

---

HELSINKI – ccNSO Guidelines Review Committee  
Monday, June 27, 2016 – 13:30 to 15:00 EEST  
ICANN56 | Helsinki, Finland

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hello, Martin. This is [inaudible] speaking. Did you manage to join the call?

MARTIN BOYLE: Hello. Martin Boyle just joined.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Good afternoon, dear Guidelines Review Committee and guests. I'm glad to see so many people interested in the things that we're going to discuss.

Well, as you know, as we discussed during our latest call, there are things that we need to do before October. We worked hard on the guideline for CSC and for [inaudible] which is not finalized yet. But that's not all. There will be other things that we need to do.

And today, with us we have Samantha who will brief us basically on what we need to do. So may I? Just a minute [inaudible] sharing the screen. I mean, Bart is sharing the screen.

---

**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.**

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, it's coming your way.

KATRINA SATAKI: It's still troubling. The screen is troubling and will be shared shortly. Oh, the video here. Your own video.

SAMANTHA EISNER: Hello. I can probably start before the document goes up. I'm Samantha Eisner. I'm with ICANN Legal and I've been working very closely both with the CCWG on accountability as well as the Internal Implementation team with ICANN to help develop the new bylaws to meet the accountability and ICG proposals. And so then with the implementation work we're doing, clearly there's a lot of work that ICANN internally as the organization needs to do, but there's also a lot of things that each of the SOs and ACs need to do to prepare for the variety of the different obligations that come in under the bylaws.

So ccNSO, in a very fortunate way and in an unfortunate way, you guys are tacked in all aspects of this, right? There are some groups that aren't – they're not as active because they're not so involved in the PTI operations as the ccNSO is. Like the ALAC, or the SSAC, or the RSAC don't have as many things to do as the

---

GNSO and the ccNSO because of the type of the work that you guys will be doing on the PTI side.

And so one of the things that we are trying to do – and this is a really simplified version – but what I was asked to come and help you with today was just to start, give some idea of the different types of planning efforts at this group – and I understand you are responsible for leading the thoughts of the ccNSOs as they work through this – the types of decisions and internal documentation that you might need to consider drafting to be ready for these different things to come into being.

And so this is a really high-level chart. There's stuff that you're going to need to do after October 2017. But we figured that this was probably the easiest way to demonstrate for you the more immediate things that are on your plate or that we see as on your plate. And I just want to stress that as ICANN staff, I'm not here to tell you how to do this. I'm here to just support you in identifying the types of things you might want to think about doing. And if there's any other information you need from me through legal, training through the implementation team or Bart, as your policy support staff. We're here to help you, but I am not here to tell you how you reach these decisions. I'm trying to identify for you the types of decisions that are set out in the

---

bylaws that you might need to make and you might wish to make some internal processes or procedures over.

So I was asked to try to give you just a high-level overview of the types of decisions that are coming into being fairly quickly, so the ways that you might want to organize yourself. And you might have already started thinking about some of these. So the first immediate one is the CSC selection. So as a ccNSO, you have obligations both to identify the ccNSO member representatives as well as assisting in identifying those registered operators that are not members of the ccNSO to the CSC.

And then the GNSO along with the ccNSO, you then have the second step of you have an obligation to confirm that membership. And so this is a place where the ccNSO itself might wish to have some of its own rules of how it wants to do the confirmation. And then there's also the consideration of how will you work with the GNSO to make sure that that happens, that you're on the same page.

I'm sorry. Something's cut off from the next one.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Do you know what that is, Sam? That got cut off?

---

SAMANTHA EISNER: Yes, I'm finding the words here. I will read it to you. And please feel free to interrupt me at any time.

So the next item is something that I want to flag for you as an item that will come into your – it'll be part of the work that we ask you to do. But I don't think that this is something that you need to do a lot of work on right now.

Part of the new bylaws on the independent review process actually give the community a voice in helping to select the standing panel that will come into being. And so there's work still ongoing within the CCWG right now on the IRP implementation oversight where we'll be working with that group to help develop some of the guidance around this. But then there's an obligation for ICANN to consult with the ACs and SOs on both the tender process and have the ACs and SOs participate in nominating a slate for that standing panel.

So we would anticipate that probably somewhere around September 2016 – Becky, it's fortunate you're here at this time; she's very active in the IRP implementation effort – ICANN will be coming to the community to discuss this. It's something to flag. You can choose how much you'd like to do in advance on that, but I think there are other pressing issues to really spend the limited time and energy you have on other forms of work that you need to collect yourself on. Because I think once ICANN

---

makes a call for coordination, it might be fairly self-evident, or you might – we don't know what that call is going to look like yet, so I don't want you to do a lot of work in advance of that in order to have wasted time.

