

---

BUENOS AIRES – ccNSO Council Workshop [C]

Sunday, June 21, 2015 – 09:45 to 11:00

ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you very much for participating in this ad hoc meeting. To distinguish this from our regular Council Prep meeting, which we will also be having in this room following this meeting, we've organized this one to focus strictly on the business of the CWG and CCWG meetings and activities that will be taking place this week and focusing the discussion for the next hour strictly on those topics. And to provide a walkthrough of what we as the ccNSO and what the Program Working Group has structured for the Tuesday and Wednesday ccNSO sessions.

So I want to make sure we're all on the same page on what's happening, how the structure is organized, essentially why it's been put together the way it has been, and then also how that feeds into the council meeting Wednesday afternoon, because I'm sure we're all aware that the council meeting Wednesday afternoon we will likely be in a position that the council will be taking a decision on the CWG proposal.

As we know, the ccNSO was tasked by ICANN to shepherd this process through the ccTLD community and at the end, we as the ccNSO Council will be tasked with two decisions, essentially. Are we in a position that we can take a decision on CWG proposal? And two, if the

---

***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.***

---

answer to that first question is yes, then what will the decision be, to adopt the CWG's proposal or not?

As a result, I think we can probably all agree that this is one of the most important decisions that this council has and probably will make. It's certainly an issue that we have to pay close attention to and consider very seriously both of those two decision points. Are we in a place to make that decision, and if so, what will that decision be?

And I think the Program Working Group has done a great job in structuring the two days of ccNSO meetings to really help the community get to that level of understanding and comfort that we as a community should be in a place where we understand the issues and are comfortable with the proposals, and ideally then, the council will be in a position then to take a decision. But I don't want to presuppose what the outcome is just yet, but that's the overall big picture.

Part of what we'll do today is actually just walk through the key blocks of the ccNSO meeting, but also just to have a general discussion on what your sense of your respective communities is if there are any issues outstanding, if there's anything that we need to know as a council or as a community to make sure that we work into the two days of ccNSO sessions.

With that I probably just also wanted to mention before we dive right into it, bring you up to date on the FOI, the ccNSO submission to the ICANN board. The recommendations vis-à-vis the work of the FOI has been received, and Steve Crocker has acknowledged such. It is on the agenda for the ICANN board meeting later this week.

---

It's my understanding, though I can't guarantee it, that is likely to be on the consent agenda portion of the board meeting, which effectively means it will just be adopted as-is. You never know until it's over, but that is certainly the way it is being positioned to me at this point.

In support of that general trajectory, Steve has also reached out to me informally and asked that we start to set up a joint working group with the board – or with ICANN staff rather – to work through the issues of adopting our guidance to the board. I think that's a very good signal that the chair himself has said even though it's not technically adopted yet, let's get going on the process. We'll also be talking about that this week and getting that organized, or starting to get that organized.

That kind of sets the frame I think, or at least some of the foundation upon which we can build the next steps of this transition process around the CWG and the work of the CCWG.

So we are going to have what we call – now I just want to move into what the structure of the ccNSO sessions are going to be vis-à-vis these specific topics. They will form the weight or the majority or much of what we will be doing over the Tuesday and Wednesday sessions. We will certainly be having other sessions. It won't be CWG, CCWG all the time, but we do have what we're calling four blocks of discussions around the CWG and CCWG. And in fact, that's probably a little bit of a misnomer because – sorry, there's five blocks, but one block is divided into two pieces.

---

There's quite a bit of content around this issue. Hello, who joined? Did somebody just join the call?

So we're going to walk through each of the sessions to give you the lay of the land and what to expect. Part of our job of course will be as ambassadors for this process, or at least educators to help people understand what's happening and how much content around this issue and how many discussions around this issue will be happening over the next couple of days.

We wanted to make sure everybody had a clear lay of the land and see how they fit, how all the constituent pieces fit in terms of the high level overview and then dropping down into CWG specific, CCWG specifics, timelines and then bringing it back around later on Wednesday for a consolidation of all the issues. All the way along, there will be an opportunity of course for feedback from the community and we are working in conjunction, having invited the ROs to participate in a robust way and including having an RO chair be – one of the chairs of the ROs chairing some of the sessions as well. So bringing the ROs into this process, given it is a unique one I think in our history and also, of course, welcoming any non-ccNSO members throughout all of this process and certainly to participate or at least observe the sessions throughout the week.

