

**ICANN  
Transcription ICANN Johannesburg  
GNSO Working Session Prep ccNSO & GAC Meetings  
Monday, 26 June 2017 at 12:00 SAST**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

James Bladel: So when Marika returns - I don't think we're starting a recording yet. Yes. You can finish your lunch. When Marika returns, we'll load the agenda - oh, here we go. (Emily)'s got us covered. And I believe both of these meetings are occurring tomorrow. No. The ccNSO meeting is this afternoon at 6:30. This evening at 6:30.

I have heard from the rumor mill that there will be refreshments. That will help. But let's start with the - okay. So this is we're starting with the GAC, which is tomorrow.

This is the - this is the agenda topic here. The first one is we present something regarding the - a status update on the reconvened group that's looking at the Red Cross, Red Crescent and IGO issues.

I think the way that reads it's bundling some of them together where they are perhaps going in divergent directions. Yes. Well I just think that agenda item

Number 1 Mary could probably - we probably shouldn't have the Red Cross, Red Crescent and IGOs in the same bullet point.

I think we could do a status update regarding Red Cross, Red Crescent and the reconvened working group. And then another item would be, you know, discussions regarding IGOs. And do we want or desire or require further facilitated discussions? And if so, when should those occur?

We can update the current PDPs and we'll probably put (Carlos) on the hook a little bit for that. But I'll cover most of them because we have heard feedback from the GAC that they do not want to see a lot of in depth - we don't - they don't want to be buried in PowerPoint.

I think if we just focus on the nature of the PDP and its - a snapshot of where it is and then what the next major milestone would be, that'd be good, yes. Go ahead Marika.

Marika Konings: Wouldn't it just be helpful that we just list the names of the PDPs that are running on the slides so you at least - and use them as your guide to talk about them?

James Bladel: Sure. That'd be fine. And if we can just - I think the key thing we want to leave them with is what they can expect between now and Abu Dhabi because the GAC doesn't usually meet (intersessionally), so.

Copenhagen communique. I, you know, how much do we want to dive into this one?

Heather Forrest: James Bladel, I think they are going to dive into the specific aspect of the two-character space on this morning's discussion. That's really the key point that came out of that communique and I think we let them do it.

James Bladel: Okay. So Heather Forrest, do you think we should be prepared to respond to their questions or comments rather than just kind of teeing it up on our own?

Okay.

Heather Forrest: Yes I do.

James Bladel: Okay. And I think we heard that there were some fireworks regarding the two-character issue while we were having our working session but that may have ended on a slightly more optimistic note. So - but I think that generally the message is we should be prepared to discuss the two-character issue. We should be prepared if it comes up in our meeting with the GAC. Yes. Go ahead. That's okay.

Heather Forrest: Sorry James Bladel. Heather Forrest. Specifically in terms of questions on the two-characters, I think some of the comments were made there around why does this stuff just end up in contracts is an interesting point for the contracted parties to note. I think you guys might be a little bit more on the hook let's say in that regard.

James Bladel: I'm sorry. I didn't catch the first part. Why does this end up in contract?

Heather Forrest: Yes. Why is this discussion having to do with contracts and not broader, I'm not sure, public policy or something? Is great dissatisfaction with the idea of it - the contracted parties are the ones that are interested and this ends up in contracts. I can't say that it made a lot of sense to me either. I'm just reporting it.

James Bladel: Okay. It's understood maybe or maybe we should, you know, just kind of elaborate on how contracts or the mechanisms...

Heather Forrest: I think...

James Bladel: ...for which ICANN holds contracted parties accountable to delivering on the policies and that - I don't - maybe there's some gaps in the understanding on how that all works. There doesn't seem to be because they usually talk about compliance.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

James Bladel: So here's a question for the group. You know, for the GAC - for interactions with the GAC, typically it'd be myself and Heather Forrest and Donna would be at the head of the table with the GAC Chairs and (Carlos).

And we're happy to proceed like that. But if they're - if you'd rather take this agenda and identify other speakers from the Council to take the lead particularly if we want to provide an update or any questions specific to PDPs that I know many of you are involved in those PDPs and perhaps can provide a little bit more color and depth on that work or on the Red Cross or IGO issue or anything like that.

I know several of us worked on the response to the Copenhagen communique. If you have some folks that would like to weigh in on that as well, that's certainly an option that's open.

