BARCELONA – ccNSO: Council Preparatory Meeting
Sunday, October 21, 2018 - 12:00 to 13:30 CEST
ICANN63 | Barcelona, Spain

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:         ICANN 63 Barcelona, 21 October 2018, 12:00 to 13:00, ccNSO Council Preparatory Meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:         Can I sit here?

BART BOSWINKEL:            Yeah. There is lunch for the councilors and all of the liaisons. And please grab your plates so we can start. We have a full agenda. So, if you want to have lunch, please grab it. The plates are on the left-hand side.

KATRINA SATAKI:           We still have one minute. Please –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:         One minute?

KATRINA SATAKI:           Yes. One minute before we start.

                          Okay, good afternoon dear councilors. It's great to see you all again. And even more, we have two new councilors joining us today. I'd like to welcome you to our friendly – well, most of the time friendly family of

the ccNSO. And may I ask you both to introduce yourselves? We have Laura and Ajay from – well, appointed by the NomCom. And if you could say a couple of words about yourself, would be really nice. This is the first time you're required to [inaudible].

LAURA MARGOLIS    Well, good morning and thank you for [being] here. My name is Laura Margolis. I am from Uruguay. I work for a registrar there in my country. Since more than ten years ago, I've been involved in the domain industry. So I hope to be here with you and make a good job here. Thank you.

AJAY DATA:    I am Ajay Data. My surname spells as Data. So a lot of people think that I have changed my surname because of my company name which starts with Data, but it is not true, it's a family name which just coincides as spells as Data. I run a company offering Internet services in India. We were the first in 1999 to start Internet in our region, and then some interest came up for IDNs and we started building the solutions around IDNs and e-mail address internationalization.

I'm part of UASG group and co-chair for EAI. I'm also chairing the Neo Brahmi Generation Panel where we are generating the label generation rules for nine scripts. Eight are already done, which is probably the fastest in the ICANN history which India has produced, and I am part of also ISPCP constituency under GNSO, and glad to be here. And I can say

that when I see the atmosphere of this council, this is definitely a friendly council. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, and welcome. With that, we also received one apology. Byron unfortunately cannot join us today at the prep meeting. But I'm sure he will be with us at the council meeting.

Okay, so you've received draft agenda for the meeting we're having on Wednesday. Any questions about that? No? Anything? Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Just one comment. I hope you agree that a lot of these items are under the consent agenda, that means one vote on the consent agenda and all the different participations, call for volunteers, etc. are done within one decision and resolution. So maybe check whether you want to have this all under the consent agenda or you want other items excluded or included.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, this is one thing that needs to be checked. Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: We're talking items three through ten, or –

BART BOSWINKEL: 12.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:        12, even better.

KATRINA SATAKI:          Alejandra, please.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:       Thank you, Katrina. Just a suggestion to separate topics that are in number 15, that is establishing the ccNSO onboarding mentor-mentee committee, and a separate one to nominate the mentor for the fellowship program since they're separate topics. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:          Thank you. Noted. Any other comments? Oh, agenda might change as we keep discussing. And we will still have meetings on Monday, Tuesday, so we may add new items if we feel the need to do it. Okay, now next item is update on SO/AC chairs meeting with the CEO and other chairs.

                         Byron and I participated in the meeting on Friday, and we shared some priorities each SO/AC had for this particular meeting, and probably even after the meeting. We listened to a presentation about the changes in the fellowship program, so how – after the public consultations, how the concept – okay, maybe not the entire concept, but how they're planning to restructure the fellowship program to make sure that the benefit of the program are working for the entire community.

We also asked the question about the sustainability of the model they currently use, because if you look at the report from the fellowship program over the years, they surveyed the participants, those many participants that have benefited from the program. They discovered that – well, actually, one of the questions was, "Why are you not participating in the ICANN environment after the end of the program?" And a majority said that, "Well, we have no funding to do that."

I asked the ICANN Org if they thought about any ways to make the model more sustainable, because apparently, it looks – as long as they receive funding from ICANN to come to meetings, they do. the moment the funding stops – and currently, they have introduced the limit of three meetings. So as long as they have funding, they come, and as soon as it comes, they stop coming because they have no money to do that.

Shouldn't be a surprising thing, especially when you try to get people who have never been to ICANN before. And apparently now they're going to pay more attention to the work in working groups. So you don't have to come, you don't have to be present at ICANN meetings to contribute to the work. So they will try to encourage people to participate in calls, to contribute to writing documents and things like that to make sure that this program really works and people get involved in doing things.

Yeah, and there's also a changed concept of this mentor thing, and maybe Alejandra will talk a bit more because she's been very deeply involved in the entire thing since –

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:     Forever.

KATRINA SATAKI:     Forever, yes. Your birth perhaps. Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:     Yes. Thank you, Katrina. So, well, I've been involved with the fellowship program since I've been here, since 2011, I think. Thanks to the fellowship program, I came to the ccNSO. And in the meeting in L.A., they started a coaching program, because that's when the fellowship group grew to double size, and it was not a manageable number of people for one person, so they started a coaching program to have people who are alumnis of the fellowship program to focus on two or three or four people maximum so they can guide them through the process.