So then the key here is really October 1<sup>st</sup>. So that is the anticipated date of the transition. Again, as you might have heard in different places already in this meeting, the transition is not a certainty but it's fairly likely and it's pretty likely that if it happens, it'll happen. The contract will end on the 30<sup>th</sup> of September and on the 1<sup>st</sup> of October is when the new bylaws come into effect and the transition has been done.

And on that date, a new entity comes into being within ICANN and that is the Empowered Community. And so there are a few different things that we're encouraging the groups around ICANN to think about in terms of their participation in the Empowered Community.

So the ccNSO is identified in the bylaws as one of the decisional participants in the Empowered Community. So what that means is that the ccNSO has an opportunity to participate in all of the deliberative points of the Empowered Community mechanisms. And with that comes the obligation to consider how you will do that. But there is actually a more administrative part of that first. And I know that there are some words missing here. I'm sorry;

---

something went wrong in the conversion to PDF. But the full text of that box says, “EC Administration selected, review team member selection process, and initial understanding and plan of EC participation.”

So that first box, the EC Administration selected, that’s referring to the need for kind of an organizational administrative component over the Empowered Community or working with the Empowered Community. And what that group is made up of, as it’s stated in the bylaws, are the chairs of the decisional participants or any other person that’s designated by the decisional participant. And so there is a bit of a default mechanism that you could always just select the chair if that’s how you wanted to do it. But then there’s also the possibility if you wanted to have someone else serve in that role, the ccNSO has the opportunity and the right to select anyone else to serve in that. And so that’s probably one of the first things you’ll want to think of aside from the CSC work, is who do we want to place as a ccNSO representative to the EC Administration.

Now the EC Administration doesn’t hold a lot of unique rights. It doesn’t hold unique decision-making powers, and so one of the items that we would encourage you to work on as an ongoing method is for the specific areas where the EC Administration is called out in the bylaws, what kinds of guidance or inputs would you expect the ccNSO to have as it relates to that EC

---

Administration representative. And I can discuss some of those items for you now.

But for October 1<sup>st</sup>, there won't be many areas that you need to worry about on that. It's really that we need to have people there because what the EC Administration does is it's effectively kind of the pass-through. It's the way that we know that we have someone to communicate with from this kind of amorphous entity called the EC so that we can get the decisions from the community to ICANN. And so that's really probably one of the first things you'll want to do as it relates to the accountability recommendations.

And again, stop me if you have any questions or if you see any online, Bart, let me know.

And then there will be a bit of an administrative thing that the ccNSO has to do at the time of October 1<sup>st</sup>. You don't need to do any sort of change to who your Board members are, the Board members that you've selected to the ICANN Board. But there will need to be a formal notice transmitted to the EC on October 1<sup>st</sup> restating who your Board member is for the seats that the ccNSO fills. And then that, the Empowered Community Administration, is then responsible for formally designating that person or those two people to the ICANN board. And what this does is it then allows all the other technical, legal things to be in



---

place so that if you ever were to initiate the board removal process, you would legally be able to remove it. That's actually one of the reasons that we have this legal vehicle that the Empowered Community serves.

So moving on with things that come out of the accountability proposal that you need to be ready with fairly soon, if not before the time of the transition, the review team member selection process. One of the advancements that's happening through the CCWG proposal that's been integrated into the bylaws is the reviews that happen through the Affirmation of Commitments will now be seated in the bylaws. And one of the big changes that's happened in that is the manner of selection of the review team members.

So whereas today, review team members respond to a call for expression of interest, and it can be anyone from the community, after the bylaws go into effect, whenever there is one of those reviews initiated, it's actually up to the SOs and ACs to provide nominations. So you could look to ICANN to assist you in a call for expression of interest or you could run your own call for expressions of interest, however you'd like to handle that.

But those are some of the questions that you need to answer. How do we want to solicit the candidates that we're going to be nominating? How will we make the rules up of who we will

---

nominate and the diversity of those people that we nominate? And then there's another layer to this as well, which is the chairs of the SOs and ACs will then be empowered to make the selection of those candidates to the review team. Currently, that's a power that's held by the ICANN chair or CEO, along with the chair of the GAC because it relates to certain reviews.

So this is now a place for the community itself to really form the composition of the review team. And so you might want to consider what guidance you're going to give to the ccNSO chair to make those formal appointments after the time of the nomination.

So there are two levels. There's the nomination and then the selection. And so these are very big responsibilities and we anticipate that there will be at least one, if not two, review team selection processes kicked off very quickly after the initiation of the bylaws.

We're in a bit of a quandary on timing right now with an SSR, the Security and Stability Review Team, kickoff date because you'll see that a call for expression of interest for that one is going out this week. But the ultimate selection likely won't happen until after the bylaws are in effect, and so right now, we have the obligation of the AoC. After October 1<sup>st</sup>, we'll have the obligation of the bylaws. And we're trying to get some further clarity as to

---

how these two can intermix. And so there will be a provisional note in that call for expressions of interest that we'll update it in the event that the selection process needs to change.

