. That's very helpful. [inaudible] once or twice, perhaps. Once or twice. I'm going to pass out some...

There are two separate documents as we work through what the week looks like. There's one document that says Preparatory Meeting Sessions Overview. That provides an overview of what we think the most important sessions are for some of us, for Council members, to pay attention to or participate in. We'll have [inaudible] about those sessions and who from Council can cover these sessions off.

Then the other document titled Overview of Dublin Sessions related to CWG walks through our program within our Tuesday/Wednesday constituency days and provides a much more detailed overview of what will be happening in those sessions, who the moderators, chairs, panelists, etc., will be. That will give all of us – or all of you – a much clearer [inaudible] of all of these sessions and what they are individually, but also how they actually all bolt together to try to make more holistic sense of the work of ICG, for that matter. I'm not going to go over it in detail right now, but I want to make sure you have this content, so that as councilors, you know what's coming, you can



---

explain it to your colleagues in your regions or just in discussions that you'll be having over the next number of days. It also highlights the fact that we are devoting time and energy to this to make sure that [inaudible] in the ccNSO, but the ccTLD community in general, have as much opportunity to get [inaudible] as possible.

And no matter what the level of interest or participation is, whether they're going to be kind of the people who want a four-page version or the 20-page version or the 468-page version of the proposal, that we will be able to provide a level of [inaudible] enables our colleagues in the community to come to a conclusion on this, or at least believe that the recommendations made by the ccNSO Council [inaudible] needs as a community.

So I encourage you to read that. We're not going to step through it line by line here today, but I would definitely encourage you to read it and be familiar.

That said, I'll turn your attention to the document titled Preparatory Meetings, Sessions Overview. The idea here is that Bart and I and others have gone through the full ICANN calendar/agenda and suggested that through the course of the week these are the sessions that there will be or may be of particular interest to Council, to our community and to Council.

---

And to just walk through them and make sure that we have people [during] these sessions who can keep an eye on them and also be able to report back to Council. Some of them are relatively regular, so we'll just walk through [inaudible]. They're relatively standard.

For example, the first one, typically always have a meeting with ALAC. Because the overall ICANN meeting agenda has been somewhat fluid in ICANN's attempt to [inaudible] more CCWG related sessions. That has had an impact on all of the various constituencies' agendas. We've had to be a little bit flexible.

You can see here that whereas we've typically had an early morning meeting with ALAC, we've had to move it around and we actually have an afternoon meeting with ALAC today at 16:45.

There are a few things on the agenda, and again, I'm not going to step through every line on the document, but to highlight that we have a meeting with ALAC this afternoon. There will be a few key discussion points, which were articulated in the comment column. And in terms of the leads on the topics, [inaudible] lead on the CCWG. It's really more of a discussion on how [inaudible] proceeding with it and how they're handling it. [Annabeth] will be talking a little bit about the country and territory [inaudible]. Those will be some of the key topics [inaudible] ALAC.

---

I would draw your attention to the next row, which is transition perspectives. Ira Magaziner will be there providing some perspective on IANA transition. Ira Magaziner was part of the Clinton White House [inaudible] Washington. [inaudible] Washington politics [inaudible] ICANN and the politics of Washington today for us, particularly those of us who aren't necessarily [inaudible] Washington politics and peculiarities.

Going onto the next row... That's something that I would just encourage people to participate in, as informational. There's also apparently four senior members of US congressional staff there which I think just highlights [inaudible] watch what happens.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] this particular group of staffers has [inaudible] come back through the house. So it's good that they're [inaudible].

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Good to know. Later this afternoon, this evening...  
Oh, sorry, Young Eum?

YOUNG EUM LEE: I'm just thinking that our meeting with the ALAC was prepared or planned before we knew of the session on the transition

---

perspectives, and I'm just concerned that... That's a session that I think most of us in his room are very interested in. I'm wondering how are we going to deal with this? This is a Council meeting with the ALAC and it overlaps almost completely with the other session. I'm just wondering is it okay for me to not attend the Council meeting and just go listen there? I think it could be the concern of many other people in this room also.

BYRON HOLLAND:

That's a good question. We do have Council commitment to be with ALAC, so certainly I would say the majority. I'd like to hear [inaudible].

YOUNG EUM LEE:

Just one more thing. I think it would be very similar... The ALAC Council would also be in a very similar position as well.

NIGEL HICKSON:

I'm seeing some [inaudible] more than once. This is extremely [inaudible]. The human rights meeting is exactly at the same time that we're due to be doing the legal [inaudible]. There's a clash here. I don't know if there's any thought to the chairs of the two sessions before, [inaudible] those two sessions. I hesitate [inaudible] real problem in the same regard.

