

---

BUENOS AIRES – Joint Meeting of the ccNSO and the ICANN Board

Tuesday, June 23, 2015 – 09:45 to 10:45

ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

STEVE CROCKER: Good morning. So I'm going to -- I've chosen to sit here so that everybody can see you guys because I'm the sort of the least important, but I'll turn around for a moment.

Welcome, everybody. This is the new -- and we will see if it's the new and improved -- format. The intent was to foster more vigorous and sort of continuous focus on specific topics with a little bit of preparation.

So feedback afterwards on how this experiment is going is very much in order.

So with that, we have, from the board, Rinalia, Asha, Chris, Mike. Is that it? I think that's --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (Off microphone.)

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah, I said Asha. Suzanne was going to sit in, but I think she had a conflict with the RSSAC meeting. And we think that's enough. There are some more seats here but we think that's enough to deal with you guys. I'm sorry.

---

**Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.**

---

With that, I'll turn things over to you, Byron.

MIKE SILBER: Steve, sorry. Can I just add?

STEVE CROCKER: Sure.

MIKE SILBER: We do have other board members in the room so if anybody needs them to stand up and wave, let us know so that you can identify them. Otherwise, they should be easily identified. They're the ones who have been beaten into submission already.

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah, we have plenty of other board --  
  
Other board members are here listening and paying attention. Most of them. Many of them.  
  
Go ahead.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Steve. And we'll all be very interested to see how this experiment works. It's certainly innovative and I'll be curious to get the feedback on it.  
  
So thank you for meeting with us. We have a relatively full and substantive agenda. First will be -- first on the docket is a report and

---

update from the framework of interpretation working group led by Keith. Then some discussion around the CWG and CCWG, specific issues relating to our community, the ccTLD community.

And the final agenda item will be an update from the SOP or the strategic and operational plan working group of the ccNSO, and that will be led by Giovanni.

I also have a colleague, the newly reelected chair of LACTLD, Eduardo, who will be also participating in the discussion regarding the CWG.

So with that, I'm going to turn it over to Keith for an update on the FOI.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Keith Davidson, for the record, and I think as a change from normal, where for the last three years we've been coming along to the board meetings to --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

(Off microphone.)

KEITH DAVIDSON:

-- we've been coming along to the board meetings to report on the progress we've been making on the FOI, and this time I think we're turning it around and asking the board for an update on where things are with the implementation.

---

We sent to the board the final report, and we've heard some feedback, but nothing formally from the board at this stage, so looking forward to hearing about the implementation plan.

And also just to note that Becky, who was the vice chair of the group, and myself are ready and available to assist with any implementation details or clarifications along the way. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER:

Chris, I think its yours.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you. Thanks, Keith. And, yes, it's -- it is a joy to be able to say we don't have to have those twice-monthly telephone calls anymore to put this together.

We have -- the matter is on the board's agenda for Thursday for the board meeting. There is a proposed resolution for us to, you know, accept the report formally as you've said.

My recollection, although I can't actually find it right now, is that we did write to Keith that -- Steve did write to Byron and say we're proceeding formally, but meanwhile we're not stopping, there is stuff happening, and we will be asking you to help form a small group to work with the staff on implementing the thing.

So that should formally follow straight after we hopefully will pass the resolution.

---

I don't want to -- I think it's on the consent agenda for the Thursday meeting, which means that it will pass in and amongst a slew of other board resolutions, so for that reason, I'd like to take the opportunity now to say that as is often the case with the ccNSO, we don't necessarily do a huge amount of stuff within the ICANN arena, but when we do, it tends to be, from the ccTLD point of view, extremely important.

Fast-track IDNs springs to mind as something that we did, and this is another thing. It's taken an extremely long time -- I think six years, probably -- to come to what sounded like a very simple thing, which was to provide color and depth to RFC-1591 and -- including having a look at the GAC principles, and we've done that, slowly but surely and deliberately and with the engagement of ccTLD managers who are inside the tent and outside the tent, and I think we as a community should be very, very proud of ourselves for having achieved that. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: I want to echo Chris' congratulations on what I know is a massive amount of work and then follow it up with three questions.

