
ICANN72 | Virtual Annual General Meeting – Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and ccNSO Council
Thursday, October 28, 2021 – 09:00 to 10:00 PDT

[Recording in progress]

FRANCO CARRASCO: Hello and welcome to the joint meeting between the ICANN Board and the Country Code Name Supporting Organization. My name is Franco Carrasco, and I am the remote participation manager for this session.

Please note that for this session, it's being recorded and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

Interpretation for this session will include six U.N. languages: Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian, Spanish, and English. Click on the "Interpretation" icon in Zoom and collect the language you will listen to during this session.

For our panelists, please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English. Before speaking, ensure you have selected the language you will speak from the interpretation menu.

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.

Also, please be sure to mute all audible notifications and speak clearly and slowly for our interpreters.

This discussion will be between the ICANN Board and the ccNSO council members only. Therefore, we will not be taking questions from the audience today. However, all participants may make comments in the chat.

Please note that private chats are only possible amongst panelists in the Zoom Webinar. Any message sent by a panelist to a standard attendee to another standard attendee will also be seen by the session host, co-host, and other panelists.

To view the real-time transcription today click on the "Closed Caption" button on the Zoom toolbar.

Having said that, I will now hand the floor over to Maarten Botterman, Chair of the ICANN Board.

Maarten, the floor is yours.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you, Franco, and welcome, Alejandra, welcome ccNSO Council.

We're really looking forward to this interaction with you as this is, for us, an opportunity to truly exchange some thoughts, ask some questions, and have conversations that we otherwise wouldn't have.

So not being able to meet in person means that we still could make the best of it, and I look forward to such informal conversation.

You will find that on the Board side we prepared for your answers, so we will have people to speak to those points particularly, but others may chime in as well because it's really to have a conversation and a growing understanding between us.

So with that, we've asked your ccNSO delegated members to the Board to lead this discussion from our side. And I'd like to give the word first to Nigel.

Nigel, please, take it away.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Yeah. Thank you, Maarten. I think now is probably the right time, don't you think, for me to say a few words about the last three years?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Please, go ahead.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yeah, thank you.

And thanks for giving me this opportunity to say a few words. It's not going to be as long a speech as it might have been. I have taken a little bit of time to try and shorten it down.

As some of you know, I'm taking a step back from involvement in all ICANN matters after what's getting on for 23 years.

I was involved in the original gTLD MOU back in 1997; the international white paper, forum on the white paper in 1998. And in one form or another, in one part or another I've been continuously involved in the development of the multistakeholder model ever since.

I'm taking this step back mostly for personal reasons. The last 18 months have been some health concerns for me, which they fortunately, I'm happy to say, prove not as much of a threat as it could have been. There's also the health of a close family member who I need to spend more time with.

It's also for professional reasons. I've got a new project to work on at home. And also been asked to help the neighbors with something. And both of those projects you should hopefully hear more of in the next 12 months' time.

I want to say a few words about my colleagues to I've served with over the last three years. Well, actually, two words: Thank you.

They say if you think you're the smartest person in the room, you really are in the wrong room. And I think I wasn't in the wrong room. I've learned an awful lot from each and every one of them, all of whom I now count as friends.

Going back as long as Abu Dhabi when I was running for this session, there was one particular community member who suggested that none of the candidates was qualified to serve on the ICANN Board. Well, with the benefit of hindsight, I'm happy to refute that suggestion roundly.

I'm especially privileged to have been involved in the last three years on the Board and in the work on the Board and in the work on the Board committees. Especially pleased that my colleagues on the Board trusted me with the chairmanship of what I think is one of the really important Board committees, the Board Accountability Mechanisms Committee. ICANN's conscience, if

you like, or ICANN's judiciary. You can look at it in both ways. I believe I've honored this trust this last year. And if I have one regret about stepping down, it's not continuing further with that work.

You do see a lot more of how ICANN works as a whole from the position of a board member that you don't from within your individual SOs/ACs. This view, the strategic view, you might say, is quite different from that of the tactical battlefield of our individual silos.

ICANN as an organization supports its board members with generous trainings, amongst other things. And if I would offer Katrina, as my successor, one single piece of advice, make the most of that. It really benefits the Board as a whole as well as the individual. And I wish you success in the new role. And I'm happy to answer any questions that anybody might want to ask right now. Thanks.

Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you for that, and maybe best it's good to give the word to Alejandra first and give it back to you for moderating also the rest

of the session. And if questions come up, they're always welcome. But Alejandra, the floor is yours.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much. This is Alejandra speaking, and I will be speaking Spanish.

Dear Nigel, we are very happy that your health is good, and we regret that your family members have had issues, but what's good is they can count on you to support them. We're also happy for your new project. We hope you will be successful in them. And we thank you for all the work you have done for the ccNSO, and we definitely hope to have you close to us. You will continue to be a member of the ccNSO, so don't go too far.

We would like you to continue participating and engaging with us. Thank you.

NIGEL ROBERTS: So questions, I suppose. Yes?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Please.

NIGEL ROBERTS: All right. Let's see.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Can we put the questions on the screen for the -- to facilitate the session?

NIGEL ROBERTS: Okay. I'm just looking the at the chat. Thank you, Herb. Thanks for the kind words.

If I overlook people who make kind comments in the chat, my apologies. It's -- I'm sitting in a hotel room here on my wi-pass and I'm trying to juggle stuff. If I overlook unkind comments, that's still (indiscernible).

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I haven't seen any.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Should I be seeing anybody with -- should there be a Q&A button or something?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: There is now. The ccNSO discussion topics are on the screen.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Right.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: And I only see good wishes for you in the chat, no real questions.
So a lot of warm wishes.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you.

Well, if that's all right, we'll go on with the main discussion.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Please.

NIGEL ROBERTS: I'm quite happy not to be a topic of discussion.
Okay. So -- hang on. I just said I didn't want to be, and there's my picture.

[Laughter]

Thanks.

So as you'll note from the discussion on the Board agenda, the ccNSO policy PDP on retirement of ccTLDs has completed its long run. I'm privileged to have been part of that as well. I think we were talking the other day and I worked out there was something like 10 or 11 years starting at the delegation through the whole policy, and there's still another one to come.

But this is only the third time, as it said on the board, that we've introduced a policy to the Board. So there's going to be questions from both sides, perhaps from some board members who are perhaps less familiar with the differences of ccNSO and ccNSO policy-making. So I'd like to throw the floor open for questions on the retirement policy.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Alejandra, please.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Maarten. This is just to say that Stephen has prepared a short introduction for the policy. Maybe it would be good if we could have access to that before the questions.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Okay. Stephen? Are you in a position to do that?

WENDY PROFIT: I'm sorry, what is it that you want?

NIGEL ROBERTS: I'm sorry, Alejandra. I was just reading the translation. I was understanding you were inviting Stephen to --

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, that's correct. I just believe he probably did not connect his audio.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thank you, I'll make this -- we already have a session where we presented the -- this to the Board. So this would not be the first time they hear about it. But, undoubtedly, Stephen will do it right.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I'll do it briefly because as you rightly point out, Patricio, it's not the first time around with it. The short and the long of it is -- excuse me for that because I have a fruit fly infestation going on.

The policy in a nutshell is to try to put in place a reasonable, accepted, and reproducible policy in regard to retirement of

ccTLDs if the ISO-3166 people decide that that territory code needs to come out of their table.

And in a nutshell, the policy is a minimum of five years before retirement. If a plan is worked out between the IANA services operator and the ccTLD, that could be extended to as much as ten years.

And that's up to the two of them to get together and formulate a plan that's acceptable to both parties.

And that really is it in a nutshell. It took us a long time to get there, I will tell you that, particularly with regards to the time frames involved, the five and ten-year. But that's where we are.

The ccNSO community -- council approved it. Went to the vote of the ccNSO community. They approved it, despite our supermajority requirements. And now it's up to the Board for its consideration.

Open to any questions from the Board regarding it. But I do hope you consider it in a favorable light. Thank you.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yeah, thanks, Stephen. I'm going to toss it to my Board colleagues for any comments or questions.

But before I do that, I'm going to say that this has received a very favorable reception. We are trying -- and my colleagues, once I've left the Board will as well -- to get this through as expeditiously as possible.

We did -- Patricio and I hoped, both of us being involved in a deep level ourselves in the community, that we might actually be able to approve it at this ICANN meeting, in fact, before I left. But that proved to be a little bit optimistic. There are various additional formalities that the Board needs to go through before approving, so it won't be as quick as that.

Patricio, do you want to say something before we open it up to the other Board members?