---

BYRON HOLLAND: Just before we go to Lesley, did you have any comment on that? I know this has been a very tough two-day program for us to put together. It's pretty challenging for us to move things.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's not a very good idea to move stuff at this point, otherwise everyone [inaudible] ALAC are going to have the same problems. [inaudible] work on the budget and operating plan. When we go to these sessions on behalf of the [inaudible] make the point that we're low in numbers because of the [inaudible], I think that would be important.

BYRON HOLLAND: Young Eum, did you have another... No? Okay. Are there any further thoughts on this? I think the program that we have is the program that [inaudible] debated and given the number of people that we brought to this [inaudible] talking about our two day, Tuesday and Wednesday. [inaudible] number of outsiders brought to bear here [inaudible] quality program also means it's completely [inaudible].

---

NIGEL HICKSON: Anybody from Council who can [inaudible]. The NCSG, CCWG, [inaudible].

BYRON HOLLAND: [inaudible] Wednesday morning.

NIGEL HICKSON: That's right, and that clashes [inaudible].

BYRON HOLLAND: Is there anybody who is recognizing that does conflict directly that our own sessions Wednesday morning, is there anybody who's willing or able to [inaudible] that particular session? 9:00 AM, 9:00 until 10:15. Yeah, this is going to be a repeatable problem. Is there anybody who can cover off that one for us?

NIGEL HICKSON: I mean, you don't have to participate. It's just [inaudible].

BYRON HOLLAND: Jordi? Okay. Thank you. Yeah, we're going to go back to the front. We'll just cover that one right now. As mentioned, the operating plan and budget – the ICANN operating plan and budget – [inaudible] but it is an important one for us, so I just highlight that.

---

If we go on to Monday, the 19<sup>th</sup>, there is the DNS Women's Breakfast. I haven't personally gone to that one. I know others have, Becky, Lesley.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Men are welcome, by the way. [inaudible].

BYRON HOLLAND: We'll certainly have coverage.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is the first time it's included just to draw your [inaudible].

BYRON HOLLAND: And the Spencer Hotel is very near here. Monday afternoon there's Women in ICANN and ICT Opportunities and Challenges. [inaudible] going to that.

Then Monday afternoon, Universal Acceptance, most relevant to those with IDNs. Another session on GAC Underserved Regions Working Group. [inaudible] and Abibu.

Finally, the New gTLD Review Implementation Review. [inaudible] that one. Thank you.

If we move to Tuesday, as we get into our constituency days, for us there's some of the relatively standard building blocks of that

---

schedule. We will start... We will have an [inaudible] room, but then we quickly move onto the board ccNSO meeting. The topics that we're going to be discussing with the board are in the comments cell. The status of [ICP-1] will be top of the agenda. Keith will be taking care of that.

As briefly touched on already is the issue around an intersessional meeting. Should the proposal be coming out in the next number of weeks, what does that look like in terms of the requirement of an intersessional meeting for decision-making and what's ICANN [inaudible]? And then there will be a discussion around the implementation as well. So those are the core themes that we'll be discussing with the board.

Then we effectively move almost straight into the GAC. Some similar points around progress of the FOI. Their thoughts on an intersessional meeting, because [inaudible] us, I'm sure it's even more so for them. Also be discussing [inaudible] as well as use of country and territory names, which if [you all remember], was a discussion point at BA at the last meeting as well. I assume we will all be in those ones.

As we move into Wednesday, according to from our own program – and that's why we've highlighted them here for you – there is a relatively early morning session on competition and



---

consumer choice. Is there anybody who's willing to cover that one? It's the morning after the ccNSO cocktail party.

Then there's the board-GAC meeting from 8:30 AM to 10:00 AM. Anybody willing to cover that? It does, of course, conflict with our own meeting. I certainly have staff here so who can at least provide [feedback] on that and provide note-taking back to us.

Jordi, you've already signed up for the next item which has been brought to our attention. The [AOC] organizational reviews. Again, all of these are smack in the middle of our [inaudible]. [Security] Framework Drafting Team – is there anybody [inaudible] highlighted it, but I think probably [inaudible] at least report back on.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] this afternoon with the [inaudible].

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay, moving along. The IANA Transition Implementation around implementation at [inaudible] that one. But it does start to conflict with our own Council meeting.

NIGEL HICKSON: Probably the core session of the afternoon on Wednesday.

---

BYRON HOLLAND: All right, well, [inaudible]. Final one on Wednesday. Is that the same one? It's during our meeting, so that one's a problem for [inaudible].

