TRANSCRIPT

ccNSO Internet Governance Review Group Meeting London
22 June 2014

Attendees:

Becky Burr, .us
Keith Davidson, .nz
Don Hollander, APTLD
Young-Eum Lee, .kr
Allan MacGillivray, .ca
Peter Van Roste, CENTR
Matheiu Weill, .fr

Staff:

Bart Boswinkel
Kristina Nordström
Gabriella Schittek

Apologies:

Byron Holland, .ca

Mathieu Weill: So as I was saying, I will do my best to Chair this meeting in the absence of Byron. You have noticed that we have the absence of Chair, but also the absence of agenda, so we figured an agenda out on the fly.

The suggestion for this meeting is as follows; I'm going to ask Bart to take us through the different Internet Governance-related topics and issues flying around during this week here in ICANN. Once we are through this description and we have explained all the acronyms -- we'll take a test -- we will -- I suggest that we -- participants of the meeting identify which of these they feel are priority, and we sort of go into this topic and see what's going to happen, where the decisions are being made, and if necessary, what kind of message we could suggest to Council or the ccTLD representatives to carry to these groups.

Is this kind of agenda okay with this group? Do we have any remote participants? I haven't heard any; okay, so far no remote participant.

So, Bart, you have the floor, and take us through with as much clarity as you can do, and I'm sure you can.

Bart Boswinkel: What I'll describe is some processes and needs, and this is a very broad picture, you may see it on Wednesday afternoon as well, so it was prepared for a discussion on Wednesday, but it lists, let me start with, say, currently we have the IANA function-related processes. I describe it this way because there are two main ones. One is the Accountability and secondly, it's the NTIA transition. Now, if you look at -- let me take you to the top line -- if you look at this one, the IANA Oversight Transition process, what you see, there are already two initiatives emerging.

One is the ICANN-facilitated process, and the ICANN-facilitated process is -- and I'll expand it once more, and they you go seasick probably, what you see here is the Coordination Committee. One of the things that needs to be done, and that's on the Council Agenda for this afternoon, together with regional organization is, how are we going to select four ccTLD people on that Coordination Committee.

The second thing is; how is the community going to provide input on public comments, that it's a workload issue? And the third thing is, and that's -- I won't go into that, but it's meeting times, at regional -- meetings of regional organizations, and meeting -- at the ccNSO meetings, it's although there are differences, at the end of the day the regional organizations and the ccNSO serve their members, which they are all ccTLDs, and we sometimes engage -- or I would say, the majority we engage are the same people, but the regional organizations can and will engage people who are not members of the ccNSO, or do not attend ICANN meetings, and vice versa.

So that's something, but that's later on, but so you understand what's there. That's the ICANN process, and this is important because it's one of the requirements, if you look at the NTIA announcement, is that it's as inclusive as possible. That means the ccTLD organizations need to engage with the -- and that's a difficult one. The 50-plus ccTLD members who are neither member of the ccNSO nor from the regional organizations, it's around 50. And I think that's the proof of the pudding is by eating it, that's the real proof whether we engage -- whether we are able to reach out to these 50-plus ccTLDs.

The second process that runs at the same -- or in parallel, which is related to the IANA Oversight Transition process is what will be discussed this afternoon as well is -- Yeah?

Peter Van Roste: Peter Van Roste from CENTR. Bart, just on your previous points, I would like to note that I, and other people that I've been discussing this with, believe that it's not only the person that will represent those 50-plus ROs that are not members of the regional organization nor of the ccNSO, but also the way in which ICANN is going to communicate with them. So it's probably good to start right now, the thinking on whether we build a platform and we communicate that to the IANA--

Bart Boswinkel: That's the point, that's what -- that's the point with engagement.

Peter Van Roste: Okay.

Bart Boswinkel: The question is whether it's -- you want to leave this to ICANN itself, or you want to do this as community, that's the underlying question, that's why I say, the ccNSO, and it goes back to the point I said about -- I need to expand it, meeting time. It's, I know there are some regional meetings, not just the regional organizations, but also others, organizations where people will show up, who are neither a member of the ccNSO nor the regional organizations, and one way or the other I think it's a good -- but that's my personal view. It would be a good thing if the community itself would take control of its own mandate.

Yeah, go ahead, Keith.

Keith Davidson: Keith Davidson. I think, yeah, the issues of diversity arise straight away, and however we address the populating of the Group, things like, you know, whether they are members of ccNSO or not, is a very relevant point, but also size of registry, make sure that small and large, and medium, registries are represented, that differently motivated ccTLDs are represented, and so and so. I think this is going to be an extraordinarily difficult task that needs to be accomplished in a very short timeframe.

So, point noted, and I think we should continue to note such issues as they arise, so that we form a matrix of how we might get the most of this group. It's going to be geographically diverse, you know, et cetera, et cetera, so yeah, potentially.