PATRICIO POBLETE: There isn't much to say. I happen to be involved as a ccTLD manager in this working group that eventually produced this, so was Nigel. So this is very dear to our hearts. And we hope that it will go on in its course to be covering policy without anything unexpected happening.

I don't know if my colleagues from the Board have any questions about the -- how this would work, how this would be applied once it becomes a policy issue.

Otherwise, I think what the ccTLD community needs to know is what are the next steps in this process, before I would offer the floor to anyone having any questions.

I see Maarten. Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: No. Basically, indeed, I'm with you. I think the policy document that we got was well-appreciated. And our initial discussions were mostly appreciative.

It also helped us to even better understand and practice what is actually the ccNSO's stance in the ICANN ecosystem and how does it function, very much recognizing the autonomy of countries in that ccNSO trying to find collaboration. So that was highly appreciated.

The optimism of being able to immediately take action, of course, doesn't work in our system because we are a multistakeholder system.

But I think, Patricio, you wanted to expand on the next steps, right?

PATRICIO POBLETE: Yes. Thanks, Maarten.

As Nigel said, we hoped this could be done very quickly. But that was because we were not too familiar with the details of the process. And I hope that's forgivable since this is only the third time that we're going through it.

So what comes next? The Board will publish this for public comment. This should take some 40 days, I understand. And then the org will prepare a summary and analysis of the comments received.

On the other hand, while this happens, the Board will notify the GAC so the GAC might advise the Board about any public policy concerns with the proposed public policy.

And then the assessment of the implementation consideration that this may require will be done by the org, and that will come to the Board. And hopefully with these three elements attempt, the Board will make a decision and hopefully pass a resolution approving this as a policy.

I hope I'm not missing anything in the process, but I was recently educated about it.

NIGEL ROBERTS: It's also my understanding. Let's say we're both optimistic.

PATRICIO POBLETE: I see Stephen.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you, Patricio.

So it's my understanding now that this goes, in spite of what color shirt I wear, I look like I'm some sort of bizarre person with this background. My apologies.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: You are in the Matrix.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Evidently so, but ICANN said use it.

My understanding, Patricio, then is that now despite it having gone out for public comment available to the entire community twice, if I recall correctly, now that it's been elevated to the Board

for its consideration, the Board needs to put it out for a public comment yet again, correct? That is correct.

NIGEL ROBERTS: That's it.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: That's a structural issue within the ICANN setup.

PATRICIO POBLETE: It's the process that's defined in the bylaws. It doesn't matter what annex it is. It is a ccNSO policy development process. There might be a reason for that because when we published it for public comment, then we look at the comments. We could have made a lot of changes after that. And then it went to the council and a vote by the membership.

But what's being published now again for public comment, in general, it could be different from what was submitted for public comment before.

Now, in this particular rotation, I think it does not differ at all, or in any significant way. I hope that answers your question.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. I keep my fingers crossed. I hope we don't have this work undone, let's put it that way. Thank you.

PATRICIO POBLETE: I share your hopes.

Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: If I may, I don't think good work will be undone ever. But it's, indeed, as Patricio explained, if you look to the bylaws, we see that once we as the Board receive the report, we're going to inform ourselves. And for that, we ask the GAC. And for that, we ask the community. So this is the process for this.

And for this, according to our way of working, it is a period of at least 40 days, most probably about 40 days for this one after which we can take action.

But this is by no means an exception because we worry. It's just the rule because this is who we are, a multistakeholder system. Yes, it takes some extra time. But it adds to the value that the community does get a final say in advising the Board on this. So I hope that helps.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: I'm not unhappy with it. I'm just -- in the ccNSO, we don't do this stuff often, as you know. This is, what, number three? Unlike the GNSO.

So, no, I'm not unhappy with it. I'm just trying to understand it because that kind of threw me for a bit of a loop, and I think it did other people as well. But if that's what the bylaws say we need to do, that's what we're going to do. There's no doubt about it.

There's no question there at all.

So thank you, Maarten.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thanks, Steve.

And I see Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. As Stephen said, we are new to this process. Yes, I would like to ask whether you expect the ccNSO to do anything else regarding the next steps, whether the working group should do something, the council should do something, or the members of the ccNSO should do something.

PATRICIO POBLETE: I don't think so.

NIGEL ROBERTS: No.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Does anyone have a different idea?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: No, no, no. There's no need for specific action on your side. You handed it to us. So you handed over the bowl. Now we ask the GAC and the community what they think of the bowl. And we have got somebody who knows even much more of the process, Avri. Please. And you don't have to use the bowl method if you prefer another one.