So right now, it's being put up under the selection process required by the AoC. But there might be a quickening of how this needs to happen. So we'll be in communication with the SOs and ACs as we progress on that path. We know that this is a pretty quick item to do.

And then the next thing, and this is both immediate and ongoing – and it's tied into the next item which is by early 2017. So within the Empowered Community, not only is it that formal designator of the Board, but it's actually the mechanism that's been identified for the community to exercise a group of new powers. And so there's a whole escalation path that happens in order for the community to exercise its powers. There's a time when a petition can be initiated in any of the decisional participants.

So the ccNSO, so your group, probably wants to figure out what are the rules of how a petition can get initiated within the ccNSO if the ccNSO wants to be one of the initiators of an Empowered Community action. And then you have to consider what rules does the ccNSO want to have in place to consider whether or not it wants to join a different petition or a petition initiated out of a different decisional participant, because it could either be that

---

the ccNSO is initiating the process or a different group initiates and the ccNSO has to figure out if it wants to join along because there are different thresholds to kick off different things. And so sometimes the act of just one group isn't enough to initiate these processes.

And then there's participation in community forums with the ability for SOs and ACs to provide questions and inputs as the community comes together to discuss the proposed power that the AC is acting upon. And so there's the question of how will the ccNSO gather together to form those types of submissions if it was just to do so.

And then once the community forum is over, then there is a decision that has to be taken. And these decisions range from a rejection of a budget to the removal of the entire ICANN Board. And so there's likely a need to consider what types of thresholds does the ccNSO think is appropriate for each of these different actions that it can ultimately take. Do you want a simple majority for each one? Are there some that you'd want to have a super majority in place for? All of those types of issues because the decisional participants, each one, goes and votes within its own SO or AC and then it reports back to the Empowered Community whether or not they were in approval of it, whether they abstain, whether they object. And that's how the threshold is determined if the power is going to be used.

---

So each of the other groups, the GNSO and the ASO, and ALAC and GAC, will each be doing the same thing at the same time. And then we get the report back of each of the decisions to see if it's been done.

So there are a lot of granular points within that that I'd encourage you to look at to see how the ccNSO wants to interact with it. And, of course, I'm sure that this is a process that, as it gets initiated from time to time, that there might be chances for refinement or anything. You don't need to report to ICANN on what your processes are. These are how you're going to organize yourself and so whatever rules you might use to then modify them in the future, I'm sure that there will be a lot of learning in the community and a lot of need for future modification to the internal processes.

But we're pretty sure that the first, while there could be the initiation of one of the Empowered Community processes before that – and that's really up to the community whether or not they do that – there will be an opportunity some time in early 2017 to start reacting to the ICANN decisions on the budgets and the operating plan because those are items that within the ICANN bylaws, ICANN must give notice to the Empowered Community and initiate the process.

---

It doesn't mean that the Empowered Community must reject what it sees. But you need to be prepared to have that critical moment of "Is this something that we want to proceed down the path?" So you need to have something in place that you understand how you might want to raise a petition within the ccNSO if you'd like to enact the rejection process. Or be prepared if another AC or SO does that, how would you respond if there was a petition raised in a different area? And then again, how would you collect yourself to participate in the community forum? And what types of thresholds or processes might you think are important to have as the ccNSO reaches its final decision on the powers, particularly for the early ones, on the budgets and operating plan?

And then there are many other things that are staged out. So as it relates particularly to the PTI world and the CSC, as well as the IANA functions reviews, those are staged out between one and two years after the bylaws come into effect and these things get operational.

But we know the first thing that's going to happen is after a year, there's a CSC charter review. And the GNSO and ccNSO are requested in the bylaws to work together to determine how that review happens. And so that's one of the next big items that you're going to have to prepare for so that we're ready to have that review kicked off in the appropriate timeframe. So that's

---

really by October 2017 and not an item of work that you'd want to start in October 2017.

And then the next year, there will be things like this review of the effectiveness of the CSC, and then the IFR starts in 2018, etc. There is some time to work with that and we'll continue to help pull items out of the bylaws for you to do that. We are working internally with the implementation team at ICANN to come up with kind of a standard document that we can share across the ACs and SOs to identify these critical points to allow each of the groups to be prepared. So you'll see the rest of the trailing information come out. We didn't want to overwhelm you with our seven-page chart today. So we're going to make that a little bit more digestible before we share it.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Samantha. Very encouraging, indeed. See, everybody is very enthusiastic about the work we have to do. So any questions? Or everything is clear? Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

If I understood you correctly, it's up to each SO to come up with their criteria for triggering, so in theory, the ccNSO could adopt a set of rules that say a simple majority and we can start the

---

process of throwing the bums out whereas the GNSO may elect to establish a super majority?

