

**ccTLD Webinar on the CCWG-
Accountability Third Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations
9 December 2015, first webinar**

This call is being recorded

Attendance:

9 ccTLDs (12 persons, including members of the CCWG)

Agenda:

1. Welcome
2. Review of main proposals
3. Q&A

Notes from Webinar:

1. Welcome webinar

- Introduce recommendations, twelve in total
- Seek decision/support from chartering organisations
- Inform your input

Questions in chat or wait for Q& A at the end of call

Also on the call Becky and Jordan,

New faces on the call, very welcome

2. Review of main Proposals

Slide 1: overview

Slide 2: Background

- 12 proposals part of WS 1

Slide 3: Draft Proposal WS 1

- Core proposals in main text of proposal. In Annexes, detailed description of recommendations

Slide 4: Building Blocks

- Principles
- Independent Appeal & review Mechanisms (Judiciary part)
- ICANN Board of Directors: remains core also in view of the CCWG
- Empowered ICANN Community, strictly enumerated.

Slide 5: Seven (7) new community powers

Enumerated

Slide 6: Framework/Structure of Community Powers

Each power follow more or less same path. Path is better visible in report. Steps to be viewed as escalation path
Use of powers only AFTER community dialogue

Slide 7: Thresholds for escalation

- Community powers only to be used after reaching high threshold and support various SO/ACs
- Every step consensus driven

Slide 8: Enforcing Community Powers

- Need to enforce community concern, in case ICANN Board does want to comply (exceptional circumstance)
- Model now part of Proposal: Sole Designator model.

Slide 9: Removal of SO/AC appointed Board Director

- Example: ccNSO appointed member of Board of Directors. Balance in approach

Slide 10: Rejection ICANN Budget and/or Strategic and Ops Plan.

- No change in approach since Dublin meeting

Slide 11: Enhance Independent Review Process

- IRP will not be empowered to change policies nor community processes.
- ccTLD revocation and delegation is excluded.

Slide 12: CWG Stewardship Dependencies

- In view of CCWG Accountability requirements are met
- Awaiting confirmation by CWG Stewardship

Slide 13: Clarification of ICANN's mission and Core Values

- Goal to avoid mission creep
- No additional role conferred to ICANN vis-a-vis ccTLDs

Slide 14: ICANN commitment with respect to Human Rights

Slide 15: Future SO/AC reviews

- Future reviews include accountability reviews

Slide 16: Stress test 18

- CCWG has reached solution. See language in Proposal
- No change in short term. Guarantees that GAC Advice will remain to be based on consensus.

Slide 17: Timeline

- Chartering Org.
- Asked ccNSO able to endorse proposal.
- If no agreement on one or more of the recommendations, second draft

Slide 18: Workstream 2

- Workstream 2 topics as recommendation in 3rd Proposal
- Intension to complete WS 2 by end of 2016

3. Q&A

Paul Szyndler: any thought / discussion as to what might happen should an SO or AC be assessed as no longer being representative of / accountable to its community?

Response: It has been a stress test. it will be further developed in WS 2

Paul Szyndler: GAC powers are obviously a sensitive issue that are still unresolved (especially within GAC). Any update on latest deliberations in this area?

Response: Still under discussion by GAC. This part of solution also scrutinized by other parts of the community.

Pierre Bonis: Does it mean that the CCWG recommendation sent to the ICG for review before submission to the NTIA will include modalities and description on how ICANN will conduct ACs and SOs review?

Response: No change of way organised, but change of scope

Paul Szyndler: Where go from here?

Response: Special Council meeting 23 December 2015

**ccTLD Webinar on the CCWG-
Accountability Third Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations
9 December 2015, second webinar**

This call is being recorded

Attendance: 8 ccTLDs, 1 RO, 11 persons.

Agenda:

1. Welcome
2. Review of main proposals
3. Q&A

Notes from Webinar:

1. Welcome

Goal of webinar is to provide:

- Overview of 12 proposals
- Inform you to provide input to the CCWG and to Council

CCWG is moving closer to conclusion.