This was meant for having some of the fellowship funding being provided to alumnis. I started as an honorary coach because I was not in the fellowship program. And it meant a lot of work. It meant to be in contact with selected fellows, maybe a month prior to the meeting. We've guided them with many things.

Sometimes, these people have never traveled in their life. So how to apply for the visas and how to get things on time and how to fill some forms. Also giving them links and guidance on what is ICANN and the different organizations and advisory committees, and also, trying to see

their interests and how to guide them to the correct organization if that was the case.

That was with the really newcomers, super newcomers. And of course, sometimes we get second-time fellows and they will be more focused, and then to them, the guidance is more like, okay, which working groups can you join, what are your interests? Presenting them to people and making that connection.

That was prior to the meeting. During the meeting, as possible for me at least, to attend the fellowship sessions with them, so to be always available. We have several communication channels like WhatsApp groups, Facebook or e-mail or Skype, whatever works, and being always available for questions, meeting them daily in the fellowship sessions and after the fellowship sessions. And when the ICANN meeting is over, then follow up on them, on the reports and their inquiries if they have any, and make sure that they get a positive outcome of the experience.

So that was the aim at that point, not actually following them forever and see that they're actually getting to the working group and they are working and they're doing something, but the idea was more to, "Okay, this is ICANN, this is what you can do, and now it's your turn to do something." So it was more leaving it up to them to continue their journey.

Now, as I understand it, it's a little bit more not up to the fellow to decide what they want to do but to have a more close follow-up. As in, "Okay, now you told me you like this working group. What have you

done? Have you contected them? Have you subscribed? Are you doing some work?"

And this takes a lot of time, but I think it's something doable. I've been doing it since L.A., all these ICANN meetings. It depends of course on the fellows you get, if they're interested and they're willing to do the job. But I've been very lucky, so my fellows behave and they are very diligent and they've done their job.

And some of them even want to now become members of working groups in the ccNSO, but for some reason, they missed the e-mails for the calls for volunteers. But now I will make sure that they get them because I have at least two in line that are like, "I want to join a working group but I don't know which one" or they see the list and some of them are already closed because, well, we need to update our website [data point.]

But it's hard work, so if you want to do it, it's something doable, but it requires a lot of your attention. If you have any questions, please.

KATRINA SATAKI:          Thank you very much, Alejandra. Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL:          Yes. [inaudible] from the same meeting Katrina attended, the question was raised with Ergis Ramaj. I think he's the ICANN Org person responsible for the problem. It was a bit about the hours you have to put into the new and fellowship program. What I've recorded was 40 to

60 hours before the meeting, before an ICANN meeting. So that's starting six weeks before the meeting itself, eight to six weeks when the mentee is known.

During the meeting, a kind of buddy system as you explained, so a lot of time and attention. And then post-meeting, around 15 hours. That was the average that is expected from a mentor to put into, just for the record.

KATRINA SATAKI:     Yes. Thank you. And that's a lot, actually. That's really a lot of time, and again, this is volunteer time, and it's something that we have to take away from our usual policy work and other things, which means that something – somebody who is capable of doing real work will have to stop doing real work and help some others do real work. Which hopefully will pay off one day, but just saying that this is something that is very difficult to decide that we have to do it, because it really means that you'll have to stop doing something very valuable, very important.

But every time when I hear fellowship program and onboarding and everything, I think of Alejandra as single success story. And for me, that's the main reason not to kill the entire thing, because hopefully, we can get another, at least one to three Alejandras or Alejandros.

Okay, thank you. That was about fellowship program. Yeah, and again, mentors are really important in this fellowship program. And yeah, work also in working groups. If no question about that, then other things that were discussed during the meeting.

This is probably more administrative. Several chairs raised issue with the policy department saying that it's – the amount of e-mails being sent directly to chairs, at the personal e-mail addresses of chairs, is increasing, all different requests, and as they send it to chairs, it's very easy for chairs to oversee all those request and delete them as spam, which, let's be honest, sometimes is spam.

But to make sure that this doesn't happen, now policy department will introduce new way of e-mail exchange to make sure that support staff also reads in copy, receives all those requests and that they can provide digest and reminders for all those incoming requests. This is also a very good step forward. Hopefully by December, the new system will be introduced, and then we will report more about the way it's being done.

Okay. This is something that came up from that meeting. Anything – oh, Byron is not here, but anything substantial maybe?

BART BOSWINKEL:      [inaudible] to mention is particular to the SOP that will be raised anyway this afternoon, but it is the new strategic plan and the exercise the board went through going over the vision and objectives. But this will be discussed at the SOP most likely as well.

KATRINA SATAKI:      Yeah. Okay. Thank you. Okay, moving forward, our meetings with other SO/ACs. So they are in your [inaudible] materials. Now we probably may get another question from ALAC, still waiting for clarification from the new chair, incoming chair of ALAC.

**EN**

BART BOSWINKEL: [Barrack,] maybe you can allude to it, the question around the relation between the ccNSO and GNSO PDP, policy development processes. It was a bit unclear.