SAMANTHA EISNER: That’s correct. One of the things that we thought was really important in the drafting of the bylaws, and I was very involved in the drafting, was that we needed to remain as true to the CCWG proposal as possible. And so one of the things that’s not in the CCWG proposal, as Mathieu and Becky can attest to, are definitions of the thresholds that should be used within each one. And so there is the possibility that there could be differential thresholds put in. But that also raises the possibility for, is this something that the community might want to discuss amongst itself? Are there minimums that the ccNSO might want to suggest to the GNSO or vice versa to say, “We think that there are some critical areas that we should be coordinated on”? But that is a matter of determination by the community.

KATRINA SATAKI: David, please.

DAVID MCAULEY: I do have a question, really for us, and thank you, Sam. This is very helpful.



---

I think we're in fairly good shape on the July 22 date because we've sent out e-mails about this expression of interest request is coming, we put out the nature of the position, etc. But at the August 2016 date brings up something that we will have to do, and that is work with the GNSO. And so we're going to need a process for that. It's not just to confirm the membership, but in the process of confirming the membership, I think it's to also agree with the GNSO that we either do or do not appoint that fifth member that could be outside the ccTLD community.

So there's really two steps, I think, for August. One is do the two groups approve of the four that have been nominated, and do they have any wish to appoint a fifth. Is that correct?

KATRINA SATAKI:

No, I think the fifth one was supposed to be appointed by a TLD which is neither ccTLD nor a gTLD and they refused to appoint it at this moment. So [inaudible] is not going to appoint a member. Yes, Sam?

SAMANTHA EISNER:

So in the call for expressions of interest that went out from ICANN, that last part, that non-G or C registry operator position, is not limited only to [inaudible]. We use the language from the CWG proposal that just phrases a non-G or ccTLD registry

---

operator. So there is the potential that a different registry might submit an expression of interest, but they have to submit the expression of interest, and that's when we would know if there's a further decision to be made by the GNSO and ccNSO jointly. As far as I know, we haven't received any other expression of interest, but would, of course, let you know as soon as possible if we did so that you could prepare yourselves to dialogue on that point.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: What are these other registries? The only thing I can think of is [inaudible], mail and gov.

SAMANTHA EISNER: Technically, in the world, that's what we understand. We don't know if there are other registry operators out there, even alternate root people or something who might wish to come in. It doesn't mean that we have to take them in, but we wanted to use the language from the proposal and we don't know if there are other people who might think that they meet that criteria. We wouldn't say that they meet that criteria, but if there are people who believe that they meet that criteria, they could

---

submit an expression and then it's up to the GNSO and ccNSO to evaluate that.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: .edu which is used for higher education.

KATRINA SATAKI: Mathieu, please.

MATHIEU WEILL: Thank you, Katrina. This is going back to Stephen's earlier comment and as well as yours, Katrina, on the exciting times ahead at defining some procedures.

I think nothing prevents the Council from relying extensively on existing procedures. It is just a matter of making a table of the various decisions to be made and deciding which kind of procedure existing on you will be used for that. And I don't think there's any requirement in the CCWG for actually setting substantial criteria about how we would make the decision in that case. So that's up to us to decide whether we actually give guidelines.

I would probably advise not to do it before actually some of the situations come up, but it's up to the Council. And so I think the most striking questions on each of these will be, is this the

---

Council or do we need a vote of the community, and if it's the Council or the vote of the community, what type of thresholds in the existing procedures.

There are some delay implications because of the timeline which is sometimes a little bit aggressive in the escalation [path] that needs to be anticipated sometimes. But it's basically sitting in a workshop with the list of various decisions, the existing procedures and mapping which one would be the most appropriate and then engaging with the community, the ccNSO community, to make sure that is understood.

And so I would hope it's not as tedious as one would think when listing everything unless, of course, we try to reinvent the wheel but I don't think that's going to be a very safe approach considering the timeline. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Eduardo?

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Thank you. I also have a question. Are we talking about all the CC community and the ccNSO are going to be the organization who define the [roles]? How could we elect the CC representatives for this group? Given some of them could be

---

members of the ccNSO or some of them could not be members of the ccNSO. I just have a question how to do that.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Well, if I understand your question correctly, well, the ccNSO is opened up to anyone, any ccTLD around the world, regardless of the membership. I think the same principle should apply to all appointments made by the ccNSO. Of course, on the global level, the ccNSO is the only organized way, how we can define processes.