Mathieu Weill: Point taken. I think we'll have to come back to that later on. I'd like to invite Bart to run through the list--

Unidentified Participant: Yeah. (Inaudible) factual--

Mathieu Weill: --so going back to -- we'll go back to that.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you, Mathieu. Going back to the IANA Oversight Transition, there is a Cross Community Working Group Initiative that will be discussed and it's being shared. This initiative at this stage is -- and I'll expand this one so you can see -- it's at the level of Drafting Team. The question is whether the ccNSO wants to participate, that's the first question, in this Cross Community Initiative? And the second question is the call for volunteers for Drafting Team Members -- Drafting Teams. That Drafting Team would produce a draft of a Charter which will go back and flow to the different SOs and ACs. So this is a Cross Community -- maybe you've already heard it and seen the rumors around it, and it was on the Council List. You've got the Cross Community Working Group on the IANA Oversight Transition process, and that runs in parallel and may feed into the ICANN process, but it definitely runs in parallel.

Now moving downwards, so this is what we know right now, and this is the original focus. The second one, and this is, again, one of the new processes, is the accountability process. Again, you have the accountability process, and to date, it's the question of Working Group participation. There was at a Council Call a couple of weeks ago, there was the idea of appointing observers, it became unclear and unwieldy whether to do it, and so we -- as the Secretariat, we did not send -- after the consulting, the Chairs and the Vice Chairs, we did not send out the call for volunteers, knowing that this -- working group participation may attract a lot of people, but we need, and this will be one of the discussions during this week, we need to balance the efforts, and we need to balance the capacity. That's the major issue I think during this week.

Don, go ahead.

Don Hollander: Sorry. Don Hollander. Just to make sure I understand. This Working Group is an ICANN-wide Working Group, not a ccNSO Working Group, on the ICANN accountability. Is that correct?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. That's why, say, if you would go down, you've got ICANN accountability processes, there is an ICANN accountability process that's say -- that's where we just submitted our comments, et cetera, as the ccNSO Council, and that process now -- in fact due for this week, needs to have participation, but that's -- it's unclear what it's going to do, we haven't sent out the call, so that's -- hopefully that's--

Becky?

Becky Burr: Just, my question about the cross country -- not cross country -- Cross Community Working Groups under each of the ICANN processes --is assuming that ICANN was willing to, sort of, relinquish its ironclad control over those processes. Would we then need, in addition, the Cross Community Working Group? Or is that just a question for us to discuss?

Bart Boswinkel: I think that's a question for you to discuss. If it's all around, and that starts this afternoon, it starts with the ICANN process, and then you have the discussion around this Cross Community Working Group, say, on the NTIA Transition process. So that was suggested by Byron and Jonathan. So that's where you see it, if you look carefully, I will reduce this otherwise you -- let me -- just a minute, please.

                     The second Cross Community Working Group with the question mark is, this is assuming, and this is the assumption based on rumors, I've heard, and others, there will be an initiative to create -- once you do it for the IANA Oversight Transition process, why not do it for the Accountability process as well, if you look at the way it's structured?

                     Again, with the argument and these, we truly bottom-up, et cetera, that's the main argument for this Cross Community Working Group, that's why I have the question mark. But my guess is once it's done for the IANA Oversight, it's a matter of time that the ccNSO -- or the ccTLD Community can expect this to happen. There will be a request for this cross community, so it's not there -- rumors, but expected.

                     Yeah? Go ahead Young-Eum.

Young-Eum Lee: Yes. Young-Eum Lee, for the record. I thought when you were mentioning the Cross Community Working Group you were talking about the existing--

Bart Boswinkel: No.

Young-Eum Lee: It's a completely new one?

Bart Boswinkel: This is all new. What I'm talking about, the only thing that's currently known and where we have -- now two things, is the ICANN process, and that includes the appointment -- and that's the first requirement -- the appointment of four members on the Coordinating Committee, ccTLD members, that's one.

                     There is a request for participating in a Drafting Team for a new Cross Community Working Group on the NTIA Transition. It's participation in that Group, and there is the Accountability process where you have a request to appoint members.

Young-Eum Lee: So then my question is; what is the relationship of this group to the existing one? Or, I mean, what is the -- what would be the status of the existing Cross Community Working Group?

Mathieu Weill: Let me answer that.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Mathieu Weill: I think -- because I see some people are not -- well those who are not on the Working Group probably don't understand, but there is a Cross Constituency Working Group on Internet Governance that was established some two meetings or three meetings ago--

Unidentified Participant: I'll get through that one in a minute.

