COPENHAGEN - Joint Meeting: GAC and ccNSO
Tuesday, March 14, 2017 - 11:00 to 12:00 CET
ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So welcome, everybody, to the ccNSO issue with the board. Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. It's always great to be here with the board. We enjoy it almost as much as we enjoy our meetings with the Governmental Advisory Committee.

[Laughter]

So, we'll start with two updates. And they are here on the bottom of the page. First is on the ccNSO policy development process. That's a retirement and review mechanism, for informational purposes only.

So, we had a working group -- set up a working group that was tasked with development of charters for our policy development process for the working groups. We have an issue report that is published and available on our website. And in that issue report, you can find issues that have been currently identified by our issues manager. And this report will be -- we will also try to get some feedback for public comment and the feedback

received will be then incorporated into the work of our working groups later.

So, we expect to kick start this process tomorrow, tomorrow during ccNSO Council meeting, where we'll announce the PDP.

So, second one, it's an update on the country -- our cross-community working group on country and territory names, the use of country and territory names. You may know that that working group has published their interim report, and they're seeking comments from various groups.

But the main idea here is that that group apparently cannot reach consensus on the use of three-letter codes as top-level domains. And apparently some more discussions and maybe other forums, other working groups with more specific mandate will be require. So, those are two updates we wanted to provide to the board.

Any questions?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Katrina, do you have any indicative thoughts or any thoughts on time line for the PDP?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. Well, we -- well, probably that's an optimistic scenario. Optimistic scenario is January of 2019. So, we need two years for that. And this includes also all the public comment periods and all the time that is needed to incorporate comments received into the documents.

But that's an optimistic scenario, of course.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you very much.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you.

Then next -- or the first one on this list, it's about implementation of the new bylaws. While it is our understanding that the implementation of our processes and mechanisms that are related to the new bylaws are already on the way, at least we in our community work on that really hard.

However, there are some areas that are not clear to us and that area is about probably the entire Annex D. But, okay, within that new scope, there are some things that in our view they need to be completed but they are not. For example, the designation of the full board and consequent designation of individual

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

directors, that's one of the examples that is not quite clear. It is our understanding that this process had to be -- or should be done properly but, again, we'd like to hear your views on that.

Another is operating standards for specific reviews, but we just discussed it. And, hopefully, they are on their way.

And we're also aware that in the near future certain processes and procedures need to be in place, for example, to effectuate an upcoming fundamental bylaw change as well as procedures around the ICANN and IANA budget and, of course, operating plan.

So here we have three questions. And the first one is: What in your view are the most important things that need to be in place at this stage?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Do you mean -- do you mean just generally or because of what the bylaws say?

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, let's limit the scope. The bylaws.

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I can take a crack and just say I think that the bylaws anticipate a number of mechanisms that might need to be used or will need to be used in order for things to happen. And so, I think that for the community definitely making sure that those mechanisms -- those -- whatever committees that are required and so on actually put in place so that should we need them, they are there.

So, as an example, the board said the other day that -- it was announced that we're proposing a bylaw change. We've just discussed it with -- Mike and Becky and I have just discussed it with you in the ccNSO with respect to splitting the BGC. And that is going to require under the bylaws a number of community mechanisms in order to allow that bylaw change to be approved or not approved or not objected to. So obviously, there should be -- those processes need to be put in place so that the community is ready to deal with that. So, that would be my view of the most important thing.

I don't know if Steve has a view or Mike or Becky. Lito?

STEVE CROCKER: Well, all that. And then sort of in concert with this, we have the empowered community which initially I thought they don't have to do anything for a good long while. But, in fact, there are

things that have to be done kind of on a regular basis. So, there's the question of how do you exercise -- what processes do you have to put in place, what do we have to do to support that. So, that's sort of different from what does the board have to do.

But I can also say that the board is thinking about, and certainly I'm thinking about, are there any gaps and what should we be doing that is supportive with the spirit in addition to the letter so that there's no issue about whether we're being cooperative and supportive. The answer is yes, and we push ahead. So, sort of looking to smooth out or fill in any gaps that there might be.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. And is there anything that we at the ccNSO could do to help the board community? Anything you expect from us?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Well, if you recognize -- and I know Stephen has been doing a fair bit of work on this. If you recognize that mechanisms need to be put in place and that means the community needs to get together in whatever form to do that, then it would be great if you took the lead in respect to that.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes. For the record, Stephen Deerhake from the ccNSO.