Just on that note, certainly outreach is one of the key issues that we've had to pay very close attention to. And definitely one of the things that ICANN – as ICANN tasked the ccNSO with this issue, one of the things that they ask for is to make sure that we have significant

---

outreach, and I think that we absolutely have and I would encourage you to go to the ccNSO website where you can actually see in detail everything that we have done from the number of tweets about this to the webinars, to the blogs, to the sessions, to the outreach. In fact, there's nine pages of detailed cataloging of all the outreach that has been done.

I encourage you to go take a look at that, so that when you're asked about it, as I'm sure many of you will be (A) you can be familiar with it and (B) you can have a sense of just the sheer volume of outreach.

Really, that's focused on the ccNSO and then there's the work that the ROs have also done, separate and distinct, but also significant on their own. There's been a lot of opportunity for people to participate, to get educated, to provide input. You can see that all in its detailed glory on the ccNSO website.

With that, I'm just going to say are there any questions or comments at this point? If not, I'm going to turn it over to Bart who's going to take us from the high level and drill down into exactly what to expect for the sessions, so people know what's coming.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Good morning, all. I've just sent you the overview of the sessions and it's the similar one that is now on the screen. This is the final one. I had to wait so long because now all the participants have definitely been confirmed. I'll just run you through.

---

As Byron already said, the Program Working Group together with Alan have divided this up in five blocks, effectively. Block one is setting the overview and the introduction on what is happening, what is expected this week, and setting the general framework of the decision.

So there will be a panel of, say, the two co-chairs – or the ccNSO appointed co-chairs – and Keith as member of the ICG together with the chair of the LAC TLD. Today we haven't included the name because today there will be a chair election at the LAC TLD this afternoon. We hopefully know who will be the new chair of the LAC TLD and will sit in on Tuesday in that session. So it starts on Tuesday.

Again, it's the introduction and overview of the sessions, the relevancy of the process, etc., and efforts of the discussions going on. The regional organizations represented by the co-chair of the LAC TLD chair, then an overall picture of the three processes. That's why Mathieu, Lisa, and Keith are invited to just briefly outline the timelines, the points of interaction, etc. So the people in the room, and hopefully we have a lot of remote participants have an understanding what is the scope of the decision to be taken this week and how it interacts with all the other processes.

Room for Q&A and wrap-up by the chair of the session. As you will see throughout the explanation, there is a chair of the session. The chair of this session is Byron. Then there will be a handover to the next block. It's block two. And the session chair of that one will be the LAC TLD chair.

The second session is a more expanded panel session.

BYRON HOLLAND: Excuse me for a second, Bart. Keith, did you have a comment?

KEITH DAVIDSON: Really, just a question. Before we go on to section two, roughly how long a time do you want each Mathieu and myself and so on to be doing that overview? Because I think it would be nice to have a timeframe to work to rather than just leaving it blank and us taking all the time. I'd prefer to angle that as a Q&A session than preaching from [inaudible].

BYRON HOLLAND: Since there are three main components, I would suggest each of you take five minutes. That's the level of detail to aim for, and then it's basically half a session will be basically content provided by the three of you and then half the session can be Q&A.

KEITH DAVIDSON: Could I suggest that the other members of the panel be advised of the time constraint?

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes, thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Just for your – today I will send out an invite to all the panelists to meet and I will include [inaudible] update this with the timing, so all the panelists will be invited to meet on Tuesday at 1:30, preparation of all the sessions.

Moving forward, to the second block, again this is more on the, I would say, elements of the CWG proposal that have been reasonably stable from the second draft onwards. So there are not many changes, with one exception. That's the bit on the service level expectations.

Again, this is following [Peter's] experience with the CENTR meeting is have a focus session on the aspect of the CWG proposal that the people were involved in developing and explaining it and then there is room for Q&A around this specific aspect of the CWG proposal. That's the core of block two which is from 14:30 to quarter past 4:00. There is a coffee break, so there is room for [expansion].

Again, these were the topics included. So authorization, functions, etc. that you can read. Again, Q&A and wrap-up by the session chair again to inform the sessions of the next day.

On Wednesday. Wednesday morning – again, this is block three. This is dedicated to the CCWG proposals and the ccTLD and where they are in the process. They had an extensive meeting on Friday and probably their report on what happened there.

What is included in this one is a little bit more time to clarify the inter-dependency between the CWG proposal. There is specific language in



---

the stewardship working group proposal that directly deals with the CCWG. So explain this inter-dependency.