Mathieu Weill:	And that was going to do -- everything to do with Internet Governance, and in Singapore we agreed that that Working Group would continue to work on aspects of Internet Governance that have nothing to do with the Accountability or NTIA transition aspects of life. So other broader Internet Governance issues will continue to be discussed in that group.
Unidentified Participant:	So just--
Mathieu Weill:	So we have five groups and counting. Yes, please?
Unidentified Participant:	Maybe.
Mathieu Weill:	And counting. I mean, we'll probably go to -- closer to 10 is my--
Bart Boswinkel:	Let me proceed with my story around these groups, so you get the full picture. Your Group, this one will -- I'll get to in a minute. I'm just focusing right now on the IANA function-related processes, so that excludes, so you are going back to the Cross Community Working Group and Internet Governance, it didn't -- dealt (ph) with it. So if you just look at these potential four processes, it's clear that, say, one way or the other we need to engage the full CC community because they are relevant, especially these two, say, accountability and oversight are relevant -- I'll reduce this, so it's clearer.
	They are relevant for the full CC community, not just for the ccNSO, not just for individual regional organizations and their members, the full CC community. And what's also relevant, probably, is if you got these four processes, one way or the other, they need to be coordinated, there needs to be a kind of coordination, what the ccNSO is, and the ccTLD community is doing. How this moves forward and that's, say, there is communication between the members who are on these working groups and who are not; and what the broader community has ensured.
	So, this is what I see right now, and this is just my analysis, knowing what's happened. As I said, this is processes and needs. So these are the IANA function-related processes, breaking down in accountability and NTIA Stewardship Transition.
	Yeah, Peter?
Peter Van Roste:	Peter Van Roste from CENTR. So, did I understand correctly that there will not be a ccNSO Working Group on the IANA Stewardship Transition?
Bart Boswinkel:	I don't know. Look, as I just said, the Group -- this is my thing, this is what I know. I don't know whether there is a ccNSO Working Group on the NTIA, there's a Coordination Community right now.
Unidentified Participant:	That's why we should come back to that when we -- when we (inaudible).
Mathieu Weill:	When we discuss about the priorities.
Bart Boswinkel:	I'm just describing what's happening.
Mathieu Weill:	So I've lost count. I see we are five or six. Don't you want to add something at this stage?
Unidentified Participant:	No. I have the same question that Peter had.
Mathieu Weill:	Yeah, okay. We'll come back to that point, just as we have to come back on criteria.

Keith Davidson:	While we are hitting working groups one at a time, I think at least for the NTIA Transition Group, the broader ICANN NTIA Oversight Transition Group, and for the ICANN Accountability process, those are two major tranches of work, the suggestion is there's going to be about 12 to 15 hours per week of time requirement from participants. So rather than just, as we normally do, we wave a flag and say, let's get some volunteers. I think this needs to be handled by a selection committee for both -- for appointments from both of those groups.
	And talking to Byron, Byron suggested this anyway, that we should have the selection committee and because of the importance of the tasks, he wants to Chair that Committee. He's suggesting that anyone who serves on the Selection Committee should be ruled ineligible from serving on either of those sub-committees. And their job and their charter will be designed around getting geographic diversity, and size and all of those sorts of things.
	So, that's probably a good way rather than just going ahead and calling for volunteers, is to have a crisis by which you could measure applicants to make sure that we tick the boxes everywhere.
Peter Van Roste:	The question for clarification in terms of process is the creation of this Nominating Committee or anything similar. Currently I did -- the agenda after ccNSO Council in this meeting?
Keith Davidson:	Sorry, I didn't quite hear the question.
Mathieu Weill:	It's part of that -- due to the time constraints on the Coordination Committee. And the Coordination Committee, in order -- say you have -- say the Council Committee there is a prep meeting starting at 4:00, this is the Internet Governance Committee, if you look at the agenda, and it's been circulated, at the end of that meeting there will be a formal Council Meeting discussing whether or not to appoint it. So I suggest we finish this list.
Unidentified Participant:	Yeah.
Mathieu Weill:	Go back to this, because if it's being discussed shortly in the Council, then there's probably value to have an exchange before the Council on what your are suggesting, Keith.
Keith Davidson:	Yeah. Let's go--
Mathieu Weill:	And the idea of a working group as well.
Keith Davidson:	Yeah.
Bart Boswinkel:	Let's go -- move forward. Now, it's going to get interesting.
Unidentified Participant:	What was it before?
Bart Boswinkel:	This needs to be added to the list of -- So first of all, some of you will know, so I've prepared this, as I said, for Wednesday. There is a list of priorities for the Council work -- of the Council Workshop in Singapore, which has been approved. The NTIA and Accountability processes are numbers one and two on that priority list. But there are others on this one as well; for example, the FOI, SOP, et cetera, all demanding capacity or volunteers.
	What I also see is upcoming major work items. As I said, this is my list, what I understand, et cetera. I will touch upon Internet Governance latest. Say, implementation

of IDN, CC, PDP, that will take some time, but post-L.A. my guess is, there will be demands of the ccTLD Community, especially relevant for those who are interested IDNs to -- yeah, actively participate in that one.

