HELSINKI – ccNSO Council Prep Meeting
Monday, June 27, 2016 – 10:45 to 12:00 EEST
ICANN56 | Helsinki, Finland

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Hello?
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	[Sorry].
KATRINA SATAKI:	Hello. Has somebody just joined the conference call?
	The ccNSO Council Preparatory Session is scheduled to start in about 30 minutes from now.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	[inaudible]
KATRINA SATAKI:	Dear councilors, we're about to start. Please take your seats.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	You need to [inaudible] these [football] [inaudible] so that people outside [inaudible]

KATRINA SATAKI: Oh. I can [shout].

Good morning again. I think we can start. We still miss a couple of councilors, but we have Ching on Adobe Bridge.

CHING CHIAO: Good morning. [inaudible] everyone.

KATRINA SATAKI: Good morning. Sorry you can't be with us here, but we hope that you will join us later this week.

CHING CHIAO: Yes, very soon. I'm on the highway now.

KATRINA SATAKI: That's good. You got your folders with a draft agenda for our meeting on Thursday. Any comments regarding the agenda? Anything you'd like to add on this stage before we start discussions? Because there are several points I'd like to stress.

Okay. Now while you start reading it, there are a couple of things that we need to do this Thursday. First one is about the PDP. We discussed it already the couple of our calls. We have appointed the issue manager.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is the wrong one.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, that's the old one. We appointed the issue manager. One thing that was left for you to think about while you were traveling, it's about the oversight committee. It's a normal thing that when we have a PDP, before we actually launch it, when we work on this issue report, we have issue manager and have oversight committee from the councilors. Have you had time to give a thought to that, and does anyone would like to apply to this oversight committee?

BECKY BURR: [I have a question].

KATRINA SATAKI: Becky, you'd like to say something?

BECKY BURR: I think it's a very good idea to have an oversight committee while the issues report is being drafted. There is quite a lot of collective wisdom in the group on these issues and where the questions are, so unless others have a different view, I think it would be useful to have an oversight committee.

EN

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Nigel?

NIGEL ROBERTS: I'll leave my question [inaudible]. I've said I agree with what you just said. The question is, how many councilors need to be on it?

KATRINA SATAKI: That is a very good question. Bart, can you comment on that?

BART BOSWINKEL: In principle, it's [three]. It's not part of the structure of [annex] B. It's one of the add-ons of the councils, which they can decide. I think my advice would be one from every region to ensure consultation with the regions and one NomCom-er, as well. It's probably the best way to engage the broader community.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think I agree with that. I think that adds up to six. Then we have room for maneuver. We have a couple of spares in case somebody is unavailable or ill or whatever.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you.

EN

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I don't know. My advice also is – and you may have seen it in the draft resolution that Becky sent yesterday – is at least Demi will be on because he is the vice-Chair with the policy and policy-related matters in his portfolio.

KATRINA SATAKI: Demi, would you be available [for it]?

DEMI GETSCHKO: Okay. No problems. It's [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Demi is definitely there, so he will lead this oversight committee. Again, we still have time until Thursday to think about candidates. Regarding the timeline, as we already discussed on our recent call, it would be great to have the issue report ready by October so that we can present and discuss it in Hyderabad.

Any other comments on that? Any suggestions, any thoughts? You see I'm very diplomatic and democratic.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

KATRINA SATAKI: If not, then another thing. Earlier in the week, I sent to you a letter we received from the co-Chairs of the CCWG Accountability. They are asking for our agreement on the draft budget. Here we have another vice-Chair, who is more into all those CCWG and CWG things and transitions and knows everything. The boss there is Byron. I hope that you could give us a short report on Thursday – not now, on Thursday – regarding this budget.

BYRON HOLLAND: And there is a plan to have a session with Mathieu on Wednesday, at which point, there will be an opportunity to become more informed as the whole community. Mathieu in particular and I will be facilitating that discussion on Wednesday.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Another issue before we start talking again about the Customer Standing Committee, there's another member we need to appoint. Here we're talking about] our member to RSSAC. As you know, RSSAC Charter is now out for a public comment. We at the Guidelines Review Committee have started working on the guideline for appointment of members to the RSSAC. We have realized that actually, neither in proposal nor in the charter, they have requirements for members on this

committee. Martin and I, we tried to reach out to Lisa and Jonathan because probably they had something in mind when they worked on the concept of this committee.