In compact terms that are easy for people who have not been so tightly involved in this, what are the key improvements or key additions to 1591? What does this actually do?

---

So that's Question 1.

Question 2 is: Where are the holes? What remains to be done?

And Question 3 is: This isn't taking place in isolation. We have this transition process which is -- has the CWG proposal, which is then leading most likely to the creation of a PTI and a CSC and all of the other machinery around that.

What is the interplay, in your minds, between that which is emerging out of that process and what you -- and what is emerging out of the framework of interpretation?

So three questions.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Okay. I think the -- the easiest gap to address is probably the retirement of ccTLDs, which is not referred to in RFC-1591 at all and is a gap in terms of policy altogether.

So -- and there is a requirement for a formal policy development process which is something the framework of interpretation group could not do because it was beyond its scope. It was to only provide color and depth to existing policies rather than creating new policies.

But I think that's relatively straightforward and should be perhaps noted in the transition that there is this gap and a need for a policy to be developed as clearly as possible after that.

---

There is also an issue around the appeals mechanism that's referred to in RFC-1591 which has never been applied to review redelegation decisions that perhaps aren't palatable to some parties, and that is potentially a lot more tricky and will probably take quite -- or an equal amount of time into the future as this process has taken.

I think lessons learned from the FOI process, just incidentally, has been -- you know, part of the reason why it's taken so long is it has been an exercise in developing true consensus amongst the diverse stakeholders within the ccTLDs and across the community, and so some of the lessons we've learned is, you know, having commitment to meeting at different times to suit different time zone around the world, never making a decision on the basis of a single call, allowing everyone to truly commit to the process.

And I think that answers your three questions, Steve?

STEVE CROCKER:

Well, the first question is: What are the improvements that this brings over 1591? That was the first question.

Second was the gaps and I think you dealt with that, although I want to come back to one element there.

And the third part was: What is the interplay between this framework of interpretation which has emerged over this period of time and the kind of new intrusion, if you will, of all of a sudden we're now in a transition stage. How is that going to interplay, if at all? I mean, is

---

there any interaction between the framework of interpretation and the transition?

KEITH DAVIDSON:

I think the ambition is that the framework will provide more predictable outcomes from board decisions and IANA decision-making, in that the color and depth that it provides to 1591 should enable us to retrospectively review the board reports on redelegations and delegations and allow us all to understand the framework that we're working in more clearly, that -- you know, given there's always the cloudiness over how local law will prevail for a local ccTLD, and hopefully not putting IANA in the worst possible position of having to try and ascertain what local law might mean and hopefully see that local community support, including government support, should mean that this is the outcome rather than, you know, odd decisions that might go in various directions on various occasions.

STEVE CROCKER:

The -- a key thing that's emerging out of the transition is the creation of a subordinate organization, PTI. Where would you envision that the framework of interpretation actions would take place? Within the subordinate organization or remain within ICANN?

KEITH DAVIDSON:

Oh, definitely within ICANN and for the IANA staff. It's the et al.

---

STEVE CROCKER: Coming back to the gap, the first gap that you mentioned --  
Now I'm having a senior moment here. Remind me what --

KEITH DAVIDSON: Retirement.

STEVE CROCKER: Oh, retirement. Thank you very much.  
What is the -- what is the current state of retirement? I mean, we've had a couple of circumstances in the past.  
For the benefit of everybody, when the -- when Czechoslovakia split into the Czech Republic and Slovakia, its country code was retired and then somewhat unfortunately reused when Yugoslavia was split into several pieces, and the time difference there was too small. It was a few years and we discovered -- everybody discovered that there was a long tail in the use of these names.  
I don't know exactly what happened, but I know that there was a subsequent discussion and kind of a de facto policy, if not a hard policy, not to reuse names for some long period of time.  
Is that what you're talking about or is there some other element of retirement that we're talking about?

KEITH DAVIDSON: No, that's exactly what I'm talking about.

---

There is a -- ISO themselves have a period of 50 years that they won't redelegate one of their two-letter country codes once it's been retired from the ISO 3166 list, so ICANN applying shorter time periods than 50 years may be inconsistent with ISO rules, but there's no clear policy and the ccTLDs believe that the ccNSO is the vehicle by which such a policy should be developed to apply to ccTLDs.

