PANAMA – ccNSO: Strategic Outlook Trends Identification Session
Monday, June 25, 2018 – 10:30 to 12:00 EST
ICANN62 | Panama City, Panama

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I can't say it's easy for me to read everything that's on the screen. Oh, thank you very much. Okay. So, I think we can start our meeting. You all received a draft agenda for our meeting on Wednesday. I hope you had time to look through it. We have a part of our agenda that is marked as consent agenda. Hopefully, there will be no questions, no discussions, around that one. It seems pretty straightforward. If there are any questions, then surely we can address them all.

Again, on Wednesday, we have the meeting. Let's quickly go through the agenda. First, it's action items. You can see all those that are completed, those that are still in process. We had two inter-meeting decisions. One was we had to adjust our timeline for the call for volunteers to serve on the Customer Standing Committee as our second member. We also pointed a rejection action petition review committee. So, thank you very much to those who volunteered.

Then, again, we have another item. We appointed [inaudible] as a vice chair of the TLD Ops Committee. I hope there are no objections to that.

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.

We will adopt the [inaudible] manager report on special elections in the European region. As you all may be aware, we have one candidate, which means that we have …. Luckily, we don't need to run elections, which means that, again, we can just approve the result.

We can issue … Well, we have to appoint a volunteer to represent ccNSO on the NomCom. Represent ccNSO is not the right term here, but our appointee to the NomCom. We have to do it by August because they have to start the new selection process. Pablo is our appointee and he currently is not limited, so he can be reelected. So, the first step is to issue a calendar for volunteers.

We will have update on PDP [CSC RZERC] is going to happen during ccNSO Members Meeting Day, as well as other updates from our working groups and we will receive written updates from liaisons.

Speaking about the travel support guideline, I'll remind you of the story. The GRC came up with an updated version of travel funding guidelines. The guideline was sent to the council for comments. Nigel provided his own version of the guideline, and therefore it was sent back to the GRC for review. That's what the GRC has done.

Actually, later today, the [inaudible] committee will review the current version – hopefully, the final version – of the … Now it's called Travel Support Guideline. If it will be adopted by the Guidelines Review Committee, we can send it to the community for their input. Then it will come back to the council for adoption.

Then we have … Yes, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: If council agrees that this is the way forward, then you can strike number 14 from the agenda because that's the same topic, but that's for adoption. So strike number 14 because this is on the consent agenda [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Initial plan was that we might try to adopt the guideline now, but it looks like it's not possible because we haven't submitted it to the community for their feedback. So, apparently we'll have to remove it definitely from regular meeting agenda because we cannot vote on that and we can leave it as a consent agenda that that's the way forward, that that's the way we proceed. So we submit it to the community. Does it sound okay?

Then we have this regular meeting. One of the first agenda items that we have at the moment, it's not clear that we will be able to

move forward with that one. That's adoption of the accountability work stream two recommendations. There's a list of questions around this recommendation.

First, what happens if we decide not to approve, not to adopt any of those recommendations? What if we're not comfortable with any of those recommendations? And if we do approve, what happens if other SOs and ACs do not approve them? And if they do, what happens if the board decides not to go forward with any of those recommendations? Those are questions that I'm not sure that they can be answered now, but this is clearly something that we can start thinking about, not just in case there is anything that goes not according to plan. Nigel?

NIGEL: I can actually answer one of those questions right now. If we approve and somebody else doesn't approve, it's not our problem. Well, actually, it might be my problem [inaudible], but you know what I mean.

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, maybe it's not our problem. But, if we don't approve, it's not our problem either.

NIGEL: Well, if we don't approve, obviously we will have a problem, otherwise we wouldn't have not approved.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. At this point, it's really difficult to say how this is going to evolve. But some of these problems, somebody has to take care of a problem if something goes wrong. Any other thoughts on this? Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, from a more procedural point of view. This topic will be on the or is on the agenda with the GNSO Council, so that's a good time to, first, check it. So, that's before the council meeting itself.