BARRACK OTIENO: Okay. I think largely, the question is around the Work Track 5 issues, around the two-character codes that are being discussed within the GNSO. So there's interest, of course, within the ALAC to understand the ccNSO's position on the same – because the question is –

KATRINA SATAKI: Work Track 5? Oh, the question is, what is the response of the ccNSO to policy developed by the GNSO. And it's not quite clear which response and which policy, because we keep responding and they keep working on policy.

BARRACK OTIENO: Okay. Let me just say before the meeting I'll make sure we drill down to our more specific question to avoid making it so broad. But so far, most of the interest is around issues pertaining to Work Track 5, the conversation that is going on.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Thank you. Yeah, as soon as the questions are clarified – well, I'm sure we can address them. Yeah, so I hope that – Annebeth, can you

make it to the meeting with ALAC? It's tonight from 5:00 to 5:45. Okay, yes. No, you should be there. Yes. Okay. Thank you.

ANNEBETH LANGE:    [inaudible] to be there.

KATRINA SATAKI:    Yeah. Better be there. We cannot leave GAC unattended. Okay, so we have three questions. Basically, we ask almost the same question that we asked the board. I'd like to know ALAC's views on Internet governance. Then strategic priorities. I hope that Giovanni can take the lead there. And what are ALAC's views on possible ways to optimize ICANN budget? So this is another issue that Giovanni could take the lead on.

Okay, good, then next one, we have a meeting with GNSO on Monday, it's lunchtime. Also, again, you se the list of issues that we're going to discuss. CSC effectiveness review, just a short update and where we are from [Debbie and Donna.] IANA function review, we will discuss progress and next steps or where we are.

New gTLD auction proceeds initial report is out. We'd like to hear from them.

BART BOSWINKEL:    [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI:	Thank you very much. Apparently, Peter will take care of that, because he's very much involved in that. Then budget process. Giovanni, have there been any attempts to coordinate a meeting with the respective group from the GNSO that [works on –]

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:	Thank you, Katrina. It's a good point because I had a couple of e-mail exchanges with the GNSO contact point I was given, and I sent a reminder, the end of July to see if [inaudible], and she said that she was going to check and come back to me. But at this stage, I've not heard anything. So we may bring this up again.

KATRINA SATAKI:	Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL:	It'd be useful to suggest to that group that they participate or at least attend as observer the SOP meetings going forward. That way, if it's locked down, that way we ensure that they participate. Because they will not have, as far as I know, the same kind of exchange as the SOP has with ICANN staff.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:	It's indeed a good suggestion, yes.

KATRINA SATAKI:     Okay. Thank you. Then specific reviews operating standards, again, exchange of views on that. [Emoji] study group progress. Alejandra, will you be able to – okay, good. And – yes.

BART BOSWINKEL:     This is a topic that really was suggested by the GNSO, so they want to know – they are starting to look into it, and maybe you could invite them as observers.

KATRINA SATAKI:     Okay. Thank you. Then if you remember in our response to some public report where they asked for comments on Work Track 1 to 4, we stressed that we believe that there's a need for common approach on evaluating IDN TLD strings, and this is something that we would like to raise again with the GNSO council.

BART BOSWINKEL:     [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI:     They asked for it. Yeah. Okay, that's – yeah, because I think that common approach, same principles applicable for both IDN ccTLDs and IDN gTLDs would be really helpful and help to limit additional confusability of the process. Okay. Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL:     So, probably one of the concerns to – either to raise or to avoid, depends on what you want to do, is the issues at stake at the cross-community working group on use of country and territory names where there was a big pushback from the GNSO that this group could not define policy.

Well, it was never the intention, but at the time, it was very clear that effectively, in that way, they started to derail the process more or less by stressing this is not a group for policy and a limited scope. So that's something to take into account when you start talking about and thinking about harmonizing it and how to structure it, because there is no mechanism to do so.

And I think Work Track 5 is in a way a good example because it's a GNSO policy process, and ultimately, you can participate, but ultimately, there is no vote from the ccNSO members on it.

ANNEBETH LANGE:     I'll comment a little on that, that I agree that part of the problem when all the stakeholders are invited in to discuss and then the end, it goes to the GNSO council and they in theory can just stop it. But to be honest, I don't think that if the group comes up with quite clear recommendations after being out on public comment, that they will do that. That's my hope. Even if they can do it, it will create a lot of problems if they stop it in the council.

BART BOSWINKEL:    Excuse me. I was more alluding to the other point. As soon as the ccNSO PDP, you'll see that ultimately, the ccTLD managers have the ultimate vote whether to adopt or not adopt the policy and whether they feel comfortable with it. That will happen with retirement policy and everything else.

If you would submit this, say, like with the GNSO policy, people in the working group – and although it's a large contingent of ccTLD managers represented in this one particular PDP, as of that moment, the ccNSO has no formal power whatsoever, and in particular the ccTLD managers do not have the ability to vote upon the outcome of it. And that's the risk if you submit something like confusing similarity, if it will be part of a GNSO PDP like the current one on Work Track 1 to 4.

And the other side, reverse, is the same case. If it would be ccNSO policy, the ultimate vote is with the ccTLD managers and not with GNSO. So that's the real issue or one of the underlying issues.