So far, we do not have a clear vision yet, but the guideline itself will be a simplified version of the CSC guideline because this time, we do not need to do any coordination with other communities. We just select the person that fits the requirements, whatever they might be.

The members of the Guidelines Review Committee also proposed to have a clause saying that in case we do not find a suitable candidate, the council may appoint one, just to choose somebody and appoint. You will see that in the guideline.

Any other comments or questions about RSSAC? Yes, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: If I understand it correctly, probably we'll be more informed on Tuesday. The community will be more informed on Tuesday. The announcement will be very late, the ICANN announcement. My understanding is they want to use the same type of procedure as they were using for the CSC, but at the same time, the deadline is still the 15th of August.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, actually we discussed it yesterday during the [inaudible]. One of the ways when we talk about requirements would be that the ccNSO submits some comments to the charter and proposes some requirements to be included in the charter. That's one of the ways, and if that's the case, probably we will need to submit it [at] the council and do it really quickly after this meeting.

So far, the Guidelines Review Committee has dealt with CSC and are currently dealing with RSSAC guidelines, but there will be many other things that will still need to be in place by October. Later today, we'll have a meeting of the Guidelines Review Committee where we try to understand what exactly needs to be done. I think we would propose that we follow the same approach we use for CSC and RSSAC guidelines, meaning that we do not establish a new committee or a new working group to work on new guidelines.

Again, we authorize the Guidelines Review Committee to come up with the documents that are required. For that, we will need to extend the mandate of the Guidelines Review Committee because when we extended it last time, we were talking only about CSC and RSSAC there. That's another thing that we need to discuss and agree on, on Thursday.

Another thing is, as you know, we have run this accountability survey. Here, I will ask Joke to give a short update on the results.

As you know, the survey is closed. We closed it a couple of days ago. We received I think 46 replies. So, Joke, can you please walk us through?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Yes, indeed. We received 46 replies. Most of them, as you can see here from the first slide, came from the European region. The questions we asked is, "Is your ccTLD a member of ccNSO? Yes or no." Most of them were indeed members. Then we asked for their affiliation with regional organizations, so you will see that in the chart regarding question number three.

"Which information do you use to stay informed about the council? Where do you look for information about the activities of the ccNSO council, and what would be your preferred method to learn about the activities and the decisions of the ccNSO council?" The preferred method by large majority was mailing list.

"How well do you consider yourself to be informed about the activities of the ccNSO council?" The responses were good. The majority said that they consider themselves to be well informed, as you can see here. Then there's a slide that breaks down the answer to this question per region.

"Does the ccNSO council welcome input from the community and explain its decision and activities?" Indeed, most of the time was the majority of the answers. Then regarding the review mechanism, if respondents are familiar with this. This was an open-ended question, and any further comments or suggestions. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Can you go back to [inaudible]?

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Joke. These are the results, 46 responses in not that bad, but I would really love to see more responses, especially from Africa – okay, North America, I think we cannot expect much – and from Asia Pacific. My proposal is that we reach out to regional organizations and ask them probably to facilitate more responses, more feedback from their communities because this is really important.

At this point, it looks okay. People are informed, they believe that members vote is sufficient mechanism to redress ccNSO council decisions, but it would be really interesting to see what other ccTLDs think. Should we reopen it after the Helsinki meeting, or you think this is enough for us to draw some conclusions? Yes, Peter?

PETER VERGOTE: Before answering that question, Katrina, I think we should answer another question first. Is there something from the current results that we can take with us? Is there some kind of a follow up planned, and evaluation if there is something with the current results that we can take home and further improve the functions of the ccNSO, or is this not the case?

I think we should first answer that, and then decide whether we are going to reopen or not the survey because the people that took the effort in filling in right now, I think they deserve that we have a thorough look at the kinds of messages that we wanted to provide us. If we just reopen the survey and suppose that, hopefully, we have a couple of dozen other ccTLDs that responds, it might be that the two messages or the messages that those two groups will feed to us get mingled.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Peter. Nigel, you want [to say something]?

NIGEL ROBERTS: I think it's been very useful. This question that's on the screen in particular is quite provocative of a very interesting debate. I think when we talk about here redress of the ccNSO council decision, it implies what we really need to be doing is actually

EN

looking at going back to the bylaws with all this focus on accountability and the actual structure of ICANN at the moment and reminding ourselves and determining what the powers of the ccNSO council actually are and what our purpose is.