The second point is that say this is a one-hour session at the Members Meeting on Tuesday, so you can sense the temperature of the room and observe it. I think on Wednesday morning, I believe, the ccNSO appointed board members and Becky and Nigel will be there in the room as well, but especially the current board members to sense their … How they look at this as one of the topics. So, you have a reasonably informed choice in front of you. And maybe it's an idea that based on your sense is that you take the decision online after the meeting to combine all the different direction of travel, so there's no need for a decision at

this meeting, but online after the meeting, so over the next two weeks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Thank you, Bart. What do councilors think about this? Again, this is something that we do not need to decide on now. We can still see how it will evolve. But, this is one of the possible scenarios, not to decide, not to vote on recommendations [inaudible] have time to actually learn more about the document and take a well-informed decision. Yeah, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe one of the related issues is as far as I can tell, at least I haven't seen it, the final report has not been submitted yet. There is still room for maneuvering that. Effectively, you have or you put yourself in a position if you put it on the agenda as [full] decision in the sense of you really want to take a decision on a complicated document that you've not received yet.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Well, definitely we won't have enough time to read everything and evaluate the document properly and discuss it. One of the opinions is that we take an online decision. Another thing is, again, we can have a call and have a more lengthy, detailed discussion. Yes, Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: My understanding from chatting with Bernard about it is there's a fair amount of scribing that still needs to be done to produce a document that can be circulated based on the decisions that were made yesterday. So, I don't think we'll even be seeing it at this meeting.

KATRINA SATAKI: So, probably we should remove it from our agenda and just look at it later when we already have the document and have some more well-informed decision. Okay, good. Yes, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Or maybe just call it update, so everybody knows where we are. So, you discuss it the way you discuss it right now for the record, and then based on that discussion, come to a conclusion how to move forward with this one.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Good suggestion. So, we don't call it adoption, but update on work stream two recommendations or something like that. Yeah. Okay. We'll definitely hear from Jordan during Members Meeting. Then based on his input on that report, we can decide on our way forward. Okay. Good.

Next one then is the final report of the CSC Charter Review Team. There is amended CSC charter. Again, I hope that you had time to read the report. It's very good suggestions. I had only one … I probably shouldn't call it concern in the new charter. It's part describing the mission. It's written about that there should be – oh, what was the wording? Just a moment. Okay, yeah.

So, the wording is that should be [inaudible] to be the IANA naming functions operators. There should be an obligation on successor operators to work with the CSC to ensure satisfactory performance of the IANA naming functions.

Well, I definitely agree with the idea as such, but I'm not sure that the CSC charter is the right document where to write it down because definitely cannot impose any obligations on any other entity but CSC.

We shared this question with the group and I spoke to Martin Boyle who is our representative – one of our representatives – on that CSC Charter Review Team. He promised to look into the wording and either say that everything is fine or propose a little improvement, just friendly amendments to make sure that we're talking about … That we do not ask for anything more than is appropriate to include in the charter. So, we're waiting a little bit about feedback from Martin and the group. Maybe those natives, especially native speakers, lawyers at this table, would say that

this is fine. If you think so, I will withdraw my comment. But at this point it seemed a little bit of a fuzzy thing to include in the charter. Any comments? Yes, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Martin just responded based on your conversation to the review team indicating that he understands the concern and is referring to the text in the report itself in 4.3.11 final paragraph where the CSC say the GNSO and the ccNSO Council may require the CSC to develop a new [RAP] with the successor operator.

So, it's more … And it's linked to the special IANA functions review because that was the condition for a change of operator, IANA function operator. So, there is some movement there to be continued.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, thank you. So, we have decided to remove item number 14 from the agenda. Then there is another item, continuation of the ccNSO onboarding mentor-mentee program. This was included upon the request received from Alejandra. Alejandra, would you like to say something? Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, thank you, Katrina. The onboarding program from ICANN started roughly two years ago, three, two-and-a-half, and because of ICANN budget cuts, the program was closed. The idea of this program was to have mentorship program and introduce people to the specific community, the way the community feels it's best to have people onboard, in our case, in the ccNSO and the aim was not only just to present what we do and how we do it and the topics being discussed or the work done in the working groups, but to ensure the continuity of the work and try to make this person or people, group of people, involved and work for the community. So, it was more like a volunteer hunt, in a way.

Since the program will now not be funded, I was thinking if we could, in a way, manage it ourselves and continue this mentorship program and since we need more volunteers to do the work in ccNSO.