There is actually a great deal of work that we in the CC need to do to get ourselves ready for this anticipated public forum, for example, as well as the follow-on decision-making by the community with regards to this bylaw change. But we're getting there, and I fully expect that we will be ready as a CC. And I hope that the ECA, which I'm the CC representative, will also be ready.

I look at this particular public forum we've got coming up to handle this approval request to be a good test of the new system, so to say the new regime.

Given that, I think we'll be ready. I hope we're ready. But I would certainly like to thank the board for doing this the right way, for making this change such that making -- doing what they want to do which makes a lot of sense to me as a bylaw change. And I want to thank our board members for coming earlier today and addressing the questions of the empowered community with regards to this bylaw change.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Stephen. Anyone from the room perhaps? Any ccTLD colleagues would like to add something? If no, then let's move to -- yeah.

STEVE CROCKER: One of the things that we've highlighted is the KSK rollover. That's in the process of -- sort of extended process that's going to take place.

In the CC community, has this been of interest, of concern, of discussion?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, we do roll our keys regularly.

STEVE CROCKER: Good. But that wasn't the question. The top level, the hierarchy, is going to change; and the concern is the end user -- or the end systems that do the validation, if they have -- are not in a position to pick up the next root key, it will lead to phone calls. Some of those may come to the top-level domain rather than to us.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Steve, if I can address that. The short answer to your question is there's not been a lot -- there's been, in fact, very little discussion in the CC formally about the pending key rollover. But I think this is something that the TLD ops people are going to take up in a big way. They've got some time left, but they need

to get going on this sooner rather than later for certainly to get those TLDs that are signing on board and aware of what's going on.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Then we move to the next item we wanted to discuss, and we kind of covered it a little bit during our meeting with some of the board members and the MSSI team. That's about all the reviews that are coming on the way.

The ccNSO -- in the ccNSO we have noted that currently three specific reviews are -- under the new bylaws are on the way or are going to be launched soon. Those are SSR, DRS, ATRT3. And another one, the final AoC review is also -- has not been completed yet. And we are also aware that -- well, at least we were aware -- we were prepared for the ccNSO review. Luckily, apparently, we will be able to postpone it.

But in short, in the next two years we expect to be involved in six or seven reviews directly relevant to our community. And of these reviews, five are caused by the board, which is the wording from the bylaws.

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

Well, we feel that perhaps with all the reviews, we should probably rename our community from ccNSO to ccNSRO, which would stand for Names Supporting and Reviewing Organization.

But so, our questions are: Who is responsible for managing all the reviews? First of all, to avoid duplication of work, solve all the conflicts, and ensure that there's added value to these reviews.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Rinalia.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you for the question, Katrina. Rinalia speaking. The reason I have to answer this question is that I chair the board committee on organizational effectiveness; and we oversee organizational reviews in terms of policy, processes, and procedure. And depending on the outcome of the board meeting on Thursday, specific reviews may also come under the purview of my committee which means that we have -- and we will have responsibility for addressing the questions that you have raised.

In terms of management of reviews, I think org or MSSI have a role. In terms of organizational reviews, they certainly manage

the projects and the reviews itself. In terms of the specific reviews, they support the review teams that are responsible for doing that. In the discussion that we had during lunch, the concern that I understood was over operational standards and the need for that, to guide the conduct of specific reviews. And we understand that it is urgent, and staff has been doing some work on that in consultation with community. There have been sessions where community input has been invited. And I think that we need to move on getting towards formal adoption of operational standards pertaining to specific reviews to guide those in moving forward.

And I'm hopeful that it will move fast and with community buy-in. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Rinalia. Is there anything that the ccNSO could do to facilitate that process, apart from some input during consultation periods? And believe me, we will provide some input.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thanks. I think that how you can help is to clarify your concerns to other parts of the community and seeing if there is consensus

within the community itself in moving forward. For example, I know there's discussion about who determines the scope of review for a specific review itself. And I think it's important that there is agreement so that it can move forward.