ANNEBETH LANGE:    That's part of the challenge, is that ccNSO and GNSO have so different processes for a PDP.

KATRINA SATAKI:    Okay. Thank you very much. So this is – yeah. I hope we will manage to find a way out of that. Okay, then our meeting with GAC, it's on Tuesday, 45 minutes only. And again, thanks a lot to Peter for liaising this with Pär from GAC. So we're trying to find a way to make it useful and interesting for both ccTLDs and GAC-ers.

Their proposal was to start with GDPR, not with country and territory names, because they are afraid that the discussion on country and territory names will eat up all the time for a discussion. So, GDPR, there, Peter has a very good presentation. Not Peter Vergote, but this time Peter Van Roste, has as presentation from a survey [CENTR] members. And yeah, he will give the presentation, and questions will follow, apparently. Yes, Peter.

PETER VAN ROSTE: Thanks, Katrina. Yes, as agreed with Pär, GDPR has taken away a lot of time for GAC members, and it continues to be a problem and they continue to seek for insights and answers. So the short version of the presentation of the [CENTR] survey will set the scene and will hopefully trigger some questions and some primary concerns by GAC.

And I think after the presentation, which gives a very good summary that there are various ways to be GDPR compliant, then it's up to them to clearly identify what is for them the main concerns and how we as ccTLDs with our experience can provide them with insights or answers or dive deeper into detail in particular solutions that some of our members have come up with.

But I would say that after the presentation, the ball is in their camp to come back to us and to say like, "Oh, okay, thank you, was interesting. I would like to have more of this and this." And then we can take further steps. If there's not much interaction or questions coming from GAC, we can throw in some extras from our side or move on to the next subject.

So, it's something that depending on the interaction and reactions from the GAC side could take easily 20, 25 minutes or even a half hour. So I think we'll need you, Katrina, in trying to keep the time as well. If you see like this is going over the specific time that we want to dedicate to that session, I think you have all the right to intervene and to say, "Okay, one more question and then we move over to the next topics." But that's how I've got it in my head.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay. Thank you very much. So we'll start with GDPR. Peter's presentation could be like ten minutes. Ten, 15.

PETER VAN ROSTE: It will be up to you to decide whether you take questions or not during the presentation. I'm fine with that, but then it becomes obviously unpredictable how long it would take. But I can do it in ten minutes of there are no questions.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Okay. So let's do it ten minutes no questions, questions afterwards. Yeah, probably ten more minutes for questions, and then we can move to ICANN's five-year strategic plan. Okay, good, but here – so we have a suggestion from Pär that we both share our priorities, so our top five priorities.

Currently, we do not have a slide for that, but this is something that we could add because now we have a placeholder in the slide deck. Some

of the priorities I shared with SO/AC chairs – but we haven't discussed them yet, of course, so we can discuss them.

So I have written down – our top priority apparently is CCPDP. That's what we're working on, so hope to complete phase one and move into phase two. Review of the IDN ccTLD overview policy, number two. Work on the remaining guidelines to make sure that the ccNSO is fully prepared for exercising its right as one of the decisional participants, which means some additional – remaining guidelines that we have for example on this board.

Another thing, okay, that's pretty internal about the rules of the ccNSO, so maybe we could skip that. But we still can think about Work Stream 2 recommendations on accountability, so how to improve our accountability.

Another internal one is ccNSO review process. So, which top priorities for the next year. I don't know about five years, could be pretty tricky even though CCPDP might take five years. Yes, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:       I'm assuming your reference to phase one and phase two refers to the retirement PDP currently underway, and phase two would be the appeals process PDP which will be a follow-on. Is that correct?

KATRINA SATAKI:          That is correct, yeah.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:    Okay, thanks. And if we're still doing this in five years, I'll shoot myself.

KATRINA SATAKI:    You can. Okay. Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL:    May I also suggest that you include the work of tech day – combine tech day and the TLD Ops, so security and stability? TLD Ops is having a workshop this afternoon, and there apparently is a huge interest in the work of TLD ops. If you look at the number of subscriptions, it's increasing and increasing. It's almost as large as the ccNSO membership pool, and there are different CCs.

KATRINA SATAKI:    Yes, okay. Good. Any other views on strategic priorities for – Giovanni.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:    Thank you, Katrina. I think we may like to go back to the exercise that we had with Theresa's team, I think it was in San Juan.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:    No, Panama.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:    Panama?

BART BOSWINKEL:             Yeah.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:            Oh, it was Panama? Okay. And there were some priorities that when we pacificated, we were invited to place the post-its on those placeholders around the room, and there were some common priorities detected from Theresa's team. I was trying to – because I was sent a sort of summary of those priorities by Theresa's team, I was trying to find it in my inbox. I think they compiled a list of priorities as well. Because that's the process they're following. So they're meeting with different constituencies and community, and they're going through these exercises like the one we had in Panama. And I think it was San Juan, not Panama.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:          [inaudible].