If you have question, raise your hand or enter to chat.

2. Review of main proposals

Slide 1: Overview and context CCWG with respect to Transition effort

Slide 2: Background

- WS 1: mechanism that need to be in place for the IANA Stewardship Transition
- 3rd Proposal only focused on WS 1

Slide 3: 3rd Proposal WS 1 Recommendation

- Core 57 page, background and documentation in Annexes

Slide 4: Four Building Blocks

- Principles
- Independent Appeal Mechanisms
- ICANN Board: remains core
- Empowered Community: most effort of CCWG. Recourse of Board of Directors decisions

Slide 5: 7 powers Empowered community

- strictly enumerated, does not extent to day-to-day operations, nor PDP.

Slide 6: Empowering the community

- Standardised way of operations for empowerment (see diagram)
- Escalation path, with defined thresholds, for example two or more SOs , need for community dialogue in community forum
- Only last resort: enforcement phase

Slide 7: Required Levels of support to go through Escalation Ladder per Community power

- Underlying requirement: high level of thresholds, no one SO/AC should be able to block or take decision

Slide 8: Enforcement model

- Extensive discussion around the different models:
Dublin outcome ccNSO discussion was Sole Designator model. This is now included in proposal.

Slide 9: Removal ccNSO Appointed Board member.

- Model discussed in Dublin now included. Need to strike balance between SO which appointed Board member versus notion that Board member serves full community

Slide 10: Veto ICANN Budget, Ops and Strat Plan

- Specific processes for:
 - PTI Budget and annual budget (distinction between caretaker budget and general annual budget)
- Giovanni Seppia as chair ccNSO SOPWG also in loop in discussions
-

Slide 11: Independent Review Process

- 7 members standing panel
- Limitation of scope: policy not subject, Revocation and delegation are excluded per instruction ccNSO

Slide 12: CWG Stewardship conditions

- According to CCWG conditions are met
- CWG stewardship currently assessing whether condition are met. CWG assessment expected by the end of the comment period

Slide 13: Clarification ICANN Mission and Core Values

- Avoid mission Creep.
- Mission update does NOT provide additional powers to ICANN over ccTLDs

Slide 14: Human Rights and ICANN

Slide 15: Enhancement review suggested

- As part of WS 1 recommendation, broaden scope by including accountability review.
- Accountability of ccNSO vis-vis its community (members and non-members ccNSO).

Slide 16: Stress test 18

- Avoid need for GAC to amend its operating procedures vis-a-vis need to avoid that one GAC member could block decision (and so effectively capturing the GAC).
- For compromise: see text 3rd Proposal
- In terms of ccNSO Dublin requirements: requirements have been met

Slide 17: Timeline

- Public comment period, not just from public but also from chartering organisations.
- If no support need for supplemental set of recommendations

Slide 18: WS 2

- Kick off anticipated in Marrakesh (around ICANN meeting in Marrakesh)
- WS 2 suggested topics included in report (see slide for more details as well)

3. Q&A

David McAuley: When do we expect Bylaw language?

Response: This is implementation question. However part is already underway (for parts that have been endorsed already). Need to meet the pressure of overall timeline of Stewardship Transition

David

McAuley: Have you heard from the board as to when they may submit their comments on 3d draft?

Response: Understanding of CCWG chairs is that Board is working on a response, and submission is anticipated next week.

Carolina

Aguirre: How is the support from chartering organizations such as the ccNSO going to be considered? ccNSO Council? The ccNSO membership?

Response: Understanding is that it will be decision by ccNSO Council that will follow similar process as CWG stewardship. So advise if comments are submitted, submit comments, if any, to both Council and CCWG

Mary Uduma: Concerned about short time line for escalation path

Response: Balancing need for consultations versus efficiency and effectiveness of the process

Mary Uduma: What happens if path is not met?

Response: After each step there will be an assessment of level of support. In implementation of proposals timelines may need to be refined. Proposal is not a final product

Closure

ccNSO appointed members of CCWG will provide their assessment to community