One way is to keep the format that it's already established, that it's one mentor, one mentee and take maybe a couple of slots of the traveling fund for this. If needed, maybe the mentor is not needed to be funded, for example, or we'll see and try to use that way to get more people doing the work of the ccNSO. I don't know. What do you think? Is it good? Is it bad?

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Alejandra. Yes, Margarita?

MARGARITA VALDES: Just because normally we are established our agenda and participating in the ICANN meetings, probably we do not need so much funding or perhaps the program could be continued with voluntary people and do this labor of mentor-mentorship. I agree that … I could participate also. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Any other comments, suggestions? Peter?

PETER VERGOTE: Could we get an indication of the amount, the budget amount, that we're talking about that has been cut?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I really don't know the numbers. I know that the budget included travel funding for two people per ICANN meeting and that means the flight, the hotel, and per diem. But I don't know the numbers. So, that's two person referred to a mentor or to a mentee. So, who could apply for that?

In the case of the onboarding program, both of them, thinking that the mentor might be from an organization that will not fund them to come to the ICANN meeting. So, it could be that way or

EN

only one of them would have their funding and the other will not be taken.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think probably lack of participation on this program because not many people know in the ccNSO. Not many people know this program, so probably that's a reason lack of participation for this program.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The reason for that, it was fairly new and now it's over. But, we do have our representatives in this program. I introduced every ICANN meeting since it started, so when we do the welcoming and tell what's going on in the agenda and ask the audience who is a newcomer, at [inaudible] say, "Here we are." So, we ask our onboarding representatives to stand up also so they can reach out to them. And that's another benefit. If for some reason they are new to a ccNSO meeting, we can refer them to make a proper introduction to whatever it being discussed. So, it's another hope that we have for the newcomers that normally are lost in our meetings for the first time.

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, I have to say that, as Alejandra tried to explain, this was a new program. Actually, within the ccNSO, we never formalized

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

the way we select mentors and mentees. They kind of emerged themselves and at the last moment, we could no run any formal calls for volunteers to participate, so we had to operate in a very tight timeframe. That's why we always selected those mentors who already had experience in mentoring and mentees who really showed some interest and wanted to participate.

It was a really … We always dealt with that in an ad hoc manner. Not the best way to do things, but taking into account that requirements were really very high and the amount of time that both mentors and mentees had to contribute to the work of this program were really very demanding because they had to do several [inaudible] sessions before. They talked via Skype, then they exchanged information, then they did mentoring during the entire meeting, then they had follow-up sessions. Requirements were really very tough and not many people were ready and willing to contribute their time as mentors, and I think it wasn't so easy to find mentees other. Margarita?

MARGARITA VALDES: I have a question. This program is for us to implement it only in the ccNSO or in other constituencies?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: It was an overall ICANN program and each of the, I would say, not necessarily communities but groups, because in the GNSO there are several subgroups, had their representation in this program. So, all of ICANN was represented there. Maybe not SSAC, for example, but GAC, several groups within the GNSO, ccNSO, and that's about it.

MARGARITA VALDES: And all of them made exactly the same structure in terms of the preparatory calls or something like that?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Not necessarily, because each group had their own approach, as in how do you think it's best for your community to onboard newcomers? What we agreed is on the preparation of materials, because that's how it started. How can we make it easier for someone new to come to the community? So, that's how the quick guide of the ccNSO was born. That's what we did, but maybe other people did a better website or something like that. And that's how the ICANNLearn course also started for the ccNSO. We keep revising and seeing other ways of building those materials. But, that was within the group that was in the ccNSO, that's how it was decided. But the GAC does different things. That's how it is. Yeah.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Any other comments? Any other suggestions? Ideas?

MARGARITA VALDES: In the future, if you ever need some help, I could volunteer myself to be a mentor.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Apparently, this program has been over. Yeah. This is something that we need to think about and probably one of the things that we can discuss during the decision of volunteering, getting more volunteers.