Unfortunately, Lisa is not available until 10:30, so that's why it starts at 10:35. So there is a dedicated timeslot specifically again to reflect a little bit more on the inter-dependency. Again, wrap-up. In this case, Mathieu Weill is the co-chair.

Then we go into the block four and these are, say, the elements of the stewardship proposal that underwent major evolution since the second proposal where we could see a lot of – say, on the second proposal, questions and comments from ccTLDs. The major ones have been invited to sit on the panel.

The structure of these sessions, though, there are two sessions. So there's block four from 12:30 to 13:30 and there is a second one from quarter-past 2:00 until quarter-past 3:00. The first one will focus on the first IANA transition model, its role, and the composition. So the [PTI].

This one will be chaired by Byron. This is a moderated session because we got a panel discussing different elements of the proposal itself or this specific part of the proposal. The moderator is Jim Tengrove. He is with ICANN's Communications department and he has experience.

Again, the flow of this one is that Lisa, in this case, will first explain what's in the final proposal and its evolution, and then the panel will discuss more their views on the second proposal and what their sense is of the changes and whether they are – if they still have concerns

---

around this final proposal and there is extensive room for Q&A with the audience. So we got – the old views can be represented.

Again, the wrap-up of the session chair, knowing these were the more [contentious] elements of the proposal, this is probably important to note whether there is any issues [unaddressed] or not. Not to seek any consensus in the room, but issues addressed, etc., for further discussion.

Block four is similar, but this is on the periodic review and special periodic review of the IANA function, of the PTI. Again, same structure, so I will not go into the details.

And, finally, on Wednesday – and this is after a quarter-of-an hour break, the wrap-up. This is the usual [inaudible] show, to put it in that words. Checking where the community stands with regard to the CWG proposal and further discussions. This wrap-up. Again, the chair is Byron. The moderator is Jim Tengrove. The wrap-up etc. will feed into – and the results of this discussion will feed into the council discussion later that afternoon, which is now scheduled to start at 5:00 PM. And that's the overview of the sessions.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks, Bart. Just to reinforce that last point, our council meeting will be an hour later than normal, so please adjust your calendars accordingly. Your attendance will be very important at that council meeting, which is at 5:00 PM on Wednesday.

---

Any observations or comments or questions? You can see it's a pretty thorough review of this issue with a lot of opportunity for input from the community, and certainly a deeper drill-down discussion with all of the relevant folks who are on the various working groups.

I think that point actually is something that bears mention. All of our cc-appointed members of the CWG, whether they are ccNSO members or not, have participated fairly extensively to different levels during the work, but nobody has spoken against the CWG proposal. I think that's very important to note that all five of our members have been supportive of the proposal, and any cc participants, as you will likely remember, there are five appointed members, but then anybody could be a participant and no cc participants have spoken out against the proposal either. Not that there aren't folks who have some issues, but just in terms of the actual formal process, all five of our members have supported the proposal and none of the participants have spoken against the proposal. I think that's a pretty powerful testament in and of itself.

Any suggestions, comments? Like I said, you are all expected or I expect you to be ambassadors for this, to let people know what's happening. As we all know, Wednesday afternoon – I know this is shocking, but we occasionally see attendants start to falter late on Wednesday afternoon. I know, it's a surprise to me, too.

But I would ask that certainly all of you need to be there, and I would encourage you to encourage your colleagues and peers from your region. As you can see, the five – actually, six – blocks fit into an overall

---

scheme and each one is important on its own, but it's the fullness of the six blocks that actually bring this whole issue together. And it's the fifth and final block that's really the wrap-up and the opportunity for broad comments, and that is where we will most definitely be taking the temperature of the room and the webcast. It's very important that we are all there and that our colleagues are there for that last session.

We'll be doing it all the way along, but as councilors, when we have to come to those two decision points, we will want to make sure that we've been in the room and that as many people as we can encourage are in the room.

Young Eum?

YOUNG EUM LEE:

Thanks, Byron. I'm, in general, in agreement with you when you say that generally there has been support for the proposals and people have participated throughout the process. And of course our [inaudible] appointed members have actually – I mean, very greatly on my part – participated very actively in the process.

I do notice that there are some members that have, as you mentioned, voiced concerns. I'm just thinking that maybe we should be aware of some of the concerns that were raised beforehand. Thanks.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Yeah. And hopefully those will come out during the six blocks of sessions. I would note that in – and I'm only talking about the CWG

---

since it's the one with the final proposal on the table. I would note that the chair, as they wrapped up the process, very specifically asked for any objections or dissents and there was a process and time period where anybody who was going to dissent, not just on the whole thing but on any piece of it, they have formal time and opportunity to do that, and nobody did.