Moving on to Thursday, Registry Operator Roundtable. Then on Thursday, there's the Internet Governance Public Session, 9:30 to 11:00. I'll certainly [be there]. I would imagine there will be a number of folks from this group who will be at that one. Yeah.

YOUNG EUM LEE: I would just like to not that I'm actually a co-chair of that group. This meeting I'm leaving on Wednesday, so I cannot be at that session, so I'd really appreciate it if for someone else.

BYRON HOLLAND: I will be there, and I think [inaudible] around getting ready for the WSIS+10, as well as preparations for the IGF in Brazil. Any other comments or discussion on [inaudible]?

NIGEL HICKSON: I haven't included the CCWG or the other ones, all the ICG [inaudible] efforts going on. I'll include that one.

BYRON HOLLAND: That probably raises an important point. These aren't the only sessions we should attend. This was a selected highlight [we

---

thought] would be important. [inaudible] all to look at the full agenda [inaudible] relevant sessions in addition to the ones [inaudible]. Further discussion on this?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We've been doing this for a while and we put [inaudible] individuals spend time [inaudible] short updates or statements that there is nothing to [inaudible]. I was wondering, and I think this is [inaudible] actually commitment to join these sessions [inaudible] documents that everybody can read. [inaudible] just having one Google Doc where everybody [inaudible]. I'm happy to do that and I would [inaudible] effort.

BYRON HOLLAND: Sounds like a good idea. Any objection to that? Without trying to increase the workload too much, just a very brief [inaudible] who can collate it for us.

We'll move on to the next agenda item, which is around the decision-making process. That's decision-making with regards to the proposal, whenever it comes out, and [inaudible] we will be asked to sort it or not. I wanted to, before we get there, have a discussion around what that process looks like. If we go back to Buenos Aires, we had [defined] a process there to get us to [inaudible] work of the CWG. So we do [inaudible] forward with

---

the work of the CWG, [or the] proposal rather. But I wanted to have a discussion around that, further thoughts that councilors have [inaudible] process that we need.

I think we also need to consider in that process is the potential for some sort of [inaudible] and how that might impact on [inaudible] leads to [inaudible] what happens if we don't have that many people [inaudible] the decision-making process? Will it be representative, etc.? Thoughts on the decision-making process and [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I'd like to take it one step further back. That is when I was listening to Mathieu and yesterday to Thomas at the GAC meeting. [inaudible] might have been actually more appropriate to ask them directly, but [inaudible] put them on the spot.

I feel that they're very much in doubt whether they would have the authority from the SOs and ACs that have tasked them with their [inaudible] on their own – as a group, that is – whether there is a need for a third public consultation round or not. And if we would start from the assumption that there is a need, then [inaudible] the process [inaudible] conclusion becomes very hard.

---

Would it make sense? And it's a question. Would it make sense to give them support or guidance in that respect from the ccNSO community to basically say we believe that the working group has the right, in the right position, to assess on their own whether that third public consultation [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

I think that if the Council was prepared to make that... It's a little hard to make that call [inaudible] what the actual proposal is and [inaudible]. But if all goes well, it would be perhaps be an enforcement model difference, but [inaudible]. So if we felt like by the end of this week, [inaudible] that would be helpful.

Alternatively, what we've been talking about in the ccNSO are charting organizations at the same time. That's difficult and we're [inaudible] that would support that. But any kind of [inaudible] that this group feels we're in a position to decide today, but maybe as we get towards the end of the week and we know a little bit more what [inaudible] for flexibility, that would be very helpful.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Well, I hear two things from [inaudible] not from Becky. The way I see it is this. Running [inaudible] no-brainer, as far as I can see. The idea, however, that... And obviously if there's absolutely no

---

change to the current [inaudible], then there's little need for further consultation. We've had... But I would strongly oppose any curtailment of [inaudible] for ccTLDs to look through. The devil is in the details. Even if it is only the enforcement model, because the devil is in the details. Enforcement and accountability. This is really the key part of it. [The key] part of accountability is how in a world where the US government does not wield a big stick can we keep the board... How can we keep the board honest? How can we keep the corporation still doing what it's been doing since 1998? I would be very, very scared.

How many ccTLDs really know what's going on here? I joined the working group as a participant – not a member, participant – fairly late in the game with one specific focus. I chose to just focus on that specific area, because the way I could achieve anything [inaudible] contribution.

But I don't know what's going on and I'm on the mailing list, and [inaudible] mailing list I don't know what's going on. I get new things in front of me saying MEM and designator model, and I have not got a clue what half of this means. And we're being served a dog's dinner expected to rubber stamp it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Just to clarify, as I said, I don't think we're in a position now to know whether [we can] skip the second public comment.