The bylaw is silent on who gets to do that actually. And based on common sense or best practices or good practices, I think the scope of the review must be set before the review team is assembled and proceed. That's just the way we have done it. Think of it as a chartering exercise. That's how ICANN has been doing it in the other areas of work. So, I think it's important to share your concerns so that other parts of the community understand the challenges and agree. And that would be helpful, and it would help us move faster.

Also, you had mentioned about the possibility of deferring the ccNSO organizational review. I just wanted to clarify that this requires board action to approve. There is flexibility in the bylaw based on feasibility of conducting these reviews. And what my committee will do is that we will send out a communique to the chairs of the reviews that are coming up, yourself, the chairs -- the co-chairs of the RSSAC and the SSAC to ask if they are prepared and ready to have the review on schedule or whether they need time because of the concern of the community workload.

If the response is yes, that they want to go now, then I think ICANN org will prepare to support those reviews on schedule. But if there is the request to have more time, then I think the OEC will make a recommendation to the board and it will also go out for public comment that flexibility is accommodated. Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you.

                         Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah, thanks.

                         What you can do in respect to the -- what do they call the reviews? It used to be part of the AoC. What are we calling them now? Specific reviews, thank you.

                         What you can do in response to the specific reviews is that in all cases the RDS and the security and stability ones, the community leadership of each of the SOs and ACs has agreed that they think that the scope of those in order to make them -- in order to deal with the logistics of running simultaneous reviews happen over a short period of time, that the scope of

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

those reviews should be limited, if possible, to deal with looking at the past review and its implementation.

And in the specific case of the WHOIS review, taking into account the fact that there are a number of other activities going on at the moment in respect to registry directory services and WHOIS, specifically a GNSO policy development process on the future of registry directory services and improvements to the current WHOIS. And that it would be not particularly helpful or useful for the reviews themselves to cover ground that is being done by other processes or for that matter start tilling new earth, opening up new ground at this stage in ICANN's development.

So, what would be helpful is if your -- if the ccNSO representatives on these various review teams were comfortable and clear that the narrow -- that the narrow scope for these reviews is the way to go and were instrumental in ensuring that the temptation amongst some to widen the scope is resisted because it is, in fact, the review team that sets the scope rather than having the scope set for them. So, that would be my plea in respect to the reviews.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Any other comments from the floor? No.

Then probably can move to the questions that were asked by the board. And I'm happy to tell you that we have a very provocative answer to the first one.

Mathieu, may I ask you to share our views to what degree is our membership actively participating in the CCWG accountability Work Stream 2. The floor is yours.

MATHIEU WEILL: Thank you very much, Katrina. Mathieu Weill speaking. I'm the ccNSO-appointed co-chair, so obviously I'm personally quite engaged.

I think the provocative answer is that we are strategically participating to the CCWG Work Stream 2. There was very strong engagement in Work Stream 1. It's certainly lower. And if you look at the excellent, excellent dashboards that this working group publishes every month, you will see that the ccNSO participation certainly is not the most striking in terms of quantity; but we favor quality of participation.

So, our appointed members are quite engaged, and certainly it does not go much farther but they're doing a lot of work with Jordan Carter being one of the co-rapporteurs. Giovanni Seppia participating through many groups. Rosario Morales from Costa

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

Rica having joined the group and being quite active in the SO/AC accountability discussions. So, we are pretty present.

Now, what could the board or ICANN org do to facilitate participation and timely completion of this work? I admire the "timely completion of this work" part of this.

I think there were several ideas, ideas that we haven't had time yet to discuss within the ccNSO because our session on the matter is actually tomorrow.

But I can share our potential ideas at this point.

One is related to the point we were discussing earlier avoiding -- I mean, at least consider how best to avoid duplication of effort with ATRT 3 is certainly an issue, or at least something that the CCWG has made suggestions about and certainly now the decision is -- it's not for the CCWG accountability to decide the scope of the review. But that's an area of potential action from the board and the chartering organizations.