AVRI DORIA: I raised my hand before but then took it down because Patricio had answered the question.

In this case, no, I don't believe there's anything for you to do unless there are comments that force the Board to come and ask you a question. And so if there are any issues, then, yes. But it's

really you're in response now and waiting mode. Sorry about that. But yeah.

And as I said in the chat, it really is a leveler. Since PDPs are a bottom-up process that come out of all the SOs, it is a way to make sure that at the end not only what Patricio said about it could have changed but, at the end, all policies have gotten an equal, you know, GAC public policy review and community review. Thanks.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Good. Does anybody have any hands up? You sure there's nobody else wants to say something?

Are we done on retirement? Going once? Going twice?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I think that's correct.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you.

So the next -- we just scroll up a little bit. I'm on an iPad so I'm struggling slightly. If you can scroll this up a little bit. Maybe I can move the hand list out of the way briefly and I can see what's going on.

Yeah, okay. So the next thing is the requested change to Article 10 and Annex B to take account of IDN ccTLDs as ccNSO members. And the discussion point is: What are the next steps of this particular process? Who would like to say something about this?

PATRICIO POBLETE: I think Avri might can explain this process.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah, thanks. This is Avri again. Apologies, I forgot to say it was Avri last time. Now I said it twice.

So in this case, it is part of a motion that the Board will be looking at today to basically initiate what's called a -- you know, the bylaws change process. And that bylaws process starts again with a community review. This has already been, you know, worked

through with legal. And I know you guys went through a whole long process on this.

So now it basically goes for a review of the community, again checking comments.

Again, you know, GAC will have the opportunity to bring in any public-policy issues that may arise with their review of it. Then it comes back to the Board.

Now, the Board has not yet discussed the details of this yet. We'll do that post the comment.

So basically our motion is to initiate the process, but it's not evaluating it in any sense. That will come after the comments.

We make our decision, and then our decision, especially assuming that it's positive, then goes to the empowered community as it is a Bylaws change.

I don't believe it's fundamental, so it just goes for review, not approval. But if I'm wrong about that, perhaps someone from the org side will correct me. But I don't believe it's in the fundamental category, so it's just review and comment, and not to actually vote on it in the EC.

Thanks.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yeah, Avri, I can't believe you would be wrong on anything like this, so I'm not expecting anybody to jump up and say that. But I'm inviting questions and comments on that.

I'm seeing nothing. It's totally clear?

Okay. Do we have anything else to discuss?

Because that seems to have --

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Nigel, if I may speak up on that quickly. It's not a fundamental bylaw --

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yes, Stephen. Carry on.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: It's not a fundamental bylaw change.

NIGEL ROBERTS: So that means we don't have to have quite the same level of -- what's the word? Scrutiny as we would have if it were fundamental; is that correct?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes. You don't need to run it through a formal approval process with the community as if it were a fundamental bylaw change. So it's simpler from the Board perspective.

Thank you.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Okay. That's good. We're about halfway through the hour. With your post-transition, Patricio, I'm going to toss the baton to you, and you can talk about or corral the cattle on the question of geopolitics. Is that okay?

PATRICIO POBLETE: Yes, although I can't find the question on geopolitics. Perhaps if it's displayed?

NIGEL ROBERTS: Oh, no, there's my picture again. We don't need that.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Here it is. Okay.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Over to you.

PATRICIO POBLETE: The Board has a question that it has been discussing with several constituencies in a similar way.

So the question is, please provide input or comments on how you think we could efficiently identify and work more closely with governments globally, as well as educate, train, and interact when it comes to geopolitical issues relating to ICANN's mission.

Well, I think this is one of the most appropriate communities to talk about this, because in our respective roles in each of our countries or territories, we have to work with governments all the time. So I think the Board is really interested in hearing what you think, what -- how ICANN can work better with governments on addressing various geopolitical issues, including legislation being considered in different countries that could affect the way ICANN works or the way the unique identifiers that we are tasked to look after might be affected by those proposed legislations.

So I think we are all ears now. See what -- I don't know if any of my colleagues wants to expand any more on the question. What kind of issues are we considering most importantly now?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I think for all clarity that it is really clear that governments do act more in this space. And it's important that when they do, they are well informed, well aware. And we are trying to help to make sure that the awareness of what we do and how it would impact what we do, if there's any considerations, how they can take that into account.