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:            You sure?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:        Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:          I think it was Panama.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, San Juan was the initial venue ,but then it was very late it came up, and then in San Juan, you did it, the SO/AC leaders did it, and then Panama came up.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Yeah. It was Panama, yes. So we may go back to that compilation of priorities or objectives or challenges, because it was a mix of everything that we were invited to write in post-it in groups and put it on placeholder. And this is the consultation that Theresa's team is having on strategic priorities to, let's say, channel all the input and start building the strategy plan process.

KATRINA SATAKI: Well, what we can do, we can have a list of priorities of our own, priorities for ccNSO, and then we can also refer back to this exercise saying that members of our community who participated in the work of – this discussion they came up with, these following priorities that they think are really important for entire ICANN. So they can have actually two slides on this one.

PETER VAN ROSTE: I think that that's an excellent suggestion, Katrina, because, well, Pär informed me GAC will not be able to produce a list this week. But what is very important is if we start to interact on that, among the GAC, they will immediately appoint members to dive into this and to do the same kind of exercise, and then following that exercise, they will get back to

us and then we can see if we have commonalities in our views of the strategic priorities.

So, the suggestion to come up with two slides would work very well, because what you just listed up, that's going to be on the first slide. It's very ccNSO-centric, so it's less evident that this is going to be priority for GAC, while on the second slide, we could list up more general things that could easily fit into the basket of GAC as well. So, thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Thank you, and Giovanni has found the list. So could you maybe just come up with a couple of –

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Yes, so the summary document that was produced by Theresa's team was about [inaudible] this strategy session that was held on the 25th of June. There were 31 participants, mainly from the ccNSO, SOPC and the ccNSO community. And we were invited to, let's say, check and express what are the main trends as a starting point for the discussion on the future strategy plan.

And the trends were divided into three groups. First of all, community-wide trends, organizational operational trends, and geopolitical or economic trends. And in community-wide trends, for instance, there is the increasing demand to ICANN for transparency, openness, accountability, or increase in discussion and debate about ICANN's mission, mandate and so on.

In the organizational operational trends, increasing demand on ICANN organization staff and resources and increasing risk on security. And in the geopolitical, increasing concerns about effectiveness and scalability of ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, and the other one was increasing pressure to integrate human rights, privacy and law enforcement into governance mechanism.

So those were the trends that were identified in this session, and then this should have served as a basis for the strategy, let's say, the ICANN staff in charge of the strategy planning to start looking into the drafting process of the strategic plan.

I think there are some elements that we can certainly use as priorities for this community regarding for instance the security and stability, which should always be one of the priority for all those working in this business. No? Silence? Okay, it's golden.

KATRINA SATAKI:          Thank you very much, Giovanni. Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL:          Maybe – excuse me. I think this afternoon after the meeting, the SOP will be informed about the current status, and maybe as a part of that discussion, you'll report back on the findings of the SOP as another possible way. And probably the answer to the GAC will be it's still under discussion but this is the direction of travel of the ccNSO. [inaudible] about the outcome.

KATRINA SATAKI: Okay, good. So this will be second item of our discussion with GAC, and the last one then will be country and territory names. The idea is that we have a summary of our response to Work Track 1 to 4, and the idea was also not to repeat again the same story about our views on two-letter codes and so on but just to give some very top-level overview of what our – we cannot give view of the ccNSO because we haven't voted on it ,but we can still give the sense of the community what many ccTLDs around the world support. So that's the last one, so we have a few slides there, and hopefully, we'll be able to finish on time. Yes, Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: While you cannot really claim the view of the ccNSO on that topic, you might want to refer to the recent communiques from both CENTR and APTLD.

KATRINA SATAKI: I will.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Which were rather strongly worded in that topic.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, I will, and I will refer to those too and to the council statement. Yeah. Because council statement covered not only two-character

ccTLDs but also similarity review and IDNs and so on. So it's more than just two-letter – no, two-character, two-symbol ccTLDs. Bart, you want to – no? No further comments? Okay.

Then we have last one with the board. We received questions from the board and sent them a few questions back. So about the main priorities, I think we more or less talked about that, so we will just list them. Then second question, how should ICANN's multi-stakeholder model of governance and policy development process evolve to balance the increasing need for inclusivity and so on?

Here, I for some reason remember Stephen's notorious quote from Hyderabad. Oh, he [made a] suggestion to the board, basically. But okay, maybe I will not go into –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:        Skip that.

KATRINA SATAKI:           Yeah, we'll skip that. I will say please read the transcript from our bilateral meeting in Hyderabad. Basically, our position hasn't changed. But yeah, so anyhow, who would like to – Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:        Are you asking me to repeat that?

**EN**

KATRINA SATAKI:           No. Okay, any comments on this? Maybe SOP has something to say. About efficient utilization of ICANN's resources.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:          No, I think – so the exercise I've done in the past couple of weeks in preparation of this meeting is to go through the five years ago, the ccNSO SOP, at that time we were a working group, we produced this comment for the ICANN strategy plan, and large part of the comments was dedicated to the management of resources and data, and also the ability to produce some forecast in terms of the income that could have been generated by top-level domains in terms of registrations and renewals.

So there was quite good comments that were submitted to ICANN about that. I think that the management of resources is an issue at ICANN level that is still there. I've been hearing from internal and external stakeholders, internal and external to ICANN, that this is a recurrent issue, even – [specially at] internal level, that at some point, there is a duplication of effort that could be easily avoided and streamlined.

