
MARRAKECH – ccNSO Council Workshop [C]
Sunday, March 06, 2016 – 10:00 to 12:00 WET
ICANN55 | Marrakech, Morocco

BYRON HOLLAND:

Okay. Good morning, everybody. Let's get going. I noticed this morning that it was all the women in the room here first, and I'm not sure what happened to our male colleagues. But I know this is a hard room to find, and we're not in it on Tuesday and Wednesday. I'm not sure yet where we will be, but presumably it will be bigger than this.

Anyway, good morning, everybody. Thank you for coming to the Sunday morning prep session. This is also a longer planning session where we look out over the coming year and potentially beyond, given some of the work ahead of us.

This morning's session will be twofold. The first part is the longer-term prep session and review of ongoing and future work. We will at the end of this meeting have another shorter session on the week ahead of us. So it will be divided into two blocks: the broader work planning and then the week specifically.

As some of you at least will remember from previous sessions like this – the last one being in Singapore in 2014 – it really is a review or an overview and a scan of the year and years ahead

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.

and also discussion on allocation of responsibility, participation, etc. Some of this will be putting information out there, but of course, it's also meant to be a discussion and dialogue on how we can best affect the work ahead of us and make the Council better and serve the community even better than we already do.

We do have a little over two hours scheduled. My sense is it probably won't take that long, but we have it available to us should we choose.

All of you were given a blue folder that had several documents in it. The first document that I wanted to walk through is the one that is a table. In the top left corner, it has Agenda Item, Welcome, and Introduction, on the top left. It is the one on the screen.

Essentially what I want to do is walk through this document over the course of the next – well, we have up to two hours. It contains I think all of the work items ahead of us, but of course, there will be an opportunity to discuss what we're missing.

You can see Agenda Item #1 here is the decision making process around CCWG and accountability, which is something that of course we will face at our Council meeting Wednesday afternoon, one way or the other. We want to talk a little about cessation planning, roles, and responsibilities and some of the

work groups that we have to make sure are properly resourced. Then we'll go into a scan of the work ahead of us.

To begin with, I just wanted to talk briefly about the decision making process for CCWG. That will clearly be one of the key agenda items for our Council meeting Wednesday at 5:00. Fundamentally what we have tried to do is create an environment much like we had at Buenos Aires, where we worked through the CWG proposal. From everybody I spoke to and the feedback we got, my sense certainly was that the community thought that that was a good process, that everybody who wanted to speak was heard, and the issues were well discussed.

And from a Council perspective at that time, certainly the Council had a good sense of where the community was at by the time we got to the Council meeting in Buenos Aires and had to recommend or not the CWG proposal. So that really was the model that we built the process on for the CCWG decision.

I think that the other component of that that is important to reflect on or to remember is that much of this discussion was also had in Dublin, specific to the third iteration of the CCWG proposal. If you'll recall, there was general, though certainly not unanimous, consensus that the third iteration of the proposal was going to be acceptable. So to the degree possible, we

should focus on what's different between the third and the fourth proposals as opposed to re-prosecuting the entire case.

Now, that said, we have lots of time over the coming agenda, over the coming two days of Council meetings, for discussion, debate, and dialogue around every element of the CCWG and also the CWG and the interaction between the two.

So there'll be a lot of time for us to listen, and of course, it makes it even more important than usual. Of course, it's always important for us as Councilors to be at the ccNSO meetings. That should go without saying, but it's particularly important that we're all at the three blocks specifically allocated to this set of topics and that we're all listening closely to what our community is saying to us. We will go through the agenda on the latter Council prep session or the week's prep session. As I'm sure you've all seen, there's considerable time allocated to this subject, but it's really important that we're all there and we are listening to it.

I think the good news is, to a great degree, we as a community have insulated or inoculated ourselves to much of what is in the CCWG – I said “much of,” and we'll debate those finer points, I'm sure – to a great degree, whether it's a carve out in the IRP or having half the members on the CSC or other things. It certainly seems like the CC community has maintained or perhaps even

enhanced our independence as a community from the broader ICANN fold. But we can discuss that at length over the coming sessions.

Anyway, that's the general process: we have three major blocks of time over Tuesday and Wednesday for presentation, for debate, and discussion. Our appointed five members to the CCWG will all have an opportunity to speak and provide their views and be questioned by us. We have sort of a side benefit that Becky is also a member of the CCWG, but from another community. So while she's not an official ccNSO member, she's certainly an informed Councilor on this subject – an informant from another community. Exactly. While of course she's a member from another community, we all know where her heart lies, and she'll be able to provide her input as well.

Generally speaking, that is the process. If there any specific questions that come up along the way, we will of course have the opportunity to raise our cards as usual. If there are any specific and germane questions that we feel need to be asked where we can take the temperature of the room, we will have that opportunity as well. Certainly, as we come to the conclusion of the two-day ccNSO meetings, I'm sure we will be asking some of those questions. I know we will be.

So that's the general flow of how we will inform ourselves as Councilors on this subject as we go to the Council meeting and come to the decision point on whether we want to – and this is an important point – recommend this proposal to the Board for its consideration.

That's an important distinction because this is simply saying we will pass it to the next step, to the Board, for their consideration and determination. I think that's a key thing to also keep in mind: it does have another step.

Each of the chartering organizations has their own process to some degree, or to a great degree, actually. As of now, as a matter of fact, two of the communities, ASO – pardon me – and SSAC, have actually approved it in their meetings already. Seems to have been relatively straightforward in their communities. Of course, their communities are unique and different from ours. The GSNO and GAC and ALAC have not yet done it, and I'm sure they will have a little bit bumpier ride than SSAC and ASO.

Excuse me for just one sec. I'm going to get a bottle of water.

Are there any questions or comments on the process piece of the decision making for Council?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Actually, I got something that came up on what you just said a couple of seconds ago. I think it's going to be quite important, both in the Council meeting, which obviously will come after the two days of discussion with the [inaudible], but also in the two days of discussion. That's: what actually are we being asked to do? Because I have a couple of concerns, and I'm already able to do one of the two things that you kind of mentioned we might doing than another.

If it's simply to say we can transmit this on to the Board for their consideration, there's nothing controversial about that. If it is, however, saying we approve it and its contents, that's a much more substantive and substantial piece of work, which I don't think any Councilors have got the time and resources to do. I've been involved as a participant walking through this, and I've struggled. I've really struggled to understand what's in this.

There's something else that's really important from the ccNSO's perspective that's quite different than any of the other constituencies or ACs. The final draft report has only just been published in translated form today or yesterday. I can't remember the exact timing, but I've just seen an e-mail from [Hilary] on that.

We need to give ccTLD managers inside and outside the ccNSO a reasonable time to be able to read and understand this. Some of us are ahead of the game. I know, for example, there's a major ccTLD that's close to me that's devoted significant legal and policy resources. I know many others that don't even know it's on the table.

We have to square the circle somehow. I don't know how we're going to do it, but that's just a comment.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks, Nigel. You've reframed it slightly, but I agree, and that's why I'm trying to highlight it: what are we actually doing? And making sure that everybody's clear on what we're doing, which is passing it onto the Board with our approval for their consideration. But it is a two-step. I guess that's the key thing here. This isn't the final step of the proposal. There is a second step, which is Board consideration and approval.