So -- And that's why we go around to the community and ask the community, like how can you help? And in particular with the ccNSO, of course, you have a very wide network, and many of you are close to local legislation makers and are early aware of things happening. So both that and both helping to understand what the impact may be, I can see ccNSO can have a great role.

What Göran has said in other sessions is one suggestion would be to at least make sure that, going forward, we would have a meeting on that every ICANN meeting to come to bring this in. But other than, what are your thoughts on that? How can you help ICANN to fulfill its mission, also by addressing this part of the environment?

So I think, Alejandra, if you would be willing to lead it, that would be great.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Maarten, Patricio, and everyone. To be honest, we had some issues in trying to find a response, an answer to that question. Even though it is true that ccTLDs have very close relationships with their governments, we have taken this question as more directed to the ccNSO and the field where ccNSO can issue an opinion does not necessarily include this part. But we can say that we can give our personal opinions and individual opinions, because we have not asked the ccTLD community on a joint answer; that we definitely will be glad to have a look at it more from a personal point of view.

Something that really surprised us is perhaps knowing what is then the role that the GAC has in this question. I was actually surprised that it was not mentioned there. Maybe if you could clarify that first.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Before we start getting answers from the ccTLD community, I think can anyone on the Board answer Alejandra? Why not talk about the GAC in this question?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Well, for sure we also asked the GAC to look into this, and in that interaction, to also play a role in early raiser, recognizing the people in the GAC are not necessarily the legislators, but at least they are also in those countries, in those administrations, and they are in ICANN to advise us. So it's good if that advice includes visions in their own country and developments in their own country also that may impact us. So for sure we invited that, and we invited their insights. And this is basically a similar invitation. And maybe you may have ideas of how to organize it.

A specific one is clear, for instance, GDPR, that all ccTLDs within the EU deal with it. No other choice. And -- and sometimes -- So that's just one of the examples where you can see how direct interest can connect to the bigger interest of ICANN as a whole to help make things happen in an appropriate way, in a way that it could work.

I hope that helps.

And anybody, please jump in if...

But I hope that helps for now.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Thanks, Maarten. I think it's important to understand the nature of this question. We're not asking for an official opinion from the ccNSO or from any other constituency. What we are trying to ask the community -- in particular, the ccTLD community -- to help us as a Board, to get, for instance, early warnings about things that may be happening or about to happen or suggest to us how to better deal with the challenges that might come along the road.

So that's why the -- we listen to the GAC here, but we want to listen to everybody also. And even if the GAC delegate, say from my country, is telling something, I as ccTLD might be telling the Board something completely different because I'm looking at it from a different point of view, right? So that's evident.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you for your clarification. I understand what you say, Patricio.

We, the ccNSO, are a platform to share information and we have had some sessions that are related to the issue that we are discussing right now. This includes the Internet Governance Liaison Committee at the ccNSO. Precisely at this ICANN meeting, in the previous weeks they had a news session, an update session, where they analyzed some interesting issues at the regional level.

And I would like to ask Pierre, who is the one chairing this committee, to provide us with his perspective. I am sure it is going to give you a good starting point. Pierre, please go ahead.

PIERRE BONIS:

I hope you can hear me well. Let me speak French. This is Pierre Bonis.

I would like to talk about the great work done by our interpreters. I've understood everything. This is quite rare. So this is great. I thank the interpreters very much. And thank you for giving me the floor.

Last October, on the 7th, we did organize with the ccNSO a session, ccTLD session, and we talked about the regional approach -- approaches of Internet governance, what were the hot topics regarding at the regional level. It was a very rich and interesting session, I believe. We had some very positive feedback. And I think that illustrates something that can be of interest to ICANN and that shows the strength, as well, of our ccTLD model. This regional approach was a country approach as well. And we talked a lot about abuse, like we talk about DNS abuse at ICANN yesterday, for instance. And we realize that Oscar Robles made a remark for Latin America, and maybe this is tyke a competition at the legal level with those new laws against DNS

abuse, and this is a competition with the different stakeholders, who's the most virtuous. And we heard it several times. We have to look into the perception of abuse, Internet abuse, or we have laws here to take care of a problem, well, they differ from one country to the other. So we have to avoid absolutely, I would say, a dissenting approach, hierarchical approach, and we have to look at all the experiences we do have in different countries. ccTLDs can do a lot of work there. It's a little bit different for the gTLDs.