So in the interim, I think the board's decisions are being made on a somewhat ad hoc basis and it would be nice to have the same consistent approach as the 1591 and framework should provide, and so understanding, you know, how long is appropriate for -- you know, until you would remove a ccTLD from the root would seem to be in everyone's best interests, including existing name holders.

STEVE CROCKER:

Yeah. 50 years is what sticks in my mind as a result of that, you know, sort of lessons learned from the previous experience.

So it would -- I'm just guessing that given the experience and given the interactions with the ISO maintenance agency, that there isn't a whole lot more to do to formalize that. I mean, that the substantive thought process has more or less taken place. And I haven't heard any pushback that said, "No, 50 is the wrong number, 47 is the right number" or -- you know, or 200 or whatever.

KEITH DAVIDSON:

That's why I'm saying I think that's the easy one to tackle.

---

STEVE CROCKER:                    Yeah.

KEITH DAVIDSON:                I don't think there will be too much controversy. It's just a policy development process as an exhaustive consensus decision-making process.

So it may be as quick as a year, if it could be done on a fast track, or two years on a slow track. It's not -- it's not -- I don't think it's an arduous or --

STEVE CROCKER:                    Yeah.

KEITH DAVIDSON:                -- problematic path, but perhaps the appeals mechanism under 1591 would be a somewhat more complex issue.

STEVE CROCKER:                    Much more complex. Thank you very much.

KEITH DAVIDSON:                Could I just add that Becky and I remain quivering with anticipation and --

---

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Not something I'd like to see.

[ Laughter ]

BYRON HOLLAND: I think he's looking forward to Thursday.

[ Laughter ]

Please.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. My name is Rinalia Abdul Rahim. I'm a new board member selected by the at-large.

The name "framework of interpretation" is not something that would make people know exactly what the topic is about, but for those people who are aware and who belong to a particular country, they will immediately be inclined to care about the issue.

The last time I looked at the FOI report was when the -- the public comment was held over the final version, and I helped conduct the at-large consultation on it and helped draft the ALAC statement on it to contribute to the process.

I cannot recall whether there was -- and I'm having a senior moment like Steve. He's shaking his head. On whether or not there was something about handling dispute resolutions involving ccTLDs, and if it's in the FOI, where is that handled? Thank you.

---

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Rinalia, can I ask you to clarify? What do you mean? What sort of dispute are you talking about? Because there are very specific different answers to that question.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you.

I had the experience of being made aware of the .ML case that promoted itself as the Malaysian TLD, and I just wanted to know: If that were the case, where could the parties go to resolve their issues if they cannot handle it bilaterally?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I might take a crack at that, Byron, if you're okay.

BYRON HOLLAND: Please. Please do.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Since Keith hasn't got the guts to do it.

[ Laughter ]

I think it -- it's an extraordinarily -- it sounds like an extraordinarily simple question that has an incredibly complicated answer.

It depends.

---

If it -- the right place to do it is definitely not here. It's a matter of -- "here" as in not here at ICANN. It's a matter for the countries concerned.

ccTLDs are -- both as ccTLD managers and the rep- -- and the code representing a country are intensely concerned to ensure individual sovereignty, and if one ccTLD is stepping on the toes of another one, that is a matter really -- really a matter for them to sort out.

Having said that, I think that it's possible for ICANN's -- it's possible for senior staff at ICANN to attempt to assist by informing the parties who the right people are to talk to in the various different places and possibly facilitating a meeting and a discussion, but that's helping the dispute to be resolved between the parties, not providing dispute resolution, which is a different thing.

So I think we have a role as the stewards of the ccTLD database. We have a role to facilitate where we can, but we have to be extremely careful not to step on the sovereign toes of the relevant ccTLDs.

And Fadi's got his hand up.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you, Chris.

Fadi?

---

FADI CHEHADE: Just to embrace what Chris said wholeheartedly, we can provide our good offices and our facilitation canvas, but we are not adjudicators. It is not our job to do that.

And I would like to add that this FOI from my perspective frankly is a superb piece of work. It is emblematic of the maturity of the CC community.