The PDP on retirement, it will be coming. Maybe it's on the list. Completion of FOI, potentially follow depending on how it's structured, but at least being in contact and in constant communication with the IANA department is on the implementation, and to monitor the implementation in order to check whether it's done properly, as envisioned by the FOI. If not, that will lead -- as in the Charter and the Council decision may lead to another PDP.

There are always new requests to participate, I don't know how high they will be on the priority list, but one, I think Don, this is especially relevant for your community, the whole work will go on, again, with either -- if you community agrees. Say, the whole universe of acceptance initiative, that is now moving forward, or one way or the other. It will engage the CCs from your region, because there is, most interesting, in IDN, ccTLDs and the universe of acceptance.

And now we go to Internet Governance. Internet Governance -- Internet Governance has been broadly defined, and if you look at, say, the Coordination Group, which is currently meeting. This is an Internet Governance Coordination Group, that itself, say, is I would call the ccNSO coordination process, which is ongoing. At the same time, and this is for the Council Meeting on Wednesday, and this is what Young-Eum referred to, is there is this Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance, which has drafted a Charter to be submitted -- which is now submitted to the Council and to be voted upon on Wednesday.

In that Charter it's on everything related to Internet Governance with the exception of the NTIA Stewardship Transition Process, and the related accountability issues. So that work or that Working Group make -- will continue. I could imagine that this Cross Community Working Group will start focusing on Internet -- say, the IGF planning part, and so forth, and this will go on. And then we have the ccNSO Coordination process, as well, related to these specific topics together with this, so that's what we are talking about now. That's what I see currently as processes and needs.

Mathieu Weill:	Thank you, Bart. You managed to do that in less than 25 minutes. Which, considering the number of acronyms, is quite a challenge. I think we are now ready to take the test. Please kill off the screen and--
	So, I have noted two key issues for discussion. One is the NomCom proposal. I think I used an acronym here; and the other one is the question whether a working group from the ccNSO would be following the IANA Oversight Transition and Accountability discussions. Am I correct? Are there any other outstanding issues that you, the participants, think we should address in substance now?
	Jordan?
Jordan Carter:	No. But I do have just a clarifying question, which, I don't know who can answer. For the two Cross Community Working Groups mentioned there for IANA Oversight and Accountability, are these -- Cross Community between the GNSO and the ccNSO? Or are they wider than that?
Bart Boswinkel:	Let me start with the one on accountability. That's what I expect. So there is no proposal on the table yet, so maybe I should strike it, or color it differently, so that's not there, but my anticipation is that will come. If you look at the Cross Community Working Group on the NTIA Oversight, that's a very, very broad Cross Community Working Group. It has

been sent to the Chairs of all the SOs and ACs, so that means that includes SSAC (ph) -- it includes SSAC, it includes ALAC and the four supporting -- or the three supporting organizations, and there is even, say, what I've seen, it's discussed whether it should go outside of ICANN. The caveat being, say, the Drafting Team -- this is just the invitation for the Drafting Team, the Drafting Team, that invitation has been sent to the six, say, SOs and ACs.

Jordan Carter: Can I ask a follow-up question? Who is going to do the hard work focusing on the interest of -- Sorry, my name is Jordan Carter from Internet NZ, I should have said -- I don't know if I said that at the start. Who is going get the hard work of doing the naming, the interest of TLDs in both processes? So, if there's just a -- there's going to be the official Coordination Group, that we are going to get four reps on, for accountability, if there's a very, very wide Cross Community Working Group during the transition stuff, where is the hard work of making sure that TLD discussions are happening? Because there's these four, sort of, customer groups of the IANA functions, that can't happen in that Working Group obviously.

Bart Boswinkel: I think you raise a very good point, which probably should be further discussed by not just this Working Group, but by the full community.

Mathieu Weill: Hold on -- I'm giving the floor over -- I don't see I'm getting the question actually, I'm lost.

Jordon Carter: Let me try again. So if there's going to be this big coordination group for IANA Oversight, right?

Mathieu Weill: Sure, 27 processes (inaudible).

Jordon Carter: Yeah .Yeah. And that's fine, but it's going to bring them all together and coordinate the process. And then let's talk about a Cross Constituency Working Group as well as broad, perhaps, but what I want to know is, it's being discussed as a kind of patchwork or quilt where the number and people work on their bit of the transition plan, the names will do their -- the protocol parameters will do their best, and the job of this Coordinating Committee is going to be to coordinate and integrate these separate proposals.

Mathieu Weill: I didn't understand it like this. To me the Coordinating Committee was coordinating, but I hadn't understood there were some subgroups being set up as the same time. Can anyone--?

Becky Burr: I'm not sure -- Oh, sorry. Go ahead.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Becky Burr: I'm not sure that they are set up at the same time. I think -- we expect, and I think that there has been discussion, but the IETF will go off with their group, and talk about how the protocols get that (inaudible), and the numbers -- the folks will go off and talk about how the numbers get dealt with, and they have a relatively, sort of, discrete package of rules and, you know, constituents and stuff. And so then, Jordan's question I take it is; who does that for names? And I assume that's what the Cross Constituency -- you know, that that's potentially the Cross Constituency Working Group.