And lastly, and I will stop here, you can find online more information about this session. We said again and repeated that one solution, one unique solution to the Internet governance is not going to work. It's going to fail.

I'm going to conclude on that, because this is a real challenge that we do have. It's very difficult for the ICANN to find only one solution, one unique solution. We're so diverse. We have so many different parts. But ICANN is considered by legal authorities that they can have a universal, unique solution, because the DNS is universal, it's global. And I think that with this dialogue between CCs and ICANN and the ICANN Board, we can find something very useful that will enable us at the national level to work together, and really work together, with an ICANN that will support some CCs, some ccTLDs, and that will know a lot about the different

laws that are asking ICANN to take some very strong decisions at the global level. So there is a relationship between all of us.

Thank you.

GÖRAN MARBY:

Sorry. May make a comment on Pierre? Is that okay? Even if I can't do it in either French or Spanish.

Je ne parle très bien Français. I should because I actually studied four years in school.

Thank you very much for what you said, Pierre. But I think one of the things that I have had trouble speaking to legislatures sometimes is to explain the difference between -- or the partnership between country code operators and other top-level domain operators and the role of ICANN as an institution. And I have a strong feeling there that you have done the same many, many times.

I remember in the early days of the WHOIS discussion in GDPR, I met with data protection authorities, and I tried to explain to them sort of the difference between the WHOIS for a country code operator which is physically in a country and the top-level

domains that is under sort of under the ICANN policy-making process.

To their credit, I do understand the problems with it. We throw around acronyms all the time, including the word "country code operator" which makes them all look like, What? We develop this language that is internal for us.

But you are right with one thing, which is the legislations hits us anywhere. I mean, GDPR, privacy, or any type of legislation has an impact on all of us. The interpretation and the outcome might be different because of your legal status, but they're all the same. And we have talked, and with Katrina as well, to find this format how to better have a conversation with country code operators about legislative proposals because I think that we have so much in common, we have so much to learn. We always ask for help, too.

So I think one of these -- so when I talked about having a better conversation with the ICANN community about legislative proposals around the world, for me, the partnership with the country code operators is essential. We know in the end we serve the same master, the Internet users of the world, regardless of the acronyms.

Also know that in part of the conversations right now about the management of the identifiers that we've been talking about over the last couple of days, that there are threats to the system and in the U.N. settings and in the ITU settings, there are countries who wants to set up common sort of regulations about not only the ICANN world but also the country code operators world and how they're managed and also with the RIRs and the root server systems.

I think that we all believe in the multistakeholder model that we all have. I mean, ICANN is one multistakeholder model. I know that your represented country code operators also have your own models for doing that. I happen to believe that we have served the world well doing such.

So I think we -- and, you know, the relationship between the country code operators and ICANN has improved vastly over the last years. I'm really grateful for that. And it's very much all to your predecessor, Alejandra, which we now have the pleasure of having on the Board.

But I also think that this partnership is important for all of us. So I take what you said as an out-reached hand to improve even more, and I see the signs for that.

But I want to emphasize -- and also thanking country code operators participating in TSG, the technical study group, UNDER Merike who is now leaving us -- but I'm not bitter, just a little maybe. Jim is coming in as a good -- he has some big shoes to fill. I know will do it. But I will still miss Merike and the work with the Technical Study Group. But you have representatives.

It shows that we should never forget that we are partners in an ecosystem. We're all bound by the hip by the functions of IANA, but we are partners in this. And I think we can improve that.

Thank you. Sorry for being late, by the way. I was giving a Latin American speech or panel that was interesting as well. And we were talking about how to improve connectivity and utilization in Latin America. And I happen to believe that was important for me.

Sorry for also -- you pushed upon all the right buttons for me, as you can probably hear. I'm fairly passionate about this. I'm going to try to be silent now.

PATRICIO POBLETE: Alejandra, her hand is up.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Patricio. And thank you, Goran. I would like to take this opportunity to share with you some thoughts that came about when we discussed this with council people.

I would like to take this into account when you talk to the governments, policymakers, to the people you are about to engage with. It's important to make a clear distinction on how the ccTLDs and gTLDs are not under the same rules. They are different groups, and that ICANN has a limited remit regarding ccTLDs. Though we have a good relationship with them, we want governments not to be confused. They shouldn't think that ICANN is going to tell the ccTLDs how to operate. So we need this to be stated very clearly.