Second, I want to stress the excellent engagement from the board members in the Work Stream 2, and that's certainly something to continue to facilitate timely completion of the work. It's extremely helpful that many board members actually engaged very early in the process, provide inputs, sometimes

even urged the groups to move forward at some points, and I think that's an excellent example of how, after Work Stream 1, we've learned the lessons and are moving forward to a new mode of corroboration with the board. Obviously I think accepting the extension of the timeline will be a nice way to facilitate timely completion because that would change the timeline.

And finally, I think it would -- one aspect which could be helpful where the board can help is encourage the president and CEO to support a closer way to address the corroboration in the staff accountability discussions. This is an area where we are a little bit struggling to establish a line of communication with staff where it's not only the community discussing about this issue. If we're speaking about staff accountability, it's about the staff/community relationship, and has to be a dialogue with staff. And I think the board can have conversations with the president and CEO about how best to engage in this. There was a discussion about setting up a pilot experiment. I think it's important that the board supports that so we can experiment with new ways of collaborating between community and staff. That's it. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Becky.

BECKY BURR: Well, thank you for that provocative answer. And my answer might be provocative in response. One of the reasons that -- and I certainly understand why a decision -- why it makes sense and it's a reasonable resource allocation to participate strategically and to focus on quality over quantity. That's the cc way and that is what's greatest about the cc.

That said -- and we know, by the way, that the ccNSO is engaged in a very complicated PDP this year that is going to consume an enormous number -- enormous amount of resources. This is something that the ccNSO takes on very rarely. So, I have particular appreciation for that.

The problem that we're -- the problem that I -- my concern is, let me put it this way, that participation has dropped down quite a lot and it's inconsistent. So, when I am in some of these Work Stream 2 calls, I notice that it's -- it's a small number of people and I wonder if there is a risk of not getting a holistic balanced community view.   And maybe it's, well, that issue is not important to us so we're not going to pay attention to it. But I have just a little bit of anxiety about -- about stretching the resources of the community so thinly that we are creating an

opportunity for capture. So, that's just a -- I don't know what the answer is and I know you will be sensitive to it and aware of it, but I do think it is -- it's part of what is motivating this question, at least from my perspective.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Mike. Or Becky.

MIKE SILBER: Thanks. Just to explain, I was hoping that the rest of the ccNSO council would come up to the table and join us up here, but you decided not to, so just to explain why Rinalia and I are so spread out. We thought we would be amongst friends.

But just in respect of that question, I have missed the voice of the ccNSO on some of the issues where I think that they are very particularly influenced and where they have a lot of experience. Jurisdiction is one that comes to mind where I think the -- the sanity that I'm used to from the ccNSO, based on principle, it's never simple and obliging, but I think that it would be really useful if there were a few more sane voices in that discussion because we're seeing, unfortunately, that conversation being dominated by some people holding very fundamental views.

MATHIEU WEILL: Thanks, Mike. Maybe if I can just follow up on that. So, I'm heavily involved in the jurisdictional discussion so I fully agree with you that there's a small number of people and so on. However, I would certainly encourage you to join the calls and not only read the mailing list. The mailing list is obfuscated sometimes by discussions that are offside and that's it. It's not necessarily the mailing list that reflects the work plan, that reflects the progress, and so -- so, well, I see exactly what you mean and I've had this discussion with many participants already, but join the calls and you'll see there's more substance and that actually the discussions are maybe less worrisome than the mailing list may seem at some points.

BECKY BURR: If I could just quickly respond, since we got into that jurisdiction issue. I do attend all of the calls, and one of the things that I think we perhaps could help facilitate this is because the -- the two sides of the argument have sort of taken sides at opposite sides of the wall and there's no real com -- there's no discussion, really. It seems to me that some of -- the Internet is global and DNS has to be coordinated at a global level and ICANN has to be able to carry out its mission globally. It seems to me that for reasons -- for a variety of reasons there's a -- there's some increased anxiety about that. And it also seems to me that it is

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 58
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

sort of part of ICANN's -- part of ICANN's best practices should be always being aware of what options there are, what steps might be taken to shore up that ability to facilitate -- to ensure that we can fulfill our mission globally and that it may be time to ask org to take a look at this. I don't think that the -- the Work Stream 2 discussion group is the place for that, but I do think that it's a -- we ought to recognize that it is a real anxiety and that it may be that we can -- we can assure the community that org is always alive to this and as part of their ongoing work pays attention to it and ask them, you know, to come back periodically and let us know what they're doing to ensure that works.