Mathieu Weill: Don.

Don Hollander: So, Don Hollander. And two points. So Becky, that's what I assumed the Cross Constituency Working Group was, and Bart clarified that by saying, though, that the Cross Constituency Working Group is across all the ICANN constituencies. I had expected it to be just like the names. And I would like to further focus Jordan's question,

is not so much as to who is looking after names, but maybe that's useful, but who is looking after CCs, in particular, because I am not so worried about the G name space, but I think the CC's name space is quite different, and who is -- and so during Bart's presentation he did not include a ccNSO Working Group on the IANA transition, and I had expected there to be such a beast. Does that help?

Bart Boswinkel: Maybe I should clarify this, and say, if you look, and it's circulated and most of you are on the Council list, you are not unfortunately, but if you look at the -- say the suggestion for the Drafting Team, this Drafting Team, say, one of its first jobs will be to clarify the scope of this Working Group; the objective, et cetera. There are some suggestions, but say this -- there is a -- not even strawman I would call it, there is a set of thoughts circulating, and the set of thoughts go into a certain direction, and there is a clear list, say -- or not -- There is a clear suggested list from Byron and Jonathan on topics that could be addressed by this Drafting Group.

And they are aligned with, say, what you see currently in all of these Cross Community Working Groups. So that's -- so going back to your point around the question on the DNS, et cetera, that could be the outcome. Which -- or around names, so it could be. It could be. Yeah, it's the Drafting Team.

Mathieu Weill: Allan, please?

Allan MacGillivray: Yes. It's Allan MacGillivray for the record. Actually I was just going to add what Bart had really said, because I worked with Byron on that call out. I guess the only other point I would make -- in other words, the scope is not yet defined, this is just a Drafting Team, and that Drafting Team will attempt to develop Charter. So unfortunately nothing is defined. I guess the only point I would make, and actually this is a point that Byron made to the GAC this morning, is the genesis of this was from the registries, with him working with Jonathan, trying to ensure, you know, that there was a mechanism to ensure that the views of the registries are adequately represented in the process.   So while that was the intention as to say where we are now is with a relatively blank slate.

Mathieu Weill: (Inaudible)

Unidentified Participant: Just three words. What a mess. I mean, we don't even know what -- I mean where domain name transition -- or oversight transition work is going to happen. Whether it's in a CC Working Group, whether it's in a ccNSO Working Group, whether it's in the ICANN overall Coordination Committee, and there is not even the scope is clear; amazing, amazing. We are in a -- it's never going to work. That's a personal comment obviously; and especially by September 15.

Mathieu Weill: The actual decision-making vehicle that ICANN is proposing for the IANA transition is the ICANN process, the top line there, there's no doubt about that. The CCWG that remains immediately underneath it, could be more an aspect of liaising, it could be -- you know, liaising for the purposes that Jordan has hinted at regarding names versus internet protocol, versus IP address, and s on, and it could be merely to liaise to say the ccTLDs are feeling this about the transition, and the gTLDs are feeling that, et cetera.

But the real place of action -- the two real places of action going forward is the ICANN process and the ICANN Accountability process for -- you know, and that is where we will be formally represented by the four members of the Group. Now, they won't be empowered to make a decision on behalf of all ccTLDs, they will have to coordinate and work back through the ccNSO and the time on a tradition, we are not empowering them to commit all ccTLDs to having to follow a process.

Becky?

Becky Burr:	So, you know, no use to make assumptions because that is always the way to make mistakes. But I mean it seems to me that, you know, we've got this 27-member committee. ICANN has essentially taken its hands off and said it's up to the Group to figure what its work is. But we know that the numbers people and the protocol parameters people are off having those discussions anyway.
	So, don't we get to decided with the Gs? I would think that there's a perfectly -- a very strong sort of sense of -- that the direct users, and that probably then includes some -- the root servers; should be working together to feed into this process, and I suppose it could be -- you could include, you know, GNSO and other parts of that as well.
	But I guess this -- my question is, why isn't the Cross Constituency Working Group supported by whatever we want to do within the CCs to feed into that, the place that we think about doing that work that feeds up to the Coordinating Committee?
Unidentified Participant:	It could be.
Unidentified Participant:	It could be.
Bart Boswinkel:	That's the point -- it's, this is the whole thing about a Drafting Charter, it's because you are at the start of the process. And say if -- say, there is no one size that fits all, it's you are right at the start of that. Going back to Don's question and your point about, say, the coordination; currently we have Council Coordination Committee; who are on it is, Byron, Becky and Keith. It is very clear, if you look at this, and the workload it brings, they have -- and we had it initially with the Internet Governance Group as well, and shared -- or with this Group, and shared the discussions and progress. It's that this small group is not -- will not be able to deal with all these processes.
	So one of the points to discussion during this meeting, again, that's why I've called it a ccTLD Coordination process, how should be shape it, or should this coordination process look like? Should it be a ccNSO Working Group? Then it's fairly easy. We can -- say, the Council can adopt it and it is one of the potential outcomes, is to ensure the coordination around all these processes, and by its very nature I would say the -- say that it could be a suggestion that by its very nature, all the members of the Coordination Committee, the Cross Community Working Group, and on the Accountability process, are members of it, plus some others, it's always--
Unidentified Participant:	It's an open group.
Bart Boswinkel:	Sorry?
Unidentified Participant:	It's an open group.
Bart Boswinkel:	Plus some others.
Unidentified Participant:	Yes. But make it an open group, by definition--
Bart Boswinkel:	Yeah.
Unidentified Participant:	--and then you can increase engagement.
Bart Boswinkel:	Yeah. Absolutely! So that's why I've called this--
Keith Davidson:	I see some concrete outcome of this meeting, and I'm not going to leave it; anyone supporting this proposal?