MARGARITA VALDES: Yeah. Because I'm thinking … Actually, I know from AP region there are really some underdeveloped countries I think probably really need that kind of help. So, if in the future we restart.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, thank you. Then we have updates from council, any other business, and information about next meetings. I think it's more or less we have on the first agenda item. Second, yesterday we had a meeting with other SO/AC chairs. Byron and myself were at the meeting. Well, we didn't manage to do everything that was on our agenda, but we did discuss several things. For

example, what's hot for each of the groups, what we are focusing on. Then, we started talking about how to, let's say, save some more ICANN money on meetings because apparently meetings cost like more than $12 million annually. That's a pretty huge amount. The team that arranges or works on the meetings, implementing meeting strategy, new meeting strategy means having A, B, and C meetings did not show any cost savings – surprise, surprise.

But, now they started – well, they tried another approach. Tried to find and come to the same place several times with some years in between and, let's say, these new developments and we were asked not to share information about potential venues because that might compromise the ability to get better rates, better deals, if that information goes out publicly.

But, the new approach, new strategy, let's say, to select meeting venues, it shows significant cost savings. But, from $12 down to $10 million annually. First of all, it's not bad, either. Of course, there were some concerns raised about this new approach, speaking about regional presentation. Are these meetings covering all the regions? And if we have, for example, all A meetings in the same region or more or less in the same region, is that a good approach? Probably it's something that needs to be taken into account. So, that's about savings from that perspective.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

Then, we also talked about GDPR. Actually, yes. I thought it was something very exciting. Yeah, it was GDPR. Actually, yes. GDPR was something. I don't know. I have mixed feelings about ICANN's approach to GDPR. It's not just that. It was they're trying to figure out whether it's legally okay to have this access, to give access, the universal approach to giving access to law enforcement around the globe and things like that.

Byron, I'm sure that you remember something from the meeting, not just GDPR. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: I think the second topic on the agenda was around the preempting funding for the next new gTLD round. Preparing implementation.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Thank you, Bart. Byron actually raised a very good point. He asked if ICANN takes into account market data when they plan for the timelines. For example, market clearly shows decrease in interest in registering domain names under new gTLDs and probably ICANN should launch a new round before the interest dies altogether. Byron, you have your own take on this.

BYRON HOLLAND: Sure. My question … Because the issues brought up by ICANN in the context of seeking feedback and my question was really around resource planning and timing. I think the way it got interpreted is given the lack of uptake in new gTLD registrations, at least in terms of predictions and the fact that new registrations and gTLDs have come off about 25% since their height a year ago, my question was just, given that and given all the other things, do you see market conditions impacting timing?

I think they received it like I was challenging the notion of actually doing a second round, so I very much got a kind of, unfortunately, classic Goran answer, which was basically I'm the vessel of the community's policy aspirations and this is all GNSO's policy, so talk to them. That's kind of where it went a little bit.

But, at the end of the day, the answer appeared to be, no, market conditions do not impact timing. It's GNSO policy. We will execute on their policy, period. Even though I think the question was misinterpreted, at least how I was trying to ask it, the answer actually was what I was looking for, the answer being, no, market conditions won't impact timing.

The one thing, if I may, Madam Chair, is I am curious in terms of the venue selection for future ICANN meetings. What they were

ICANN POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

looking at, and I won't go into specific specifics, but what they were suggesting is a change in how they approach selection with budget being, I would say, the preliminary or primary lens through which they view selection of venues, which is a course change in terms of venue selection, at least as far as I'm concerned.

In the next nine meetings – three years, nine meetings – five of nine would be in geographic North America. Now, of course you can slice that up by ICANN's unique interpretation of geography, but the fact is five of nine are in geographic North America. I'm not going to go into the other four because that will give them away too much, but … I can't. It was a Chatham House Rule, so I have to honor that. And I think there are some issues even just with the other four.

But, I wanted to get a sense of … Because I think we said five of nine, you can call it what you want, but geographically they're all in North America. You're going to get in trouble. This is going to be a problem.

I'm not sure we got a lot of response from that. It was basically cost is a primary driver. We will be saving $2 million a year on meetings. That's an important factor given budget constraints right now. It was a little bit of an, "I take your point. Thanks for

your feedback. Moving on." I wanted to take a temperature of the room on the notion of that.

KATRINA SATAKI: Let's be [inaudible]. It wasn't like, "We're not going to take your concerns into account." It was like, "Yeah. Okay. We're going to think about it because, clearly, we did not see it that way." But, taking into account your comments, I really hope that they might look into those issues, especially because some other groups were not very happy, either.