Now, of course, if all the communities come through and say, "We're supportive of it and pushing it to the Board for final consideration," it would be my expectation that the Board will adopt it. So we should be clear that if we are supporting it for Board consideration, and the other communities all do the same, then it will likely be adopted by the Board. It's a nuance,

but it's important to recognize what we're actually doing, as I think you and I have both stated in different ways.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

I think that's correct, but I think the other thing is that the nuance is largely lost on others, and particularly outside the community. What it appears – whether this is true in reality or not – that we and the other chartering organizations are being asked to do is to essentially say, “We have received this. We have read it carefully, and we like it. Therefore, we approve it, and we want this to happen because it's in our best interests.” Personally, I don't think that's necessarily quite exactly where we should be, but we're going to develop this in the next two days.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Any other input or intervention on this? This is really mostly just a process discussion: “Here's what's to expect over the course of the next couple of days, in the next few days.” Since I can't actually read the Adobe Connect from here, Lesley and Keith, can you hear us? I'm sorry. I should have asked you at the outset.

LESLEY COWLEY:

Good morning, Byron. Yes, I can hear you very well.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Welcome, Lesley. I should have acknowledged you right out the gate. Keith, are you on there?

KEITH DAVIDSON: I sure am. I'm here. Hi to everyone.

BYRON HOLLAND: Well, we miss you both, especially given that it's each of your last meetings as Councilors. It's too bad you couldn't join us. I would have bought you a beer at some free reception somewhere, I'm sure.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Your generosity is overwhelming.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. If you have any interventions you want to make, I guess please put your hand up and I'll acknowledge you as promptly as possible. Thanks.

We're going to move onto Item #2, which is around cessation planning, roles and responsibilities, and some of the work going forward.

As I think everybody knows, there's going to be something of a transition at the Council level, as I noted when I was reappointed for the last time. This would be my last term as Chair. I obviously made everyone aware of that again in the last Council meeting or two meetings ago. So there will be a transition there, and therefore also from Vice-Chairs, given Keith is leaving. That's something we'll be working towards at the Council meeting.

There will be a shift in rejuvenation, I'm sure. I have another year as Councilor, so I will certainly be staying on and doing whatever's required of me as a councilor. Everybody will need to be thinking about those changes as we come to the Council meeting where the election of the new Chair and Vice-Chairs will happen at the end of the Council meeting.

In terms of roles and responsibilities, we have a number of essentially standing working groups which need to be resourced by us and others within the ccNSO, as well as some of the more ad hoc ones. CCWG probably feels like a standing working group, but it is actually ad hoc, and there are others.

There are key elements of participating in the working groups, and one of the challenges that we continue to have is making sure that we have enough folks with the relevant expertise and availability to participate in the working groups as ccNSO

members on the cross-community working groups, as well as specifically on our own working groups.

One of the discussions I wanted to have is a discussion that's been had before. I remember Lesley talking about it when I was new to the Council, so this is an ongoing challenge. It's: how do we increase participation? How do we make sure that we have enough volunteers participating in the various working groups and activities that we have?

We have some new Councilors, so we'll make sure to coopt them and throw them into the fire early, while they're still young and new and fresh to the Council.

Also, all joking aside, we have 160 members right now, and yet I would probably be correct in saying that the actual members really engaged in doing the work on working groups is probably not that much different than when we had 60 members.

How do we get that broad cross-section of country code managers and operators to engage and participate in the ccNSO? Because, of course, it's in their own interest. It is in their own self-interest to make sure that we're well-represented and they're well-represented. Also, it's part of the kind of communities that we tend to operate, which is participating in both the local and broader community. So how do we get them engaged?

One of the challenges always is, even though we're a very open, collaborative community, it can be perceived that there is this membrane or this wall around us, be it acronyms or expertise or understanding of specific issues, that can be somewhat intimidating.

I also recognize the business of the ccNSO is done in English, which also can be a limiting factor and a challenge for others. How do we make sure it is as welcoming as possible?

I don't have specific solutions, per se. That's why I wanted to have a bit of a discussion right now. We have 160 members, yet often it's the same handful of folks doing a lot of the heavy lifting. What can we do as a Council to try to generate more interest and more participation by the boarder cross-section?

I'd like to throw that out as a question for all of us. What can we do there? Nigel?

NIGEL ROBERTS: Well, first of all, I'd like to say that 160 out of 200 and – whatever the exact figure is – is about two-thirds. It's an incredibly good number so far. I hark back to the fact that we, once upon a time, had a Councilor whose job it was to beat up the non-aligned and drag them into the fold. Isn't that correct, Lesley? It obviously worked because it dragged us in. Maybe we can revisit that, and

maybe Lesley might somehow be able to assist us in letting us know what techniques she was using. We can use them on the non-members.

But as you rightly said, it's not just the fact that we need to get numbers in. We need to get participation up from those who are within. I think the one way of doing so is to make sure that no ccTLD manager thinks that they might potentially be threatened by being a member of the ccNSO. We know there are certain ccTLDs that, for all legal and structural reasons, feel they cannot become part of the ccNSO. Perhaps they're government departments and thing like that. Often, those ccTLDs participate anyway.

We do perhaps need to restart an engagement process – a standing engagement process.

BYRON HOLLAND: Lesley and then Katrina?

LESLEY COWLEY: Thanks, Byron. Thanks, Nigel. I can't remember being allocated a role of beating people up, but we certainly did try to persuade people to participate more. I think participation early is really important. As soon as somebody gets involved, to actually give them something to do early has been quite successful.

I would support the suggestion of actually having some Council members specifically responsible for encouraging participation and engagement.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Lesley. Any particular tactics on that front that you would suggest or you may have used when you were not beating them up but at least twisting their arm?

LESLEY COWLEY: Well, bear in mind my involvement was particularly around why CCs were not getting involved. That led to the bylaws change and so on. So once those barriers had been removed, it was about really persuading people that it was better to be in the tent, as it were.

Now I think that situation has changed. I think what we will have going forward is, increasingly, CCs competing against each other. Therefore, the tactic would need to be around: actually it's better to both compete as well as work together. My real concern leaving the ccNSO now is that some of that competitive behavior will actually damage the working together that we have always had.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, and that's an interesting point because that is an evolving dynamic that this community is going to have over the coming year and years, for sure. It's not going to affect all of us, but it will certainly affect some of us.

Katrina?

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Byron. Frankly, I'm not overly optimistic about the fact that new members bring us new participants because I think, even now when many non-members do participate and participate in very meaningful ways – Lisa, for example, when she was with .dk (and they're a non-ccNSO member) I think contributed immensely to the work of the ccNSO.

Yeah, well, we at the Guidelines Review Committee, or GRC – another acronym that might scare people away – looked from a different perspective. We looked at the [work done in] guideline about working groups. We probably looked from a different perspective. We did not try to engage people. We tried to give leverage to the working group to actually get rid of those people who apply very enthusiastically but at a later stage they just fail to participate and disappear or perhaps cause some trouble to the work of the working group by some obstructive behavior or something.