MATHIEU WEILL: Excellent suggestion.

KATRINA SATAKI: And we have a queue. Goran, please.

GORAN MARBY: Goran Marby, for the record. I just want to stretch out my hand and say we are happy for the invitation that we just recently received to figure out a way to start -- start participation in that working group. I also think it's important to know that it's -- Mathieu did a very good comment when they had this meeting

last week where he said it's about functions and not people. And I think that we -- when -- to get it -- sort that out how we can be involved in that one. And I think that -- so thank you for the recently taken invitation, and we are going to work with it. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah Jordan.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: On the same topic, Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER: Yes.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Cool because I want to ask Mathieu a question. You go first.

JORDAN CARTER: It sort of supplements it by the point that Becky made about involvement. We used to have about four projects going on Work Stream 2. We had a lot of staff resource supporting and we had a deadline and that deadline drove some involvement in interest by the community. Now we have nine groups and a

little bit less time pressure from external sources. I know your selection and trying to -- I'm one interested person. I could keep across four work streams but not nine. So, I think we face a little bit of a trade-off. And if we want to make capture of the discussions less likely, we might have to not try and hurry up more. And that's a real tension. We can't both go fast with volunteer burnout and cover nine topics at the same time and produce high-quality work.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah, I agree and I think -- so what I was going the say, and Mathieu you might want to comment, as chair -- one of the co-chairs of the CCWG as well as, obviously, the ccNSO, my concern is that in the CCWG in Work Stream 1 we had a series of working groups that had good participation that did the sort of, if I could say, sort of legwork that came up to the CCWG which kind of, you know, put the -- the topsoil, took -- I'm mixing my metaphors here, put the topsoil on and then went up to the chartering organizations for sign-off. My concern is that if the small -- if the working groups in Work Stream 2 are not peopled by enough input and enough people, then -- and then the CCWG itself is waning in its energy, it doesn't have -- the stuff that eventually bubbles up to the top doesn't have the same already built-in buy-in to it that it had in the CCWG and Work Stream 1

and yet it's still coming up as recommendations from the CCWG. So, that's -- I mean, that, to some extent, kind of goes to what Jordan is saying about maybe we do need to not hurry up so much. What do you think?

MATHIEU WEILL: Well, I've been personally on the record saying that yes, the big difference between Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2 is that Work Stream 1 had a deadline, whether it was admitted or not. Because I can quote a number of there was no deadline comments. But I think we have to admit that there's no deadline for Work Stream 2. And it's been -- I mean, from the chairing perspective, it's a completely different exercise. And as a consequence, we need to find the right safeguards to avoid this capture, which is a legitimate concern. And at the same time recognize that the issues are not the same. This is way more into the cultural aspects for diversity and staff accountability or almost somehow -- some form of implementation like the Framework of Interpretation. And as a consequence it's totally humane that the community would not be mobilized as such. So we're trying really hard within the group to structure the process so it -- people have time to review the documents, much more time than they had to Work Stream 1, that the discussion takes place at a more -- at a slower pace so that momentum can

be built, and certainly the early board engagement is a very important safeguard in this, to avoid any part of the community who would go too far in one direction, with good intentions, and call them back to the reality of what ICANN is, of its budget, of its resources as a whole. So, that's why I think this is -- this is really a very, very important aspect.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Could I just pick up on one thing that you said? The challenge with no deadline is that it's not -- unless we change the structure, which we could do, it's not just that there is a small working group that continues but then in fact the whole of the CCWG needs to continue. And under the current structure. And my second point on that -- which is expensive and so on. My second point on deadline would be, I don't think you -- you can have no deadline because when do you consider the project dead? I mean, does it go on forever until it comes up with a solution or do you rely on self-determination that you can't get anywhere or do you wait for new blood to arrive with new suggestions?