But, yes, they took into account … Well, first of all, of course, they took into account ICANN's budget, which means that ICANN pays for large number of staff for staff travel and accommodation in the area, and for venues and for community funded travelers, which makes it really the largest portion of those meetings. So, when they looked into travel costs and costs for hotels, they took into account their costs, transferring their people and communities. It doesn't mean that costs for other travelers will be lower than those for ICANN.

But, going back to Byron's questions or he wanted to see temperature in the room. Yes, Stephen?

ICANN 62
POLICY FORUM
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Byron, for that update. Two observations. I'm very curious to know how ICANN's analysis came to the conclusion that North America is a global low-cost region. Second, I think they're really out of their minds to have so many meetings concentrated in the North American region. My third observation is that with the current meeting structure and the current rotation amongst regions, they really need to sort out how to get the various A, B, C meetings popping up in different regions. On that point, I really have an issue with having all these meetings in North America, unless you're just going to devolve into having every meeting in LA to minimize ICANN staff travel cost.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Peter was first.

PETER VERGOTE: Thanks, Katrina. I'm going to say I'm worried with this evolution. I'm getting the sense that there is a lot of creativity going on. Not to go back to the structural rules and models that were chosen for the type of meetings and how many ICANN meetings there should be on an annual basis, but instead of doing that, it's like looking for a creative way within the framework to do some [adjustments], creating potentially dangerous issues, like having such a concentration of meetings in North America.

And for what? For basically a maximum 20% cost reduction. While if you would go back to the fundamentals and ask the question, "Do we really need three ICANN meetings a year?" especially since when this was originally conceived, now we have a GDD event as well that comes on top of it. So, that makes three ICANN meetings a year probably even a bit less relevant.

If you could, for instance, bring it down to two meetings, you have a 33% cost reduction.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Well, thank you, Peter, but first, it's not upon ICANN Org to decide. They cannot decide to remove one meeting and there was a community working group that came up with the new meeting strategy and they decided to retain three meetings. We were the ones who voted on that as well. Yes, please?

PETER VERGOTE: I realize that, Katrina. What I'm saying is maybe it's time to redo the work and reconvene such a community working group and refigure out, based on the new circumstances. I'm not saying that ICANN Org has the opportunity to make such a decision. I said maybe it's time to look into this again.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. I'm just pointing out that this was work that was done by ICANN Org. That was their proposal to reduce costs. They cannot decide not to have three meetings. That's one thing.

Another thing, I think this is our third year of the new meeting strategy. Third year, right? Of course we can go back and have another working group to come up with another strategy, but it might be a little bit probably too often to change. But, okay, I agree this is one of the things that needs to be discussed.

What I want to point out, Byron said North America. It doesn't mean that it's North America in ICANN's terms. Well, in ICANN's terms, North America has only two countries where you can organize a meeting. Okay, Puerto Rico, too. They can organize it in Puerto Rico as well. Yes. So, three countries where they can organize.

For example, Panama is so close to North America region that it can be viewed as North America. It doesn't mean that they … It doesn't mean that all those venues are in these three countries. They are in the region. That's what Byron meant, that they are reasonably easily accessible. First, Alejandra then Young-Eum.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you for the clarification because my point was that if it is a trend that now people are not comfortable being everything US-centric, then that does not help having all the meetings in the North American region or close.

The other concern, a huge concern, is the visa issues. It's very difficult for most of the world, I would say – well, not everyone. So, it will be very difficult for people to be able to attend, even though if it's close. For me, for example, it's close and I do have a visa, but it's not the case for everyone. It will make things more different for participation.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. I think Byron wants to clarify.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah. Hopefully, I was clear and I tried to make the point. Geographic North America, not ICANN North America. Geographic North America, five of nine.

I think the other important thing is the shift in focus to cost being a primary driver for meeting selection. Now, that's not inherently a bad thing, and certainly this community through the SOP and individuals has continued to hammer away on ICANN to constrain costs. So, to some degree, they are trying to do that based on what the community is telling them.