NIGEL HICKSON: Perhaps we should consider if somebody was to bring back to the Council a suggestion to abbreviate public comment third round with specific reasons as to why [inaudible], then I guess we could look on that reasonably comfortably, but [inaudible].

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Lesley?

LESLEY COWLEY: Being practical, I think we have to [inaudible] the likelihood of another consultation, and even if they're not needed, they can be dropped. Regional meetings, the ROs, or whatever. Then they [can even] assume that some of those things are going to be needed. [If they're] not needed, they can be dropped.

BYRON HOLLAND: I would agree with the [inaudible]. Please go ahead, [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I wanted to propose I think we actually need to make provision for [inaudible]. Going by what Mathieu mentioned here, that some compromises have already [made] behind closed doors, it might bring challenges if this is not [clarified] to the public why

---

certain people have made a turnaround after [opposing] aspects of the CCWG’s work on the [inaudible].

BYRON HOLLAND:

Well, hopefully over the course of this week – our own program, but also all the other sessions – a lot more of that will be made clear. But I take your point. I would imagine that there will be enough changes to the current proposal, that it will require [inaudible] is probably a relatively safe assumption. If a [new proposal] comes forward in the next month and we are going to have a 45-day comment period, just [gaming] it out, it would allow for a comment period that stretches from late November through December and into early January, at which point really we would have to have an intersessional in mid-January. That’s the way it would look if we’re actually going to follow the comments period and making an assumption [inaudible] proposal comes out.

So it would seem that if we’re going to have an intersessional [inaudible] in mid-January. Certainly that’s a challenge I’m sure for many people’s schedules, if not many people’s budgets. So we would also have to make sure that we have robust remote participation to be able to make a face-to-face meeting in mid-January.



---

But when I game it out and look at the timelines, that's what it looks like to me. Therefore, back to the question of decision-making for us, assuming there's a public comment [period required] [inaudible] comfortable in a decision based off of [inaudible].

NIGEL HICKSON: I don't think you can answer that question now.

BYRON HOLLAND: And I agree with you. It's too early to tell. I think we have to wait this week out and see what transpires, but when I look into my murky crystal ball, that's the kind of timeline that I see – or at least I fail to see many other options. Becky?

BECKY BURR: Have we ever tried to do something that would be not just remote participation, but hubs? So regional hubs where as many people who can get [inaudible].

BYRON HOLLAND: Bart, did you...?

---

BART HOBART: As [inaudible] say with the help of [inaudible] organized several regional hub meetings. I don't know [inaudible] about it.

BYRON HOLLAND: And that's an interesting suggestion and maybe one of the things we'd follow-up with during the course of the week. And they also did it recently. I know ISOC did it recently. That one actually worked fairly well.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We did indeed one for NETmundial [inaudible] and almost everybody that showed initial interest actually [inaudible]. I have a bit of doubt on whether [inaudible] region hub makes sense.

Byron on the timing, you say that consultation would run until the beginning of January, that mid-January would be very optimistic [inaudible] for a meeting. I would leave the CCWG one or two weeks.

BYRON HOLLAND: I don't disagree with your assessment and my timeframes are [inaudible]. But if we have 45 days a consultation, those would be [inaudible].

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] mid-January, but there is the unfortunate, but maybe [inaudible], meeting and the [CENTR] meeting [inaudible] February. Maybe we will be a hub whether we want it or not.

BYRON HOLLAND: I think, to echo the point, it would be very difficult to actually come to [inaudible] proposal shape is starting to take. [inaudible] governance structures, like sole member [inaudible]. If it's more [inaudible] around the margins in terms of knowing the budget, if I could say that's [inaudible] margins. That may not require full public comment. So until we [inaudible] play by the end of this week, I think it's going to be very difficult [inaudible] what some of the potential options look like and the obvious associated [inaudible] unlikely to be any good solution; hence picking least worst alternative.

LESLEY COWLEY: And just reflecting on that, might it be sensible to organize an additional Council call?

BYRON HOLLAND: Probably a good suggestion. I'll definitely take that under advisement. [inaudible] of course making any changes to [inaudible] calls are always a challenge. But I think if there's

---

anything that warranted a special call, this may be [inaudible]. Any other feedback or comments on this as we go into the [inaudible]? No? No further comments on that.

Given that, we'll close that topic and move on to the final topic on our agenda which is any other business that Council members wanted to raise. No? Okay. I'll call this meeting to a close and give you back [inaudible]. Thank you very much for coming out on a Sunday morning. See you in the hallways or at the SOP meeting.

NIGEL HICKSON: [inaudible] meeting is in this room starting at 1:30.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**