From my perspective wearing my staff hat, this is going to help us immensely because it makes things very clear and it removes some of the holes we've had in the past. And wearing my hat as a board member, you'll have my full support on Thursday to move forward and adopt this FOI. So thank you very much for this piece of work.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Fadi.

Any other questions or comments related to the FOI? No? Thank you, Keith. Thank you, Becky. Moving onto the next agenda item, issues specific to the ccTLD community with regards to the work of the CCWG and the CWG.

Let me just sort of preface it by saying the ccNSO has been tasked by ICANN to bring the entire ccTLD community into this discussion and also to be part of the various working groups.

And just to make clear the ccNSO is a voluntary member organization where we have approximately 155 country code managers inside the ccNSO tent. But given there are almost 250 or thereabouts ccTLDs, we

---

represent a significant majority but certainly not all ccTLDs. And it was important for us as a broad community to make sure all members of that community could participate. And that's part of what ICANN actually tasked us with. Part of our responsibility as a ccNSO, to make sure there was significant outreach and involvement of any and all ccTLD members -- ccTLD managers who wanted to participate in this process.

So we were certainly very inclusive and have gone to great lengths to inform and educate the full community on this.

And that is where, in a sense, my questions lie for the board. As ICANN has tasked the ccNSO, and by extension the council, in making this decision, where is the board in terms of being comfortable with the level of outreach and engagement that the ccNSO has done? In essence, how much is enough? And when will you know that you've seen it?

Mike.

MIKE SILBER:

Byron, thank you. I think you raise a very important issue because I think the answer is that the board doesn't have a view on this, and I think you're bringing it to the attention of people who seem to think that -- or possibly don't realize that unlike some other entities, the CC community is a voluntary community of which some people have chosen to participate in the ccNSO. Some people attend ICANN meetings but are not members of the ccNSO but are still active

---

participants in the activities and work of the ccNSO. And some people are AWOL. For whatever reasons that may be, they're AWOL.

And I think the answer is really we need some guidance from you as to whether there's been adequate outreach done.

My feeling is that if CC managers are not aware of the process by now, then there's something wrong. And if they're chosen not to participate, then it indicates that they don't really have an interest. But that's my very blunt approach, and I'd really be interested in your view on that one.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Byron, could I just add something to Mike's blunt approach?

BYRON HOLLAND: And I would expect nothing less from Mike than a blunt approach.

So, please, Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I think Mike's right in the sense I have been involved in watching what you have been doing. I think you've made excellent efforts. And it's, basically, a case of you have built it and if they choose not to come, that's a matter for them.

I think we have reached out to them pretty much as far as we can. I don't know what else we can do. You don't have to pass an exam to get into the ccNSO. You don't have to sign a form. You don't have to

---

say you're going to join. You can come to the meeting and participate fully and completely and say, I'm not part of this but I'm just here to help. So that's open to everybody.

We've reached out to all of the ccTLD managers. There's a list that, I believe, everybody we have email addresses for is on. I really don't know what else we can do.

So I would be comfortable, I think, that personally that we've done as much as we can.

BYRON HOLLAND:

So we have -- I'll just take one moment, Steve. We have had four sets of face-to-face meetings over ICANN meetings. We've had multiple Webinars. Obviously the two working groups have communicated extensively. We have extensive social media outbound push. We do have the ccTLD world list, which is every ccTLD manager in the IANA database.

It is a list that is used very sparingly from kind of a global perspective over time so that when people get a message from that list, it's -- it should be known it's a relevant and rarely used vehicle so people pay attention to it.

And we have worked extensively with our regional organization colleagues. Eduardo, our newly re-elected LACTLD chair, is very familiar with what they've done in the LAC region.

---

Maybe, do you want to say a couple words on what's happening outside the ccNSO to help communicate this issue?

EDUARDO SANTOYO:

Thank you, Byron.

And good morning, everyone. Yes, we as a regional organization, not just LACTLD but also the other three regional organizations, have been working a lot in order to contact much more ccTLDs with the notice that the process is going on.

We are sending a specific and individual note inviting them to be aware of this is happening within the ICANN atmosphere. The discussion is going on, and they are invited to participate. We are sure that in most of the cases, if not in all, the message just arrived to the correct people in every ccTLD around our -- the scope of our geographical organizations. In Europe, in CENTR, in Asia, in Africa, in Latin America and the Caribbean.