MATHIEU WEILL: So, I would certainly encourage a conversation between the board and the chartering organization. Not within the CCWG. That's not for us to have this discussion.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: But I'm talking about the ccNSO.

MATHIEU WEILL: What point should we consider it is no longer needed to continue Work Stream 2?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes.

MATHIEU WEILL: And as a ccNSO member, I -- I've said several times that I would think this discussion would be perfectly legitimate and would actually probably help overall. Now, that's not the position of our group yet, at all. But that's another story.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. And Becky wants to ask Jordan a question. Jordan.

BECKY BURR:	I think, because you are part of a rapporteur for self accountability, am I remembering that correctly? So, since Mathieu started us out with provocative questions, I just want to think through an issue with you. You run an organization and you have structures for having your staff be accountable to you and I -- sometimes when I listen to the working group I think there's a little bit of a tension between we want to have an effectively run organization, be able to hold the CEO and the board accountable for what goes on in there. As somebody who manages people myself, I expect people to come to me if my staff is not performing, with a sort of odd direct-to-staff kind of chain.
	I just want to take a moment to -- to articulate and say that all of us who are managing those people understand what the tension is, and I wonder if making that tension more explicit would lead to more productive conversations.
JORDAN CARTER:	So that was almost a question, but I think it was. The reason that I volunteered or was voluntold to be a co-rapporteur on this group was because I wanted to make sure there was someone who was an executive in that discussion because I think that there is a risk of trying to create some monster where no one

ICANN 58 COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

works for anyone because they work for everyone or to use some kind of Salem witch's trial of hoisting particular staff or particular things they are alleged to have done or not done, and I wanted to make sure those two things didn't happen in the process. So maybe by being more explicit about that tension there needs to have a kind of clean line management. Just articulating it might help. And the other thing that we're trying to articulate, me and Avri as co-rapporteurs, is to say that what we're looking for is structural changes or a creation of forums or validation of processes that don't interrupt the normal chain of command, that don't mean that Goran can't be held accountable for the performance of the organization but that mean that there's assurance or improvements to the ability for community feedback to be taken into account in his performance management role. So, that's why I was interested, and that's what I'm trying to see from the group. If we can be more explicit about things like what does staff accountability mean, what doesn't it mean, and if that helps reduce the tension or concern, that's great to know.

STEVE CROCKER: This feels a bit disjointed. It's clear from the nature of the suggestion that there's a belief that there's a problem, and what's being proposed is a particular kind of solution and then

some jockeying back and forth about what that solution should look like.

Stand back and just think about it from first principles, and sort of echoing the kind of thing that Goran says quite repeatedly. He's the guy. The buck stops with him. If there's a problem with staff performance, he's who the community should go to and he's who the board should go to.

So, I'm puzzled, actually, because I don't have the same data that you have or that others are --

Would it be possible to get examples or specifics that we're talking about? Because if it's a structural issue, that's one thing. If it's particular people, that's a different thing. If it's particular instances where the circumstances cause something to be dealt with in a way that was -- seemed odd or uncomfortable, that's a third thing.

It feels like it would be best handled with a rather candid, informal, nonthreatening kind of conversation, just to find out what it is we're talking about, and then to craft or discuss what improvements are necessary to deal with that.

There's too many open steps between, you know, what we're sitting with and what you're proposing, and --

ICANN 58
COMMUNITY FORUM
COPENHAGEN
11–16 March 2017

JORDAN CARTER: Can I briefly -- because I completely agree with you, and that's the change to our scope and focus and our request that the CCWG signed off on Friday.

So, what we said was we need some people to talk with from ICANN org who can have exactly that conversation to get the issues on the table and we need to focus our written work on, "These are the issues, systemic issues, not personal issues, and this is what we're doing about them."

So, there has been follow-up from Goran through Theresa. Avri and I have got a meeting to work out what that might look like with one of Theresa's people tomorrow. We'll work that through the working group. And that's exactly the kind of conversation and exactly the kind of outcome that we want to get to, Steve, so thanks for that.

STEVE CROCKER: I'm just trouble hearing every word and when I look at the transcript, I see something extremely interesting. It says, "Avri and I have got an egg moo to work out." I want to --

JORDAN CARTER: I don't know what an egg moo is, but --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Look out for that egg moo.