There is no other global organization for ccTLDs. Therefore, I would see the ccNSO as a platform for working on procedures and yeah, defining all of the procedures. But definitely any ccTLD must be able to – must be given opportunity to participate, put their name forward, and it's definitely not limited. If I answered your question. Any comments? Yeah, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL:

Maybe additional thing, the CSC guideline is probably the best example already and that was said, going back to what Mathieu said. That was a difficult one, but once you got it in a very tight and defined process on selection, etc., you can use it and reuse it and adjust it. And I think the core principles which will be discussed this meeting is like the CSC which is probably the most

---

important part for the ccTLD community. It's open – say, membership is open – for all ccTLDs, non and members and ccNSO members.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yeah, one thing that worries me though is in some cases, it's specifically stated that we must select ccNSO members and as a principle, we do not limit it to ccNSO members only. But there is also some requirement that we have to select ccTLD which is specifically said that this is non-member. So I think this, well for me, especially in the future, I think this might be the trickiest part if we are required to select a ccTLD that is a non-member because those that are active... No, I mean... Yeah, sure, sure, no, there are active non-members, but at some point, we will just have to tell them, "Please do not join ccNSO anymore because we need a pool of non-members to select from."

So any questions to Sam? Yeah, Mirjana?

MIRJANA TASIC:

Mirjana Tasic from .RS. All the time I was watching and trying to be helpful during all these processes we have in GRC. I have one, let's say, thing which is not quite clear to me. Sorry.

That's how shall we make an agreement with GNSO about something? It is not clear in my mind what we shall do to have

---

an agreement about anything with some other SO. It is important. The ACs are not in this moment.

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, I see several ways here. We can bribe them. We can threaten them. Well, I don't know. It's just the first thing that...

[MARK]: It's obvious [inaudible] to.

KATRINA SATAKI: Fair point, Mark. Thank you very much. So, well, apparently, they are reasonable people and I certainly hope that we are reasonable too. And it's just something we have to try because we've never done that before. So unless we try and we realize that there's no need for bribing or for threatening people. Yeah, David?

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you. I think it's a good question and that we should anticipate it because when you have different distinct entities that don't share the same processes, at least in business, they sometimes do this through what's called a memorandum of understanding. It could be like one paragraph, but basically, the point is, is it through the chair? It would probably be through the

---

chair of each organization that we would make these arrangements is my guess.

But it might be, it's probably a good idea to put down on paper, how do we reach this confirmation that's due in August? How do we know when we've reached the confirmation? And I would suggest that we might want to explore a memo of understanding with the GNSO just so we're not looking for the vehicle at the last minute.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Well, I think that... Well, if you look at ICANN, it's multi-stakeholder model when we discuss. I can't imagine how can we possibly formalize discussions we have. Yeah, but if there are proposals for... Yes, Stephen, please.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

I like David's proposal with respect to the MOU and we are meeting informally with the GNSO later this week. I suggest that we ask them, does that make sense to them. In other words, put this topic on our list of things to talk about with them.



---

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, but I would like to have something more substantial than just an MOU. Could you probably come up with some ideas, what we should include in this?

DAVID MCAULEY: Yes, I could. And I agree with your instinct that this should not be overly complex, but it might be nice to have thought it through, how this is going to work. And so, yes. The answer is yes, I'll try and put some points together in a day or so.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Yes, Sam.

SAMANTHA EISNER: Following on from that question about how will the GNSO and ccNSO interact in the ways that are specified in the bylaws, the other part of this that I think exists particularly on the accountability side is there will be times when, for example, the community has the ability to bring a community IRP or to initiate community mediation.

And so the decisions to get up to that point each reside in the process that we were discussing. Each group has their own method of coming to decisions and then the decisions collect and they have time to interact with the full community. But at

---

the end of that process, the community itself will stand together in the prosecution of an IRP or of a reconsideration request or in a mediation.

And so as I see it, this is a place where I would encourage discussion among the community itself of how will we do this together, how will we make sure that we're aligned in the positions that are taken and put forward and defended against in those conversations. And so clearly, this isn't something that can be solved as easily as what you were just discussing, but I think as I see this, I would encourage the community to have those conversations before crisis point is reached so that there can be some discussion about it because I think that there is a very big cross-community component to this that we can't overlook.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Any other comments, questions? Oh, absolutely. And I don't even see how to, where to start. Yeah, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: May I go back, Sam? I think, say, we've seen the example of the GNSO, what they've done in a way. So we as all the ccNSO has a lot of internal rules already in place. I think what is a good starting point is going back to, say, what Sam has shared with us

---

and do exactly what Mathieu suggested as mapping, say, what is needed by date because that's the most important one because that sets the pace of the work of the GRC and map what we already have.

So the good example is the CSC. We're using it for RZERC. You can use it as a basic mechanism for the selection of these AoC reviews as well. And then you will have some open space there, but that's the most important part of that, what we already see with the RZERC is the criteria. What are the selection criteria? And that will come up every time for every new event.