There's an implication in the question – it's not exactly incorrect either – that we as a council actually make decisions that affect people, as if we're a government making a decision to grant a license or something when really the purpose of the council is rather more conciliatory, declaratory in nature as far as the bylaws are concerned. I think we need to get out of this idea of the members send us to sit on here and make decisions, rather than the coordination role that is really the main purpose of being here.

I think it's a great question. It's a great survey. I'm not giving you any answers or any prejudices here, but we should look at that.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: [To] add to that, that's probably the important one because you will not find this mechanism in the ICANN bylaws. This is an internal rule of the ccNSO. That's why we've included the link to that rule mechanism. If you really start looking at it, and I think

it's a great idea, but then consider the internal rules of the ccNSO as part of that package because they threw one of the articles. I don't know which one. You can see it in the new guidelines. They all refer to the same section in the ICANN bylaws. These are internal ccNSO rules.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Any other comment? Yes, [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. Just a request. A significant number of ccTLDs in Africa are francophone, which poses a major challenge when the questionnaire is in English. If it could be considered in future, then it will allow more participation, but it's a major issue for us.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. That's a good point. I must admit I'm totally unable to translate it into French. Yeah?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Maybe I can help. I speak French. Also, I wanted to add that sometimes the e-mail doesn't work, and for Haiti, there are some internal issues and some of the e-mails don't work. So it can happen for other ccTLDs.

KATRINA SATAKI: It's always an issue. Of course, mails can get stuck in spam filters and other technical things. In any case, I'm sure that we can translate short surveys like that. Thanks for this proposal. Probably it could improve participation in the future.

During our meeting days, we will have a session on accountability and we'll talk a little bit about this survey as well because it gives us some initial basis to start a discussion and at least some feeling on what the community thinks and how they view the ccNSO and the council. Perhaps we will discuss it more during the sessions if people would like to have it reopened or not.

Thank you. If there are no more comments about this, next is a hot topic. It's about the CSC and selection of our members to the Customer Standing Committee. Let me again stress the process. I'll tell you about the process step-by-step.

First, we inform the community about the CSC, and I think about RSSAC as well during these two days. Then around Thursday, so around June 30, we launch call of expression of interest. We give time until 15 June, July sorry (it would be mean to have it until 15 June) 15 July to submit expression of interest.

When we have all the submissions, they submit them through the secretariat e-mail. The secretariat sends all the applications to all those councilors who did not submit their application, so

non-conflicting councilors. Councilors will have I don't remember how many days first to find out if they match the criteria, if they fulfill the requirements, and then rank them. If we have six, then up to five, and then five. If we have less, then how many we have, and rank them in order of priority. Your top candidate goes on top, second one second, third, and so on.

You send these results to a separate e-mail address. It will be created specifically to deal with the rankings. It's because e-mails that are sent to the secretariat are received by the Chair and the vice-Chairs, just so that all of the votes are not visible to everybody. They are just sent through a separate e-mail address.

The secretariat comes up with the total ranking, and the top two candidates voted by all the non-conflicting councilors will be the ones we choose to the Customer Standing Committee. Is it clear so far? Good.

According to the proposal, we have to discuss our members with the Registry Stakeholder Group. Here, that's why we proposed and we agreed that we will have selection committee, which is not a selection committee. It's a coordination committee, but we call it selection committee. We have this selection committee just for organizational purposes, not to have this consultation process too messy. We have six people from the council, and we agreed on that. Six people from the council who will have a call

with Registry Stakeholder Group and inform about our members and so on.

Then when we have this theoretical consultation with the Registry Stakeholder Group, we will need to approve these two selected members. We won't have time for e-mail vote. It's around probably 21st July is the latest. Either we have call, and we must be quorate in that case, or we just say, "You, selection committee, have the right to approve these two members selected by the council." Are you with me so far? Good.

I know it's very complicated, so I'm trying to make sure that we are all on the same page. Now by 22nd of July, all the other ACs/SOs, all those who will nominate their liaisons to the Customer Standing Committee – again, there are five members to the Customer Standing Committee. In this case, there would be only four, two from registry stakeholders group and two from ccNSO. Those can be ccNSO members and ccNSO non-members. It really does not matter if those are members or not. All other communities will have their candidates for liaison submitted.