This is a recurrent comment also from the ccNSO SOP. I think there should be a moment for ICANN to start thinking about that. And one example is the GDPR and thinking about how many people at ICANN [inaudible] that have been managing the GDPR case in Europe. And I can easily mention ten people. I think this is a matter really of managing resources and making sure that if there is a situation like the GDPR, there is consistency in the management, not only from the message

they want to deliver but also the level of the people they want and that should deliver the message. Because keep adding or changing people or recruiting new staff, I don't know how much that's valuable.

KATRINA SATAKI:             Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL:             If you're talking about the second question, maybe I think what is interesting – because that triggered a thought – use GDPR as a case study as it goes back to probably – because if you look at the question, it's broader than just what ICANN Org should do, it is the whole community, including ICANN and ICANN Org.

And I still recall some of the discussions we had in preparation of the Johannesburg meeting with Peter on who was involved in setting the tone and setting the scope of the WHOIS, the original question about how was the relation between WHOIS in general and GDPR. That was still unknown, it was on the brink. And how people start o interfere and broaden the question ,everything else. And that was a very good starting point, and that was before, around the same time that ICANN Org really got interested in the GDPR question. So maybe that's a nice way of returning the question, use this as a kind of case method, and the example you used is you will see these very weird things going on of ten, 15 people involved who send different messages. It's a messy thing.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:     Even having meetings at the same time in Brussel with different people and delivering different and inconsistent messages.

KATRINA SATAKI:     Yeah. So, this question, I think – the idea of this question is way deeper, because when we talk about multi-stakeholder model, we all know it's slow and it's very expensive. So either we go away from multi-stakeholder model into more authoritarian way, or we find a way to – because it's going to cost what it costs, right? If we can do anything about this, then we can make the work – of the use of resources more efficient and we can make processes more efficient.

We cannot cut – perhaps we cannot exclude public comment, we cannot exclude several steps of several drafts and everything, but yeah, maybe we can decide that we do not need to print everything out. Just an example. It's about processes. How can we make it more efficient?

BART BOSWINKEL:     Maybe also as a point this brings on, learn from the mistakes of the past. For whatever reason, there's hardly any evaluation of past experience and what to improve and what went well, what didn't go well and make it a real, genuine exercise.

KATRINA SATAKI:     Maybe do not repeat same things. Yes, Giovanni.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Yes. I think there are different layers you can go through these questions. One is resources, one is learning from what has been done and possible mistakes that were made. I believe that what I see now personally and what I heard from many GAC members is that ICANN is going through exactly the same that was when Fadi took over, so what is the mandate of ICANN? So they are reopening the discussion, what is the mandate of ICANN? And this is what is the key question that is currently discussed at the GAC level.

And I know that some GAC members have been approached by ICANN staff to say this is what we really should answer, what is the mandate of ICANN, is it limited to what's written in the bylaws, or should we even change again the bylaws to enlarge and broaden the scope of ICANN?

And this is exactly what was done a few years ago. I'm not against changes, but I believe that there should be at least – and this is what the SOPC has been asking ICANN – I'm not asking a 100-year plan because I know it's not feasible in an internet-based community. Who knows what's going to be in 100 years. But at least ten years with room for changes.

This should be something that the ICANN community should look forward to having, and including the ICANN board, because I'd like to recall what happened with the last ICANN strategy plan. So the community was requested to submit input to the plan, and at some point, we were told, although there was no agreement, that the five objectives were frozen, there was no chance to change the five objectives and the actions linked to those objectives. They were frozen

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

because they were approved by the board. And we were told openly that the only chance to change them would have been in five years' time, which is now. Because at that time, they were frozen.

Now, freezing objectives in an Internet-based – [I always say] recently in Brussel, think about what Facebook and Twitter have been doing in the past five years and think about what this community has been doing in the past five years. And I stop there.

KATRINA SATAKI:     Thank you very much. I'm afraid we cannot stop there because we still have to find a way to answer this question. Well, for us in any case, I think another issue that we see – and we saw it [was] such an important thing. I still believe it's a very important thing for ccTLD community, it's IANA functions review. We had to issue the call twice, because no one responded to the first one.

So we really have an issue of volunteers. In our case, it's a pretty closed community, it's not like Internet users, 7 billion of them – potential users. But for us, it's really an issue, and yeah, so speak about the inclusivity here. I don't know. Debbie. I see you want to say something.

DEBBIE MONAHAN:     Not quite sure what you want to hear. If I had the magical answer for people wanting to volunteer, I would have offered it many times. And the further engagement, I suppose one of the issues ICANN faces is that there are big differences among the constituencies who want quite

ICANN 63
ANNUAL GENERAL
BARCELONA
20–26 October 2018

different things, and that is where a clear vision of where ICANN want them to go strategically I think is quite important.

And I think one of the things is a lot of expenditure and a lot of time gets wasted because there's such a disparity, and you're trying to all get consensus on something that's never going to get consensus on. So I know what you were saying before, Katrina about [inaudible] but I do think there comes a certain time when there needs to be a way to cut through, where just a mere fact of where the constituencies are coming from means you're never going to get agreement.