SAMANTHA EISNER:

If I can just confirm following on to both Bart and Mathieu's suggestion, there is no requirement that you come up with brand-new procedures. And I know that I went through a lot and it sounds like there are a lot of decision points. But it doesn't mean that you have to decide to do something new. So, you know, that's the benefit of having an organization that's been around this long. You know how to do things.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Probably, and another reason for mapping is it's not so much to see where there is a gap, but once it's done, you have a clear overview of which procedure is used for which purpose. And so

---

the community's aware where to go to and how to use these procedures as well. So you have a clear, full framework on the procedure. So that's the accountability of the SO itself.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yes, okay. Thank you. So as far as I understand, we start with David and Stephen will try to come up with some most important points that we should have, well, at least propose to the GNSO regarding our possible MOU. Then we start just mapping things that need to be done. Yeah. Bart volunteered.

Yeah. Well, so thank you very much, Sam, for coming. I think it was very helpful. At least, it gave us some perspective and understanding of what needs to be done.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Maybe that's a suggestion as well. Based on the mapping, based on what you said, is that the GRC, say, on its next call, and yeah, we do need to do the prep for it, that we set out a timeline, say mapping [end] timeline and maybe confirm with Sam if that aligns with the timeline you see because that's what you really want to know is that everything is covered.

---

**SAMANTHA EISNER:** So I really want to know that you're in a place that you can make processes that work for you. And so that's why I'm here. And so if there's anything that I can do to help you with that, any other information or things that you want me to look over, that's fine. We do have some critical points that we see for implementation to get us to the place of being ready for the transition. That is the CSC. And then the rest of it, I think we need to make sure that we're ready to act as situations come up. But again, there's no reporting that's necessary to ICANN on this. It's yours.

**BART BOSWINKEL:** [We] suggested it to engage you in the process of this group. There is one more, Sam, for you, and that's not on your list and that's what this group has been struggling with: RZERC. When is it needed and when will this group know how and when?

**SAMANTHA EISNER:** Thanks. I was hoping that Trang was going to be here to discuss that because I don't have the RZERC timeline front and center in my head. We do have the RZERC charter out for public comment. I know that we'll – I understand that we'll be receiving some comments, so I'm not sure how that will affect the materiality of it. But hopefully it's fairly small and something that can then get moved on to be approved.

---

But I think that the RZERC, the planning should be that the RZERC would be identified somewhere around that August/September area in terms of timeframe of identification of who would be the ccNSO representatives on it.

BART BOSWINKEL: It is not as, so you almost have [critical] square for the CSC. And RZERC is not in the same league of criticality.

SAMANTHA EISNER: So RZERC is critical. We do need RZERC to be – we believe that we need RZERC in place to be active quickly because we want to make sure in the event that there is any sort of issue that it needs to engage upon such as KSK rollover or anything, that it's up and ready. And so that's one of the reasons that the RZERC charter is out now, so that we can then seek the composition of the RZERC to move it forward before that October date.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. So thank you very much. We will need your advice as we will proceed with our document. So thank you. Thank you very much.

So on this happy note, we can go back to our RZERC guideline perhaps if you could upload it. There are still things that, yeah,

---

probably many of you know but some do not know, that Martin sent an e-mail to Lisa and she included Jonathan, too. And the question was about these requirements for our members to RZERC as we discussed on our call.

Well, the reply was, well, Lisa asked ICANN staff and Trang responded just with everything that's written in our RZERC charter at the moment. That's all that is known. That's all we can operate with at this moment. So one of the possible ways is still that if we come up with some requirements, then we could ask the ccNSO Council to submit it as a comment to the charter. That's one of the possible ways we could act.

But, well, can't anyone come up with the requirements for people on RZERC?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Maybe you explain your e-mail as well.

KATRINA SATAKI: Are you talking to me?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

---

BART BOSWINKEL: So you've been in contact with Jonathan and Lisa around the criteria.

KATRINA SATAKI: That's what I said. Martin sent e-mail to Lisa. Lisa included Jonathan and Lisa asked ICANN to comment and Trang responded.

Yeah, so, okay maybe I'll try to find the response from—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Just a moment. We're a little bit confused here.

KATRINA SATAKI: RZERC charter specifies that the committee will consider issues raised to the committee to identify any potential security, stability , or resiliency risks to the architecture on operation of the root zone – which I would assume that people on this committee should be able to understand what are potential security, stability or resiliency risks. So it must be technically advanced.

And they will coordinate with the committee's respective organizations and communities – in our case, with the ccNSO or ccTLDS – and if appropriate, external experts, whoever, to ensure that relevant bodies were involved in decision making



---

and ensure that relevant expertise was available. Again, that means that the person must have some good communication skills and must be definitely able to communicate in spoken and written English because, well, England hasn't left ICANN yet. Well, he left so they did leave.