I guess what we're saying is we don't want to be handcuffed to a tradition here just because it's always been the Chairs and Vice-Chairs and the GAC liaison speaking to these issues. We're certainly open to broadening that responsibility. Yes Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. I just wanted to mention about Item 3. So I think you've skipped over that one. That is I think a standing item on the agenda concerning the implementation of the GAC GNSO Consultation Group recommendations.

And you may have seen that I sent out an updated version of the implementation plan right before this meeting. That has also gone to the GAC.

And basically in short I think the main thing to mention is that the proposed changes to the PDP manual to capture the GAC quick look mechanisms are now out for public comment.

So we basically have incorporated that as a standing step of the PDP as recommended by the Consultation Group and adopted by both the GAC and the GNSO.

I think the only remaining item on there is that staff committed to producing some flowcharts that would kind of highlight the different engagement opportunities that the GAC has.

Due to other priorities, that has dropped a little bit from the list but I'm hoping that between now and ICANN 60 we'll be able to deliver that. And I think then there's one remaining item but it concerns I think obligation of (Carlos) to produce a report for the annual meeting on his activities. So those I think the two remaining items but we hope that basically by ICANN 60 those would be completed.

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks Marika. Sort of related but not necessarily part of agenda Item 3 is if it comes up, we might want to discuss their progress in renewing or reorganizing their Secretariat because I think that one of the things that we founded through the Red Cross and IGOs and some other issues is that it's been very helpful if we can coordinate with some Secretariat report on the GAC side. And I believe that's changing now. So...

Woman: Really?

James Bladel: Yes. And we'll throw it under AOB just to get an update from them on what the status of their Secretariat contract is. Yes, (Carlos).

(Carlos): Yes. And that issue they have been worrying a lot about these proposals that are going to be discussed under the Empowered Community changes to the bylaws. And the fact - (Stephanie) - and the fact that those decisions have a very short decision period that falls between the sessions.

And I think it's possible they're discussing kind of a committee or a smaller group that works between the sessions and deals with these short-term decisions to any one-day period for the decisions of the Empowered Community.

So that might be a very interesting development to ask them about because that might produce a group of GAC members, which we all know, which are they that might be available during the sessions and might be easy to communicate with and not wait for the next ICANN meeting to have a reaction.

So it might be a combination of a Secretariat and a smaller group of countries. They don't know if they're going to call it steering committee or working group or if it's going to be permanent or not. But certainly they are planning to have one group within - between now and Abu Dhabi meeting.

James Bladel: Okay. Thank you (Carlos). Any other thoughts about our meeting with the GAC to discuss?

(Susan): Just a quick question on two, update on current PDPs. Is that going to also include the IRT? The privacy proxy is pretty important to them.

James Bladel: Yes. If you could be prepared to speak to that. You the liaison to that? Is that correct? That was (Darcy). I'm sorry.

(Susan): And she has participated more than I have.

James Bladel: Okay. If we can make sure that we are ready to speak to that. I think the last I'd heard that we just received the law enforcement framework for disclosure. Is that correct? Okay. So - okay. So we'll - good point (Susan). We want to leave the IRTs waiting at the station. Okay.

We've got a group of Board members gathering to join us here in about 15, 20 minutes. So let's then talk a little bit about our meeting for this - with the ccNSO Council.

Now this is happening this evening I believe starting at 6:30 until 7:30. And here's the agenda here; 15 or so. We have a welcome. We have CCWG status, country and territory names. Heather Forrest I believe recently submitted - is that that final report to the Council list? I'm expecting not a lot of folks have had an opportunity to read it fully yet. But it is there and it is available.

We have the CCWG IG and expecting next steps there particularly with regard to the revised charter. And we have an update with the Board working group on IG as well.

And then an update on CCWG auction proceeds of which our GNSO co-Chair Erika is here and can provide some updates and the ccNSO as well. Yes. No. Go ahead. Jump in now.

Heather Forrest: Thanks James Bladel. This is Heather Forrest. I'm - look, I have a specific comment and then maybe a general comment. In relation to that CCWG status, where we are, and again I'll speak to this in our Council meeting on Wednesday when we actually talk about the final report. And if anybody has any questions about the final report before then, I'm happy to answer them.

I think that the failure of that CCWG is largely down to the fact that the ccNSO wasn't prepared to extend the rationale that we had, which was largely a result of a GNSO compromise on two characters. They weren't really keen to extend that to three characters.