And how do you manage that? I don't think ICANN has a process or way of actually dealing with genuine dissent and disagreement on a point. And I think they need to tackle that if they want to actually succeed.

KATRINA SATAKI:        Thank you. Peter.

PETER VAN ROSTE:       Thanks, Katrina. Like Debbie, I don't have a magical answer, but I think I do have an answer, it's just an expensive one, and that is I think we should start to consider replacing some of the volunteers by consultants that are hired by a group of ccTLDs. We've had similar situations in CENTR where in the end, external help, in terms of an editor for instance for a paper, is finally moving things forward.

And to keep on relying on volunteers that are getting more and more stretched, the number of additional committees from the

accountability working group Work Stream 2 for instance I think shows that. For dedicated projects, I think we really should start looking into this.

And I would be happy to have a chat with some of the CENTR members and see if they want to contribute to a reasonable fund where we could appoint one of the many consultants that came out of our industry. From the ccNSO group, there's at least five people that know very well, that know our industry, that know our interests, that know ICANN and that are available for this type of work.

But it's not a magical solution, it's just one that requires some additional funding.

KATRINA SATAKI:     Yeah. Thank you. It could be. Yes, Alejandra, please.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:     Thank you, Katrina. I have a comment regarding having new people in the working groups or representing us, because for example, for the IFRT, there was an application from Ignacio Velazquez from dot-PY, and he was the outcome of the onboarding program that finalized recently, and I think he might not have been preferred for the position, maybe because he was new or people didn't know him.

And I wonder how we can make the way for new people to actually be able to get into these positions, because they have to start somewhere. And in my personal opinion, for example when I had to say which

candidates I preferred, I did put him a little bit higher because I wanted to give him the chance, not because I thought that he was the best of them but I knew he could deliver, and against, let's say for example, Frederico Neves that he's excellent.

And I think he's super prepared, but he's been in this community for a while, and I felt maybe we can give Ignacio a chance. So I think there should be a way of allowing ourselves, well, maybe to take small risks, or to make people more known. I don't know. That's my comment.

KATRINA SATAKI:          Yeah. Thank you very much. Yeah, it is an important issue, how we can get new people onboard if we keep supporting the old ones. And it's understandable, because we know that the old ones have experience, they can contribute and everything, but if we keep preferring people we already know and do not take some risks, yes, that could be – Ajay.

AJAY DATA:               I just wish to share my experience around volunteers. When we did this New Brahmi Generation Panel, we had very high difficulty to get linguists, nine languages, nine LGRs, and completely free. And the solution came up with a lot of time that we should have linguists who do this professional work.

So there was always a dilemma that volunteers, we want to work them free, and then we [had consultants to] pay. So this [inaudible] unfair on the volunteer part, and this becomes a trend. So it is not against the volunteers, but it is about the [inaudible] strategy and clearly

announced that volunteers are free to welcome and join and do the task, and no rejection policy.

And that opened the gate of volunteers. Because the volunteers do not participate because they do not know they'll be accepted or not, they will be given a chance or not. So this was the experience which I faced and I thought might be helpful. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Thank you very much. Sorry, we're running out of time and we still haven't answered board question. So I propose that we do it that way. So we start with our questions to the board, because this is the question we actually –

BART BOSWINKEL: [Reversed.]

KATRINA SATAKI: Reversed back to the board. Same question. They asked us the question, we said, "Okay, we want to know what is your answer to your question." And while they answer our questions, we'll have probably some time to think of our answer to theirs. Or we just run out of time and then we say, "Oh, sorry, we wanted to answer your questions so badly, but we just have no time."

Okay, so that's what I propose to do with those questions. Then I'd like also to encourage you to attend cross-community sessions if you're

interested, and then if you hear something worth reporting back to the council, please do so.

Short update on reviews, ATRT, I hope they will start in January. In June, July, I asked Demi – thanks again Demi for volunteering. He's our only volunteer to this ATRT3 group. He's still available, still willing to do the job. The question is, should we have another call? In the hope to get more people to ATRT3. That's the thing, the question that we need to discuss.

Then again, there's going to be another leadership training right before Kobe meeting. Alejandra and I attended leadership training, Stephen attended leadership training. We need to decide – probably we're going to have – actually, we're going to have at least two new councilors. We have Giovanni who's a new councilor, maybe some of the new councilors could participate in that leadership training to learn more about other SO/ACs.

So that's just a thought. This is something that we need.

BART BOSWINKEL:          [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI:          Yeah, one of the new chairs. Yeah, working group chairs. This could be something. Yeah. Then one thing I really wanted to talk about – and may I ask Joke to open the presentation? So that's one of the issues that were raised during our last call. So that's how we evaluate applications.

JOKE BRAEKEN:          Which presentation?


KATRINA SATAKI:        I sent it to Kim.


JOKE BRAEKEN:          Could you send it to me?


KATRINA SATAKI:        I think I sent it to her via Skype.


ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:     So, while we get the presentation for Katrina, I wanted to make you aware of the other document that you have in your papers about the ccNSO community onboarding program. Margarita and I have been working in this document jointly with Jelena Ozegovic, who unfortunately left dot-RS and will not be able to join us anymore in the evolution of this document, but we thought it would be a really good idea to try to continue the efforts that the onboarding program from ICANN community was doing to our internal process.

So do please have a look at it. Any comments you might have, of course, we can discuss them. And we will need to see how to start a committee to make this work. But since we have the percentage now – is it that one? No?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:     [inaudible].

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:     So, back to you.

KATRINA SATAKI:     Okay, so as we do not have much time, I'll try to be really quick with this one. Okay, so how we select candidates.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:     [inaudible].

KATRINA SATAKI:     No, I better do that myself. Can we go back? Yeah. Thanks. Okay, so first, what we usually have – hopefully we usually have a pool of candidates, and we need to [inaudible] set of requirements. So hopefully, we find candidates that meet at least some, preferably all, requirements.

And then we can come up with required number of candidates. So we have a number of seats that we need to fill. Hopefully, again, we have more candidates than we have seats. So we receive applications from N candidates. In this case, what we do, we ask the councilors to review all the applications, review them against the set of criteria requirement that those candidates need to meet, and then we ask the councilors to come up with a list of preferred candidates.

Which means that you're asked to send – to list them in order of your preference or with candidate A being the most qualified one, candidate two less qualified but still very good, and so on. So far, the principle is clear.

And then if for example a councilor realizes that certain candidate do not meet a criteria, they consider them disqualified, and it's okay because not all candidates meet the criteria, meet the requirement. So it's okay that you find some candidates not qualified at all for this position. But in this case, we'd really like to make sure that you understand that you believe that these candidates do not meet criteria, so you say these people do not qualify and [inaudible].

Which means that – okay, let's go a little bit further. When the secretariat starts counting the points, your most preferred candidate or your candidate number one receives N points. So we have N candidates, number one receives N points. Candidate number two, N minus one point. And those candidates that do not qualify, they receive zero points, which means that they do not qualify.

Not that you forgot to include them in the list, but they really do not – you believe that they do not qualify. They receive zero. Okay? if you think they are all qualified but you prefer some to others, then you just list the all, and the last one will receive one point. It's fair enough, right?

So, when secretariat counts the votes, we have a list of winning candidates, and the first M – if you have M seats, they will fill those seats. In this case, we avoid situation that those candidates that do not qualify, they do not come up somewhere on top. As I remember, it was

Hiro who noted something wrong with the way we assigned points. So this is the way now we try to formalize to make sure that everybody understands. We will try to put it into some clarifying document to make sure that this is the way we count points.

Another thing that is really very important, the latest vote on IFRT members received only nine votes. Nine votes from 17 councilors. This is hardly a good thing, to put it mildly. I'm not going to ask each of those who did not vote why didn't you vote, but this is really something that we need to attend to. And please, again, remember that the list of votes, not the actual vote, but the list of those who voted, is published.

And just to make it clearer for you, so this is about the regions. So when you do not vote, your region, those ccTLDs that entrusted you with the job actually are not properly represented. African region and North American region, they got only one third of all possible votes. And EU – I'm glad of course to say that EU region was very active and could influence the outcome of the vote. But it's really not a good thing.

Again, please do vote. Your views are important, especially if you know those people and you're sure that they can do the work and everything. And again, it's really – as Alejandra already said, those new people, they need our support, they need to get promoted, they need to get appointed to working groups. And it doesn't mean that the old ones have to be discouraged or something, but

Yes, so please vote, please express your views clearly. If you do not know the person, read their application. They're really very good. From application, you can understand what this person has done before in

the past, about their qualification and everything. So read, evaluate fairly, not because "This is my buddy and we'll vote – application is horrible but I will support him or her because I know him or her or they're from my region." No, you have to vote for the benefit of the ccNSO.

So, thank you very much. Are there any questions?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:     Thank you, Katrina. I think it's a point taken. I would also suggest that in case there is a doubt about the process [in the sense] how can the ccNSO help the councilor to vote, I think that the secretariat is always available to clarify the procedure, and I would recommend anybody who finds himself or herself a bit unfamiliar with the process to liaise with you or the secretariat or Bart to become more acquainted to the voting process. We all start from somewhere, and that could be a good starting point.

KATRINA SATAKI:     Yes, exactly. And thanks again, Giovanni. As a newcomer, he has pointed out a certain wording that we use in our e-mails that are very well understood by old members, but for newcomers, they might be pretty difficult to decipher. So it's good to hear some feedback, and I see that SOPC members are already here.

Again, thank you very much. We have a meeting on Wednesday. We have two members meeting, we have bilateral meetings. I hope you all

will be active, and if there's anything, just let us know. Thank you very much, and see you around.

BART BOSWINKEL:       Those councilors attending the ALAC meeting or the meeting with ALAC, the meeting is in the ALAC room, so that's 115, I believe. So it's the –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:       [It has a big sing.]

BART BOSWINKEL:       It has a big sing outside. It's next to the – close to the ccNSO meeting room. And the ccNSO meeting room is 114. The SOP members would like to sit at the table, and we invited guests as well.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**