Bart Boswinkel:	No.
Becky Burr:	(Inaudible)
Mathieu Weill:	No. The proposal to -- recommended to Council, extends the mandate of this -- whatever group was created in Singapore, I don't remember exactly the name, to make it a liaison -- a coordinating group amongst all these various initiatives between CC -- between ccTLDs.
Bart Boswinkel:	So we -- now we have to be careful. It's if you look at it; say we have a ccNSO Coordination Group on Internet Governance that was led into NETMundial--
Unidentified Participant:	Why not merge it?
Bart Boswinkel:	They could be. I mean--
Unidentified Participant:	Please, let's stop multiplying working groups, treating any and every (inaudible)--
Bart Boswinkel:	The only question is, Mathieu -- the only question is, if you look at it, say, the Internet Governance discussions, although relevant, and that's more a question than anything else, should they be merged with NTIA process?
Unidentified Participant:	What do we want to merge with the NTIA process?
Bart Boswinkel:	That's what you want. It's you want to merge the Internet Governance discussions around the IGF, and say the planning projects that we--
Unidentified Participant:	Well, as far as I'm concerned, it's going to be one -- I know I'm going to work -- I'm going to dedicate work time only on one group. I don't care about the other. So, you do what you want, but as a regular member, I don't have the time to follow X numbers of working groups, and so it's okay to acknowledge that the priority now is IANA transition, and accountability. And maybe the IGF gets a little less time, that's -- I mean, that's life.
Unidentified Participant:	Pardon?
Unidentified Participant:	Within the ccNSO, I'm speaking, right.
Unidentified Participant:	Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.
Unidentified Participant:	It doesn't preclude anyone to getting involved in the IGF, but let's recognize the priorities now.
Mathieu Weill:	I think that's exactly what we are trying to do, and I think that discrete look at the NTIA transition of IANA, the overall accountability mechanisms for ICANN and the general, broader Internet Governance arena, are three discrete areas. So, yes, I think you are right, we don't want people who have expertise and interest in that specific subject, having to deal with more than their share, but I think also going back to Byron's point, you know, Becky, Byron -- sorry, Bart's point. Becky, Byron and myself and Katrina, as the other Vice Chair, are conscious that we need to be, as a group, aware of what's happening in some detail, in all of these areas, so we'll probably the coordinating or the liaison group between the groups.
Unidentified Participant:	And that sounds (inaudible).
Mathieu Weill:	Yeah.

Unidentified Participant: But I think that's just the effect of being the Executive of the ccNSO Council.

Unidentified Participant: From the situation.

Mathieu Weill: Anyway I'd like -- because we only have 10, 15 minutes left, maybe to understand a little better your proposal, Keith, on the Nominating Committee.

Keith Davidson: Well then -- you know, this is not trying to force a conclusion or -- that's just a recommendation of a way forward for the ccNSO to deal with, and I'm a little bit uncertain about the Peter's and Don's question about ccNSO having its own Working Group on the IANA transition. You know, there is a process outlined by ICANN which is seeking to appoint four representatives of the ccTLD Community in some form, to attend to this.

Now, as I said earlier, they will not be able to act unilaterally and commit CCs to an outcome, they all need to be communicating with all ccTLDs, all ccNSO members along the way. So I would have thought that base would have been covered by the appointees to that Group.

So I'd like both Peter and Don to tell me what's missing from that formula that would you require yet another working group. But the suggestion is that those three working groups, the IANA Oversight Transition, the forum there, and the -- however many might be decided to be on the Accountability Working Group, people that are going to have to commit 15 hours a week for the next 15 months, and so if they are a CEO, they probably need to go and consult with their Board, and make sure they have approval.

If they are not the CEO, they probably need to get their CEO's approval to serve, because that is a substantial slice of time. So having clarified that there is a big ask, then there is a big ask in terms of the process of appointing the right group of people to represent our broader community. And so the suggestion is, that we have a Selection Committee, potentially, of three or four people, but Chaired by Byron, who will set about populating those two groups with the right mix of people.