It's not that we didn't have objections through the process. Most definitely people did. That's why the proposal today looks very different than the proposal in December, but as we came to the end of it, there were no dissenting opinions provided, even though they had a specific call for dissenting opinions and a specific period to provide them in.

Bart, then Keith.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Maybe in addition that's why if you look at the panelists for block four, these were not picked randomly. They represent the voices against some elements or they raise concerns against part of the second proposal. They are asked to explain those concerns and how they view the final proposal.

Again, in order to inform those who were not able, who have not been following it that closely as they have been.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks. Keith?

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Thank you. Yeah, it would be fair to say that it's pretty hard to hit a moving target and this has been a bit of a moving target. I think we have quite a lot of discussion ahead of us to resolve.

You may be aware that the ICG met for two days on Tuesday and Friday and already there is one showstopper aspect of the names proposal that came up for discussion there where the names proposal contains a statement asserting that ICANN has exclusive use of the intellectual property right, IANA. And the IETF have strenuously objected to that, as have the RIRs because they or the IETF has 3,300 [inaudible] published since ICANN's been in existence.

So [inaudible] IANA. The concept that ICANN has exclusive use is wrong. There are issues like that that are relatively minor and got through in that sense of a moving target being difficult to get it right everywhere.

But the question that I have as a result of that is there's likely to be a number of those smaller issues that arise as we discuss these things. So maybe we should be spending a little bit of time thinking about what process we might follow should it prove necessary – should we not be able to sign off on the names proposal while we're here.

One of the things about changes to the proposal is that it would need to go through another process to develop consensus. So would we be sending something back to the CWG for further work? In which case, do they have to go through a consultation process? Do we have the

---

right to amend without understanding those consensus? Can the ICG do a modification to a proposal later on without having changed consensus, because eventually a single proposal will go out to establish that.

Maybe some bit of thinking around that during the next few days to keep in mind for when we get to our council meeting. It could be worthwhile and maybe just a hard discussion or whatever. I think we can't just leave it to chance. We need a better concept of planning around the whole process. Thanks.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks. Actually, that raises an interesting question. The ICG is going to get three separate proposals to stitch together. Presumably, there will be some distance on various issues between them. The ICG is not just going to stitch together three disparate proposals. They're going to integrate them into one, and I would assume that there will be differences throughout all three.

What is the intent of the ICG on that front? Is it anywhere there's a difference to try to kick it back to the respective communities or is it to synthesize and integrate and make some decisions along the way?

KEITH DAVIDSON:

That's a really good question. We didn't really get to answer that during this meeting, and I think it will depend on what the level of the issue is in itself. The final proposal will need to go to a consultation process regardless, but at this stage, what the ICG has done is

---

developed an evaluation team to the names proposal specifically, and incidentally, Martin, Mary, and I have volunteered to be [our reps] on that group and Xiaodong Lee has volunteered from ccNSO to do the evaluation of the joint proposal after the names proposal after the names proposal is integrated.

There is still a strong desire in ICG to cut and paste the individual proposals into a single document, and through this evaluation process, do the stress testing and so on to see that they're not contradicting each other and so on.

It seems to me that the IETF is a cut-and-dry remote process compared to the names and numbers, but names and numbers may have some points of contention that will need addressing. The way to resolve those and the points of resolution are not known, so that's why I think we need to have our ducks in a row because it would be counter-productive time-wise for the ICG to get to the point of evaluating a single proposal and then bouncing up back and asking the CWG and the CCWG to start again or revise their proposals at a point potentially after Dublin ICANN. We might need to be thinking about the expedience of the situation as well.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks, Keith. It probably actually does warrant a further comment just to remind everybody that the decision here is about taking a proposal and pushing it to the next step. Are we comfortable with it going to the next step, which is to the ICG where they will do something? It's not exactly clear yet.



---

Then it will go back to public comment. So this is not in the sense of the final final step. This is a step in the journey of which there will be more opportunity for further fine-tuning, but I definitely take your point.

Any other input on this?

Okay, well, then I don't think we have anything else on the agenda for this topic specifically. Maybe we'll take a moment. Give me a couple minutes and then we will go right into the Council Prep meeting. I'll get back to you in a couple of moments. Don't go anywhere. Now that I've corralled you here, don't go anywhere.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**