So we propose to give leverage to the Chair of the working group to try to solve the initial conflicts between a member of the working group and the Chair and then escalate it to the Council if it's not possible to solve the conflict.

Plus, I also think that it's important to increase the accountability of working groups and people who do apply. It does not motivate to participate, but if somebody applies and wants to participate in a working group where many other members are not participating, it might discourage and demotivate those who really want to work and contribute to the work of the working group.

So, yes, we do not motivate them, but at least I believe that we propose some leverage to make the work of the working group more efficient and at least not demotivate people from participation. Yeah. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks. Peter?

PETER VERGOTE: Good morning, all. I quite agree with Katrina's point of view, that chasing the numbers should not be the main focus. Like Nigel indicated, having two-thirds of ccTLD representation already is a fairly massive and impressive number.

Like Katrina indicated, I don't think – I'm not convinced, at least – that adding new members will automatically lead towards an increase in participation, both on the level of working groups, or both in general, in the activities of the ccNSO.

I think what we should be working on is to increase activity of the current members. In order for them to become interested or willing to participate in working groups, I think we should probably tackle with a higher issue first. Get them more active as a member, both in the regular ccNSO activities.

If they start being more active into our regular activities, then they automatically will become more interested in also specific activities that are carried out in working groups.

So my suggestion would be giving the anticipation that the time we are going to invest after the Marrakech meeting is going to be, according to my expectations at least, less on the CWG and CCWG. Obviously, it's not going to be cleared from the agenda, but I do think that we have a couple of sessions that we can gain in future ccNSO meetings.

Would it not be envisionable to have a specific geographic session in the region where the ICANN meeting is held? For instance, if we have an ICANN meeting in Latin America, have a session of, say, one or two hours that is dedicated for only ccTLDs of that geographic area because I see that, in our normal

ccTLD update sessions, there's a lot of interest. I think that it's often the same ccTLDs that are coming back to do an update because they're not scared at all to address the public. Perhaps there is a natural tendency that they are picked or that they somehow can come with a more interesting update.

We could eliminate that by saying, "Let's have a dedicated session that is going to rotate and function of the ICANN regional meetings." We keep the regular updates, of course, as well.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks. Thanks, Peter. That's a couple of interesting ideas. Absolutely.

One of the things that I've been thinking about also is when we get a new member. I think like any, in a sense, an adoption curve, if somebody becomes a new member, they've expressed interest. They want to participate, at least in some way, shape, or form enough to have said, "I want to become a member as a CC."

We also know that ICANN and the ccNSO to some degree are somewhat impenetrable just through the lexicon, through the language, through the issues. There are a whole bunch of hurdles that make it difficult for people to participate.

One of the things that I think we need is a bit of a buddy system, and that is, when a new member joins – and we can go back and look at who the recent new members are – they get paired up with somebody on Council or an “old hand,” somebody who’s been around the ccNSO for quite some time and understands it and is willing to help. Perhaps we can pair those people so that at least in the first meeting that a new member or a recent member attends, they have a sherpa or a guide or somebody they can go to very specifically and ask, “What does this mean? What’s happening? What’s the issue?” Just general help, as well as perhaps introductions. I think that that might be something we could do as a Council to lead off on that.

Alejandra?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, thank you, Bryon. Right now I’m working with Janice Lange on a community mentor pilot program. We are developing some documents to introduce people to our own communities. Right now I’m writing a document on introducing new members to ccNSO, for example. I’m going to review it with [Joke] and maybe Bart will join us, too.

We will try to make it as easy possible so people will understand sort of quickly how the ccNSO was established and what it’s doing. Also, since it’s a mentorship program, it’s supposed to be

also a companionship through an ICANN meeting. They will not only know the community that they're interested in, as in the ccNSO, but also how the ICANN ecosystem works.

BYRON HOLLAND: That's very interesting. Maybe I didn't catch it. Who are you doing that for?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: For Janice in the Fellowship Program and the Newcomers' Introduction Program, too.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Margarita?

MARGARITA VALDES: Good morning. Following the idea of Alejandra, yesterday I got some interesting meetings – because sometimes people that have to or we think they have to participate in the ccNSO are first approached if they're around other groups or Civil Society or whatever that they are trying to gather. Perhaps it's interesting to have some kind of label because we don't have anything. We are just participants.

We can do everything or we are not showing our affiliate group, so perhaps for us, in terms of the ccNSO Council, we have

something different because you have the opportunity to talk with a lot of people, but they don't know if they have the opportunity to be among us.

That's my suggestion. Something like that. Right. Yes. Because there are newcomers and other kind of levels. But in the case specifically of the ccNSO, we don't have it. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND:

That's a very good, basic, practical suggestion. I think, as we all know, there's no silver bullet or magic solution to this challenge. We will make a difference through many small steps. That I think is a good example of just one small thing but potentially powerful thing because we identify ourselves. People can see who to come up to in a way – it does say ccNSO, and the font is this big, and quite frankly, if somebody came up to you and stared at you to see it, you would probably be unnerved by that.

MARGARITA VALDES:

The idea comes up because, yesterday night, I met a lady from [Syria]. It's a kind of older lady in the good sense. I don't remember her name.

BYRON HOLLAND:

She's one of my Board members.

MARGARITA VALDES: Yes. Sorry. I don't know the word in English. The thing was she said that she has a lot of experience because she is in the industry from the other point, as I remember. The point is that she didn't know what kind of meeting she had to participate in or if she would have to come up. We were with Hartmut Glaser and people from .br. We were trying to lead her in order to let her figure out what could be the [natural] space for her.

So that's my idea. It comes from here, because this is the ccNSO, you see? That was my experience yesterday night.

BYRON HOLLAND: I actually think the tags are a good idea. Perhaps some kind of a buddy system that is regularized by relatively informal, if people are willing to be mentor or a buddy. Yrjo, and then Young Eum. Yrjo?

YRJO LANSIPURO: Thank you. I'm a member of the EPSRP Working Group. I don't know if everybody knows what it stands for.

BYRON HOLLAND: Could you tell us?

YRJO LANSIPURO: I believe it is Extended Process Similarity Review Panel for IDN and ccTLD. Sorry.

BYRON HOLLAND: See, when the people on it don't even remember...

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yes, something like that. Its members seem to be required to have their specific expertise, so it is not easy to join the working group without expertise. I think it's kind of a general thought on it. For the members, information sharing and discussion on making positions or rules are different things. Many ccNSO members joined the ccNSO I think mainly for information sharing but may not be interested in discussions or making positions or policy.

I think this is true even for longstanding members, as well. So it's not easy to discuss in deep if she or he doesn't have enough time. Maybe the problem is many think that deep knowledge and deep thought is necessary to join our working group and to behave as a working group member. It's sometimes, yes, but maybe not always.

My suggestions is, when recruiting working group members, the working group chair and the working charter should say whether deep expertise of some topics is needed or common knowledge

and general feeling is enough to be a working group member.
Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: That's actually a very good point, and it's something we should take away for the charter writers because you make an important distinction.

Katrina, did you have something to say?