JORDAN CARTER: A meeting.

STEVE CROCKER: Oh.

JORDAN CARTER: A meeting.

STEVE CROCKER: Well, we're fond of making up new words in a funny language called Swenglish. I think an egg moo is a great idea. Maybe that's the translation of FECA.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Jordan.

                      We're going to move on to the second bullet point now, which is: What policy advice issues are top priorities for your group?

                      Katrina?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. Thank you, Chris. As I already mentioned in the very beginning, we have a very important PDP this year and we're going to launch it tomorrow.

Since we have time -- at the beginning, I was afraid we might run out of time, but now we have time, so if you're interested in the details, I will ask our issue manager --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I think that would be very helpful for the board to understand.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. I'll ask our issue manager to clarify some more -- most interesting points to the board.

So, Bart?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sorry to throw you that one, Bart, but if you could -- if we -- I think that it would be useful for the board to understand what the PDP is about, and come sit up here and use one of these microphones.

KATRINA SATAKI: While Bart is --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: That would be fantastic.

KATRINA SATAKI: -- coming here -- yeah -- we're also concerned with implementation. We're working on our internal guidelines to make sure that we have them in place when we need to act.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Excellent. So, Bart, over to you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Again, for the ccTLD present, this will -- excuse me -- preempt the discussion we will have in 20 minutes.

For the board, it started with three council questions and I will share this slide deck with you after the -- after the -- after the meeting.

The first one is: Should the ccNSO council initiate a PDP to develop policy for a review mechanism and -- on retirement of ccTLDs?

And why this is important, I'll go through in a minute.

The second question is -- and that's more -- appears to be a logistical one but it's probably very important again around the

discussions you just had with respect to resourcing, time line, schedules, et cetera, is: Should the council initiate one or two PDPs? Because that will have an impact on the time lines, will have an impact on the number of volunteers, the expertise, et cetera.

And the third one -- again, this is related -- is a task force or use another method, read working group, because this is a requirement under the Annex B rules.

Now, in order to move to the -- say the PDP and to initiate the PDP, one of the major questions is around, yeah, what are the topics that need to be addressed and whether it's useful to do it anyway.

And so there is a high-level list of issues identified and that's more around the scope of a review mechanism, and questions that need to be answered by the working group are decisions or actions that should be subject to a review mechanism, whose decisions or actions should be subject, what should be the result of a review mechanism, what powers will be bestowed upon the review panel. You can all think about potential outcomes of this discussion, so this is not preempting any outcome.

These are the questions posed for the working group. Or for the PDP.

Then who has standing at the review mechanism. Again, if you look at the background material, there are some suggestions that all with an interest in the ccTLD should be allowed to have standing at the review mechanism, review panel, or for a review mechanism, and this will have quite some broad implications, and others would say and there is a suggestion it's only open and applicable for ccTLDs.

And then the second question, particularly relevant for the ccNSO itself and for ICANN in the future is, is it limited to ccNSO members only, because by their membership they agree to the policy, or should a review mechanism be applicable to all ccTLDs or should it be eligible to all ccTLDs.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I just -- just let me stop you because if I got slightly confused now and if I'm slightly confused, then maybe other people were.

One example of -- is this the thing you would use to review a decision to what we used to call redelegate but now we say -- what is it?

BECKY BURR: Revoke and --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Revoke and delegate.

BART BOSWINKEL: Or transfer, yeah.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So this is what Jon Postel contemplated in -- what this will become is what Jon Postel contemplated in 1591 as some form of panel that would actually do this. Is that right?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes. If you go back -- and I skipped this slide, but you will see it afterwards. If you would look to RFC-1591, say, what it -- what it means is there should be something like a DNS names review board. "The committee established by the IANA will act as a review panel for cases in which the parties" -- so -- and "parties" would be the local Internet community at -- say in the terminology of the time now, significantly interested parties -- "cannot reach agreement among themselves, the IDMB decisions will be binding."

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Right.

BART BOSWINKEL: So that's -- so that's one background document --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah.