So this is our current...

BART BOSWINKEL: Latest version.

KATRINA SATAKI: Latest version of our guideline.

BART BOSWINKEL: This is a first criteria. Based on the e-mail exchange Katrina had and the response from Trang, there were two criteria in the charter and I've changed it a little bit to adjust and make it in the same line as this. But the first criteria, selection criteria, for RZERC membership would be ability to identify any potential security, stability and resiliency risks to the architecture and operations of the root zone. So that is, according to the charter, a requirement for such a person to be on, or membership requirement.

---

The second one would be the ability to coordinate with the committee’s respective organizations and communities and, if appropriate, external experts, to ensure that relevant bodies were involved in the decision making and ensure that relevant expertise was available. This was a role of NTIA if they almost, in facilitating discussions with external parties. And this is replacing that role of NTIA with the RZERC. That was the reason, effectively, for creating the RZERC if you go back to the CWG proposal.

So these were the two criteria following from the CSC charter and discussions. The question is whether this suffices for this group, so for the ccNSO to select and enable the Council to select members, or you want to add additional ones because we do have additional ones which are the regular ones discussed by the GRC, so demonstrate the ability, excellent communication skills, etc. But the ones marked yellow are the ones that we based on Martin’s exchange and Trang’s responses. And the question is whether this suffices or you want to have additional ones.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you, Bart. Any comments?

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think it suffices.

BART BOSWINKEL: Let's do it. What I'll do is I will say this is the latest version I took from the Google Docs. I added these two criteria that are marked yellow. They're also included in the call for expression, again, as we did in the CSC charter.

My suggestion is I'll share it today with the GRC and if you have any concerns around these criteria with the question whether this suffices, yes or no. If you have any concerns, then we defer and put it on the discussion for, I think, it's the 4<sup>th</sup> of July we have our first call.

KATRINA SATAKI: That is the question next on my agenda, something that we have to discuss.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. But say or an online discussion. But then we defer it. Otherwise we can put it on the Council agenda.

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, this would be one of the possibilities, to have this probably already discussed by the Council and at least have some understanding of the Council support.

---

BART BOSWINKEL: So let me first forward it to the GRC list so you can have a look at it at your own leisure. And then please reply and the question will be whether this suffices, yes or no, as criteria for RZERC membership. You see it in the context of the other criteria as well.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, David.

DAVID MCAULEY: Hi, Katrina. I thought on the Google Docs you had a good observation, Katrina, about somebody needing security, stability and resilience, somebody that would know about that. Do you feel that what you were looking for is in those two yellow things?

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, ability to identify. Yeah, well, perhaps if you can't make it any stronger unless we have probably experienced working with some technical issues, the ability to identify probably is enough. I don't know. But maybe we need some, really, because for CSC, we asked some deep knowledge and an understanding of IANA. Do we have it? Can you scroll it? Do we have, do we ask? Okay,

---

here we have IANA naming function. Maybe if we have this direct experience and knowledge of the IANA naming function together with ability to identify. Yes, Martin?

MARTIN BOYLE: I have a question. I'm not sure what direct means in this sense, but I would say experience would be enough.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes because direct could be implied, that he has been working on IANA. It could imply that.

KATRINA SATAKI: I think we have it for CSC as well. But yeah.

BART BOSWINKEL: With the exception of the one David noted and I deleted it yesterday because I replaced it with these two, the other criteria are the same as in the CSC charter or the other demonstrated ability, candidates actively participate, RZERC, so that's a bit updated, and employed or active backing. That's what we used for the CSC as well.

---

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, so let's follow the plan. You send out all of the requirements and you just have...

BART BOSWINKEL: This latest version.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah.

Okay, thank you. So I think we do not have many outstanding issues with this guideline. Yes, Alejandra?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Just a quick comment. On the other yellow paragraph, it's in past tense. Should it be modified? It says "that were involved." Maybe it's "are involved," as in future?

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, that question goes to our native speaker experts.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Not me.

KATRINA SATAKI: So we're looking at you, David and Stephen, this much. English is so complicated. They do not know themselves.

---

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe that should be involved, are involved.

DAVID MCAULEY: I think it's written in a way to say that decision-making actually refers to decisions that were made and that's why the word "were" is used. So I think it implies active as well as being written past tense. I think it's fine.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, it looks very English to me, too.

DAVID MCAULEY: To be honest with you, I do have a comment, though. I mean, at the end where it says that relevant expertise was available, I would recommend instead of saying "was available" because it could have been available and not consulted, as you say, "relevant expertise was consulted as appropriate," consulted, needed or something like that.

