

Special Council Call - 23 December 2015 @12:00 UTC

Agenda:

- 1 Welcome & roll call
2. Taking stock - Where are we?
3. Next steps

Notes

Welcome & roll call

Apologies:

Peter Vergrote

Young-eum Lee

Hiro Hotta

Not attending:

Souleymane, Vika, Ching Chiao, Celia

Meeting is quorate.

Fluid nature of CCWG

In contrast to where we anticipated when we agreed to have special meeting

Basic Agenda

Agreed by all present

In November meeting agreed to have today's meeting

Goal at the time to be in position to make a decision

Watching process, it is a fluid situation. Purpose now is to have a feeling from Council on direction of travel.

Agreed Basic methodology

Understand if there is general consensus

Requisite number of members of CCWG need to support proposal Unanimity is not required. Their job to engage in process (together with participants)

Further general support for essence of proposal from community and thirdly conditionality of CWG -Stewardship needs to be met.

Invitation to Councilors need to speak up

Taking stock

Timeline: Submission by end January

Recent events put timeline under question.

- Number of comments received, including from ROs and individual ccTLDs
- US Politics: DOTCOM has not come to floor and likely will not, not part of the US Omnibus. Maybe some positive elements not make as well. -
> Becky: Process is less clear, some level or order we do not have now. If result is well structured and well supported, could shorten 30 legislative day process. If a ll went relatively well, may not need 30 legislative days.
- Board comment is extensive: one side relative supportive, on other side critical. Without addressing those potential of slippage

GAC position appears to be on its way

ccNSO appointed CCWG member are not unanimous. Concerns on process

CWG Stewardship Comment

Requirement is that a minimum more clarity is needed.

Summarize as being positive and headed in direction of support, but need for additional clarity if not change

Next Steps

Nigel: Brief sense. Will there a resolution?

Response: Not in position to pass a resolution, but need provide an opinion

Nigel: agree not in a position to take a resolution

We could provide feed-back to CCWG, wants to provide input, could do over the list?

Response: What are we going to do still not clear, but basic suggestion is to make a meaningful and constructive contribution

Other communities have had varying opinions. Looking at the ccTLD contributions, generally positive but at a minimum need for additional clarification and number of issues, that need to be addressed. For overview see email Mathieu as forwarded.

Question: What is Council going to do over evolved landscape

Stephen: No reason to go forward other than

with thank you , premature to take other position, before last hurdles have been taken.

Lesley: Inclined to be more supportive then Stephen

Include need for clarity. Minded to be supportive, subject to clarification

Keith: I don't really think we need to -

would be nice to get greater clarity to see if we can achieve unanimity...

Becky: In agreement as described by Lesley and Byron

Proposed direction statement

- **Appreciate work**
- **Reminding CCWG that from cTLD perspective**
 - **Conditionality of work around the CWG-Stewardship must be met**
 - **Note fact that ccTLD and ROs in general supportive but flag they have noted issues. At a minimum provide more clarity.**

Any comments on messaging?

Peter Van Roste supportive of line of reasoning as well as Abibu and others

Drafting process

- **Include messages in draft (Byron and Bart)**
- **To be circulated over the list right after X-Mas:
Ensure that it is on the list so Councillors could chime in**

- **Send to CCWG just before new-year**

General agreement over procedure. All expect brief text over next few days

Revisit topic on regular scheduled meeting 21 January 2016

AOB

No further questions