One of the outcomes is placing a primary lens on meeting selection as a cost-based lens. That's not inherently a bad thing, but it's certainly a change, and this is one of the outcomes of changing the filter set through which you view this question or this challenge. That, to me, is one of the things we need to take into consideration.

If it is cheaper and if it saves $2 million a year, then that may be a good thing. But I'm not sure that we've had that discussion to make that tradeoff compared to the way meeting venues have been selected in the past. I think that's just worth a conversation [inaudible]. It's certainly convenient for me and anybody from the North America region. But I'm not sure it's something that's been fully discussed and accepted in terms of changing the priority of how we select meetings.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Young-Eum?

YOUNG-EUM LEE: I just wanted to add to what Byron has just said. That is that when we were voting on the new meeting strategy before, we hadn't taken the cost aspect into consideration and now that it has come up, it may be time for us to reconsider, just like Peter

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

has suggested, and really look at the cost-benefit analysis. Do a cost-benefit analysis of the cost versus the regional diversity.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Nigel?

NIGEL: Well, most of what I was going to say I've been beaten to. It was on the visa issue. Even if you include this redefined version of North America, which is easily able to be misunderstood to include some places that aren't in North America, then you're still going to have a disproportionate number of meetings inside the United States itself with all the visa issues that there are for not only countries that President Trump thinks are unfriendly, but I know of one of my employees – my own employees – who has serious visa issues for going to the United States through previous, shall we say, indiscretions 20 years ago. It's a problem. If you want inclusivity from everywhere in the world, you have to hold your meetings in a place where most of those people can go to.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Stephen? That's the last comment. Sorry, we have to move forward.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: A question and an observation. The observation is that ICANN seems historically somewhat challenged in terms of defining geographic regions considering that American [inaudible], which is well in the southern hemisphere and a whole lot closer to New Zealand than it is to the continental United States is considered part of the North American region.

My question is, not being in the know as regards to the expansion of what they consider to be North America, how far south does this new definition go? Does it stop in Panama? Does it go as far as south as Buenos Aires?

NIGEL: Please include Argentina.

BYRON HOLLAND: I'm not trying to be coy, but it was a Chatham House Rules environment. So, the official geographic definition of North America is what holds.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [off mic]

BYRON HOLLAND: Mexico. The real world, not this parallel ICANN world. The real-world definition of North America.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, thank you. Let's move forward, then. This is something definitely to think about and your feedback will be very appreciated.

As you know, we have this emoji study group, as we agreed to form it. I'm asking David Conrad to appoint one or two people to this group. We are also sending e-mail to SSAC asking them to appoint observers, SSAC members, in their own capacity to participate in this group.

But, one thing is that we do not have a councilor on that study group. It would be really nice to have somebody who could keep an eye on the group and report back to the council.

So, the question is any of the councilors would like to join the group? Yes, to participate in discussions. Anybody who feels strongly about emoji or somebody who enjoys … Yes, Nigel?

NIGEL: You don't actually want somebody who's got strong opinions on it. You want somebody who's going to be reporting back for

everybody's opinion, I think. I mean, I've got strong opinions, but I'm not going to be a council member. I'm not volunteering.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. You want to be a councilor very soon. I mean, you have to … Do you know what emoji is? Alejandra, you'll be on the [inaudible]. Okay, thank you. At least one councilor knows what emoji is. Thank you. Good. Agreed? Thank you.

Next one. Our meeting with GAC and GNSO Councils. Here we can hopefully move … No, I cannot do that. Doesn't work. Ladies, can you scroll? Because it does not work. Okay, yeah, thank you. Was this the first one? I think we first started with GNSO. Can we go back with GNSO? Okay, we have our printed versions. Don't bother.

On Tuesday from 2:00 to 3:00 local time we'll have a meeting with GAC, and as one of the outcomes from our discussions in Puerto Rico, we decided that … We saw that there is a need for GAC to learn more about ccTLDs, about diversity of ccTLDs, that you cannot use same approach to all ccTLDs. So, we're giving them a short 20-minute presentation explaining what ccTLDs are, how they differ, how they differ from gTLDs and how they differ from each other and so on. So, this will be a short presentation about ccTLDs.