Large and small registry, geographically diverse, ccNSO member, this is non-ccNSO member. So we can -- If there's agreement within our ccNSO Community, that this is an appropriate mechanism rather than just calling for volunteers and hoping that people will do the job, then I think it's worth exploring and using, so that we are making sure we have the right skill sets in the room for the right purposes, for those two, most critical functions.

Mathieu Weill: Jordan?

Jordan Carter: For the record, I think that sounds like a good idea, to have a nomination process like that, and putting them all together. The reason I asked my question actually was because the announcement from ICANN says, the Coordinating Group will be responsible for assembling the components from the respective communities into a single proposal, meeting NTIA's criteria. So it's clear that the overall Coordination Group is designed to coordinate, not to generate the proposal. So the question comes back to, is it going to be generated in that CCWG? And if it is, that CCWG sounds like the same group of people, and the same set of constituencies as the Coordinating Group, altogether. So it looks like it's just doubling up.

So I think that there does need to be a space where CCs can do the hard thinking and talking without having everyone else in the room. But if it's the Reference Group that Keith has talked about that does that, I don't care where it is, I'm just saying that we need to have a space to do it.

Mathieu Weill:	Just stressing, before handing over to Peter. How is it consistent that a purely Coordination Group, assembling contributions, would request 15 hours time times 27 persons, times 18 months commitment. There's something wrong there.
Unidentified Participant:	Yeah.
Mathieu Weill:	And that's clarity about scopes, and clarity about deliverables, and the added value. Peter?
Peter Van Roste:	Well I think there's hardly anything to add to what Jordan said, and what I -- I wasn't -- I was surprised by it, it's not up to me, as you know very well., to suggest anything to the ccNSO, I'm just observing. So while observing I was surprised --no, I mean, that I think on the last discussion the Chair has made that clear, that I'm an observer. So I was just surprised not to see one. I mean, if I would talk to my members and said, we will just appoint two people, they will go off. They will keep you informed, but there is no space in which you will be able to provide them a structured way -- input for that process, they would be concerned.
Mathieu Weill:	I think in terms of developing the scope and charter for the group who is being represented, that may -- I mean, it's likely that that will include, or I would think you would be insisting that it would include reporting mechanisms back to ICANN meetings along the way, and perhaps intercessional meetings for all ccNSO members. I don't think--
Unidentified Participant:	ccTLDs
Mathieu Weill:	--yeah, ccTLD -- well, all ccTLDs who are interested in the topic, I think this is not a matter of subgroups being able to make a decision, this is a decision that affects each and every one of us, and the involvement for those who are interested in the topic, needs to be that broad. So the groups who are serving on that IANA Oversight Transition have to be reporting back as frequently as possible. And if that's covered in the scoping and charter document, then that shouldn't be a problem, I wouldn't have thought. Yeah. But they are in subgroups, you've got--
Unidentified Participant:	(Inaudible)
Mathieu Weill:	--you're going to have them and us. I think we've got a comment, and then -- Becky?
Becky Burr:	I believe that in our comments we said that the members of whatever these groups were, had to come back to the constituency and for approval of whatever, that's what we recommended, is that wouldn't be a recommendation from the Coordinating Committee that went up to the Board, but that it would come back to the ccNSO and CC members for ratification.
Mathieu Weill:	You had another comment, Peter?
Peter Van Roste:	Yes. Thanks, Becky. I think that clarified my question. Well you then talked about the NomCom and that they will obviously take into account a set of rules on how to point people, once you nominate -- well, once you appoint the NomCom, will they get those rules from the ccNSO Council? Or would they set those rules themselves; which would make them very powerful in this whole discussion?
Mathieu Weill:	I would think under our bylaws that would be required to set -- yeah, set a draft for circulation and comment to the ccNSO membership, but I don't know -- I don't think we would be seeking to empower a group to act unilaterally without some recourse to the community. And it shouldn't be subject to the audit of the broader membership, I would have thought. I mean, was that your question?

Peter Van Roste: It's part of the question, but if you suggest such a process so that they draft around requirements, then back to the ccNSO, get approval before this -- and then appoint candidates before the 2nd of July, that does not make any sense. So I think it might be good if the Council, in the next hour, or over the course of a couple -- the next couple of days, comes up with a list of requirements that can be voted on by Wednesday. And then at least that is done, and the NomCom can basically just check off a list of requirements. Do we have people from four different regions, and there's a gender balance. So it's a list of requirements I think that the Council should make.

Unidentified Participant: If I may, just jump in. Requirements or -- and priorities, it's not going to be possible to find a perfect representation by all criteria, and therefore there's a need for the Council to prioritize between, I don't know, gender balance, geographical balance. ccNSO, non-ccNSO, et cetera, et cetera, and that's -- and then I really support Peter's suggestion that this is something the Council should provide, whatever, the committees. And I also support the idea you've put forward earlier, Keith, that being part of the Nominating Committee, it means you are not part of -- you're never going to be nominated. And it has to be made very clear.