KATRINA SATAKI: Oh, thank you very much. Yes, I wanted to say thank you very much, Yrjo, for bringing this up because this gives me an opportunity to advertise the work of the GRC. In the guidelines I already mentioned we say that, if there is a specific requirement for some expertise, it should be included in the call for volunteers and apparently in the charter. So thank you, Yrjo. It was noted and already implemented – well, at least presented to the Council.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Thanks, because I think, Yrjo, you're absolutely right, and it's good to her that that's already weaving its way into the work of the GRC.

Is this specific? Okay. Bart and then Young Eum?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes. Just for your information, one of the things – and I will share it later today – is you’ve seen [Yoka] in the back of the room. [Yoka’s] responsibilities are outreach and engagement. Based on this conversation, we’ll come up with some ideas and bring them back to the Council for further decision making.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Young Eum?

YOUNG EUM LEE: Yes, thank you. Just a small point. One thing that might actually add to the encouragement could be to maybe have the first- or second-timers to the ccNSO meeting on Tuesday. Before you begin, just ask them to stand up so that we may be able to identify who they are and then maybe begin the buddy process. Thanks.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Thank you. So even just in ten minutes of discussion, I think there was a handful of very practical suggestions that could help us with generating interest and participating.

Bart, you’ve taken note of those?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, or [Yoka] has.

BYRON HOLLAND: Or [Yoka] has. Thank you.

Any final comments before we move on? No? Okay. Now we'll move on to Agenda Item #3, which is a scan of the work items.

Debbie?

DEBBIE MONAHAN: Sorry. There's another bit to #2 which I'm interested in, which is the timing of Council meetings. I'd just like to say that 1:00 A.M. in the morning for every single kind of Council meeting – can we just rotate one or two of them or a little bit more? Because it seems there's just some of us that get all the heat of bad timing. I'd just like to propose that, maybe instead of just having it at the same time right through the year, can we change it a little bit?

BYRON HOLLAND: It is, I believe, on the Council agenda, or I know that I asked for it to be on the Council agenda because I as a – well, I'm still going to be on the Council. I have another year in my term. But as a parting Chair, I've raised that issue as a point of discussion for the Council meeting on Wednesday.

Stephen and then Bart?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I just want to weigh in in support of Debbie's request and recommend – and I will do so at the Council meeting Wednesday – that Council follow what the FOI Working Group did, which was to share the pain by rotating the meetings. I think we rotated every four hours or every six hours.

BYRON HOLLAND: Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: That's why it's on the Council meeting. One of the reasons why we, for example, haven't scheduled out for this coming year is knowing that Byron would step down. It first and foremost is trying to fit it into the agenda and checking it with the new Chair of the ccNSO when to schedule it out. So most likely, at the end of this week or early next week, we will send out a schedule based on that one. I think the rotating basis is, if that's feasible, we'll include it.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah. And just to be clear, I put it on the agenda for a topic of discussion. No decisions are made. Obviously, the next Chair will have to make in some part those decisions.

Katrina?

KATRINA SATAKI: Who do I buy a drink for? Thank you very much. Since we started talking about this rotating schedule, could we also reach out to regional organizations so that they do not schedule their meetings, well, somehow we try to correlate their meetings with our Council calls because I've noted that, lately, they collide a lot? It would be great to have if councilors are traveling to regional meetings, so it's really very challenging for them to join the Council calls. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: That's a good point. Given that our meeting is always a fixed day, generally, published well in advance, we can certainly socialize that with all the regional organizations. What they choose to do with it, we may have some influence but we probably can't tell them what to do. Anyway, duly noted.

Any other comments before we move off of Agenda Item #2?

BARTY BOSWINKEL: Maybe just one more if I may?

BYRON HOLLAND: Sure. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: As part of, say, the roles and responsibilities Byron alluded to, the different Council committees – the Triage Committee, the Travel Funding Committee, and the Members Application Committee is – I will circulate later today a list of who’s already on there. If there are new volunteers and if somebody wants to step down, let me know it so by the end of this week we can include it in the Council agenda as a matter of decision making so these standing committees are staffed properly.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes. Thank you for reminding me, Bart. All of those are just ongoing committees which likely will require some refresh during the next Council year. So that will come up as part of the agenda for the Council meeting, but I would ask all of you to think about your willingness to participate, or if you’re on it and need to do something else, whether you should still be on it. I’ll be looking for people to put their hands up and share the load on those standing working groups.

With that, we'll move onto a scan of the work items. If you have the hard copy in front of you, you'll note that this particular section is several pages long. It is not my intent to run through this point by point. It is meant for you to have as a document. But we will hit all of the key headings to make sure that there's awareness and then also to ensure that we believe that we have captured all of the key big work items so that, if there's anything else, councilors are free to make note of it. And in case we miss something, please identify anything that we've missed.

I do just want to hit the high points of it; like I say, not run through it in specific detail. The first item of course is to do with the IANA stewardship transition and the accountability process.

As we move through this, I will make the assumption that, on balance of probability, it looks like the accountability process will move forward, although it may not. So I'm working with the assumption that it will likely move forward. If that is the case, then we will move from the stage that we've been over the last two years, essentially, into more of an implementation phase, particularly around the work of the IANA stewardship transition, which is of course particularly interesting to this community. We've had a lot of say in how that shaped up.

The implementation phase of that will start to take place, things as straightforward as how we're going to get members on the

CSC, the Customer Council of the new IANA. So just some very basic tactical things in terms of process and how we do that. All of those various implementation elements will start to become the focus of our attention in the coming year in particular.

Also, assuming that the CCWG does move forward, there will be implementation elements associated with that. How are we going to start to work that into our schedule, our agenda, and our workload?

If it passes, then there will also be Work Stream 2. How do we want to participate in that? Who will participate in that? So this issue will evolve for us from more of the discussion, debate, and proposal into the execution and implementation. That will certainly be a key element of what's on our agenda over the coming year.

Moving on. If there's any discussion, I'm certainly open and you're welcome to, but this is more a highlighting of what we believe. When I say "we," I worked with Bart and Keith and Katrina to think about what we see as all of the issues and put them on the table for Council. Like I say, if we missed something, please highlight it to us. These are the things that we see as the major blocks of work.

Peter?

PETER VERGOTE: Byron, just a quick question. According to your view, how will the future workload look like in terms of – well, assuming that it goes through, that there is support from the community to the proposal of the CCWG? If we move into the implementation phase and into Work Stream 2, compared with the current level of activity on the agenda of the ccNSO that we have, would you estimate that it will go down, that it will stay the same? What are your thoughts about it?

BYRON HOLLAND: My sense is it would be less. I think the heavy lifting required by the CWG and certainly the CCWG and the level of effort by our appointed members as well as the amount of time and effort required by individual councilors and ccNSO members will be less. The production of documents, the amount of reading, the amount of time allocated to it in ccNSO meeting: it is certainly my sense that it will be less than what it has been over the past 24 months, 12 months in particular.

Now, that said, that's just my interpretation of it. I truly believe it will be less than what it has been. I can't imagine it will be more.

PETER VERGOTE: My gut feeling as well, but it's not exact science, but at least it's opens perspective that for future ccNSO activities there might be room available, space available, to fill up with other things.