Then we'll talk about country and territory names. Apparently, the group will have a discussion with GAC on Monday. Today they have a discussion with the GAC, so we'll see how it evolves. We will also have our own discussion, so this session will be a summary of all these discussions. Then Q&A, apparently. So, that's about GAC. Then there will be actually another session with GAC on Thursday when Bart will tell them about country codes.

BART BOSWINKEL: I will [inaudible] Jaap.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. Bart spent a couple of days in Jaap's company, so now he is also very knowledgeable about all those codes. Debbie?

DEBBIE MONAHAN: I would like to see on the GAC, and I'm putting Stephen on the frame here. Stephen is still trying to get the GAC to appoint an official person to be … Work with us on the working group, the PDP Working Group. So, is there a chance to put a slot in this for Stephen to do a sales pitch for someone to put their hand up?

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, we'll try to squeeze him in. Peter?

PETER VERGOTE: If I just can, I think we have a slot AOB. So, you can take that slot to make a statement or to warm them for participation.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: The AOB slot should work. I may actually have a tentative candidate based on sharing a cab ride in from the airport, but I do want to make a similar appeal that I made at the last meeting. Thanks.

PETER VERGOTE: Sure.

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, I'm not as optimistic as Peter. I think our meetings with GAC have never went according to our agenda, but we'll definitely try to leave at least some minutes for Stephen to talk about … Debbie?

DEBBIE MONAHAN: I think the benefit of having that specifically on the, if you like, list of topics is hopefully one or two of them might give us some thought because it's quite clear that it's going to come up, and hopefully they might start lobbying amongst themselves as to

who it's going to be. [inaudible] for actually having it on there. GAC representative to the PDP Working Group.

KATRINA SATAKI: Actually, I think that what we can do … Probably it's a better way forward. After I give a presentation on ccTLD diversity, I can say that that's one way, right after my presentation as a natural step. Another thing, another option, would be that after Bart's presentation on Thursday, we could do that. No, you think it wouldn't work?

BART BOSWINKEL: On Thursday, you will have the issue that I don't know how many people will be attending. That's a very voluntary one, and say on Tuesday, people will be in the room. Maybe it's just a suggestion that – Peter, I'm looking at you – that say … Because normally at the start of the meeting, there will be something around the agenda that you want to insert five minutes for Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Fair enough.

KATRINA SATAKI: Sorry, what was the proposal?

BART BOSWINKEL: That at the start of the meeting you will propose to Manal or Peter [inaudible] that to add five minutes to maybe even a brief update on where the PDP is at, and also the call. It's just a five-minute slot. That's all you need, probably.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Five minutes should be more than enough.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. I'll try to propose that in the very beginning. Okay. But, I still think it should follow naturally from this presentation on ccTLDs and then we can … Okay. Good.

Then we have a meeting with GNSO Council and that has more items to cover.

CSC, first [inaudible] charter review with the final report and everything. Then we have two upcoming reviews. One is CSC effectiveness review. Another is IANA function review. This is something that at least we at [GRC] start talking about. Okay. Then, election of CSC members and liaisons and the role of the ccNSO and GNSO Councils. [inaudible] appointed the selection committee that will coordinate and approve the full slate. That will happen I think early September at most, probably.

Reviews and operating standards. Actually, we have submitted our views on the draft operating standards. Haven't heard anything back from MSSI team if they have updated the operating standards.

Actually, this was one of the topics that was also discussed yesterday during SO/AC chairs meeting. We have too many reviews. Too many reviews that we have to do according to the bylaws. I think this year there are like eleven reviews, all different kinds of reviews going on in parallel, more or less in parallel. Our own organizational review is going to start I think in August.

It looks like some of the groups have issues with their organizational reviews. For example, RSSAC, they are very unhappy with the way their review is going. They believe that the external reviewer has not delivered according to the scope and requirements. That's their belief. ALAC is still unhappy with their report. I think SSAC's report is now out for public comments. NomCom's report also is out. We'll see how our review will proceed.

In any case, as Chris yesterday said, it looks like we are going to review ourselves to death. Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Quick question with regards to our review. Is it out to tender yet or about to go out to tender?

KATRINA SATAKI: The tender is out.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: It is out, okay.

KATRINA SATAKI: I think it was supposed to close recently. I think it should have been closed. I hope that they have somebody.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: When are they next going to need time from us? I don't have that schedule off the top of my head.