And we also have many other things trying to get the people more involved. The purpose of all this, we are giving to our staff and to our board members the possibility to discuss internally this and to give to our members some guidance, some information -- more digested information about these.

And we gave also translations for many of the documents in -- for instance, we in LACTLD in Spanish for our members in order to facilitate them in the study of this.

---

It is really difficult, of course, to get them involved. It is really difficult to have all the members talking with only one voice about anything more than this one, more than this one. This is really complex. It is really difficult to understand to many of our registries in the process where IANA is working; so they don't understand what is happening, what is changing. At IANA we continue working. We are doing from our part in order to contribute in the process -- in the discussion process getting more people involved in this.

We also have provide comments to our community through the ccNSO in order to let us know from our -- from the point of view of our organizations how are the proposals going. And we did that.

But, true, Mike, it is really difficult to be sure that everyone's aware that everyone is completely clear in what is happening but the efforts that we have done, not just within the ccNSO but at a regional organization level are really strong. Believe me. Sorry.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks, Eduardo.

Steve, you had your hand up?

STEVE CROCKER:

The number that you said of the participating sounded pretty good to me. I don't remember the precise number, but it was 150ish.

---

BYRON HOLLAND: 155 ccTLD managers are part of the ccNSO.

STEVE CROCKER: And what is the max number? What is the total that are in?

BYRON HOLLAND: Well, in terms of CCs, there are approximately 250 in total. So, of course, recognize that out of 193 countries, 250 is higher because there are also some territories on that list.

STEVE CROCKER: Is there some duplication because of IDNs?

BYRON HOLLAND: Not yet.

STEVE CROCKER: That frames it you are at 155 out of 250 something. So in round numbers, say you are at the 60 plus percent, if one just wanted to take a simple statistic like that.

Come at this from both their perspective and from the ICANN perspective. So from their perspective, what are the -- what's their view? Why aren't they participating? Is it too expensive? Is it not meaningful? Are they getting the services that they need out of the regional activities, et cetera? Has anybody built a model and have any kind of sense of that?

---

And then from the ICANN side, what is it that we're not getting? Or is it necessary? Or is there any missing utility there?

BYRON HOLLAND:

I don't think I could speak for the full range of folks who are not part of the ccNSO. We do welcome them. Every meeting is open. It is certainly not cost, I don't think, because it is voluntary contributions with ICANN.

The barrier to entry is extremely low. Basically put up your hand and say, "I would like to become a member."

So I don't think there are any really significant logistical or practical hurdles. The fact that people don't join are for their own individual reasons. Some potentially because they are run by governments and they are not going to be a member of the ccNSO. There is a range of reasons.

Some are ccTLD managers who have been running their ccTLD from before there was an ICANN and don't want to officially participate for their own reasons associated with that. So there's no one reason.

We also represent about 70% of domains under management. So there's another statistic, ccTLD domains under management that is potentially relevant, at least in terms of its representation of registrants.

---

Probably five to six years ago we were 40 some members, and now we are 155. So in terms of the overall community, there is very significant uptake and adoption of being part of this organization.

One final note, we welcome all non-ccNSO ccTLD managers into everything we do. We have many who sit in the ccNSO and participate actively, though elect not to become a member. And even in a CWG and CCWG, while we as the ccNSO were tasked with the responsibilities of participating there, we were also very explicit in making sure non-members participated and you can see that in the likes of our CC co-chair of the CWG is a non-ccNSO member. So one of the most important roles there is a non-ccNSO member. And we as a community are okay with that.

Some of you may be familiar with the name Paul Kane. He is a very active member of the CWG on behalf of the ccNSO dealing in a very wholesome way with the issues around the SLEs.

So, again, we as a community, I would say, are extremely open and inclusive to our members and to anybody who wants to participate from the rest of the ccTLD community.

And I think, Giovanni, you had your hand up and then Fadi and Becky.

MIKE SILBER:

Sorry. Can I interject for a second? Because I think we are going down a rat hole that we don't need to go. I think you asked a question, and you got an answer. And now we're going into an internal detail about

---

membership and non-membership that's not really that relevant for this discussion.