KATRINA SATAKI: This is wording from the...

DAVID MCAULEY: Yeah, sorry.

---

KATRINA SATAKI:                   Wording from the charter itself.

BART BOSWINKEL:               Yeah, Martin agrees with you and Ben suggested switch word to “are.”

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:           Do I get the tie-breaker here? If so, I’ll go with “are.”

BART BOSWINKEL:               Martin says both work for him, so let’s go to “are”. Put it this way, at least it confuses you and that’s a fair point of changing it to “are.”

KATRINA SATAKI:               Yes, and if somebody asks why we changed, we say it confused Alejandra. Okay.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:         So it’s my fault.

KATRINA SATAKI:               No, it’s not your fault. It’s just, okay. Thanks. I don’t think we had any, these were the main points that we...



---

**BART BOSWINKEL:** So just the follow-up from that one is what you see. I'm sorry you got seasick. You will see this list. We've used the same kind of framework, say, for the call for expression of interest. These two criteria are now included as well. So just to be complete so you're not surprised. So I need to change it there as well.

**KATRINA SATAKI:** Okay, thank you. So apparently now we'll still be very busy with all these documents around our transition. Even though there are still other guidelines waiting in line, other older guidelines we were supposed to review and one thing that we promised to review to the ccNSO Council around travel funding and that. So I think after Hyderabad, but we'll have to do that really, really quickly.

So one more thing is about our next call. Theoretically, if we follow our bi-weekly calls pattern, we are supposed to have a call next Monday, so it's on 7 A.M. [Inaudible] you're very fresh and yeah. But I think it's a very nice start of the day to talk about guidelines. Monday, especially it's a nice start of the week. So theoretically we are supposed to have one next Monday, but will we have anything to discuss, because I'd like to start discussing this mapping of the things and I'm not sure we'll have enough time to work on that.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I won't.

KATRINA SATAKI: You won't.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. So I would propose we have our next call on 11<sup>th</sup> of July so that we have something substantial to discuss. We will hopefully send out this mapping. Yes, Martin?

MARTIN BOYLE: I think there is the RZERC charter is in public comment, isn't it? When will it finish?

KATRINA SATAKI: 5<sup>th</sup> of July, I think.

MARTIN BOYLE: 15?

---

KATRINA SATAKI: 5<sup>th</sup>.

MARTIN BOYLE: 5<sup>th</sup>. Okay. So conclusions are probably there then in our next meeting, so we can finalize the RZERC guidelines or charter, whatever it's called.

KATRINA SATAKI: It's guideline for us. It's charter for RZERC. Yeah, it's a fair point. Yes, so we will be able to look into that too. Yeah.

Okay, so 11<sup>th</sup> July, 6, 7 in the morning, and thank you for joining us. I know it's difficult. It would be almost impossible for me to get up so early and start talking about guidelines.

BART BOSWINKEL: What time? At 6:00 A.M.?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. No, it's 6:00 for Alejandra and 7:00 for Eduardo, but I'm sure you can. You're used to that anyway. Sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: For ccNSO Council, it's [inaudible].

---

KATRINA SATAKI: UTC, we do I think it's 12:00 UTC. Yeah. 12:00 UTC. Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Katrina?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, it's not 6. Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hi. May I suggest you have, since you were talking that we need to review the other guidelines, to do teams as in some of the working group members revised travel funding and be rest 6:00 to the... no?

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, I would prefer not to have it because I feel that then I will have to be with the other group, too.

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe as a suggestion for this group, maybe it's an idea that, say, first of all, we do this mapping stuff. We know what needs to be done. But also, again, revisit maybe for 15 minutes where we are with respect to the other guidelines and see and check what needs to be done because another element that came out and that will be discussed during this week are the results of the

---

council survey that was done, for example, to adjust if necessary the council election guideline, etc. So it's too late to do it for the upcoming council election anyway.

So it's important, but it's not urgent. And I think it's more set in the priorities in the sense what needs to be done and then go through a bit of a work plan that you and I work a bit on the work plan and propose it to the GRC based on the mapping and then we have a real overview of what needs to be done over the next two years.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Well, yes, when we establish this Guidelines Review Committee, no one ever expected such a huge work load. So thanks a lot for being on board and keep rowing. So thank you very much for joining. I think that if there are no other questions in the chat room, in Adobe, no questions. Thanks a lot to our remote participants, Ben and Martin. And thanks to all of you here around the table and well, we'll meet on the call in two weeks. So thanks. And let's keep working. And please respond to requirements that Bart is going to send and to ideas, probably David and Stephen will send to the list as well, your MOU ideas.

Well, we have a meeting with the GNSO on Wednesday meeting. They will be drunk so this is a good opportunity to discuss the MOU.

---

Okay, so thank you very much and see you online.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**