

ISTACC - 14 January 2016 @20:00 UTC

Agenda

- Welcome and Roll call
- Update CWG –Stewardship
- Update CCWG – Accountability
- Update Council decision-making
- Marrakesh sessions (CWG, CCWG, and ccNSO)
- AOB

Notes

• **Welcome and Roll call**

All others attendants listed in AC room

Welcome Byron. Focus of the call is the

exchange of information. Share status of respective groups.

Potential issue how to factor in the progress of CCWG in Transition process.

• **Update CWG –Stewardship**

Lise Fuhr:

CWG is now more into Implementation phase

Primary focus of recent discussions is on IANA IPR. Discussions is on principles.

It appears that IETF Trust can accommodate requirements of CWG Stewardship and other Operational Communities. However progress needs to be confirmed in second reading.

As to CGW/CCWG coordination: The CWG should and will follow progress CCWG more closely on and on a rolling forward basis to avoid issue of losing opportunity to warn CCWG of potential concerns from CWG end. As to issues identified with respect to 3rd Proposal:

- IANA Budget: CCWG appears to have resolved issue noticed by CWG
- Sidley will draft Bylaws for PTI; Bylaws drafter has a lot of questions. CWG-Stewardship notes it is a difficult legal text. Suggestion is to put some draft Bylaws language in Annexes.
Need to respond on questions. It is quite complex. Special, dedicated group to look at issues

Open Issues:

- IPR issue, however looks resolved
- CCWG work needs to be monitored
- Legal issues

Martin Boyle:

Bylaws issue: Contacted by Donna Austin, chairing CSC sub-group. She responded on CSC specific questions.

PTI Board: Using ICANN Bylaws specifically for PTI, is explained as request from CWG.

Concern is expressed

that real requirement is to have Bylaw from Accountability side that ICANN should have oversight over whomever performs PTI.

Lise's response: CWG has asked Sidley, that PTI works whomever performs it, to avoid need to change Bylaws.

Byron: Did you have an opportunity to look at statement to CCWG?
Need to clarify issues that are flagged by CWG.

Any concern at this stage?

One issue potential concern: separation issue. Direction of travel at this stage is to consider it an implementation issue,

CWG would provide feed-back to CCWG through email (on-line)

Major concern: To have CCWG Accountability WS 1 ready

- **Update CCWG – Accountability**

Mathieu Weill:

X-mass present: 90 comments

Input from ccNSO is considered as well. Other SO/ACs, in particular ALAC, SSAC, ASO have submitted their comments. The GAC has submitted a consensus preliminary comment. CCWG expects additional comment from the GAC. As to the GNSO: Stakeholder groups and constituencies have provided comment. CCWG is awaiting (and expecting) feed-back from GNSO Council.

Comment assessment.

Board raised 5 major issues, and which are flagged as public interest issues.

Three (3) issues are in good shape.

CWG concerns: are addressed in view of CCWG

Open issue: Mission statement as refined, raise concerns. Note and of particular

interest: Although discussions are gTLD centric, ccTLDs

need to follow, to ensure subsidiarity principle remains paramount. Becky is focusing on this area.

Role of governments (including stress test 18) : awaiting for GNSO consolidated input & GAC consensus comment.

Timeline CCWG is not clear at this point. Two factors:

Need to assess whether there is a significant change needed to 3rd Proposal.

Secondly, assessing and working through comments determines timeline as well

CCWG very aware there is a need to re-confirm expectations on timeline.

Once short term assessment is over, re-asses timeline

No further questions.

- **Update Council decision making**

Update: Council assumes that by Marrakesh it will be having a final report.

At special meeting on 23 December 2015, the ccNSO Council reviewed the state of play at the time and agreed on short statement, with a positive tone, but also raising concerns. This agreement was not a uniform consensus position, a small minority of Council members raised issues around work of CCWG and process.

Some observations:

The issues that are being discussed in the CCWG are not germane to the ccTLD community. A general feeling is that it is relevant to keep distance to ICANN. The challenge of ccTLD Community then is how broad do we want to make comments. how broad do we want to make comments or to what extent do we want to be limited. To date a rather fundamentalist view was taken. Only focus on ccTLD related issues.

As said the Council statement is positive, but not unanimous.

ccNSO Council went to considerable length to make clear consensus is not unanimity

Expectation: Rigorous discussion at Council level.

Mathieu: Need for independence shared by RIR community.

ASO has a very similar position. Very reluctant to look into and get too involved in ICANN and its accountability.

Suggestion is to interact with ASO/NRO to see how they get involved.

Response: will definitely look into how ASO has interacted.

- **Marrakesh sessions (CWG, CCWG, and ccNSO)**

ccNSO Sessions.

Tentative: Tuesday discussion on latest CCWG Accountability (90 minutes), question. III be used to inform and discuss with community present the latest state of play.

Assuming the Final Report will be ready by then, also used to inform the Council.

Wednesday afternoon additional sessions : Implementation focused

- CSC, RZERC, SLEs, etc. next steps.

The ccNSO Council is scheduled for 17.00 to allow for as much discussion as possible.

- **AOB**

No other business

Next call

Doodle poll by secretariat. To be most useful: before 18 February (next Council meeting)