I would also add a personal note that I think for tactical and strategic reasons, I would advise against the Chair of the ccNSO being part of any of these working groups outside of the ccNSO. So that the ccNSO never appears committed to whatever comes out of a group. I think it would be an important recommendation as well.

Keith Davidson: Can I comment on that. Barnes already suggested that he would think to Chair the selection or NomCom Group, and preclude himself from participating in the structural groups as a result of that. And I think that's quite appropriate, so that he can be party of -- or part of the decision-making of who is going to represent in what way, but it precludes his participation exactly for point you outlined. So I think that's covered.

And just to cover the other point, I think items 1, 2 and 3 on our upcoming Council Agenda, are exactly the questions of who, the what, the scope, and so on. So this was just designed to see how some representatives of their community are feeling about these broader issues. So the feedback has been extraordinarily valuable.

Bart Boswinkel: And it's part of, say, the mandate -- or say which part, and that's something to revisit as well, of this Group that came together today, is to say -- it's the Internet Governance Group of the ccNSO, and say, the question is, how to proceed from here knowing all the processes going on, and as you rightfully said, you don't want to be -- you don't want to be, if you want to commit time, you want to be at the time where it really matters.

Mathieu Weill: I have Don, and then Peter.

Unidentified Participant: So, Don, you have minus 12 minutes -- or minus 2 minutes.

Don Hollander: So just the recommendations that come from this Nominating Committee, are they decisions that are taking by the Nominating Committee or are they recommendations that go to the ccNSO Council? And how does that affect possible selections of members who are not in the ccNSO?

Mathieu Weill: What would you like the answer to be, Don?

Bart Boswinkel: Maybe one step back. I think there are two issues at stake. Whoever is going to be the representative from the ccTLD Community on this Coordination Committee is one item. And that's what we are discussing. If you look at the way that's presented by ICANN, as the facilitator of the NTIA process, the ccNSO is appointing -- is being tasked to appoint

the four members of this coordinating committee. And how it structures it, and how it's doing this, that's another matter, that's up to the ccNSO, with the whole community. And it's very clear that's one of the two points you want to address. So going back to your point about who is doing what, I think it's clear in the -- say one point is clear in what ICANN, as a facilitator of the process, already dictated.

Don Hollander: Yes, sir.

Unidentified Participant: So, ICANN said, the ccNSO will make that decision, and the question is, does the ccNSO Council retain the final decision? Or are you empowering the Nominating Committee to make that decision?

Bart Boswinkel: And I think that's a discussion to be had starting at 4:00.

Unidentified Participant: Good idea.

Mathieu Weill: Which do you prefer, Don?

Don Hollander: Yeah?

Mathieu Weill: Just as an input, you are an observer in the meeting at 4:00.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Mathieu Weill: What?

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Mathieu Weill: I'm interested in your opinion as well though, Don.

Don Hollander: So, the short answer is, I'm not sure. Part of me says, I think the ccNSO Council should have that final decision, but if you are -- from an outside perspective, if you want to make sure that all CCs are of -- could be considered for the role, then maybe you empower that Nominating Committee.

Mathieu Weill: I support the second option, as far as I am concerned, personally. I've said so, for ICANN, I think ICANN should demonstrate its ability to engage outside of its community, and empower other organizations to designate participants to these processes, and that would be a good signal. I have no idea whether it's legally feasible or whatever, and I don't really care.

Keith, do you want a last word?

Keith Davidson: I think (inaudible) -- but Peter -- you had Peter on your list.

Mathieu Weill: I had Peter on my list, and I forgot Peter. And I apologize to Peter, but after all, he's just an observer.

Peter Van Roste: So two points. On Keith's question, I think it should be the Council who has the final say, because I think the Council should be setting the criteria, and so they should be checking whether the Nominating Committee followed those. I'm confirming that. And then the second point was actually a suggestion to Bart, on the presentation of all this, I think it's so complex that I would really go to almost graphical, very simple presentation, where we have colorful blocks that are the different groups for which we need people.

Unidentified Participant: That's fairly easy.

Peter Van Roste: Well, my experience with this was that it was not as easy as it could have been, for a group of well-informed people.

Mathieu Weill: Okay. And can I -- Can I have the final word.

Keith Davidson: And Keith's -- just before my -- can I just record our thanks to Mathieu for jumping in -- or making himself available to Chair this session. I think because Byron couldn't come, he asked to Chair it, but I thought I'd rather participate as a participant. So thank you, Mathieu. Thank you for being -- allowing yourself to be thrown in at the deep end, and I thank you for chairing it so well.

Mathieu Weill: Thank you, Keith. And I guess we'll have other discussions on this week. And that will be my final, final words. Have a good meeting for the Council.