BYRON HOLLAND: I believe so, and I certainly hope so. But I actually believe it, too.

If we move to the next item, which is other ongoing work, these are activities that are both what I would call regular run rate business for us as well as maybe specific activities that have a particular lifespan but are already ongoing, such as the IDN ccPDP, certainly ICANN's longer-term strategic plan and ops plan. Those are activities that we are engaged in on a regular and ongoing basis, and there is a list of other activities that you can see there. None of them should be a surprise to any of us, but those are ongoing activities. I think we've captured all of the major ongoing activities there.

If we move on to the next one, other work items, starting at March this year, if we flip to the next page, or at least in the hardcopy version, I think one of the big ones to note here is the ccNSO PDP on retirement of ccTLDs and their review mechanism regarding decisions around delegation, revocation, transfer and retirement; essentially, the next phase of work done by the FOI and in particular how it interacts with the work of the CWG. That will be a material next-phase in that stream of work.

Thanks.

So I highlight that one to you because I know it's of particular interest to many people in our community and certainly around this table. It will probably not be a trivial effort, either.

Again, I'm certainly open to discussion here. I'm just highlighting some of what I consider the key elements.

From a longer-term perspective, if we move to the next category, upcoming work items foreseeable in the two- to three-year timeframe, you'll see that a number of them are related to CCWG/CWG, but also others, including the review of ccNSO bylaws and other elements. This is sort of the two- to three-year view as best as we can see it at this point.

Moving along to the administration of ccNSO Council and ccNSO, as was mentioned already, there are some basic everyday pieces of business that we must attend to, like the work of the Triage Committee. Just as a reminder, the flow of inbound requests to this Council a couple of years ago was getting to the point where we needed to manage it. The Triage Committee was created in order to be the initial recipient of all the requests, and as the title would suggest, triage what really needed to come to the Council or not. That's an ongoing piece of work. We will need to re-resource that group in the next Council term.

There are a number of other ones like traveling funding that will be important. That's always an issue, and certainly Chair and Vice-Chair elections coming up as part of our regular run rate business.

Bart, could you walk us just through the chronology of Board seat elections and where we should start to be discussing that?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes.

BYRON HOLLAND: Perhaps also the NomCom as well, just to give everybody a sense.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. If you look at the current way we do the Board seat elections, we start with them at the same time as the Council elections. Effectively it means the community and the Council have selected a Board member almost a year in advance of when they take their seats. That has been changed in the last couple of years.

A new Board member takes his seat at the annual meeting. That's the October meeting. Most of the time, we know one year

in advance who will be the ccNSO-appointed new Board member.

Now, what is happening is, from the Secretariat, we send out calls for Council members and calls for Board members at the same time. Given the change in timing, one of the things we've been thinking through – and maybe that's a way to engage the community as well – is start staggering these elections and selections. You have the NomCom first, and we had quite a debate last year around the NomCom appointment or appointing a member to the NomCom committee. Based on the discussions in the year, one of the thoughts came up was, "Why don't we do it early so we can use the June meeting to interview the NomCom appointee?"

With the Council [elections], they are currently staged to start in September. That's worked pretty well because if there is a run-off election – we can't rule it out – we still have the October meeting to interview potential candidates for the Council elections.

If we then stage the Board selection process, again, when that one is completed, somewhere starting January, then we have, say, this meeting, the February meeting, to interview potential candidates for the Board seat. So we start to stagger and stage

the different relevant and important appointments across the year or throughout the year.

In future, and one of the things that the Council needs to consider is, for example, the selection of the CSC members as well. That's a result from the CWG stewardship. The ccNSO has been tasked to appoint two ccTLD managers on the CSC, and that will be, again a selection process resulting in a final appointment. Yeah, there is a way to stage it.

We have the ability now to start staging the different elections and selections throughout the year.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Everybody get that? Nigel, could you run that back to me? Before you go, Nigel, I think it was very important to take note of that because all of these elements are potentially evolving and changing timing a bit. Maybe what I could ask staff to do is actually just build the recommended timeline to make it easier for us to digest – or at least those of us who are visual in nature to digest – how this is going to happen, just as opposed to only curing it. So thank you for doing that in advance, Bart.

Nigel?

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you, Byron. I'd underline what Byron said about being visually oriented and wanting a timeline.

Well, I'm just going to make a comment. I take it this is going to be a decision to do this that will come before Council in due course, but my real plea or my real point is that, when you stagger things, some things may be done slightly earlier and some things will definitely be done later. As we have three or four different things that we're going to need to be selecting/electing, my suggestion is that we keep the Board seat as early as possible because there's an advantage to knowing in advance who the next Board member is going to be for Seat 11 or whatever the seat is – 10 or 12; whatever it is – in that the person who is elected can shadow the existing Board member for a sensible period before taking seat at the AGM and hit the ground running.

So if we're going to do it, can we put the Board seat at the beginning of that series of four and not at the end?

BART BOSWINKEL: I understand what you're saying, Nigel, but as I was saying, if we can keep it this way, then it will be more than a year in advance before that person takes the Board seat.

If you look at the timeframe, the question is, how much time does a new Board member need to shadow and when will he or she be allowed to be on the Board list, etc.? That's probably one of the variables that needs to be taken into account.

If there's half a year in advance, then we can really phase throughout the year. I'm not talking about one month in advance before they take their seat at the annual meeting, but somewhere around half a year because now it's over a year.

BYRON HOLLAND:

So we'll build a timeline and bring this back to Council for suggestion. I wanted to make everybody aware that there is some evolution in the nominating/electing timelines. We'll have further opportunity to discuss exactly how we want it to play out when we see more clearly the interplay of at least these three components, if not more.

Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL:

A little remark. The GRC, the Guidelines Review Committee, is currently looking at the different guidelines on the election and selection of Board members and Council members. I think the GRC is taking on what you just said because Council at the end

of the day needs to adopt these guidelines, and this is where we will define the processes.

So turning this into a package and having a submission sheet with the timeline included, and I think the GRC has taken it on already discussing these different timelines.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks, Bart. Any further discussion? Okay. We'll move on to potential new activities for discussion. I think we've actually covered capacity building unless there are any further comments on that.

We'll just go to a review and update of the ccNSO website. Just one point to note so we're all on the same page there: you will note that Council meeting attendance, as we have discussed in previous meetings, is now actually up and on the site with three basic categories: you attended, you didn't attend but sent regrets in advance, or we simply just never heard from you and you didn't show up. That one's in red. That is all available on our website, and that's part of being transparent. That's part of being accountable to your region, to your peers around this table, etc., and something that has been discussed for a long time and is now available for all. So I would just make that note for all of us.

Bart, did you want to say anything in addition about the website?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes. It has been an ongoing process. Some time ago, we started as Secretariat to seek input from the community on how the ccNSO website could improve.

However, we are dependent on the ICANN processes as well. They have just relaunched the ALAC. They are now working on the GNSO, and we are down the line. As soon the ccNSO website needs to be revamped, we'll set up a consumer user group again to seek your input to make it as useful to you as possible.