So I don't know if people still feel the need to intervene, but I would ask that we try to keep to the topic at hand.

BYRON HOLLAND:

One thing just to put some also facts on the table in terms of engagement, on the ccNSO Web site, for everybody to see, who chooses to look, we have a catalog of all the outreach efforts which extends to nine pages. I will admit, it's a little bit dry reading. But for those who want to actually see the facts and details, there's nine pages of details on the outreach efforts that you can find on the ccNSO Web site.

Giovanni.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you, Byron. Very shortly, to complement was Eduardo said as CENTR board chairman, I would like also to say that we have done a lot to reach out to our membership during the past two General Assemblies. There were a handful of sessions of the General Assemblies which were dedicated to the discussion regarding the IANA transition and also the accountability.

I believe at some point that we have to acknowledge that the processes are quite complex. And we are looking at ccTLDs that have different structures, A different organizational chart. Some of them,

---

they have staff capable to follow the discussions. Others they are really small ccTLDs.

So when we are saying, yes, we have over 250 including IDN ccTLDs, we have to think a large part of them is made of a maximum five people staff.

So in this case, it's more difficult for them to get into these discussions because they have to dedicate most of their work to be operational towards the community they serve.

So I believe a lot has been done. And I don't see what else could be done. There's one little thing that in the near future I believe should be done, and that was reflected in the comments that the CENTR board submitted, is try to go an extra mile for simplifying certain concepts and make them more accessible and readable to broader communities. So instead of using 3 million acronyms, start from the assumption that not all know all the acronyms and shorts. And, therefore, just start to go the extra mile and make it more accessible because that can be done. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Giovanni.

Fadi and then Becky.

FADI CHEHADE: I would like to go back to the substance of your second bullet, if I could, acknowledging certainly from my perspective, I agree with you,

---

Byron. The efforts you've made are fantastic to reach. I don't think hardly anyone could argue that we have not reached out to them, and that's a very important thing. You've done everything possible. I also want to acknowledge the incredible growth in the membership of the ccNSO, and that's really fantastic.

But back to the substance as Mike was saying, I have two questions that maybe you can give us some assurances or hopefully some good vibes about.

The ccNSO, just like all the chartering organizations, has a very important goal during this week, which is to look at the CWG and push it forward.

As the chair, what is your sense of the ccNSO on the CWG proposal? And are we going to be hopefully sailing forward with the ccNSO?

The second question I have is a bit more subtle. The CCWG work, one of the concerns that are coming are about the change in the power balance of governments within ICANN.

So to the extent any proposal -- and I'm not commenting or ask you to comment on any proposal that's -- we're still very early in that stage, but to the extent any proposal will change the power balance of governments within ICANN, either up or down, what is the view of the ccNSO on that and its impact on the transition? Especially given the closeness of many CCs to their governments?

---

BYRON HOLLAND:

So in terms of the first question, what is my feeling, you know, speaking as the chair of the ccNSO, not to use a cliché but I will, I'm cautiously optimistic. We have two very full days of multiple sessions on this issue, but that's really the culmination of work that started four ICANN meetings ago. So my sense right now is there are some issues still but they are relatively minor, and I think we can see a path to addressing any of the -- what I'm going to call the fine-tuning issues as opposed to the major substantive issues. So while the tale is yet to be told, I feel cautiously optimistic that we'll be able to make a decision by Wednesday at 5:00 when our council meeting happens.

As far as the second -- the second question, honestly at this point I'm really not in a position to answer a question like that because we have not unpacked the essence of your question inside the ccNSO. So I wouldn't feel it appropriate for me to answer that one at this -- at this time.