There is also a suggestion, which is being talked about in the Internet Governance Forum. We want to have a sort of analysis to know what is going on all over the world, to know what is happening at the RIRs, and to see what is needed locally, what has to be addressed locally. So with this map, we will be able to know what is going on everywhere. And it will be easier to follow up on all the actions and initiatives that are carried out worldwide. And, finally, there is a recommendation regarding the use of the language. We must be careful because governments may not want to be educated or trained. So this is just a word of caution.

I don't know if any of my colleagues in the council would like to add something. Go ahead, raise your hand. This is a time to speak up.

GÖRAN MARBY:

Can I make just a short, two fingers, especially on the last one.

We all followed that interesting discussion. As you heard, there were several governments that didn't oppose at all for us to use the word "educate" or "capacity-building" or anything.

We often get invited as ICANN to talk about the -- how the technical identifiers work and the way to reach information. And we often -- as you pointed out, the importance of saying we are colleagues in the ecosystem. ICANN doesn't have a policy role when it comes to how these country code operators operates.

That reminded me, when I joined, I very much had the same discussions with the numbers community on how we can work together without giving the impression that ICANN is trying to -- or myself, as the CEO, is trying press the boundaries of what we're responsible for.

By the way, I had the same discussion when Tripti was heading up the root server operations group. How do we define this?

In the end I asked -- when it comes to the implementation of IP version 6, we all have a common goal. So in the end, I actually got speaking notes from the RIRs that they agreed upon how ICANN can promote the IP version 6 without stepping on sort of toes -- that's the wrong word -- without going out of the boundaries that ICANN -- to stay in our remit.

And maybe that is something because I -- we all want to help each other. I have been actually following those speaking notes every time I talk about IP version 6 in any setting which I often do. I do give a reference to go and speak to the regional RIR. So it's always been a part of how we do things.

I would be very happy to have the same sort of speaking notes from the ccNSO, if you are interested in, because, as you know, if you are doing marking, on page 65, I seem to think it is, you have in the CEO -- my report to the Board which we make public, you will see all our interactions with governments and the IGOs around the world.

As you can see, we do meet a lot of them. Many of them is because they actually contact us.

I'm very happy to give a message from the country code operators. And I will promise you, and I think I have proven that with the RIRs, that I will stay with that message.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Goran. I believe that ccTLDs would be really great for -- if before any interaction or engagement with their governments, if you could contact them first. I believe this would be the ideal scenario so that there are no misunderstandings. This is great idea to talk to the ccTLDs first.

PATRICIO POBLETE: With my ccTLD hat on, I fully agree with Alejandra. It's very necessary.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: If anybody is talking, I don't hear it right now.

Were you still talking, Patricio?

PATRICIO POBLETE: No. We're almost at the end of the hour. So last call for anybody else to speak about these geopolitical issues.

And from the chat, I read that Peter van Roste wrote that how ccNSO members have helped ICANN, centers, monthly policy updates, give a good overview of the current and future regulatory environments on the European regional level.

Last call.

Seeing no hands, I give it back to Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Or to Alejandra, first of all. Alejandra --

PATRICIO POBLETE: Maarten and Alejandra.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you very much for this. And just -- I hear you about getting the message from ccNSO to our contacts. Basically, the good news is that this Board is immersed with ccNSO deep knowledge with many of the Board members that are there, not only those sent by you. And with Nigel leaving, we have a very long track record. We have Katrina back who has a very deep track record as well but also others like even Becky. And Akinori is even involved in some way in the ccNSO because we do understand the

autonomy, and we do understand also the importance of the ecosystem.

And if I may illustrate that very shortly, the Caribbean ministers had a meeting two weeks ago and they invited me to speak with them. And we talked about the ecosystem. There were some concerns about so how does this work, how do we know that we can trust this ecosystem. And basically the CCs are also functioning as a kind of stake for any country in this ecosystem because if you do well within your country, then the rest of the ecosystem has to do at least as well to become relevant for the users of the Internet in that country.

So with that, recognizing very much the important function of ccNSO and thanking you for the present-day constructive interaction.

And congratulating you again for your policy submitted to the Board. Last word is for you, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you, Maarten, for your kind words. I must confess this is the first session with the ICANN Board. It has been quite a nice conversation we have had. I believe we have good take-home messages. We will meet again soon.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you very much. And thank you, everybody. And see you later today. Meeting is adjourned. Bye, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]