BYRON HOLLAND: Do you know when that will be? No insight at all? Okay. So we won't hold our breath then? That's what you're saying? Okay.

BART BOSWINKEL: [inaudible]

BYRON HOLLAND: Then we'll move on to the next item, which is titled "Issues Workshopping," if we want to go out and shop for any more stuff to do.

Essentially, have we covered all the ground here? Is there anything we missed? Is there anything that needs to be a particular priority or have a particular sense of urgency? Or do we as the Council feel that this document fairly reflects what I'm going to call the big boulders or the big pieces of work? Of course, there are many smaller and more day-to-day things that aren't covered here, but from the big boulders of work or the big chunks of work, have we covered everything? Have we missed anything that anybody around the table can think of?

No? Okay. I'd say it was a job well done then by the Vice-Chairs and staff. Thank you. Is there anything on the list that people want to flag from a particular urgency perspective?

Okay. Then we'll move onto any other business. Is there any other business that people would like to discuss from a Council prep perspective? Remember, we will have another section around this week specifically, but around the longer term Council prep.

Maybe I'll just make a couple of observations from this meeting. Oh, Peter, go ahead.

PETER VERGOTE:

Thanks, Byron. I think it might be interesting for the Council to know where the other ACs and SOs stand with regards to the

final proposition of the CCWG working group. Not that it needs to influence our line of thinking, but just for convenience, it would be good if we had a tendency whether the ACs and SOs are likely to adopt it or support it or if there is within specific SOs and ACs large resistance against the proposals. Thanks.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Sure. Nigel, just one second. Two communities have adopted already, ASO and SSAC. I will give you just my read of it based on the SO/AC Chairs meetings, which we held on Friday past and getting a report from the Chairs of the respective SOs and ACs.

With the GAC, Thomas indicated that he felt they would get to a position where there wouldn't be objection, which is essentially all their hurdle, effectively. There has been some discussion whether they will go recommendation by recommendation. I think that's fluid and that now the goal is they will likely try to come to a conclusion as a package rather than individual recommendations. But predicting what the GAC will do is a questionable endeavor. Anyway, that is according to Thomas.

In terms of the GNSO, they're going to have some turbulence in getting there, but listening to the constituency Chairs within the GNSO and the GNSO Chair, it seems to me they will come to a positive conclusion on it, although there's still work to be done

there. I would say ALAC is roughly in the same category, although for different reasons.

I think I've covered everybody there. Yeah. So two are already done. A couple have a bumpy ride ahead of them, and it looks like GAC will go with one package and achieve non-consensus, which is what would be required for them to go forward.

Nigel?

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Yeah. I just want to pick up something that Peter said. It's very useful what he said, actually, to focus on this. I think I want to caution against the part which says we need to know what everybody else is doing, because if they're all ticking the box yes, we should perhaps be thinking that we should be ticking the box yes. There's a cognitive bias involved here, which I'm going to call the wisdom of crowds. I'm going to be diplomatic here. It's the exact opposite.

I think it is helpful, what you suggested, when we know maybe where the speedbumps in the other communities might or might not be. It sounds to me like it's the GAC and the GNSO where there might be concerns or issues that are specific to the GNSO or the GAC themselves. It doesn't necessarily relate to what our concerns might be or our special position.

I think as best we can we should keep that in mind while at the same time focusing about what's special about ccTLDs. But, yeah, that's helpful. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah. I would actually strongly echo Nigel's point. It's interesting and informative to know what the other communities are doing, particularly when they do their own work and research and might surface issues that we should think about or talk about. But what they do is relevant to them as a community. We need to be focused on what is relative to us as a community. We can be informed by their views, thoughts, and positions, but we need to take our own position.

Young Eum?

YOUNG EUM LEE: Kind of related to that is the fact that that in the GAC there are some bumps. I don't know if we want to discuss that or not, but that is something that I think we should note.

BYRON HOLLAND: And I think during the course of the next couple of days we will definitely have lots of opportunity to discuss exactly that.

Becky?

BECKY BURR: I just wanted to say it's actually interesting to me that the bumps in the GNSO and the GAC are actually about exactly the same things. They just come out in a different place.

BYRON HOLLAND: Any final comments on any "any other business"?

Okay. Given we're relatively ahead of schedule by 30 minutes, we did have a break scheduled, which we could take before we go into the next session. But perhaps I would suggest we just roll right into the next piece of it if that's okay with everyone. Any objections?

Okay. So then we'll go into the next part of our Council prep, and that is turning our attention from the longer-term, bigger-picture issues to what is coming up over the course of ICANN55.

In your package, you would have received several other documents. One is a table that lists specifically topics of interest throughout the ICANN meeting not necessarily specific to ccTLDs as well as our full agenda both days. Then the third document you should have received was the overview document from the CCWG itself. This will effectively be the document that Mathieu walks us through during the session that he's presenting at. I thought it would be important for all of us to have this

document in advance so you can have a preview to see what's coming to think about it and to be ready with any questions, comments, arguments, etc. that you may have.

All ccTLDs, yeah. And these are of course available to everybody, not just us. I'm not going to go over this by any stretch. It's meant for your information and for your preparation.

The two items that I did want to walk through in a little greater detail were our agenda itself as well as highlighting some of the sessions that I think are of particular relevance to this community and to us and that we should make sure that somebody from Council is attending and can report back to us on.

Katrina, did you want to walk us through the agenda and hit any of the key highlights as the leader of the Program Working Group, who has done a lot of work on making sure that we have an appropriate agenda for this stand of issues ahead of us?

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Byron. I just want to say that, yeah, this is a network of the Meeting Program Working Group's collective effort. Thanks a lot to Bart and Alan for helping to shape all the discussions around the stewardship transition process.

Yes, the program is structured in the way that on the first day we give an overview of the current state of the proposal. We give opportunity to all of ccNSO members on CCWG accountability to present their view on the proposal. Of course, we'll give an overview of the proposal to the community.

I completely agree with Nigel. It takes a lot of time and effort to go through the proposal, and not all ccTLD managers have time and resources to dedicate to this process.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Sorry. I just want to pick up on a point that Katrina has made that I think is very important for all of us and for our community, and that's, in this session that Katrina's referring to, each of our appointed members will have the opportunity to provide their input, insight, and perspective. We need to remember that, as a Council and as a community, we delegated the authority to participate in the CCWG to them.

By doing that, in essence they become our informed experts on this subject. Any of us are free to read 337 pages or whatever it is, but we delegated that responsibility to our five members because we as a community believed in those five members. We should continue to believe in them, I think, and listen and consider their opinions very, very thoroughly. They will each be given the opportunity to provide their input. So they're in a

sense our eyes and ears on this process. Their input will be absolutely critical.

That said, we're all free to read the 337 pages and pay attention to the 33,000 e-mails that went back and forth on that list, which I'm sure we all did. But our five members will be able to provide us with a consolidated view.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Not only that, but everybody from the community will be given opportunity to ask their questions if there's anything they do not understand. They want to clarify.

So one-and-a-half-hours are dedicated to this issue. This is like a starting point for the rest of the discussions. On the first day, we won't touch upon the transition process anymore. We'll just give information and let it settle. Plus, we will have cocktails in the evening where people can still keep discussing things and ask their questions.