KUO-WEI WU:

Byron, thank you very much for giving me a chance to continue talking about CWG stuff. And I just like to put in my personal concern about particularly the CWG current proposal we saw last -- yesterday. Later on they say they eventually have a -- you know, an outside of the, you know, the IANA Function Review and also the custom service stuff. And we tried to put all ICANN stakeholder into the list. And a side concern, first of all, is it seems like those IANA Function Review two questions have to be careful. The first question is, what kind of IANA function they want to review? I think although -- although in the CWG

---

yesterday they answer, say they are not going to touch the number, they are not going to touch the IETF stuff, but I really worry one thing from my personal perception is one of the CWG members told me, they say that can be solved. Eventually IANA office will be a three team. One is for IETF, one team's for the number community, one team's for the -- the name concern stuff. As I was the IANA chair for several years, the IANA office didn't run that way, and I don't know if that is a big impact to the IANA office or not. I think we need to really be thinking about how the impact to them.

Second question is, when they're talking about IANA Function Review team, I understand it. They try to put every stakeholder have a one representative in there to make some kind of balance. But when I was the chair of the IANA committee and still shepherd for the IANA, you know, the name redelegation stuff, actually when the IANA office send me the stuff, I usually take no more than three days to let it go, if they follow the process. There's only process check. I really worry about so many of the people there and I don't know how many of them really familiar with the IANA operations. If somebody asks questions they will continue to slow down the process of the IANA operation, and that is not good to particularly the ccNSO or gTLD registry because that means when you change your managing officer, when you change your organize -- institution it take longer. I told you that. It only take no more than two or three days to go through it, you know. And because you put almost a -- every team in the morning 12 people there and many of them actually never see how they work. And that really -- another thing in my perception is not good for the name communities.

---

And it's in time the customer service stuff. I came from the number community APNIC. Actually we have very limited dialogue with IANA. It seems like for me, look like the PTI design those teams, anything the IETF have, we want it. Anything the number community have, we want it. And that would degenerate the PTI operation and very complex. And I think it's not good for name communities because you know, if you look at the IETF proposal and also you look at the IR proposal, it's very simple. And one thing is valid in there, that is what I really worry, to be honest. Because the IETF and IR proposal is always bear one thing. If this IANA operation getting very political, very sophisticated, very difficult, then it might be walk away. There will be dangerous to the whole ICANN community. Also dangerous to all of us.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you, Kuo-Wei. In trying to unpack everything you said, there's a lot of content in your comments. So maybe I'll -- before we move to the next agenda item I'll try to make two quick comments. One is on the notion of IANA being split into separate functional groups. I mean, it would be difficult for us to really comment on that. Certainly that would be an IANA internal management decision set of functions. And perhaps there's an opportunity to make reference to that in the implementation phase or the next phase, vis-a-vis the phase that we're in right now. But I take your point and your concern.

The other one on the IRT, you know, certainly the understanding is there would be one period where it would be a two-year period before

---

the IRT took a review but then it would be five-year rolling increments. So yes, I'm sure IANA staff would be impacted by that on a five-year rolling basis. Certainly within the CWG I think the idea is that that would be a regular checkpoint but not an extremely heavyweight one. But your points are relevant. And the CWG should take that into account.

With that, Giovanni has an update from the SOP, and at last joint meeting here, the agenda prevented him from providing that update. So Giovanni, you have 10 to 15 minutes.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you, Byron. I'll try to be very short. We have, as a system, so strategic and operating planning working group. We have submitted our comments at the end of April and we have read with interest the feedback provided by Xavier's team to the comments received in the public comment period. And the feedback was published at the beginning of June. We have acknowledged in our comments the very positive developments in the way the operating plan, as well as we did for the strategy plan, has been presented to the community. It is now much more consistency against the previous plans. And so we can acknowledge that there is a good flow of information that is going between ICANN and the community.

If there is one point I'd like to highlight, it is that with this all IANA transition and accountability discussions, it might be -- go a bit unseen the fact that there's been a great progress in this area by ICANN. And during the ICANN CEO's presentation we should really

---

complement ICANN for being ready to show the community a dashboard of KPIs that allow the community to check where ICANN stands with the different actions and objectives and would allow also ICANN to better monitor the work that is done internally and how that can be further refined.

That said in our comments, and we have done that for many years and we never get tired to underline that we pointed out that we would like to see more metrics and more KPIs included and associated to the different actions. We have been having about this topic a couple of interesting meetings, one phone call and one face-to-face meeting with ICANN staff as well as the meeting of the ccNSO SOP last Sunday where we have been assured again that ICANN is working on that. And will make it happen in the near future.

