

**Prep meeting ccNSO Council
Sunday 11 March 2018**

**ccNSO-GNSO Councils meeting
Monday Lunch time**

Topic	Sub-topic, if any	Presenter	Comment/ issues to be raised
ccNSO and GNSO as Decisional Participants, and EC procedures and processes		Katrina	Explain what ccNSO is doing currently: Current status
	Progress on rejection actions procedures and other items	Stephen Deerhake	Current status, webinar, offer to assist
Proposed FY19 Budget – exchange of views on input provided by ccNSO & GNSO		Giovanni Seppia	Present findings, major concerns
Customer Standing Committee related topics (CSC)		Byron Holland	Update on CSC itself,
	Charter review process – Progress to date, proposed changes to charter, managing upcoming reviews (CSC effectiveness & IFR)	Abdalla/Donna	GNSO and ccNSO have a role to play in accepting the revised charter, ccNSO and GNSO have to initiate the effectiveness review.

	CSC members and liaisons elections, role of ccNSO & GNSO Councils	Byron	Trang will be in the room to allude to it. Call for volunteers to initiated post Panama. ccNSO and GNSO Councils need to approve full slate again in September
WT5: Participation of ccNSO – experiences to date		Annebeth Lange	Progress to date Safeguards on process, for discussion
Specific reviews: current status of reviews and draft Operating Standards and next steps. What is role of ccNSO and GNSO?		Katrina	Submission ccNSO, High-level need for OS before continuing with ATRT and for future. Number of reviews: what to do to change the schedule. ccNSO identified that in the upcoming 5 years it will be involved in 7 reviews, ranging from ccNSO organizational review to SSR 3 (to start in 4 years). Need to find collaborative way to stop the train. (Raise at Public Forum?)
Internet Governance Engagement Group Proposed Charter		Young Eum Lee	Position ccNSO, if any
AOB & Wrap up		Katrina	

ccNSO-Board meeting, ccNSO meeting Room
 Tuesday 13 March –
 11.00-12.00

Topic	Sub-topic, if any	Presenter	Comment/ issues to be raised
Welcome		Katrina	
Board Questions			
	Public comment proceeding seeks community input on the recommendation that SOs and ACs that do not currently employ a due diligence integrity screening process similar to the Nominating Committee adopt the proposed Uniform Board Member Integrity Screening Process	Katrina	Extensive discussion recent Board nomination process. Nominated Board member (Nigel Roberts) agreed voluntary submitted Will be included in updated version about Board Nomination Guideline.
	What are your key goals in 2018? The Board is interested in this question to make sure that its own priorities are aligned	Demi/Katrina/Byron	Reference outcome of the Council workshop

	with the community's priorities.		
	What are your most relevant longer-term goals? The Board is interested in this question because discussions about longer-term goals and strategic planning will commence soon between the community, the Board and ICANN org	Demi/Katrina/Byron	Reference outcome of the workshop
ccNSO Questions/topic			
	Communication between the ICANN Board and the ccNSO regarding Board's decisions [that affect the ccNSO, in particular its workload and priorities]	Katrina, other	Reference Emoji as typical case. Discussion to date focuses on community setting priorities, however at a minimum Board passes the ball from one to other. No process to inform affected community, Passed on without any insight in number of volunteers: pool get thinner and thinner. Also reference that Board expects that other parts of the community act in a similar fashion, Not expect resolution but at least start of discussion, broader issue than just ccNSO
	Impact of the leveling of ICANN's funding on	Giovanni Seppia	

	ICANN's priorities and priority setting mechanism		
	Next steps for adoption of the IDN overall policy	Katrina	<p>ccNSO submitted policy in 2013 for Board discussion and decision. Mutually agreed to further use the Fats Tarack for its original purpose as a experimental basis. With Risk Mitigation Panel in final stage. The original timeline Fast Track has been stretched out.</p> <p>New issues are surfacing. Variance of IDN ccTLDs Riski mitigation panel process etc.</p> <p>Need for overall policy needed not only around the selection of IDN ccTD strings, but also to open ccNSO for IDN ccTLDs : that is dealt with as well in policy.</p> <p>How to proceed? New no process: suggest Mutual agree needs to be reviewed?</p>

ccNSO – GAC meeting

Tuesday 15.15- 16.15 [Ballroom B, level 3]

Topic	Sub-topic, if any	Presenter	Comment/ issues to be raised
Welcome		Katrina	
Progress GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures WG (WT5 – geographic names), and the role of ccNSO and GAC in this process		Annebeth/Katrina	Initially common position What is experience to date from ccNSO side, What is experience form GAC side Concerns from GAC/ GAC members.
GAC Underserved Regions Working Group (USR WG) initiative to prepare FAQ regarding ccTLD delegation and transfer.		Katrina, Stephen	Submission of glossary PDP WG. What are next steps? Need for additional clarification. Use method for other purposes
Role of the agenda setting committee for the joint sessions between ccNSO and GAC		Peter Vergote	Review of format, what to do to make interesting for both communities moving forward.

Update PDP WG retirement		Nigel, Stephen If time permits	
AOB		Katrina	