According to the proposal and according to the CSC charter, at this point, we the ccNSO council, we need to coordinate with the GNSO to ensure that the final slate is diverse in terms of geographic, gender, as diverse as possible because if no men apply, then it's going to be tricky to have them. Of course, it

would not be possible if we had only one liaison per SO/AC. That's why we kindly ask them to submit two names, two diverse names, preferably. Not from the same region, for example. If they're going to submit their names for liaisons, that would hopefully give us some leverage to choose a diverse slate of members plus liaisons. They are not members. They are liaisons.

Again, this must be done in consultation. To be more efficient, again we think that it's better if only six councilors or selection committee will consult with designees from the GNSO about which liaison to choose. There were, of course, some doubts about that, so probably we should send all the names to all the councilors so they can voice their concerns regarding some individuals so we can try at least to choose another one, but again, it's diversity. It's very difficult to play around with.

Here our selection committee, together with GNSO, will choose liaisons to ensure there's diversity.

CHING CHIAO: Katrina, can I ask a simple question?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, please, Ching.

CHING CHIAO: Is it a good time just to clarify one…?

KATRINA SATAKI: Absolutely, yes. Please ask.

CHING CHIAO: Thanks. The question would be, let's say we rank the top five and we have the name of the [list]. We know the priority. Then we talk to the GNSO. For example, there could be multiple scenarios. For example, we insist that the top two ccNSO candidates needs to be in the CSC. There's no room for us to talk with the GNSO. We must have these two people, or the scenario is that the top two person that we pick after the consultation with the GNSO, we gave up this first two and we only go for three and four. The question would be whether it's up to the selection committee to do the job, or do we go back to the full council and make the case and have those candidates to be selected.

This just kind of popped up in my head. It seems that this would put the selection committee in a spot. Even if we put this very bluntly, a bargaining process with GNSO in terms of the diversity, in terms of the gender, this could put the selection committee in a weird spot. I'm just throwing out this. Maybe

we'll have more time to talk about this later during the members meeting.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Ching, for this question. No. The idea is that these top two candidates that are selected as CSC members from the ccNSO will remain the same. We're playing around only liaisons. Yes, Debbie.

DEBBIE MONAHAN: I am all for diversity, and I believe that when you can get it, you should have diversity, but I am first and foremost for the right skills on that CSC. I think it's really important. This has been set up in the monitoring, and that of IANA is absolutely key. How it starts will be very instrumental into how successful it is, so I'd really urge that the top priority is the skills of those people. Then if there are people with equivalent skills, then you can use diversity as a way of perhaps differentiating between them, but to me, the skill mix of those people is paramount.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you for this comment. I totally agree with that and that has been agreement on the Guidelines Review Committee, as well. Yes, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: If you look at the charter of the CSC, it's in the CWG stewardship proposal. It talks about to the extent possible, so first and foremost, it's the skill set and the experience. Then you start looking at the diversity. To put it a little bit less diplomatic, that's a nice thing to have diversity, but first and foremost is the quality.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, exactly. I totally agree with that. Since Bart started, I won't be diplomatic either.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [When are you ever]?

KATRINA SATAKI: That's true, yes. I'm trying. I'm struggling, you see.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Now you can [be your] actual self.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, exactly. Now I can stop pretending.

We select members, and members are the ones who vote on the CSC. Liaisons do not have the voting rights, so they are there for beauty. Beauty contest. Here around this table – around would probably not be the right word here – but we are a really diverse group of people. We represent all five regions. We represent bigger and smaller registries. We represent government and not government, whatever. We're really a diverse group of people, and if we as a diverse group of people come up with two names, you cannot apply diversity over diversity again. We come up with two names that we believe are the best, and therefore, at least I do not see any justifiable transparent algorithm. How can we select the fifth on the ranking just because this person is a man, for example?

We select two people, and we as a council, as a diverse group of people, we select two names. These are the two names we stick to.

After we have selected these two names to be members, to represent the interests of ccTLDs on the Customer Standing Committee, then we can do some beauty contest with liaisons.

Yes, I haven't been diplomatic, but I hope that other communities will select the best people from different regions and different skillsets. Yes, totally agree. For us, the professional criteria are much more important.

So far, we are in agreement. Now, when we have this selection committee together with the GNSO, we have selected hopefully to the extent possible diverse Customer Standing Committee. Now again, according to all the documents, the ccNSO council and the GNSO council have to adopt the full slate, which means again either we as the council have a call – and I have no idea how long it might take for the selection committee to coordinate this beauty contest with the GNSO – but at some point, either we have a call, we might not have a week to do vote over e-mail so most probably we'll have to have a call and we must be quorate. It's end of July, beginning of August – or again, we can authorize the selection committee to vote on the beauty contest

Those two members selected by the ccNSO council won't be touched. We're talking about the full slate. Any questions? Is it clear? I know how complicated it is. It took us several months to decipher it. Any questions? Peter?