At the top of that we also have recommended ICANN to be a bit more prudent when it comes to income and expense projection. As we have seen, there were some increases in certain level of expenses, as well as there were some estimates regarding some income that the ccNSO SOP working group again highlighted, been quite optimistic. So we have -- we have asked ICANN staff again to be a bit more cautious when making these estimates.

Last point, and this is the point I'd like to really ask the Board to help Xavier and his team is to help them to pass on to the ICANN senior management a culture of performance assessment which is really important. We have seen again great progress against if we compare it to five years ago, it's like looking at another organization, and that's

---

been -- but I think again, as I said before, for the simplification of the IANA transition and accountability processes, we may go an extra mile and make this culture of performance assessment a bit more stable and regular in the ICANN senior management. Which doesn't mean there is not that culture, but again, to make this culture stronger.

So -- and the last point is that we have invited Xavier and his team to make sure that in the next iteration of the review of the strategy plan 2016 and also in the fiscal year '17 operating plan and budget there is a special attention to the different scenarios that may be happening regarding the IANA transition and the accountability mechanism that might be in place after this transition and those changes are implemented.

So that is the summary of what we have been discussed. And again, I'd like to underline once more the extremely constructive and valuable exchange of views that we have been having with ICANN staff. And again, against if I look back five years, it's really -- and I've been in this working group for many years. It's really a different approach, a different mindset, so chapeau to ICANN staff for this. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you, Giovanni. Mike.

MIKE SILBER:

Giovanni, thank you firstly for the kind words, and having been somewhat involved in these processes, I'm very pleased to hear that.

---

What I can also indicate is that the ICANN finance staff actually look forward very much to the contributions of the ccNSO and throughout the team because they find it an invaluable mechanism, and there seem to also be a number of other members of the community kind of follow your lead and sneak in behind you in terms of the comments and the work that's put in. So really, it's greatly appreciated, the wonderful work that Roelof did. You've now taken the bat on and carried on running with it, and it really is greatly appreciated.

In terms of focusing on performance and key performance indicators, that's something that Fadi has been taking very seriously. It's something that we've been looking at significantly from the Board perspective. Because it is something that's concerning us, is that our planning -- planning and budgeting processes are only as good as we then execute against them. So Fadi mentioned it in his opening speech, but it's something that we've been looking at across various of the Board committees as well as the Board as a whole in terms of actually in setting the KPIs for the organization, getting some good reporting on that so that the community can see what's going on, and then getting feedback on that as well. Because it allows us to then populate into the ongoing planning cycle, operational excellence, the appropriate standards against which we measure ourselves in various instances. So I think the comment is well-taken. And what I would just really appreciate is that the ccNSO don't stop pushing on these issues because I think this working group and the input that they've provided has really helped us on the Board as well as the staff moving forward on some of these issues.

---

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you, Mike. Any other comments or questions on that? Any other business? Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: I'll just take a moment to say thank you for two things. Thank you for this session, and I'll ask for -- as I said at the beginning -- feedback on the format on how well this experiment works. But I also like to say thank you frequently to the mere existence of the CCs. You guys are sort of the honest outside independent measures and source of great diversity and -- and ingenuity, provide a much richer source of ideas than if we were sort of a single culture inside of ICANN. So I -- I've always thought that this was a healthy thing rather than kind of a nuisance that we had to deal with.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you for those kind words, Steve. Fadi, last word?

FADI CHEHADE: I want to second my chairman by saying that your independence is our asset. And we value it. And I urge you to use it in this important transition that we're facing. Your views, your independent views, are going to be, in my opinion, what will form the wise middle ground approach so we can move forward. The balance that you have helped us maintain in this organization and in the power structure of ICANN is very critical. And I urge you to be very active. And my question about

---

the government role in ICANN is a direct one and is one that applies to all other parts of ICANN. So thank you for being very engaged, thank you for helping us make sure we get through this safely. This is the time. We don't have a lot of time between now and Dublin. So I thank you for your contribution and your independence, and I beg you to be as active as you've always been to guide us through a wise middle ground that does not -- that does not upset the delicate balance we've built to date.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you, Fadi, and the rest of the Board members.

[ Applause ]

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**