And my concern - the reason I'm putting this here is I think that's a fairly albeit sleeper cell, I think that's a fairly contentious issue on our agenda. That's probably the hot button issue on our agenda.

And I'm not sure that it's one that interests all members of the ccNSO. In fact, I don't think that it does but just so that we're all aware that that is an issue. And there's also a fair bit of resistance to the subsequent procedures PDP and the efforts that that group is undertaking this week in relation to geographic names.

So we just need to know that there's some tension there. And as we heard this morning from the update from (SubPro), there's tension there over the scope of that PDP charter and so on and so forth.

So I think we need to be prepared for the fact that there are some and I see a few nods around the table. There are some latent tensions there and could come up in that discussion. Thanks.

James Bladel: Okay. Thanks Heather Forrest. Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks. Donna Austin. So Heather Forrest, I think it might be worthwhile if we can actually try to open up that discussion about why we think we're the right place for that geographic names discussion. Perhaps Avri might be able to help us out in that regard when we have the conversation with the Council - ccNSO Council.

James Bladel: You know what's missing from this list is Work Stream 2. Is there anything meaningful to talk about there or is the ccNSO also lend their support to the

extension of their scope and budget? SSAC came through just recently.  
Okay. If there's nothing to talk about, I guess it's just that I noticed it wasn't on the list.

Next up is the Empowered Community admin and the empowered - and the community forum process, procedures, timelines. I don't expect we'll see a lot of controversy here. Mary, do you have any insights on what we can expect?

Mary Wong: From what we understand, the ccNSO's concerns here are not about the fundamental bylaw amendments, it's not about the substance. I think, as you know, it's about the overall timelines for many of the actions for the new power. So it's probably going to be a broader discussion than either the bylaw amendment or even just the approval process.

James Bladel: I think we're going to be challenged by some of those timelines and some of those windows and deadlines are hard coded into the Empowered Community processes. So like the ccNSO, I think the GNSO as well will experience challenges meeting those deadlines. Yes. Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. Just to know that if we can have some time under the AOB today I think from 2:30 to 3:00 to talk indeed about the changes they're having put up for public comment.

It also talks about (indeed) how its proposed that the GNSO deals with the timelines, which indeed seems to be a bit of a (fix) because there's no real way within the current procedures to do it probably but it's something indeed that may help (you in it) as well have that conversation with the ccNSO.

James Bladel: You mean flag it for AOB today?

Marika Konings: Yes.

James Bladel: Okay. Will do. Try to review on the CSC status update. How did that get - yes, go ahead Donna.

Donna Austin: There is a requirement that the CSC Charter be reviewed 12 months from the first meeting of the CSC. That review is done by the ccNSO and the Registry Stakeholder Group. And the Council ultimately has to - the ccNSO Council and GNSO Council have to sign off on any amendments.

It is a process. And I think that we'll just provide an update that we've started to think about that. But the Council doesn't have a role to play until some months down the road.

James Bladel: And the Registry Stakeholder Group though is on point from the GNSO perspective. And has that already started? The registry...

Donna Austin: Yes.

James Bladel: Okay. Great. Okay. And then next step is planning for FY19 PTI budget status update. And we heard (Elise) this morning. I think - yes. Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Yes. This is Marika. I think this is also an item kind of, you know, saying what - CSC of particular interest from both the GNSO and the ccNSO side in that process. I would think the idea is just to know that indeed a discussion already took place here to hear from them as well whether the same thing has happened there.

And I don't know if there is a need for the two groups to speak more in detail about the planning for the budget or priorities or things like that. I'm not sure. But just to touch base and then see.

James Bladel: Sure. I mean - I don't know that we had a lot to talk about it here amongst ourselves. So I don't know how much of a contribution we can make to the discussion with the ccNSO. So but we'll leave it on the agenda.

Is that it? Or do we have Number 6 AOB? It's just that? Okay. So just a reminder that that session with the ccNSO Council is at 6:30 in which room? Ball Room 2 on Level...

Woman: Two.

James Bladel: ...Level 2. Okay. Ball Room 2, Level 2 and there will be - I guess there will be cocktails and snacks available for given the timeframe. So that'll be something that's open to us and hopefully make the meeting a little bit more expeditious.

Any other comments on our meeting with the GAC or our meeting with the ccNSO? No? Okay. Our next session is a discussion with the Board working group on Internet governance. And I see we've got a few of them gathering here. Some are outside. And there's (Chris) and (Renalia). So while we gather them, we're a little ahead of schedule.

END