We'll have a very interesting marketing session update from our working groups, and of course, updates from ICANN IANA.

The second day will start with a legal session. Here I must say that we'll actually initiate a discussion on very interesting issues, intermediary liability and ccTLDs.

Peter, proposed this topic because it's in focus of more and more ccTLDs, and we believe that probably the next meetings will keep revolving around these topics and will try to explore and find the common ways to a common position on this issue.

Of course, on the ccTLD new session, yes, I completely agree with Peter. It's really great to have presentations from a local region, and we always try to do that. This time, I must say, yeah, it's good we had some proposals from the region, and Barack tried to attract many presentations from this region. Unfortunately, I can't say it works out the way the Program Working Group would like it to.

Then we have another interesting session on this introduction to the policy development process. Becky and Bart will give more information on that: what's in front of us, what the challenges are, and what we have to do.

Then we have Block 2 on the IANA transition process and the final block after the coffee break, the last coffee break of our second meeting date, Block 3, when we actually need to understand the sense of the community regarding the support of the CCWG accountability final supplemental proposal Work Stream 1.

Of course, we'll need to facilitate feedback during all the blocks. It's not just the last block. This is the official agenda of the meeting.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Katrina. Any comments or questions for Katrina on the agenda overall?

Peter and then Debbie?

PETER VERGOTE: Thank you, Byron. Well, I must say this agenda looks really impressive, so warm congratulations for everybody who helped in pasting this together. Thanks very much.

One very small detail. I see my name here for Block 3, and between brackets it mentions CENTR. If possible, I would like to remove that as I'm no longer Chairman of CENTR. So it might give the wrong impression.

KATRINA SATAKI: I knew that, but I saw that you agreed to be of CENTR but okay. Sorry. That's a tiny detail.

BYRON HOLLAND: But you can be who you want to be. Be, yes. Thank you for picking up on that.

Debbie, and then, Peter, did you want to – okay. Debbie?

DEBBIE MONAHAN: Yeah, I agree. I think it's a good agenda. I like [these words here,] ccNSO cocktail. I suppose not a lot of us were aware that actually you were successful in getting the money and there was actually a cocktail. So I think if we can actually just highlight that to people that it is actually taking place. Or unless I've missed the e-mail. And whether it's onsite or off-site or what's actually happening. That would be really good. Of course, it'll all be highlighted but – yeah. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: You don't have it in your pack, but all the CCs will receive their own pack, and it includes the invite for the cocktail. It will be highlighted, and it's a good thing. We'll send out an e-mail today as well because it will be partially inside and outside. In the evening, therefore, you better take a sweater or something or a jacket. It's a five- to ten-minute bus ride. The buses are departing from this venue. Okay?

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. For anybody who hasn't been here yet over the evening, it does cool down a fair amount, so you'll want to be prepared for that given that this venue is partly outdoors.

Okay. Peter?

PETER VERGOTE: Thanks, Byron. Yes, excellent agenda. But as always, the price to pay for a really good agenda with long-term preparations: it's sometimes hard to pick up on new things. I was wondering if there would still be somehow time and/or possibility to add two issues.

Because there is no GAC session, I think it would really be useful to get an update from somebody from the GAC. Who is our liaison?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: There is none.

PETER VERGOTE: Okay. So maybe we appoint a liaison and then the liaison could give us an update on the ccTLD delegation/re-delegation survey that the GAC has been running. Apparently the results are out. I think it would be really useful for us to know what they're up to. So that's one thing.

The other thing: I was just notified by a colleague that the future new CEO of ICANN is now speaking at the GNSO. I think it's a real shame. I think it also tells a story, but it's a real shame that he's not on our agenda.

We had a call with him a couple of weeks ago, during which he spent about half of the time explaining how important the CCs were and how he respects us and all that. There was supposed to be a meeting in Marrakech with the CC community, but he was a no-show. So probably it's not realistic to get it on the agenda with such a short notice, but at least try to establish the communication on what happened and how we can avoid it in the future.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Is there a backstory as to why we're not meeting with the GAC this time out?

BYRON HOLLAND: I think it's strictly logistics. I don't think there's an under-the-covers story, per se. It was just logistics and timing.

BART BOSWINKEL: It's about a ten-minute walk from this venue to get to the GAC meeting room, so you lose about 15 minutes. Before we herd everybody into the GAC, you'll lose half-an-hour of meeting time. That's a lot, given the CCWG accountability stuff. So that was probably the background and the major reason why we're not meeting with the GAC. It will be high on the agenda in wherever the next meeting is.

BYRON HOLLAND: Wherever the next meeting is, yes. I was just going to say, just so we know, Panama has now been officially replaced by Helsinki.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

BYRON HOLLAND: Helsinki.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Helsinki.

BYRON HOLLAND: Helsinki, Finland. Yes, so we'll have 22 hours of daylight to work.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] for me to go there.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah. Luckily it's only a four-day meeting, but it's 22 hours a day.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Oh, my gosh.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It will be the future of Meeting B.

BYRON HOLLAND: Exactly. The future of Meeting B always held near the Arctic Circle. B+.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Apparently the new concept that people are discussing is that the first B meeting would not be a B meeting but a B+ meeting, which would mean that they add the Sunday, which basically makes it an A- minus meeting, I guess. So the concept is still being formalized, I guess.

BYRON HOLLAND: Just on that note, it was discussed at the SO/AC Chairs' session on Friday, and that's because the folks who do the meeting

planning for ICANN, Nick Tomasso, according to him, every community but our own has been continuously lobbying ICANN to have extra room and extra sessions prior to the official four-day B meeting. Essentially, Nick came to us as the Chairs and said, “What do you really want? You’ve had a working group work on this for literally years. It’s had Board resolution and approval. Yet when we try to execute it, every single group wants more time.” So it was a subject of considerable discussion.

Certainly the GNSO had been asking for more time. ALAC had been asking for more time. I said it was something to take back to the – well, actually, everybody said it was something to take back to the communities. People were giving their general impression.

My general impression was our community has been okay with the four days. We can still continue to have our two days of meetings and a Tech Day and meet with other constituency groups. So there wasn’t a big push to have more time allocated to it like there seems to have been in the GNSO or ALAC. The GAC said, “We’ll fill whatever time given to us. So if you want to have a seven-day meeting, we’ll fill seven days.” But Thomas did say they were certainly willing and able to work with the four days.

It’s an issue still out there. I did make the point that we haven’t even done one yet, so maybe before we actually go back on

what we just approved, as a broad ICANN community perhaps we should do a couple of B meetings and learn from that because human nature is: we will fill the time available to us, but we will also find a way to work within the time available to us. So my comment was, “Let’s at least try it before we start to change it.”

There isn’t a decision yet on whether it becomes a B+ meeting, but there’s certainly some pretty heavy lobbying to make it a B+ meeting.

Let’s move onto the coming week. There is another document that’s a table that highlights some of the key sessions. We’ll just go through it briefly. Some of them are just for your interest. We think these would be sessions that would be of interest to councilors or our community. There are a few that I think we should have somebody from the Council attend, as we have had in the past.