BART BOSWINKEL: -- and one way of looking at it.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: And then the --

BART BOSWINKEL: Then you have the FOI interpretation as well, so the framework of interpretation working group. "The FOI working group believes it is consistent with RFC-1591 and the duty to act fairly to recognize the manager has the right to appeal a notice of revocation by the IANA operator to an independent body."

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay.

BART BOSWINKEL: That's, again, a different scope, different actors, and that's the type of questions that need to be addressed around the review panel.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay.

>>   (Off microphone.)

CHRIS DISSPAIN: And then there's retirement --

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: -- which is the other part of it, and you've decided to do this as one PDP?

BART BOSWINKEL: That is -- let me -- that's the suggestion, and then have two working groups --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay.

BART BOSWINKEL: -- within it. Say retirement is around, say -- there is -- there is currently no policy in place with respect to retirement --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No.

BART BOSWINKEL: -- Of ccTLDs, so that's the starting point.

At the time in 2011, it was already advised to the community to start this policy development process. Because of the framework of interpretation work, it was delayed, and now it's time to start this, and if you look at the issues that need to be addressed -- that is, consistency of terminology, what triggers a retirement, who triggers retirement -- so there are already areas of decisions in there --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah.

BART BOSWINKEL: -- that will be subject to or could be subject to the review.

So, the reason for having one PDP, although there is an interdependency between them --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay.

BART BOSWINKEL: -- so in order -- if you close up one --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah.

BART BOSWINKEL: -- so the review first and you start the second one, but then you have -- afterwards you have to reopen the first one again --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I get it.

BART BOSWINKEL: -- that's why --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I get it.

BART BOSWINKEL: -- that's why we want --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I get it.

BART BOSWINKEL: -- to have one PDP.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: And just finally, what -- and Nigel, if you want to come and say anything, feel free to do so.

What is the -- so clearly this PDP is going to be of significant interest to the GAC.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: What arrangements are you making -- is the ccNSO making to ensure that we don't find ourselves in a situation where, in two years' time, the GAC realizes you've been running this PDP and isn't very happy about the results.

BART BOSWINKEL: If you say there are --

There's some formal and informal mechanisms in place. The formal ones is that the GAC will be informed of the kickoff and there will be asked an opinion or advice around the issue report at the start, and at the end about the final report, say, for the vote. That's the formal part.

The second part -- and that's probably the most important one -- is that they will be actively approached to participate in the working groups, and, yeah --

And the third element is that we -- the working group -- and it is anticipated that the working group will keep the GAC abreast of its programs.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. So that's great. If --

The GAC is going -- going to be going through some changes this year with leadership changes and so on. If you find that you are not getting traction with the GAC and they're not -- they're not actually -- if you -- if there's anything that the board can do to help, please let us know. We've gone through a period with the -- of discussions with the GNSO lately where, you know, they've said, "Well, the GAC -- the specific aspects of the GAC weren't -- chose not to be involved," and so on, so I think it would be really useful if -- if you -- if you have a problem, if you could let us know and we'll see if we can help.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. I'll inform the chairs about this.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: And the -- Yeah. Oh, sorry, that was actually more addressed to you than Bart. I apologize, Katrina.

And also, I assume that you'll be asking the SSAC to be involved because there will be some security and stability issues with this?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes. If you would look at the charters as developed by the drafting teams, they list the at-large, SSAC, GAC, and GNSO --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah.

BART BOSWINKEL: -- and they can participate in any way or form they want.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Excellent. All right. Good. So I think -- well, thank you very much, Bart, and I hope that board members have a clear picture. This is a fairly significant thing for the CCs. We've run -- this is our third policy development process in the existence of the ccNSO. The first one was -- was a review of ourselves, so that doesn't really count, although it was a PDP.

So, this is very -- and it's also very significant because, of course, retirement of -- retirement of ccTLDs doesn't -- there is currently no policy, and there is no -- and if there is one of -- the biggest issue for ccTLDs is the redelegation/revocation thing.

So -- so with that, we're out of time and I'd like to thank everybody very much, indeed, for their attendance. And the last word goes to you, Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, thank you very much. Thank you very much for inviting us and still wanting to see us and...

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you very much, everybody. Take care.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]