PETER VERGOTE: Not a question, but maybe a practical point in getting us further. During the last ccNSO council call, I remember that I was more in favor of having the full ccNSO council having the decision and the vote on this, but the fair point was raised that we needed to be quorate.

Would it be feasible that we set a limited number of dates upon which a call could take place and then have the councilors look at those potential dates and indicate whether they're still available during that days so we have a view whether there is likely to be a problem with getting the quorum or not? If we see that there is a risk, even only limited and let's say only affecting one particular region, if we get the feeling that we might run into problems, it will probably be easier to accept that we say, "It's up to the selection committee to handle this."

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, Nigel?

NIGEL ROBERTS: Without going into detail for reasons I mentioned on the last call and it may apply to others, we may have a slightly lesser pool of people in order to make the quorum. You need to bear that in mind, particularly with the quorum requirement that there be one representative from each region.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Just to [allude, say you need to exclude] if a councilor's [down], you need to exclude him from that vote anyway.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, Debbie?

DEBBIE MONAHAN: I like Peter's idea because if a councilor thought they were going to be in that position, they'd just put unavailable, unavailable, unavailable for all the calls. As long as that's done, with something like a Doodle poll or something like that, you can actually see at a glance. It's easy enough for anyone in those positions to just make themselves unavailable.

NIGEL ROBERTS: I think that's a great suggestion. I wasn't really referring to that. I was referring to the fact that for example, say there was one councilor in one region. The other two have got to make sure one of them is on the call.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, that's the case. Yes, Bart?

EN

BART BOSWINKEL: Following your suggestion, I think that makes everybody's life easier. We all send out a Doodle poll later today, and if you can respond by Wednesday, then we can inform council on Thursday what the result is. Then you know where you're heading.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, we can certainly do that. Thank you, Peter, for the suggestion. Anyway, I'd like to have some backup plan if people indicate that they are going to be on the call and if on that call, we do not have quorum. We need to have a backup plan. Yes, Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Both of these calls are critically important. I'm assuming that this Doodle poll will cover both calls.

KATRINA SATAKI: It should, yes, both calls. The first is the 21st July. The secretariat may ask you to work out, but again, we have no clue how this will go, what it means to coordinate the pool of liaisons, how much time it might take, and so on. It's really a very dark forest at this moment.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Associated with this, I will send out an e-mail this afternoon as well, first of all regarding the PDP for the oversight committee. If you form one from every region with the exception of Latin America because we've got Demi, and for the other ones, and secondly for the selection committee. If you want to put your name forward, please let us know so we can appoint them by Thursday.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. These are two things that we need to have in place on Thursday. Thank you. Any more questions, any comments around that? If no, I think we have covered most of the issues about our agenda for Thursday.

Then you have in your files a summary of the most important sessions for these upcoming days. As you know, this is the first time ever that we have this Meeting B or Policy Forum, and the main idea is to break the silos. We work in silos until 3:00 PM, and then after that, we go out into the wild and mingle with the other communities. At least, that's the idea.

I must say, the program working group worked really hard because things changed all the times and all the discussions around cross-community sessions were a very hot debate, but thanks to their hard work, I think we still have a very interesting agenda.

But there are some things. You know that normally when we have these sessions, we assign people. We ask who is going to go to that session, and then somebody steps forward. Then we write down that person A was going to session B. Then we ask people to send the report to tell more about the particular session.

Last time, we did receive three or two reports. Thanks to Peter, thanks to Debbie and Giovanni. Somebody else I think submitted the report, but generally people are not very active in submitting their reports. The question is either we stop assigning people to sessions or we give the secretariat a stick they could use to chase those who agreed to report on the session.

It sounds like Ching fainted there. What are your thoughts, dear councilors? Do we keep assigning people to sessions and then we ask the secretariat to chase them to get some feedback, or we just go wherever we want and save some time for the secretariat to do other things?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Question?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, Nigel?

NIGEL ROBERTS: Assuming we can remember back to when these were being done a bit more diligently than they are now, what value did we get from them, the reports?