The other thing I would ask, however, is, if you take that responsibility and attend that you submit a very short e-mail back to the Secretariat, and they will consolidate an update for all of us on what happened in that session that’s of importance to CC members. So if you’re going on behalf of us, just a quick, short e-mail on the most important points.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [inaudible]

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah, it's one that in the top left corner says, "Sunday 6 March."

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Starting today, if we can just go through the various line items, but the first page is for today, Sunday. You can see there are a number of meetings spelled out. There's the Geo Interest Group at 5:15 today, which is more of a potential interest for us. We don't specifically need somebody to cover it, I don't think, unless somebody is willing to. But I thought it would be of interest.

BART BOSWINKEL: I'm going to be there.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay.

BART BOSWINKEL: I'm going to be there because, besides .be, we're running .brussels and [inaudible].

BYRON HOLLAND: Would you be able to type out a couple of notes on anything?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Thank you. The ALAC ccNSO meeting happens at 5:00 today. It's only a 30-minute meeting. Katrina and I and Annebeth will all be participating in that. Of course, it's open. Everybody's welcome. I encourage you to participate. It is a joint Council meeting, so I would ask that everybody come. That's at 5:00, and I have no idea where that room is.

BART BOSWINKEL: Level -1 in the convention center next to the room where we'll meet on Tuesday and where there will be Tech Day tomorrow.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. So it's the main building just across the parking lot, for those who haven't been there yet.

This evening will be the Budget Ad Hoc Working Group. Giovanni will be there on behalf of the SOP. I think that might be a closed meeting. Anyways, Giovanni will be there as Chair of the SOP, and in part I think it's closed just because the room that they got was so small.

DEBBIE MONAHAN: I can join Giovanni if you want me to join Giovanni. They're one of the worst meetings, but I'll do it.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Thank you, Debbie. Moving on to Monday, there's the DNS Women's Breakfast. I won't be going to that, but I want to make sure everybody's aware of it, for those who want to go. The Registry DNA breakfast meeting is being held at 10:00 A.M. – sorry. It's just a 10:00 A.M. meeting, not breakfast meeting. Is anybody planning on going to that? Was it closed?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [I'll join.]

BYRON HOLLAND: Can I put your name down for that then? Thank you. At 10:30 A.M. there's a general update on the IANA stewardship transition. That's more for your information, given how much is already on our agenda for that subject. I don't think we need specific coverage on that, but I did want to highlight it.

At noon on Monday is the joint GNSO-ccNSO Council meeting. Of course it's important that we all attend that. It's a different time than we've ever really had it before, so I did want to highlight the fact that it's Monday at lunch. And we get a free lunch.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes. Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BYRON HOLLAND: Hopefully you're there more than just for the boxed lunch, but yes. We will have good coverage on that one, but we would certainly encourage all Council members to participate.

Moving on, there is the CCWG Accountability Engagement session. Again, I think we have so much on our own agenda for that that this is just for information only.

Moving on, there is a Registration Data Access Protocol Implementation session, which I think may be of interest. Peter, are you going to that?

PETER VERGOTE: Not personally, but we're here with a couple of other colleagues, so I might inquire if they can attend, but I can't make any promises right as now.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Is there anybody else who's planning on attending that one? Maybe I could ask you to let me know if that's the case. Otherwise, we'll find another solution. That's followed by the New gTLD Program Review and Related Activities, again, mainly for your information.

We flip the page. At 3:15, there's the Exploring Public Interest Within ICANN's Remit. I know that members from the SOP will be

there, so I can ask Giovanni to do that, unless there's anybody else who's planning on – Nigel, would you be able to do that?

NIGEL ROBERTS: No promises, but I'm going to try to get out of Tech Day if the agendas permit and attend that because it's something of interest to me.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. And Becky has also put up her hand. Can I ask you to self-organize between the two of you to, one of the two of you, send a very brief update on that? Thank you.

Okay. Tuesday and Wednesday are obviously primarily focused on our own agenda. We do have the Board meeting at 9:45 on Tuesday, so very early in our agenda.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BYRON HOLLAND: Well, we're going to them, so I assume the majority of them will be there.

BART BOSWINKEL: It's the regular Board ccNSO meeting in, yeah, the combined main hall.

BYRON HOLLAND: If we move to Wednesday, March 9th, you'll see that there is the GAC Board meeting at 8:30 A.M. on Wednesday. Who here is planning on going to that? Too early for everybody?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I can do that.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes? Thank you. There's an all-day meeting, effectively, on the Consumer Trust Competition, etc. It's a working session. Anybody going to that? It conflicts directly with our own, but I did want to highlight it.

BART BOSWINKEL: There are some ccTLDs who've volunteered for this group, so I'll seek who is in that group and ask them to, either today or maybe in the future, provide an update on where they're at.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. Thank you. At 9:00 A.M., there's Universal Acceptance of TLDs. Unfortunately, of course, these conflict directly with our own sessions, so it does make it challenging.

At 10:45, there's CC – yeah?

BART BOSWINKEL: On Universal Acceptance, I know they're having a whole-day meeting today. Somebody of DNS Belgium is following that, so I might get us a brief résumé of what has been discussed today. Then probably we will have covered that slot as well.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. That would be great.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] presentation.

BYRON HOLLAND: There is a presentation?

MARGARITA VALDES: We will have an update from them.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Tuesday.

MARGARITA VALDES: On Tuesday evening during the ICANN IANA update.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. All right. Thank you for reminding me. Yes.

At 10:45, there's a meeting on Accessibility Best Practice. Again, really that one I'm just highlighting. Then there's an IDN Program Update at 10:45.

Moving to Thursday, first thing in the morning is the ICANN Ops Plan and Budget. I think that's probably a tactical decision. After the gala, they slide in the budget discussion first thing in the morning. I know that the SOP will be covering that for us. Again on Thursday, we've highlighted some of the other, I think, interesting sessions that I don't think we need coverage per se on them, but I wanted to highlight them for the group. And that is Thursday.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah. Any comments or discussion on the schedule?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Keith has raised his hand.

BYRON HOLLAND: Keith, go ahead. Keith, if you're talking, we can't hear you. We can see your typing. I didn't get to scroll down, yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Keith said there's a possible IANA Transition Group meeting on Monday morning at 7:30 A.M. Keith is happy to report into the Council on this meeting if it transpires.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Keith. Okay. Any other comments or discussion? Young Eum?

YOUNG EUM LEE: Yes. There is the Internet Governance meeting on Thursday from 9:00. We'll be discussing activities outside ICANN that have the potential to have some kind of an influence or that have some type of a relationship with Internet Governance activities, such as the WSIS.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Any other discussion? Then that is it for our longer-term prep session, as well as our prep session for the week ahead. Thank you very much, everybody. I appreciate – right. Oh, that’s right, 12:00 noon, on the nose.

Thank you very much, everybody. It’s certainly going to be a busy and very important week. I look forward to seeing you throughout Tuesday and Wednesday and the Council meeting – very important Council meeting on Wednesday afternoon.

And we’re all free to go. Thank you, Keith and Lesley.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]