KATRINA SATAKI: Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: During the GSE there will be an update from Larisa on the progress. That's right after this meeting.

EN

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Okay.

KATRINA SATAKI: Larisa is coming to [GRC] meeting and then we will be able to brief the council.

BART BOSWINKEL: As far as I understand from her, that's my understanding, their own schedule, whatever it means.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. This is another thing that [GRC] will be working on. That's the response to those documents, short-term and long-term documents on amending schedule of reviews. Yesterday it was agreed that deadline for submitting comments is extended to the end of July, so we will have time to prepare our response.

Next is Internet Governance Engagement Group proposed charter. We have sent our questions to the group. Young-Eum, any update?

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Yes. Thank you, Katrina. This weekend, Nigel Hickson has sent the SO/AC group a report of the activities of the CCWGIG which kind of tries to answer, as an example, the questions that you have proposed, but I will prepare a written answer to those

ICANN
POLICY FORUM
62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

questions with the report as an example or citing the report as an example as to why the group should be chartered. [inaudible] it is basically not any … It is not a group that requires anything of the ccNSO. It's just that most of the people that have been involved in this group are those people that have been very concerned with the actions of the ITU since 2004-2005, up to 2010, 2011, or 2012 with the WCIT and the 2014, the [ITU] Plenipot. As recently as last year, they have tried to restart their enhanced cooperation working group and it's just a group that tries to maintain the status of ICANN in its rightful place.

So, it doesn't have anything to do specifically with the ccNSO, but should anything happen so as to make the role of the ITU bigger or give any role to ITU in the Internet governance realm with regard to domain names an IP addresses, it can have very significant consequences for the ccNSO.

So, this is something that the ccNSO needs to be constantly be aware of, so that's why.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Taking into account that GNSO Council does not support the current working group. They have withdrawn their participation and they do not support the new charter. Should we actually discuss this with the GNSO or we just give them a brief update and move forward?

YOUNG-EUM LEE: I will just prepare the answers.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Yes?

NIGEL: I was just going to make a brief comment. Brief updates are always good.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Then a brief update on emoji study group. Stephen will shortly talk about ccNSO and GNSO as decisional participants. This is one of the things that I also mentioned yesterday during our meeting, that we believe that there is a need for a clear channel for communication, how we receive information from ICANN – specifically, from ICANN secretary. I also believe that they need a clear template, how they present this information, so that we do not have to … We don't need to calculate the timeline within each group, that this timeline should be calculated by the ICANN secretary and then they send it out to the community, so that we are all on the same page. This is one of the things that yesterday mentioned during this meeting.

Again, Stephen, progress on rejection action procedures and other items. Then any other business and wrap-up, which is actually what we should be doing now with our council prep. Then the last page we have a short summary of all the things that are going on today, tomorrow, Wednesday, and on Thursday.

Any other really brief comments? We have two minutes. Yes, Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Real quick question on the [ECA] related stuff. Now that we've been engaged in this operationally for some time, there have been some things that have kind of fallen through the cracks. Would it be useful for me to try to track down and consult with my [ECA] counterparts and develop some specifics for this?

KATRINA SATAKI: I think we should develop a proposal first and then you could go to your [ECA] colleagues and discuss it. It's easier to discuss something substantial. It's not just an idea but this is the way we see it as [GRC] develops a proposal and then you can go to [ECA].

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: That's fine. I just want to point out that we have a rather high turnover on the [ECA] from the other participants.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Ultimately, you talk to yourself.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I do that already.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, very nice. It's always good to have a conversation with an intelligent person. Okay. So, thank you very much. We're ready for our council meeting on Wednesday. Now, GRC. Those who are not interested in the work of the Guidelines Review Committee, please leave the room and invite those waiting.

You're going to leave anyway. Really, you're always welcome to stay, but if not, okay.

Dear GRC members and guests, please come in. Okay, welcome to the face-to-face meeting of our Guidelines Review Committee. We'll start with a brief five minutes update from Larisa on organizational review. So, how is it going?

LARISA GURNICK: We actually have a quick slide presentation. So, while that's coming up, I'm Larisa Gurnick. Thank you for having us here. On the ccNSO …

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]