BART BOSWINKEL: They never [inaudible]

NIGEL ROBERTS: I think you've answered the question then, haven't you, Bart?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] certain [inaudible]

KATRINA SATAKI: Theoretically, if a report is submitted, then other councilors can read it. If there is no wish to ever read them, there's no point in asking anyone to write and submit them.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Katrina, with respect, if we never get them to read, how do we know people really want [it]?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Maybe this has evolved over time. Fortunately, we don't need it this time because of the agenda topics with the meeting with the GAC, but these meetings were used and have always been used to prep for the joint meetings. [And then add on] came at the request of some of the councilors, came on an overview with other interesting sessions are around. Say that part never got, never off the ground. We don't mind providing this overview, but again, if you use it for your information, that's fine, as well. But assigning people to it, it takes 10, 15 minutes. It's awkward, and we don't follow up.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think assign [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI: Anybody wants to write report?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

KATRINA SATAKI: Apparently no? Which means that we won't assign people, but still, if you go to a session and you spot something interesting and see interesting developments there, please report back to the council, just to alert others, as well.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: May I ask a question? Do you find this helpful to go to sessions and to find your way through the sessions? If you don't use this at all, then we stop preparing it. It's good? It's helpful? Okay, then we'll keep on preparing this.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you for preparing this. I think it's really interesting. Actually, we have many interesting sessions, especially those cross-community discussions that we have worked on. I'm sure that they will be interesting. Any questions? Maybe Bart, you could give a short overview of this, or it's just self-explanatory.

BART BOSWINKEL: I think it's self-explanatory. The only thing is – and that may be interesting for most of you who are not on the SOP, and it's got a little bit under the water. It's on Tuesday afternoon, the session at 5:00 with Sally Costerton and Susanna Bennett. It's a cross-community session, and it's on the operational planning goals of some of the department KPIs, etc. It's really a pre-empting on future discussions on the direction of ICANN's operation. That might be an interesting one for those who are not very familiar with the work of the SOP. I think that's the only one I really wanted to stress for this week. The rest is self-explanatory.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, Becky?

BECKY BURR: This is probably not as useful for ccTLDs, but I would say that I think that WHOIS issues are becoming increasingly complicated and complex in ICANN, in part because with the new gTLDs, we're seeing a lot of gTLDs that are located in countries that have more developed data protection regimes. It would be great if CCs could share their experiences with WHOIS and what the different arrangements are, to add that to the knowledge mix and the discussions that are happening because I do think that it generally is going to get to be a very complicated issue here.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Becky. Any other comment?

                         If not, then there's one more thing I wanted to say. It actually came as a result of our prep meeting in Marrakech. If you remember, we were thinking about some signs how to make ccNSO people more recognizable. This is the outcome. You see? Ribbon, ccNSO ribbon. You'll get one.

BART BOSWINKEL: You get it tomorrow in your pack.

KATRINA SATAKI: You'll get it tomorrow in your pack, so thanks a lot for this idea. Margarita, I think it was yours.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We used to do this years ago.

KATRINA SATAKI: Really? Now we do it again. Please use it. Yes, Stephen?

STEVEN DEERHAKE: I just want to make the Chair aware that we do not have a liaison at this meeting for the ALAC.

KATRINA SATAKI: Oh yeah, right. Any update on…? Yeah, please.

STEVEN DEERHAKE: Our ALAC liaison, Ron Sherwood, has been in hospital this last week. He obviously will not be at the meeting. It's looking better than it has been looking. I've been getting updates daily from his wife, but he obviously will not be attending, and it's very doubtful he'll be on Adobe chat either. We are down a liaison.

KATRINA SATAKI: We as the council send him our best wishes. Please tell to his wife and ask to give our best regards and wishes.

STEVEN DEERHAKE: I will convey the council's…

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much because we'll miss him this meeting, but we're looking forward to see him in Hyderabad.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: India.

KATRINA SATAKI: In India, yes. I can make that. Thank you very much, and see you tomorrow, definitely at the ccNSO cocktail.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

KATRINA SATAKI: I will. Wednesday, and of course, Thursday when we have our council meeting. Thank you very much, and don't forget on Wednesday evening, we have this invitation to the GNSO council meeting. Drinks, drinks. Quarter past 7:00, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [I'll check again].

KATRINA SATAKI: It's changing a little bit, but yes, please update us if there are any changes. Just to say hello. We'll have to work very hard together on the CSC and RSSAC. Thank you very much, and see you around.

CHING CHIAO: Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Ching.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]